This electronic thesis or dissertation has been downloaded from the King's Research Portal at https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/



Mechanisms of remission in type 2 diabetes mellitus using Roux-en-Y gastric bypass

Carswell, Kirstin

Awarding institution: King's College London

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without proper acknowledgement.

END USER LICENCE AGREEMENT



Unless another licence is stated on the immediately following page this work is licensed

under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

licence. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the work

Under the following conditions:

- Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- Non Commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- No Derivative Works You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you receive permission from the author. Your fair dealings and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact <u>librarypure@kcl.ac.uk</u> providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Mechanisms of remission in type 2 diabetes mellitus using Roux-en-Y gastric bypass

Kirstin A Carswell MB ChB FRCS (Gen Surg) Student ID no: 0930990

PhD Thesis December, 2017

Supervisors:

1. Prof. Stephanie Amiel BSc MD FRCP

RD Lawrence Professor of Diabetic Medicine, King's College London School of Medicine

2. Mr. Ameet Patel MS FRCS (Edin) FRCS (Eng),

Consultant General Surgeon and Honorary Senior Lecturer, King's College Hospital, London

Division of Diabetes and Nutritional Sciences Research University of London, King's College London School of Medicine London, UK

Abstract

Introduction

Defects in fat processing, in particular non-esterified fatty acids (NEFA), may hold the link between obesity, hyperlipidaemia, insulin resistance (IR) and type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). The secretion of insulin, more effective at inhibiting lipolysis than glucose production, is inhibited by high NEFA levels. I hypothesised that postprandial hormone alterations following Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) improve adipocyte insulin sensitivity through the peripheral effects of incretins.

Methods

Participants with T2DM (n=9) and without T2DM [NDM] (n=10) underwent RYGB for morbid obesity. Fasting and postprandial blood was analysed for glycaemic, lipidaemic and gut hormones changes around surgery. Intra-operatively, adipose tissue biopsies were taken and lipolysis assessed during a 2hr incubation with pre- and post-RYGB plasma and relevant hormonal concentrations.

Results

By post-operative day 4, there were improvements in IR (p<0.0001) and reduced fasting insulin levels (p=0.0017) despite no reduction in postprandial insulin (p=0.6714). Fasting NEFA levels were reduced in NDM (p<0.05) but not in the T2DM group (p=0.0816), whilst postprandial NEFA (Δ AUC [360min]) reduced in the T2DM group (p<0.0001) but not in the NDM group (p=0.4111), ANOVA p<0.05.

Significant changes in gut hormone levels around RYGB were noted, in fasting: reduced GIP (p=0.0079), PYY (p=0.0066) and ghrelin levels (p=0.0005); post-prandial: increased GLP-1 (p=0.0018) and PYY levels (p<0.0001); reduced GIP (p=0.0318) and ghrelin levels (p=0.0004).

Incubation of adipocytes in both fasting and postprandial plasma post-RYGB resulted in increased lipolysis versus pre-RYGB plasma (peripheral p=0.0235

and p=0.0205, respectively [n=8]). Insulin and PYY inhibited lipolysis but no effect of GLP-1, GIP and ghrelin on lipolysis was detected.

Conclusions

Although likely that postprandial hormonal alterations improve adipocyte lipolysis through their peripheral effects, it is most likely the global reduction in insulin levels, thereby reducing the anti-lipolytic effect, combined with overall improvements in IR, responsible for these findings and not the peripheral effects of incretins.

Word count: 300

Declaration of contributors

The majority of the work described in this thesis was performed by the author. All collaboration and assistance are described below.

Analysis of plasma for glucose, insulin, gut hormones and lipid profiles was undertaken with the assistance of Tracy Dew and her team in the Department of Biochemistry, King's College Hospital.

The adipocyte experimental techniques including: isolation, incubation, Doles triglyceride extraction and the glycerol assay have been adapted from established techniques learnt from Dr Susan Fried at the Adipocyte Core, Boston Obesity and Nutrition Research Centre, Boston, MA during a two-week training visit 2009.

The adipocyte isolation, incubation and glycerol assay techniques have been optimised with the assistance of Dr Ragai Mitry, Institute of Liver Studies, King's College Hospital.

Acknowledgements

I must thank both my supervisors for their continued advice and support, without which this project would not have been possible.

I am most grateful for the advice and laboratory support I have received throughout the years from Dr Ragai Mitry, Tracy Dew and Professor Carel le Roux, whilst at King's College Hospital, London.

This work was funded by the Ritchie Trust Research Fellowship 2009 from the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons Glasgow.

Contents	Page
Abstract	2
Declaration of contributors	4
Acknowledgements	4
Contents	5
Index of figures	13
Index of tables	19
Index of supplementary material (unbound)	19
Abbreviations	20

Chapters

1.	Introduction		22
	1.1. Development of the Rou	ix-en-Y Gastric Bypass (RYGB)	23
	1.1.1. Effects of RYGB u	ipon type 2 diabetes mellitus	23
	1.1.2. Effects of RYGB u	ipon insulin resistance	27
	1.1.3. Proposed mechar	isms through which this occurs	27
	1.1.3.1. Weight loss	3	27
	1.1.3.2. Restriction	of food intake	28
	1.1.3.3. Re-routing	of the GI tract	31
	1.1.3.4. Alteration in	n dietary fat processing	33
	1.1.3.5. Alteration in	n gut transit time	35
	1.1.3.6. Gut hormor	ne secretion	38
	1.1.3.6.1. Incre	etins	38
	1.1.3.6.1.1.	Gastric inhibitory peptide	39
	1.1.3.6.1.2.	Glucagon-like peptide-1	40
	1.1.3.6.2. Pep	tide tyrosine tyrosine	41
	1.1.3.6.3. Ghre	elin	43
	1.1.3.6.4. Cho	lecystokinin	44
	1.2. Adipocyte		46
	1.2.1. Structure		46
	1.2.1.1. Regional va	ariations	46
	1.2.2. Receptor express	ion	48
	1.2.3. Function		48

	1.3. Lipolysis		49
	1.3.1. Princ	ples of lipolysis	49
	1.3.2. Effec	t of weight loss upon lipolysis	49
	1.3.3. Regio	onal variations in lipolysis	50
	1.3.4. Horm	onal effects upon lipolysis	53
	1.3.4.1.	Insulin	53
	1.3.4.2.	GIP	53
	1.3.4.3.	GLP-1	54
	1.3.4.4.	PYY	55
	1.3.4.5.	Ghrelin	55
	1.4. Hypothesis		57
2	Materials and m	pethods	58
۷.	2 1 Summary o	f the study protocol	58
	2.2. Clinical par		59
	221 Recru	uitment and enrolment	59
	2.2.2. Inclus	sion and exclusion criteria	61
	2.2.3. Quan	tification of T2DM and IR	62
	2.2.3.1.	Fasting plasma glucose and insulin levels	63
	2.2.3.2.	HOMA-IR	63
	2.2.3.3.	Oral glucose tolerance test	64
	2.2.4. Partic	sipants	65
	2.2.4.1.	Participant characteristics	67
	2.2.4.2.	RYGB procedure	67
	2.2.4.3.	Controlling for weight loss	68
	2.2.4.4.	Controlling for post-operative inflammatory	68
		response	
	2.2.4.5.	Relevant medical history	71
	2.2.4	5.1. Duration of T2DM	71
	2.2.4.6.	Drug history	71
	2.2.4.7.	Length of post-operative stay	71
	2.2.4.8.	Morbidity and mortality	72
	2.2.5. Quan	tification of post-prandial gut hormone and	75

metabolite response

2.2.5.1.	Mixed meal to	est	75
2.2.5.2.	Study bottle p	preparation	76
2.2.5.3.	Choice of mix	ked meal	76
2.2.5.4.	Principles and	d description of assays used	78
2.3. Adipose tissu	ue and adipod	cytes	79
2.3.1. AT bio	psies		79
2.3.1.1.	Extraction teo	chnique	79
2.3.1.2.	Preparation c	of AT for isolation	79
2.3.2. Adipos	e tissue rece	ptor gene expression analysis	79
2.3.2.1.	Isolation of to	tal RNA	80
2.3.2.1	.1. Reage	ents	80
2.3.2.1	.2. Cell ly	sis	80
2.3.2.1	.3. Phase	separation	80
2.3.2.1	.4. RNA p	recipitation	80
2.3.2.1	.5. RNA v	vash	81
2.3.2.1	.6. Dissol	ving the RNA	81
2.3.2.2.	Reverse trans	scription reaction	81
2.3.2.3.	Qualitative re	al-time PCR	82
2.3.3. Adipoc	yte isolation		83
2.3.3.1.	Adipocyte iso	lation technique	83
2.3.3.2.	Quantificatior	n of fat cell diameter	83
2.3.3.3.	Quantificatior	n of total triglyceride content	84
2.3.3.4.	Calculation o	f adipocyte cell number	85
2.3.4. Adipoc	yte incubation	n	87
2.3.4.1.	Adipocyte inc	cubation technique	87
2.3.4.2.	Lipolytic expe	erimental conditions	88
2.3.4.2	.1. Basal		88
2.3	.4.2.1.1.	Adenosine deaminase (ADA)	88
2.3	.4.2.1.2.	N ⁶ -[R-(-)-1-methyl-2-phen-ethyl]	88
		adenosine (PIA)	
2.3.4.3.	Stimulated		88
2.3.4.3	.1. Isopro	terenol (ISO)	88
2.3.4.3	.2. 8-Bron	no-cAMP	89

	2.3.4.4. Inhibited		89
	2.3.4.4.1. Ins	ulin	89
	2.3.4.5. Gut horm	ones	91
	2.3.4.5.1. Inc	retins +/- insulin	91
	2.3.5. Infranatant analy	rsis	93
	2.3.5.1. Glycerol a	issay	93
	2.3.5.1.1. Pri	nciples of the glycerol assay	93
	2.3.5.1.2. BS	A precipitation	94
	2.3.5.1.3. Gly	cerol assay technique	94
	2.3.5.1.4. Gly	cerol assay data analysis	96
	2.4. Statistical calculations		99
	2.4.1. Sample size cald	culations	99
	2.4.2. Statistical analys	is	100
	2.4.2.1. Participar	t outcomes	100
	2.4.2.2. Plasma o	utcomes	101
	2.4.2.2.1. Ch	anges in plasma hormones and	101
	me	tabolites around RYGB surgery	
	2.4.2.2.1.1.	Fasting	101
	2.4.2.2.1.2.	Post-prandial	101
	2.4.2.2.2. Ca	lculation of the effect of RYGB	102
	up	on the hormonal and metabolite	
	res	ponses	
	2.4.2.3. Adipocyte	outcomes	102
	2.4.2.3.1. Ad	pocyte cell diameter	102
	2.4.2.3.2. Lip	olysis and anti-lipolysis rates	102
	2.5. Study management		103
	2.5.1. Study duration		103
	2.5.2. Study involveme	nt	103
3.	The early effects of gastric	bypass surgery on glycaemic	104
	control and insulin resistan	се	

 3.1. Introduction
 104

 3.2. Methods
 106

	3.2.1. Clinical methods			
	3.2.2. Assays			
	3.2.3. Statistical analysis			
	3.3. Results		108	
	3.3.1. The e	arly effects of the RYGB surgery upon	108	
	fasting	g plasma glucose and serum insulin levels		
	3.3.1.1.	Glucose	108	
	3.3.1.2.	Insulin	108	
	3.3.1.3.	HOMA-IR (1)	108	
	3.3.2. The e	arly effects of RYGB surgery upon	115	
	post-p	prandial plasma glucose and serum insulin		
	levels	S		
	3.3.2.1.	Glucose	115	
	3.3.2.2.	Insulin	115	
	3.4. Discussion		123	
	3.5. Conclusion		133	
4.	The effects of R	YGB surgery upon gut hormones	134	
	4.1. Introduction 1			
	4.2. Methods 1			
	4.2.1. Clinical methods			
	4.2.2. Assays			
	4.2.3. Statis	tical analysis	135	
	4.3. Results		137	
	4.3.1. The e	arly effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting	137	
	plasm	a gut hormone levels		
	4.3.1.1.	GLP-1	137	
	4.3.1.2.	GIP	137	
	4.3.1.3.	PYY	141	
	4.3.1.4.	Ghrelin	141	
	4.3.1.5.	ССК	141	
	4.3.2. The e	arly effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial	145	
	plasm	a gut hormone levels		
	4.3.2.1.	GLP-1	145	

	4.3.2.2.	GIP	148
	4.3.2.3.	PYY	151
	4.3.2.4.	Ghrelin	154
	4.3.2.5.	ССК	157
	4.4. Discussion		160
	4.5. Conclusion		165
5.	The effects of R	YGB surgery upon plasma lipids	166
	5.1. Introduction		166
	5.2. Methods		167
	5.2.1. Prosp	ective study into the effects of RYGB upon	167
	fastin	g plasma lipids in the first post-operative week	
	5.2.2. Syste	matic review and meta-analysis of the effects	168
	of RY	GB upon plasma lipids	
	5.2.2.1.	Search strategy	168
	5.2.2.2.	Literature screening	168
	5.2.2.3.	Data extraction and analysis	168
	5.2.2.4.	Definitions	169
	5.2.2.5.	Statistical analysis	169
	5.3. Results		170
	5.3.1. Early	effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting lipids	170
	5.3.1.1.	Total cholesterol	170
	5.3.1.2.	LDL-cholesterol	170
	5.3.1.3.	HDL- cholesterol	170
	5.3.1.4.	Triglycerides	171
	5.3.1.5.	NEFA	171
	5.3.1.	5.1. Fasting	171
	5.3.1.	5.2. Post-prandial	173
	5.3.2. Syste	matic review and meta-analysis of the effect of	183
	RYGE	3 surgery upon lipid profiles	
	5.3.2.1.	Data retrieval	183
	5.3.2.2.	Description of studies identified	183
	5.3.2.3.	Patient characteristics	183
	5.3.2.4.	The longer-term effects of RYGB surgery upon	186

	5.3.2	.4.1.	Total cholesterol	186
	5.3.2	.4.2.	LDL-cholesterol	186
	5.3.2	.4.3.	HDL- Cholesterol	186
	5.3.2	.4.4.	Triglycerides	194
	5.3.2	.4.5.	NEFA	194
	5.4. Discussion			199
	5.4.1. Exog	enous		200
	5.4.1.1.	Food	intake	200
	5.4.1.2.	Gut r	ealignment	200
	5.4.1.3.	Bile a	acids	201
	5.4.1.4.	Gut r	nicroflora	201
	5.4.1.5.	Dieta	ry lipid absorption and re-absorption	201
	5.4.2. Endo	genou	S	202
	5.4.3. Limita	ations		203
	5.5. Conclusion			205
6.	The lipolytic effe	ects of	plasma and gut hormone changes	206
	around RYGB s	surgery	,	
	6.1. Introduction	۱		206
	6.2. Methods			208
	6.2.1. Huma	an adip	ose tissue handling	208
	6.2.2. Gene	expre	ssion	208
	6.2.3. Lipol	ysis an	d anti-lipolysis experiments	208
	6.2.4. Assa	ys		209
	6.2.5. Statis	stical a	nalysis	209
	6.3. Results			210
	6.3.1. Gene	expre	ssion of gut hormone and fatty acid	210
	recep	otors in	human adipose tissue from visceral	
	and p	periphe	ral depots	
	6.3.2. Lipol	ytic and	d anti-lipolytic effects of plasma and gut	210
	horm	ones ir	human adipocytes from visceral and	
	perip	heral d	epots	
	6.3.2.1.	Plasr	na	211

	6.3	3.2.2. Gut	hormones	215
		6.3.2.2.1.	Insulin	215
		6.3.2.2.2.	GLP-1	215
		6.3.2.2.3.	GIP	215
		6.3.2.2.4.	PYY	215
		6.3.2.2.5.	Ghrelin	215
		6.3.2.2.6.	Combined of insulin and incretins	216
	6.4. Discu	ussion		224
	6.4.1.	Relevant ge	ene expression	225
	6.4.2.	The effect of	of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis	225
	6.4.3.	The effect of	of gut hormones upon lipolysis	227
	6.4.4.	Strengths a	nd limitations	229
	6.5. Conc	lusion		232
7.	Conclusio	ons		233
8.	Future wo	ork		234
9.	Referenc	es		235
10	. Appendic	es:		299
	Appendi	x 1 – Nutritio	nal information for Belgium Chocolate	300
	Haagen-	Dazs ice-cre	am	
	Appendi	x 2 – King's	College Hospital relevant biochemical	301
	Assay pr	rotocols		
	Appendi	x 3 – Funnel	plots of the meta-analysis of the effects	319
	of RYGB	B surgery upo	on plasma lipids	

11. Papers, presentations and awards 324

Index of figures

Diagrammatic representation of RYGB procedure ¹⁷
Fasting plasma glucose levels after RYGB ¹¹
Mean capillary glucose levels after Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting ²⁴
Time course of HOMA-IR after RYGB ¹¹
Digestion, absorption and transport of long-chain
triglycerides and medium-chain triglycerides98
Principles of lipolysis
Hormonal regulation of lipolysis in adipocytes ³¹⁴
Mechanisms of insulin-stimulated glucose uptake in adipocytes ³¹⁴
Effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study summary
Effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study attrition
Scatter plot of the effects of RYGB surgery upon weight
between pre-operative and post-operative day 4 in
participants with and without T2DM
Diagram of the glycerol assay reaction
Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon
fasting plasma glucose in participants with and without T2DM
Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon
fasting serum insulin in participants with and without T2DM
Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon
HOMA-IR(1) in participants with and without T2DM
Box plot of delta HOMA-IR(1) pre- and post-operative
day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM

- Figure 3.3.2.1i Graph of the post-prandial plasma glucose levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and postoperative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 3.3.2.1ii Box plot of iAUC post-prandial plasma glucose levels after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 3.3.2.1iii Box plot of time for plasma glucose levels to return to baseline following mixed meal test, pre- and postoperative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 3.3.2.2i Graph of post-prandial serum insulin levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 3.3.2.2ii Box plot of delta 0-15min post-prandial serum insulin levels after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 3.3.2.2.iii Scatter plot of iAUC post-prandial serum insulin levels after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative 4 around RYGB in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.1.1 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma GLP-1 levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.1.2 Scatter plot of the early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma GIP levels in participants with and without T2DM

Figure 4.3.1.3 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma PYY levels and participants with and without T2DM

- Figure 4.3.1.4 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma ghrelin levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.1.5 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma CCK levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.1i Graph of the post-prandial plasma GLP-1 levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and postoperative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.1ii Box plot of post-prandial response of GLP-1 (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.2i Graph of post-prandial plasma GIP levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.2ii Box plot of post-prandial GIP response (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.3i Graph of post-prandial plasma PYY levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.3ii Box plot of post-prandial PYY response (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.4i Graph of post-prandial plasma ghrelin levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.4ii Box plot of post-prandial ghrelin response (tAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB in participants with and without T2DM

- Figure 4.3.2.5i Graph of post-prandial plasma CCK levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 4.3.2.5ii Box plot of post-prandial CCK response (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.1 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma total cholesterol levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.2 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma LDL-cholesterol levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.3 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma HDL-cholesterol levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.4i Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma triglyceride levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.4ii Box plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery (pre- and post-operative day 4) upon Δ fasting plasma triglyceride levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.5.1 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting serum NEFA levels in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.5.2i Graph of post-prandial serum NEFA levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.5.2ii Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial NEFA excursions, without baseline correction, in participants with and without T2DM
- Figure 5.3.1.5.2iii Box plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery (pre- and post-operative day 4) upon post-prandial ΔAUC NEFA

following a mixed meal test in participants with and without T2DM

- Figure 5.3.2.1 A systematic review of the effects of RYGB surgery upon plasma lipid levels study attrition diagram
- Figure 5.3.2.4.1i Forrest plot of the effects of RYGB surgery upon total cholesterol levels including all subgroups
- Figure 5.3.2.4.1ii Graph of the mean plasma total cholesterol levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data)Figure 5.3.2.4.2i Forrest plot of the effects of RYGB surgery upon plasma
- LDL-cholesterol levels including all subgroupsFigure 5.3.2.4.2iiGraph of the mean plasma LDL-cholesterol levels at all
- time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data) Figure 5.3.2.4.3i Forrest plot of the effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma
- HDL-cholesterol levels including all subgroups
- Figure 5.3.2.4.3ii Graph of the mean plasma HDL-cholesterol levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data)
- Figure 5.3.2.4.4i Forrest plot of the effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma triglyceride levels including all subgroups
- Figure 5.3.2.4.4ii Graph of the mean plasma triglyceride levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data)
- Figure 5.3.2.4.5i Forrest plot of the effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma NEFA levels using a fixed effects model including all subgroups
- Figure 5.3.2.4.5ii Graph of the mean plasma NEFA levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data)
- Figure 6.3.1 Relative gene expression levels in human adipose tissue from visceral and peripheral depots
- Figure 6.3.2 Box plot showing the median levels of human adipocyte cell diameter (μm) from peripheral (p) and visceral (v) depots in participants with and without T2DM Figure 6.3.2.1 Graph of the mean and sem of the effect of fasting and post-prandial plasma taken around RYGB surgery upon basal lipolysis (%) in human adipocytes (visceral and peripheral)

- Figure 6.3.2.2.1Box plot of the anti-lipolytic effect of insulin upon human
adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots
- Figure 6.3.2.2.2 Box plot of the effect of GLP-1 upon lipolysis in human
- adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depotsFigure 6.3.2.2.3Box plot of the effect of GIP upon lipolysis in human
- adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots
- Figure 6.3.2.2.4 Box plot of the effect of PYY upon lipolysis in human
- adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depotsFigure 6.3.2.2.5Box plot of the effect of ghrelin upon lipolysis in human
 - adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots
- Figure 6.3.2.2.6.1 Graph of the antilipolytic effects of insulin in combination with GLP-1 at varying concentrations upon human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots
- Figure 6.3.2.2.6.2 Graph of the antilipolytic effects of insulin in combination with GIP at varying concentrations upon human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots

Index of tables

Table 2.2.4.1	Effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study participant
	demographics
Table 2.2.4.5	Relevant medical conditions in participant of the effect of
	RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study
Table 2.2.4.8	Morbidities in participants of the effect of RYGB surgery
	upon lipolysis study
Table 2.2.5.2	Fixed meal challenge study bottle preparation
Table 2.3.2.3	RT-PCR standardised plate template used
Table 2.3.4.2	Lipolysis experimental control conditions
Table 2.3.4.3	Experimental gut hormone concentration calculations
Table 3.3.1	Early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting glucose, insulin and HOMA-IR(1) levels
Table 4.3.1	Early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma gut
	hormone levels
Table 5.3.1	Early effects of RYGB upon fasting plasma lipid levels
Table 5.3.2.2	Study characteristics for included publications in the
	systematic review of the effects of RYGB surgery upon
	plasma lipid levels

Index of supplementary material - attached unbound

- Carswell KA, Lee MJ, Fried SK. Isolation and culture of human adipocytes and adipose tissue. Human Cell Culture Protocols, Methods in Molecular Biology Vol. 806 3rd edition (Ed. Mitry RR, Hughes RD), Humana Press 2012 (ISBN 978-1-61779-366-0)³⁷¹
- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar AP, Amiel SA, Patel AG. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of gastric bypass surgery on plasma lipid levels. Obesity Surgery 2015. Epub ahead of print⁵⁰⁷
- Carswell KA, Vincent RP, Belgaumkar AP, Sherwood RA, Amiel SA, Patel AG, le Roux CW. The effect of bariatric surgery on intestinal absorption and transit time. Obesity Surgery 2014; 24:796-805⁶⁶

Abbreviations

ADA	Adenosine deaminase
Ado	Adenosine
AGB	Adjustable gastric band insertion
AT	Adipose tissue
AUC	Area under curve
BA	Bile acid
BMI	Body mass index
BPD	Biliopancreatic diversion
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
cAMP	cyclic Adenosine monophosphate
ССК	Cholecystokinin
CRP	C-reactive protein
DG	Diacylglycerol
DJG	Duodenal-jejunal bypass
DPPIV	Dipeptidyl peptidase-4
FFA	Free fatty acid
FFAR	Free fatty acid receptor
FPG	Fasting plasma glucose
FPI	Fasting plasma insulin
FSI	Fasting serum insulin
GB	Glycine buffer
GIP	Glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide
GJ	Gastrojejunostomy
GK	Glycerol kinase
GLP-1	Glucagon-like peptide – 1
GPDH	Glycerol-3-phosphate dehydrogenase
HDL-C	HDL-cholesterol
HOMA-IR	Homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance
HSL	Hormone sensitive lipase
IFG	Impaired fasting glucose
IFSO	International federation of surgical obesity
IGT	Impaired glucose tolerance

IR	Insulin resistance
ISO	Isoproterenol
KRB	Krebs-Ringer bicarbonate solution
LCFA	Long-chain fatty acids
LCTG	Long-chain triglycerides
LDL-C	LDL-cholesterol
LPL	Lipoprotein lipase
MCFA	Medium-chain fatty acids
MCTG	Medium-chain triglycerides
MMT	Mixed meal test
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
NDM	Subjects without T2DM
NEFA	Non-esterified fatty acids
NGT	Normal glucose tolerance
ns	non-significant
NTC	No template control
OGTT	Oral glucose tolerance test
PDE	Phosphodiesterase
PIA	N ⁶ -[R-(-)-1-methyl-2-phen-ethyl] adenosine
PKA	Protein kinase A
POD	Post-operative day
PYY	Peptide tyrosine tyrosine
RT-PCR	Real-time polymerase chain reaction
RYGB	Roux-en-Y gastric bypass
T2DM	Type 2 diabetes mellitus
TG	Triacylglycerol/triglyceride
VLCD	Very-low calorie diet
VLDL	Very low density lipoprotein
WCC	White cell count
WHO	World health organisation
8-Bromo-cAMP	8-Bromoadenosine 3':5'-cyclic monophosphate sodium
*	p<0.05
**	p<0.01
***	p<0.001

1. Introduction

The world's health is under attack from an epidemic of huge proportions. In 2005, >400 million adults were obese (Body mass index [BMI] >30). This was predicted to increase to >700 million by 2015.¹ In comparison to healthy weight individuals (BMI 22.5-25) morbid obesity (BMI 40-45) reduces medial survival by 8-10 years² through obesity-related conditions including cardiovascular disease and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM).^{3,4}

The strong underlying pathophysiological link between obesity and T2DM suggests that the prevalence of T2DM is set to increase exponentially. Global projections for the T2DM epidemic suggest a 72% increase in cases between 2003 and 2025.⁵

The development of T2DM occurs when pancreatic islet cells are unable to increase insulin secretion to sufficient levels necessary to compensate for insulin-resistance, and maintain normoglycaemia.^{6,7}

Surgical treatment is more effective than medical treatment for T2DM in the morbidly obese⁸, Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB) resulting in remission in 84% of patients⁹ and reduction diabetes-related deaths by 92%.¹⁰ Originally it was presumed these changes were due to weight loss but rapid resolution of insulin resistance (IR) and improved insulin secretion occurs prior to discharge from hospital (before major weight loss).¹¹ This discovery has given hope a tailored surgical procedure and potentially a pharmacological cure to T2DM may be possible.

1.1 Development of the Roux-en-Y Gastric Bypass

Obesity surgery is the only successful long-term management for morbid obesity.¹² Together with advances in complex laparoscopic surgery this has resulted in a surge in demand for this intervention. Over 300,000 bariatric surgical procedures were performed worldwide in 2008, a 135% increase since 2003 (49% were gastric bypass procedures).¹³

The first gastric bypass for morbid obesity was reported by Mason in 1967¹⁴, who had observed that following partial gastrectomy (for peptic ulcer disease), underweight patients had difficulty gaining weight. Accordingly, he designed the operation to combine a 90% antral exclusion with a short loop retro-gastroenterostomy. Minor modifications including the use of the Roux limb formation to reduce bile reflux¹⁵ have resulted in the RYGB which is commonly performed today (+/- addition of a non-adjustable gastric band¹⁶), see figure 1.1.¹⁷

Reports of unexpected dramatic changes in T2DM post-RYGB appeared in the literature by 1995.¹⁸ Currently obesity surgery is more effective than medical treatment for T2DM in the morbidly obese.⁸ However, there is data to suggest that this effect is transient¹² and so the term "remission of T2DM" rather than the definitive term "cure" is used to describe this phenomenon.

1.1.1.Effects of RYGB upon type 2 diabetes mellitus

Remission of T2DM after weight loss surgery is reliant upon pre-operative βcell functional capacity with "percentage excess weight lost" and "time with diagnosis of diabetes" being significant predictors of remission.¹⁹ This suggests insulin secretory capacity and therefore insulin secretion to be involved in the remission of T2DM post-bariatric surgery. Although peak postprandial insulin maybe increased, area under the curve (AUC) data reflects an overall reduction in postprandial insulin secretion (not statistically significant difference, possibly underpowered studies for this outcome).^{20,21} Obese subjects may have larger β -cell nuclear diameter than lean subjects and post-RYGB a reduction in β -cell nuclear diameter (and therefore potential reduction in insulin secretion) may not occur.²² It remains to be shown whether this occurrence is confined to patients with post-RYGB postprandial hyperinsulinaemic hypoglycaemia syndrome (the pathological state investigated in this study), post-RYGB or normal for all patients who have undergone substantial weight loss, irrespective of causation.

The original studies describing remission of T2DM post-RYGB were performed after surgical weight loss has occurred. As such, it was argued that the remission of T2DM was due to a reduction in oral intake and/or weight loss rather than as a result of surgery. This was not the case and studies performed in the early post-operative period have shown that post-RYGB gut hormone changes begin to occur by post-operative day 2²³ however, the inflammatory changes post-surgery may impact upon these results.



Figure 1.1 Diagrammatic representation of RYGB procedure¹⁷

Reprinted by permission from Prof AG Patel (unpublished), 2017.



Figure 1.1.1i Fasting Plasma Glucose levels after RYGB¹¹

Reprinted by permission from: Springer Nature, Obesity Surgery, Loss of insulin resistance after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass Surgery: a time course study. Wickremesekera K, Miller G, DeSilva Naotumme T, et al. Copyright © 2005.

0

Figure 1.1.1ii Mean capillary glucose in DM patients after coronary artery bypass grafting²⁴

American Diabetes Association: Perioperative glycaemic control and the risk of infectious complications in a cohort of adults with diabetes, American Diabetes Association, 1999. Copyright and all rights reserved. Material from this publication has been used with the permission of American Diabetes Association.

It is plausible that the early remission of T2DM is simply due to "fasting for major surgery" as patients after coronary artery bypass surgery (non-gastrointestinal surgery) have also been shown to have dramatic improvements in glucose levels, presumably through these mechanisms, see figures 1.1.1i and 1.1.1ii.^{11,24}

1.1.2. Effects of RYGB upon insulin resistance

IR describes the reducing sensitivity of the tissues to insulin.²⁵ Early dramatic changes in IR have been shown post-RYGB using a homeostatic model assessment of insulin resistance [HOMA-IR] (non-invasive model for IR, see section 2.2.3.2), p<0.00001 for differences between pre-op and POD6, figure 1.1.2.¹¹ This data is supportive of a systemic change in glycaemic control in the body after RYGB. Although caution should always be taken with respect to the very early data, within the first week following major surgery, as these subjects will have fasted for a significant period of time, usually >24hr. Reassuringly these effects persist longer term^{11,26}, and though it has been postulated that this reflects a reduction in energy intake as diets and result in significantly reduced IR,²⁷ the same argument could be used in support i.e. as energy intake post-RYGB increases up to a year, no correlation with deterioration in IR is noted. Persistent improvements in HOMA-IR in the first year post-RYGB is supportive of a substantive change in IR after RYGB.²⁶ These dramatic improvements in IR after weight loss surgery are not confined to RYGB, similar improvements shown after the purely restrictive bariatric procedure, the adjustable gastric band (AGB), irrespective of weight loss.²⁸ Suggesting a causative link between adipose tissue mass and IR exists.

1.1.3. Proposed mechanisms through which this occurs:

1.1.3.1. Weight loss

Patients with T2DM are pre-disposed to weight gain²⁹ presumably due to multi-factorial reasons including natural aging, insulin resistance, medications

which predispose to weight gain³⁰ for example exogenous insulin (which is anti-lipolytic). Patients with T2DM tend to have poor weight loss even with aggressive dietary and medical management rendering this patient group particularly hard to manage. This problem is self-perpetuating with insulin resistance increasing with weight gain. After weight-loss surgery this does not seem to be the case, no difference in weight loss post-AGB when subjects with non-diabetes mellitus (NDM) are compared to T2DM.³¹

If weight loss is achieved in this patient group, obesity-related T2DM has been shown to improve,^{32,33} with improvements in insulin secretion being proportional to weight lost.³⁴ Post-weight loss surgery the link between weight lost and improvements in insulin secretion appears to be altered. Despite similar weight loss after-AGB poorer oral glucose tolerance when compared with post-RYGB.³⁵ Increases in postprandial glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) secretion post-RYGB compared with AGB has been postulated as an explanation for these findings.³⁶

Changes in gut hormone profiles following bariatric surgery combined with early post-operative improvements in fasting glucose and HOMA-IR data suggest that weight loss is not the sole mechanism of remission of T2DM post-RYGB but certainly is an additional factor.³⁷ This theory has been put to the test by La Ferrere et al, an elegant study in which T2DM matched for weight loss (diet-induced), revealed 1 month post-RYGB reduced postprandial glucose levels (p=0.014) and greater GLP-1 levels (p<0.001), not related to weight loss.³⁸

1.1.3.2. Restriction of food intake

Reduction in calorie intake is known to improve glycaemic control in obesityrelated T2DM more rapidly than weight loss. The converse is also true, after weight loss metabolic control can worsen once calorie intake is increased, without weight gain.³³ In the early post-RYGB period, patients have physical restriction of oral intake which results in substantial reduction in calorie intake. It is therefore plausible that this effect augments T2DM postoperatively. Very low-calorie diets (VLCDs) of <800kcal/d have shown significant weight loss and ~50% reduction in Fasting Plasma Glucose (FPG) after 2w in obese T2DM groups, maintained for the 6w of treatment.³³ At study completion, weight regain was coupled with increased FPG levels.³⁹ Another study showed that 10d total fasting with weight loss 5.1% of initial body weight reduced fasting plasma glucose values of T2DM by 64.5% (from 17.2% to 6.1 mmol/L).⁴⁰ Complete fasting or prolonged use of VLCDs is not safe and therefore not a long-term management solution for either obesity or obesityrelated T2DM however these results are of interest.

"Dumping syndrome" occurs in approximately 15-20% of patients after partial gastrectomy.⁴¹ This syndrome describes postprandial upper gastrointestinal and vagal symptoms resulting from rapid drainage of the stomach contents, exacerbated by high sugar and fatty foods.⁴² Post-bariatric surgery dumping syndrome occurs in up to 70% of patients.^{43,44} Anecdotally, patients says that the threat of dumping syndrome post-RYGB results in avoidance of high sugar and high fat foods, reinforcing "good" diet choices and improvements in weight loss. To date this has not been formally studied.

Combined with early post-operative nausea, increased physical restriction of the small gastric pouch and potentially the newly created oedematous gastrojejunostomy, "dumping syndrome" may result in a reduction in caloric intake post-RYGB with increased detection of sugars and fats post-operatively being proposed as a reason for avoidance of particularly "unhealthy" food choices.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷

Gut hormones have been shown to reduce hunger and enhance satiety.⁴⁸ Links between sustained postprandial satiety and gut hormone release post-RYGB has been proposed ²⁰ with potential augmentation of central brain responses to food post-RYGB.⁴⁹



Figure 1.1.2 Time course of HOMA-IR after RYGB. P<0.0000 for the differences between HOMA values before up to 365 days after RYGBP in all patients. P<0.0000 for the differences between HOMA values between the different patient groups.¹¹

Reprinted by permission from: Springer Nature, Obesity Surgery, Loss of insulin resistance after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass Surgery: a time course study. Wickremesekera K, Miller G, DeSilva Naotumme T, et al. Copyright © 2005.

The possibility of a central augmentation of the satiety response to dietary intake has also been proposed as a mechanism of weight gain in T2DM. Failure of oral glucose to inhibit hypothalamic activity, and therefore potentially satiety, has been shown in patients with T2DM.⁵⁰ Differences exist between lean and obese patients brain activation, using fMRI, after overfeeding in response to food images⁵¹ and direct effects of peptide tyrosine tyrosine (PYY) having been shown to activate brain regions related to food reward.⁵² However, the effect of obesity surgery on taste reward circuits in the brain is awaited.

1.1.3.3. Re-routing of the gastrointestinal tract

The most tempting proposed mechanisms by which remission of T2DM post-RYGB occurs concentrate upon the re-routing of the gastrointestinal tract, the "foregut" and the "hindgut" hypotheses:

- "foregut" hypothesis duodenal and proximal jejunal exclusion from dietary nutrients, possibly preventing secretion of signal which promotes IR and T2DM (the "anti-incretin" signal) ⁵³⁻⁵⁷
- "hindgut" hypothesis expedited delivery of undigested food to the distal intestine, enhancing GLP-1 secretion in the L cells of the distal bowel, improving glucose metabolism ^{54,58-61}

These theories were tested in a non-obese rodent model of T2DM,⁵³ where the rats underwent either duodenal-jejunal bypass (DJB) ("foregut") or a gastro-jejunostomy (GJ) ("hindgut"). Oral glucose tolerance was improved in the DJB group but remained unchanged in the GJ group. When the rodents subsequently underwent duodenal exclusion their glucose tolerance improved and conversely, restoration of duodenal passage in DJB rats reestablished impaired glucose tolerance, suggesting that the exclusion of the foregut and not the increased speed of transit and/or increased GLP-1 secretion is ultimately responsible for the remission of T2DM post-RYGB.⁵³ Of interest, the DJB rats had lower fasting plasma non-esterified fatty acid (NEFA) levels, comparable to NDM animals and lower than GJ (p<0.01). Early reports in humans of an endoscopically-placed duodenal-jejunal sleeve is supportive that these effects are transferrable to humans.⁶² Rodent studies post-RYGB are suggestive that the duodenal exclusion alters both intestinal structure and glucose transport function with a reduction in glucose absorptive capacity.⁶³ Human studies are awaited.

Although it is a widely held belief, there are no data to suggest that post-RYGB a reduction in dietary absorption occurs. The anatomical re-routing of the gastrointestinal tract of this procedure results in a delay in contact of the food with the intestinal juices (gastric acid, bile salts and pancreatic enzymes). It is through this rearrangement of the gut that the intentional malabsorption of dietary nutrients is believed to occur. In addition, exclusion of food from the antrum may impair gastrin and subsequent pancreatic enzyme secretion,^{64,65} as faecal elastase levels are reduced post-RYGB.⁶⁶

Normal dietary absorption in the intestines is reliant upon alterations in the pH of intra-luminal contents at different levels of the gastrointestinal tract⁶⁷ and it is reasonable to presume this will be different post-RYGB, as gastric acid "un-buffered" by foods will pass through the bilio-pancreaticico-duodenal (BPD) limb. Questions remain as to whether gastrin secretion is effected by RYGB and to-date this field remains relatively un-investigated.

Bile secretion and re-absorption post-RYGB may be altered. Bile acids have been linked to GLP-1 secretion from the L cells which can be modified by bile acids via TGR5 signalling pathway⁶⁸ in addition to glucose and lipids.⁶⁹⁻⁷¹ Plasma bile acids and insulin sensitivity in humans have been linked⁷² and plasma bile acids are elevated after bariatric surgery vs obese controls, with a positive correlation between bile acid concentration and peak GLP-1 suggesting further potential mechanisms of remission of T2DM.⁷³ Serum bile acids are higher in humans with prior gastric bypass, potentially contributing to improved glucose and lipid metabolism.

The impaired breakdown of dietary foods should result in increased viscosity of intra-luminal contents in the post-RYGB gastrointestinal tract however data is currently not available regarding this. Increased viscosity is associated with slower intestinal absorption and inhibition of glucose transport, a similar mechanism through which increased consumption of soluble fibre is thought to improve postprandial glucose profiles.^{74,75}

1.1.3.4. Alteration in dietary fat processing

Initially for T2DM to develop, pancreatic β -cells must be unable to compensate fully for decreased insulin sensitivity.⁷ It is believed the β -cell response to changes in insulin sensitivity probably involves NEFA signalling and sensitivity to incretins.⁷⁶ The obese and patients with T2DM have increased NEFA levels^{77,78} and the siblings of two parents with T2DM have increased postprandial triglyceride (TG) levels and blunted early postprandial lowering of NEFA,⁷⁹ suggesting an alteration in dietary fat processing occurs prior to the development of T2DM.

An acute rise in plasma NEFA levels will result in IR within hours in humans.⁸⁰ This effect has been shown to be reversible, insulin-mediated glucose uptake and glucose tolerance improve with an acute decrease in NEFA levels after treatment with the antilipolytic agent Acipimox.⁸¹

Plasma NEFA appearance is related to dietary fat absorption, intravascular TG lipolysis and adipose tissue lipolysis. It is likely insulin is responsible for changes in plasma NEFA levels due to its ability to stimulate LPL-mediated lipolysis of chylomicron and very low density lipoprotein (VLDL) TG in the circulation,⁸² suppress intracellular adipose tissue lipolysis⁸³ and possibly stimulate esterification of NEFA in adipose tissue.⁸⁴ Previously it had been postulated that insulin may contribute to adipose tissue uptake of NEFAs generated from intravascular TG lipolysis^{83,85} and so reduce NEFA spill-over. This theory is supported by in vivo studies describing NEFA uptake into adipose tissue.⁸⁶ However, recently the mechanism of insulin-stimulated clearance of plasma NEFA in humans was shown to be through the reduction of the endogenous appearance rate of NEFA.⁸⁷

Many believe the development of T2DM from insulin resistance is due to impaired postprandial reduction of NEFA by insulin, resulting in increased exposure of non-adipose tissue to NEFA⁸⁸, including islet cells. Increased postprandial deposition of dietary fatty acids in liver and skeletal muscle previously being reported in subjects with T2DM⁸⁹, supporting the theory that NEFA storage in adipose tissue is impaired in these patients.

In the obese, the release of exogenous NEFA in plasma is altered, possibly due to increased tissue fatty acid uptake aided by the action of lipoprotein lipase (LPL)⁹⁰, and preferential uptake of long-chain fatty acids (LCFA) when compared to medium-chain fatty acids (MCFA) by adipocytes thereby potentially increasing fat deposition if greater LCFA is available than MCFA⁸⁶.

In turn, NEFA has been shown to directly affect insulin secretion with NEFA receptor expression (GPR40 and 43) by human pancreatic β-cells. Acutely, NEFA stimulates islet cells to secrete insulin⁹¹ but chronic exposure to NEFA is associated with marked impairments in glucose-stimulated insulin secretion and decreased insulin biosynthesis.^{92,93}

Alteration in NEFA levels post-RYGB has not been fully established. There is early conflicting data regarding post-operative NEFA levels in rats^{53,94} and in humans postprandial NEFA levels were higher than obese and non-obese controls.⁹⁵ However, when exogenous fats are defined using a tracer, little spill-over of the lipolysed dietary TG into the plasma NEFA pool occurs in the post-RYGB vs non-obese control. Enhanced fatty acid trapping by peripheral tissues in the post-obese has been postulated as a cause for this finding.⁹⁶ Of note, in both studies the post-RYGB groups were not controlled for weight loss and are a skewed population, subject to changes in incretin levels which may contribute to plasma NEFA concentration by directing altering lipolysis. The gastrointestinal tract re-routing of the RYGB results in dietary fat meeting the gastric secretions, bile salts and pancreatic juices later, in the mid-ileum, which may result in consequent alteration in plasma NEFA levels. Dietary medium-chain and long-chain triacylglycerols are absorbed differently. The majority of the medium-chain triacylglycerols (MCTG) pass into the portal system as MCFA (hydrolysed by gut lipases or directly as MCTG). Long-chain triacylglycerols (LCTG) undergo hydrolysis by mostly pancreatic lipase but are unable to pass into the portal system due to their large size. Instead, LCFAs combine with cholesterol and phospholipids to become chylomicrons, which enter the systemic circulation via the lymphatic system.⁹⁷ Most of LCTG absorption occurs in the proximal small bowel, figure 1.1.3.4i. After gastric bypass it is likely MCTG absorption will be greater than LCTG due to anatomical alterations, altering the MCTG:LCTG absorption ratio. However, little is known about MCTG and LCTG absorption in disease and no data available post-gastric bypass.

It is believed the β -cell response to changes in insulin sensitivity probably involves non-esterified fatty acid (NEFA) signalling and sensitivity to incretins⁷⁶ which may have a direct effect on adipocyte lipolysis.

1.1.3.5. Alteration in gut transit time

The re-structuring of the gastrointestinal tract in RYGB results in food passing relatively unhindered into distal jejunum; bypassing the antrum, the pylorus, the duodenum and ~70cm proximal jejunum. Logic suggests this will reduce gut transit time thereby reducing dietary absorption and reducing postprandial glucose levels accordingly, this may not be the case. Mixed reports exist with respect to gut transit time post-RYGB.^{66,99-101} Possible explanations for the reported delay in gut transit time include changes in intra-luminal content viscosity, increased GLP-1 and other incretin secretion, altering GI motility. Reduction in gut transit time could impact upon dietary fat and sugar absorption however, further data in this field is required. A corroborative study has shown delayed gut transit time post-total gastrectomy and Roux-en-Y esophagojejunostomy, where food rapidly passes into Roux limb with delay in small intestine transit versus controls.¹⁰² Changes in dietary content in the intestinal lumen as a result of the RYGB
may explain this phenomenon with increased consumption of high-fibre diet being shown to delay gut transit time through decreasing bolus propulsion to the rectum and increasing gas production by colonic flora.¹⁰³

A-glucosidase inhibitors are used as a treatment for T2DM because they slow glucose absorption by reducing the rate of enzymatic digestion of starch, delaying release of glucose molecules for absorption, resulting in reduced postprandial glucose and insulin levels.¹⁰⁴ Changes in gut transit time is therefore another potential mechanism through which the RYGB can improve postprandial glucose control.



Figure 1.1.3.4 Digestion, absorption and transport of long-chain triglycerides and medium-chain triglycerides⁹⁸

Reprinted by permission from: Springer Nature; Lipids, Medium chain triglyceride in early life: effects on growth of adipose tissue. Hashim SA, Tantibhedyangkul P. Copyright © 1987 and the American Oil Chemists' Society, copyright © 1985.

1.1.3.6. Gut hormone secretion

1.1.3.6.1. Incretins

Since the 19th century it has been accepted that humans process oral glucose better than intravenous.¹⁰⁵ It is believed this occurs through the release of peptides known as incretins. An incretin is a peptide which stimulates the internal secretion of the pancreas i.e. insulin secretion.¹⁰⁶

To be an incretin a substance must meet specific criteria:

- 1. produced in the GI gastrointestinal tract
- 2. secretion stimulated by nutrients
- 3. stimulates insulin secretion in the presence of glucose

(modified from Creutzfeldt¹⁰⁶)

Glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide (GIP) and GLP-1 [the two main incretins] are responsible for 50-60% of postprandial insulin secretion.¹⁰⁷ They are secreted in response to food ingestion, and enhance insulin secretion (the incretin effect) prior to a change in plasma glucose.

The "hindgut" mechanistic theory regarding remission of T2DM post-RYGB suggests that enhanced nutrient delivery to distal intestine enhances stimulation of L cells resulting in increased GLP-1 secretion.⁵³ Since the GJ operation does not affect glucose homeostasis the hindgut theory does not fully explain these changes.

In T2DM, GIP secretion is normal but the effect of administered GIP on insulin secretion is blunted^{108,109} and, GLP-1 secretion, possibly stimulated by GIP via vagus nerve,^{110,111} is reduced.¹¹² IR subjects have been shown to have impaired postprandial GIP and GLP-1 secretion, severity of which is related to degree of IR.¹¹³ Of note in this study pre-operative NDM and T2DM had no differences in peak insulin or AUC insulin postprandially however post-RYGB the T2DM group had an reduction in fasting glucose and insulin. Despite an increased postprandial peak insulin levels, a reduction in AUC insulin (ns) was reported. This hints that remission of T2DM post-RYGB is predominantly due to changes in insulin sensitivity combined with alterations in gut hormone

secretion and improvements in postprandial "tailored" (not increased) insulin secretion.

It should be noted that some of the blunted gut hormone responses in T2DM increase to supra-physiological levels post-RYGB,²¹ not merely returning to baseline.

1.1.3.6.1.1. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide

GIP is a peptide which is secreted from the K cells in the duodenal and proximal jejunum¹¹⁴ in the presence of glucose and fat. But it is the rate of absorption, rather than the luminal content, which is the main stimulus for GIP secretion.¹¹⁵ In turn, this incretin stimulates insulin secretion in a glucose-dependent manner,¹¹⁶ responsible for ~ 80% of nutrient-induced enteroinsular pancreatic beta-cell stimulation.^{117,1} It can induce β -cell proliferation and enhance resistance to apoptosis.¹¹⁸

At the adipocyte, GIP promotes energy storage through fatty acid incorporation,^{115,119} stimulates lipolysis and increases NEFA reesterification, similar to insulin, an effect reversed by ANTIGIP.¹²⁰

Increased dietary fat intake has been shown to stimulate GIP secretion more than sugars.¹²⁰ The resulting GIP hypersecretion could increase nutrient uptake further in adipocytes¹²² thereby increasing mass, linking GIP to obesity. This has been shown in mice, GIP-receptor knockout mice have reduced adipocyte mass and are resistant to diet-induced obesity despite a high-fat diet¹²³ and GIP knockout animals have increased energy expenditure.¹²³

The pathogenesis of T2DM has also been linked to a defective expression of the GIP receptor.¹²⁴ Unsurprisingly, in both obesity and T2DM, there is increased fasting and postprandial GIP secretion^{115,122,125-127} and the insulinotropic effect of GIP is lost in T2DM,¹⁰⁸ reversible through fasting.¹⁰⁶

Sadly, the reported effects of RYGB on postprandial GIP secretion are not consistent.^{21,36,38,57, 128-131} Likely resulting from many methodological variations discussed in chapter 2.2.5. When paired samples around RYGB surgery are compared, in morbidly obese patients with T2DM the pre-operative blunting of postprandial GIP secretion appears to return to NDM levels post-RYGB.²¹

1.1.3.6.1.2. Glucagon-like peptide -1

GLP-1 is a peptide which is synthesised and secreted from the L cells, which co-secrete PYY¹³², predominantly found in the distal ileum and colon.^{133,134} They are secreted in a bioactive form as GLP-1 (7-37) and GLP-1 (7-36NH2), which have a short half-life of 1-2min prior to conversion to GLP-1(9-37), GLP-1(9-36NH2) and GLP-1 (7-38) by dipeptidyl peptidase-4 (DPPIV).¹³⁶ As DPPIV is on the luminal surface of vascular endothelial cells and circulating in the plasma,¹³³⁻¹³⁵ only approximately 25% of active GLP-1 reaches the portal circulation.¹³⁷ It is therefore likely to have paracrine effects via intestinal vagal afferents.^{138,139}

GLP-1 can inhibit food intake in mice and rats^{140,141} with GLP-1 infusions being shown to enhance fullness and reduce energy intake in healthy weight, obese and T2DM patients.¹⁴²⁻¹⁴⁴ Other groups have reported no anorectic effect.¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁴⁷ Supportive of its anorectic role, this effect is reversed both in GLP-1R knockout mice and using a GLP-1R antagonist, exendin(9-39), in intact mice,¹⁴⁸⁻¹⁵⁰ rats^{149,150} and humans.¹⁵¹ Vagotomy can abolish this effect, highlighting its importance in mitigating this neurohumoral response.¹⁴⁰ GLP-1R, a member of the G-protein-coupled receptors¹⁵² are present in the neurons of the nucleus tractus solitarius including the hypothalamus.¹⁵³

GLP-1 is secreted in response to all nutrients, with a preponderance for carbohydrates.¹⁵⁴⁻¹⁶⁰ It has a biphasic postprandial secretory pattern.^{134,158,161} The first-phase is within 15min of food ingestion and may be related to neurohumoral activation,¹⁶¹ small numbers of proximal L-cells.¹⁶² or result from cholecystokinin (CCK) stimulation of GLP-1 secretion, prior to nutrient

stimulation.^{158,163} The second-phase is due to nutrient stimulated GLP-1 secretion, metabolite production from gut microflora¹⁶⁴ and bile acid stimulation.^{165,166} Although it remains unclear if obesity impacts upon nutrient-stimulated GLP-1 secretion;^{159,167,168} in adipose tissue, GLP-1 promotes both lipogenesis and lipolysis dependent upon concentration,^{169,170} potentially altering body mass.

GLP-1 (7-37) stimulates insulin release by islet cells through increasing intracellular cyclic monophosphate sodium (cAMP).¹⁷¹ It is known to increase the activity of several kinases (PI3K, PKB, p44/42 MAPKs, p70s6k), similar to insulin. ^{136,172-175} It can increase glucose-dependent insulin secretion^{171,176-178} This combined with the reduction in plasma glucose levels following insulin secretion suggest that GLP-1 is inherently protective against hypoglycaemia.

In T2DM, there is preservation of the incretin activity of GLP-1 [7-36 amide] but not of synthetic human gastric inhibitory polypeptide.¹⁰⁸ As such GLP-1 analogs (exenatide and largatidine) are now being used as medical treatments for obesity-related T2DM.¹⁷⁹⁻¹⁸¹

Over the first 6m post-RYGB the increased postprandial GLP-1 response increases further despite weight loss.¹⁵² The mechanism of this change is unknown. Incretin levels change in patients with T2DM post-RYGB, with increased GLP-1 secretion returning, if not surpassing, obese NDM levels.²¹⁻²³ GLP-1 has been noted to reduce B-cell apoptosis and increase B-cell hyperplasia in rats and monkeys, and postulated to cause this effect in humans resulting in the rare phenomenon of postprandial hyperinsulinaemic hypoglycaemia after RYGB.^{22,182,183}

1.1.3.6.2. Peptide tyrosine tyrosine

PYY is secreted as PYY (1-36) from the L-cells in the distal ileum and colon, most co-expressing GLP-1.^{184,185} It is then converted by DPPIV into its bioactive form, PYY 3-36.^{186,187} PYY is inactivated by nonspecific peptidases¹⁸⁶ with a half-life in plasma of approximately 9 min.^{184,187} PYY (1-36) increases eating by binding to neuropeptide NPY1 and Y5 receptors, and can bind to Y2 whereas PYY (3-36) decreases eating through selective binding to only Y2 receptors.¹⁸⁷⁻¹⁸⁹ Corroborated by studies showing, that the eating-inhibitory effect of PYY (3-36) is blocked by Y2 receptor antagonists¹⁹⁰ and that PYY (3-36) cannot inhibit eating in Y2-receptor knockout mice.¹⁹¹

Akin to its L-cell counterpart, GLP-1, PYY may be indirectly stimulated via neuroendocrine mechanisms activated in the duodenum in addition to direct cellular contact of nutrients.^{187,192} Nutrient stimulated hormonal secretion from the L-cells is specific in that carbohydrates strongly stimulate GLP-1 secretion but are weak for PYY release.^{158,184} PYY secretion varies dependent upon the stimuli, in order of increasing stimulation: lipids, protein, glucose.^{193,194} Postprandial levels of PYY peak after 1 hour and remaining increased for up to 6 hours.^{184,187,191,195}

PYY reduces appetite and food intake in the postprandial period,^{196,197} with increasing plasma PYY levels proportional to caloric content in humans.¹⁸⁴ Food intake is reduced when peripheral infusions of PYY (3-36) are given at postprandial levels, in rats, mice and humans.^{191,198,199} PYY also slows gastric emptying and delays gastrointestinal transit,^{184,200,201} inhibits gallbladder emptying and secretion of gastric acid and pancreatic enzymes.²⁰²

Morbidly obese patients have reduced plasma PYY concentrations²⁰³ but its effect persists, PYY infusion given to both lean and obese subjects, inhibits 24hr food intake.¹⁹¹ Postprandial PYY levels are also blunted in the early stage of the development of T2DM, in genetically susceptible individuals, preceding the presence of IR and adiposity.²⁰⁴ However, as nausea is a common side-effect of the higher dose of these infusions, this may be an additional mechanisms through which PYY suppresses food intake.

Following RYGB an increased postprandial PYY response has been reported when compared with lean and obese controls.^{36,205,206} These increases in PYY levels post-RYGB increase within the first 6 months post-operatively. Despite a significant reduction in hunger or satiety post-RYGB no specific effect of an increasing PYY level upon this outcome was reported,²¹ possibly due to post-RYGB vagal disruption, Y2 receptors are expressed on vagal fibres and vagotomy attenuates the anorectic effect of peripheral PYY (3-36).^{140,207}

In the short term, plasma glucose levels are unaffected by PYY (3-36) but after 4 weeks administration a dose-dependent reduction in HbA1c occurs.²⁰² This may be due to changes in glucose uptake in muscle and AT rather than insulin release, as PYY (3-36) does not affect glucose metabolism in the fasted state but increases glucose disposal during the hyperinsulinaemic clamp.²⁰⁸ To date, no correlation between postprandial plasma PYY levels and glycaemic control post-RYGB has been identified.²⁰⁹

1.1.3.6.3. Ghrelin

Ghrelin is produced in the gastric fundus and the proximal intestine²¹⁰⁻²¹² and is known to stimulate food intake in animals and humans through increases in hypothalamic expression of the orexigenic neuropeptide Y.^{213,214} Ghrelin infusions have been shown to increase meal size.²¹⁵⁻²¹⁷ It is increased in fasting and reduced in the postprandial period however presence of food in the stomach alone does not suppress ghrelin.²¹⁸⁻²²⁰ These signals appear to originate in the small intestine,^{156,219,212,222} are proportional to the amount of calories ingested,^{223,224} and may be mediated through changes in plasma glucose and insulin, intestinal osmolarity or enteric neural signalling.^{218,225,226} Obese have lower fasting ghrelin levels and reduced postprandial suppression, compared with healthy weight individuals.²²⁷

RYGB-associated weight loss has shown significant reduction in ghrelin levels vs dietary-associated weight loss.²²⁸ Following RYGB, reduced fasting and postprandial ghrelin²²⁹⁻²³³ or no difference in fasting and postprandial levels^{23,36,206} have been reported but some groups have shown the converse.^{234,235} Such heterogeneity in these studies could be explained by improvements in insulin resistance and hyperinsulinaemia post-RYGB as both are associated with ghrelin suppression.^{236,237} Further implication that ghrelin may feedback upon insulin resistance is its effect upon islet cells, endogenous ghrelin enhancing glucose-induced insulin release from the pancreas however, exogenous ghrelin suppresses insulin secretion.²³⁸ Ghrelin secretagogue receptor 1a antagonists have been shown to enhance insulin secretion in rodents, through currently unknown mechanisms.²³⁹

1.1.3.6.4. Cholecystokinin

CCK is mainly secreted from the duodenal I-cells in response to intraluminal foods, in particular breakdown products of proteins, oligopeptides and amino acids,²⁴⁰⁻²⁴³ and long-chain fatty acids.^{154,244-246} The plasma concentration rises rapidly and remains elevated for 3-5 hours but it acts via endocrine and paracrine pathways.²⁴⁷ CCK stimulates exocrine pancreas function, gallbladder contractility assisting bile acid secretion and subsequent fat absorption, slows gastric emptying through stimulation of pyloric contractility,²⁴⁶ modulates intestinal motility^{249,250} and acts via vagal fibres to transmit a sensation of fullness in the dorsomedial hypothalamus.²⁵¹ CCK-1 receptor expression being present in both the sub-diaphragmatic vagal nerves and the dorsal vagal complex in the hindbrain.^{252,253}

CCK is an important regulator of satiety. Intraperitoneal injections can reduce meal size, in rodents,²⁵⁴ and intravenous infusions of CCK can reduce food intake^{255,256} and induce satiety.²⁵⁷ These effects are reversed by the type A CCK receptor antagonist loxiglumide.²⁵⁸ With CCK-1 receptor gene abnormalities are associated with increased meal size, food intake and increased weight.²⁵⁹⁻²⁶²

Following RYGB, food bypasses the duodenum and as such one would presume that in the fasting state CCK levels would be unaffected but reduced following meal stimulation. Studies investigating CCK levels around RYGB in the fasting state, including our data above, agree with this theory.^{57,263,264} However controversy exists regarding postprandial CCK levels, some groups reporting increased postprandial CCK levels following mixed meal stimulation,²⁶³⁻²⁶⁵ whilst others report no significant difference with glucose or protein only meal stimulation.^{206,266} As CCK potentiates the secretion and effects of GLP-1, it may diminish gut transit further altering gut hormone changes post-RYGB. ²⁶⁷

Increased villus height and crypt depth have been shown post-RYGB, in rats, in addition to increased number of villus and crypt goblet cells.⁶³ Hypertrophy of the roux and common limbs but not the bilio-pancreatico-duodenal (BPD) limb, has also been identified, with increased total and mucosal surface areas of these hypertrophied limbs. Increased enteroendocrine cells are present in the Roux and common limbs including CCK-immunoreactive cells, felt responsible for the increase in relevant circulating hormone levels, due to the increased total numbers of cells.²⁶⁸ These changes have been reported following jejunoileal bypass^{269,270} supportive of gut adaptation following gut diversion surgery.²⁷¹ Increased post-operative GLP-2 levels has been linked to this increased mitotic rate and crypt cell proliferation, humans and rats.²⁷²

1.2. Adipocyte

1.2.1. Structure

Adipocytes are spherical, unilocular structures which have the ability to vary dramatically in size, to accommodate storage of lipids. The fat cell comprises of 90% lipid droplet which is predominantly TG but a small volume of diacylglycerols (DG), phospholipids, NEFA and cholesterol are also present, with the nucleus pressed onto the periphery of the cell.²⁷³ Adipocytes continually modify their structure through fatty acid esterification and lipolysis.

Adipocyte hypertrophy is directly related to insulin resistance in T2DM, irrespectively of total body fat²⁷³ and reduces together with improvements in insulin sensitivity with dietary and exercise-induced weight loss.²⁷⁴

1.2.1.1. Regional variations

Significant regional variations in adipocytes exist including differences in adipose tissue (AT) distribution and molecular characteristics: differences in adipocyte size, hormone receptor expression, adipokine secretory profile, expression pattern.²⁷⁵ Morphological and functional differences have been noted between visceral and peripheral AT.²⁷⁶

Visceral adiposity is specifically related to insulin resistance.²⁷⁷ Differences in AT characteristics from the visceral and subcutaneous depots may help to explain this.²⁷⁸ Visceral adipocytes express more genes encoding secretory proteins than subcutaneous.²⁷⁹

It would stand to reason that as omental AT is more insulin sensitive than subcutaneous AT with respect to lipolysis²⁷⁸ the increased visceral adiposity associated with IR would be related to this function. Once increased omental/visceral AT volume occurs these cells which are effectively in a perpetual state of lipolysis (increasingly resistant to the effects of insulin) will effectively "flood" the portal system with glycerol and NEFA, resulting in the progression of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (and impair insulin clearance and action and, increase glucose and VLDL output from the liver).^{280,281}

When differences in adipocyte cell size was studied Buren et al²⁰² and McLaughlin et al²⁸³ found no difference in cell size between NDM and T2DM and insulin sensitive and IR subjects respectively. Questions regarding the most appropriate cell sizing techniques have been raised. Development of fatty liver results in IR in mice without subcutaneous and visceral fat²⁸⁴ and fatty liver has been noted in lipotrophic patients with IR.²⁸⁵

It is known that intra-abdominal fat is more lipolytic than subcutaneous fat and is also less sensitive to the anti-lipolytic effect of insulin.²⁸⁶ Together with its anatomical proximity to the liver, this potentially could result in greater exposure of the liver than the peripheral tissues to NEFAs. Differences in exposure and the presence of the portal-peripheral NEFA gradient could explain why the liver can be IR at a time when the peripheral tissues are not.²⁸⁷

Assessed using magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scanning, a longitudinal study post-RYGB revealed rapid lipid mobilization from both visceral and peripheral depots post-operatively together with enhanced NEFA flux to the liver. Disconnection between liver fat and insulin sensitivity occurred in the early post-RYGB period.²⁸⁸

Fatty liver disease is increased in obesity²⁸⁹ however it is more likely related to degrees of insulin resistance than obesity.^{290,291} Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease being shown to be exaggerated in IR.^{289,292,293} Via the portal vein the gut drains the products of dietary absorption (except LCTGs which drain directly into the left subclavian vein via the lymphatic system (see section 1.1.3.4.), and ultimately reaches the omental and peripheral AT without first passing through the liver. The products of omental lipolysis drain directly into the left subclavian.

1.2.2. Receptor expression

Adipocytes have multiple hormone receptors on their surface including: adrenaline (B1, 2, 3; alpha), insulin, growth hormone, insulin-like growth factor, cortisol and PPAR.²⁹⁴ Human adipocytes express receptors for gut hormones: GLP-1;²⁹⁵ GIP;^{123,296} PYY;²⁹⁷ ghrelin;^{298,299} and NEFA: including FFAR2 (GPR43)³⁰⁰ and GPR 120.³⁰¹

Visceral AT has larger number of adrenergic receptors on the cell surface and higher lipolytic activity.³⁰² In addition, higher GIPR gene expression levels are found in visceral when compared to subcutaneous adipocytes.³⁰³ Knocking out the gene encoding GLUT4 in adipocytes results in systemic IR in vivo and skeletal muscle IR in vitro, despite normal GLUT4 levels in the skeletal muscle.³⁰⁴ This would suggest that the adipocyte is of greater importance than skeletal muscle with respect to insulin resistance.

1.2.3. Function

The role of adipose tissue has not been fully elucidated. It is the main energy storage area in the body, storing excess sugars and fats as TG in the lipid droplets and releasing them in the form of NEFA when needed.³⁰⁵ In addition it is of paramount importance as a physical protector of the vital organs in the body and prevention of heat loss. Adipocytes release multiple cytokines³⁰⁶ which have pro-inflammatory effects.³⁰⁷⁻³⁰⁹ The finding that adipocytes not only respond to but also secrete hormones have identified revealed it to be the largest, and potentially the most important, endocrine organ in the body.³¹⁰ In fact, insulin is more efficient at inhibiting lipolysis than glucose production.³¹¹ Alterations in this pathway post-RYGB, through direct effects upon lipolysis could alter plasma NEFA levels and in turn IR.

Depot-related differences in adipose-produced molecules have also been reported including leptin, adiponectin, IL-6 and angiotensinogen.^{312,313}

1.3. Lipolysis

1.3.1. Principles of lipolysis

The primary role of the adipocyte is to store triglyceride, in lipid droplets, and release NEFA and glycerol through an enzyme-dependent system known as lipolysis.

Hormone sensitive lipase (HSL) is the rate-limiting enzyme for lipolysis, regulated by reversible phosphorylation. NEFA is released at each step of TG breakdown with glycerol only released when complete hydrolysis of the lipid occurs. Quantification of glycerol concentration is therefore a measure of complete lipolysis breakdown of TG within adipocytes, figure 1.3.1i.

There are many known activators of the lipolytic cascade, summarised in figure 1.3.1.ii.³¹⁴ As shown in the diagram, the main known activators of lipolysis are catecholamines. Stimulation of adenylyl cyclase increases intracellular cyclic AMP (cAMP) concentrations which promotes the activation of cAMP-dependent PKA.³¹⁴ The PKA phosphorylates HSL and promotes its activation, thereby increasing lipolysis.^{315,316} Lipolysis is inhibited by reducing cAMP, which is catalysed to 5'AMP by the enzyme PDE-3.³¹⁷

1.3.2. Effect of weight loss upon lipolysis

Weight loss through diet alone reduces adipocyte lipolysis and fat oxidation however the addition of endurance exercise to diet reverses this effect.³¹⁸

Obese adipocytes have lower basal and stimulated lipolysis when compared to lean.³¹⁹ This data is supported by: endurance training in obese AT decreased basal lipolysis, lipolytic effects of β -adrenergic response were increased and the antilipolytic effects of α_2 -adrenoceptor and insulin were significantly attenuated.³²⁰

1.3.3. Regional variations in lipolysis

Adipocytes from visceral and peripheral sites have different characteristics. HSL activity and mRNA expression is higher in subcutaneous than omental fat cells suggestive of increased lipolytic capacity in these cells. Lipolysis rate significantly correlated to HSL activity.³²¹

In rodents, there is lower HSL activity and mRNA levels in subcutaneous adipocytes versus visceral,³²² subcutaneous adipocytes have lower expression of the 3 β-adrenoceptor subtypes and HSL.

Human subcutaneous adipocytes have higher LPL activity and are more lipolytic than omental adipocytes however omental adipocytes have a greater response to both adrenergic receptor– and post-receptor-acting agents compared with subcutaneous adipocytes.³²³ It is thought that the increased catecholamine-induced lipolysis in visceral fat is due to increase expression of β 1- and β 2-IRs^{302,324} and enhancement of β 3-AR function.³²⁵

Omental adipocytes are more responsive to catecholamines and less sensitive to insulin.³²⁶ Stated another way, omental fat is more lipolytic than subcutaneous fat and less sensitive to the anti-lipolytic effects of insulin.^{278,286,327} This could be explained by the reduced insulin binding capacity and reduced activation of insulin receptor signalling events including tyrosine phosphorylation of IR and IRS-1 and PI 3-kinase activation in human visceral adipocytes.³²⁷ A higher glucose uptake rate has also been noted in omental adipocytes and is almost certainly explained by an increased GLUT4 expression.³²⁸

To date I have found no study regarding the difference between lipolytic effects of incretins from different adipocyte regions.



Figure 1.3.1 Principles of lipolysis



Figure 5 Hormonal regulation of lipolysis in adipocytes. The cascades of signalling events controlling the activity of hormone sensitive lipase (HSL) in adipocytes are represented. Catecholamines, through α - and β -adrenoreceptors, modulate the activity of adenilyl-cyclase (AC), thus increasing the intracellular levels of cAMP. By contrast, insulin decreases cAMP levels by activating the phosphodiesterase 3B (PDE-3B) through the PI 3-kinase/Akt pathway. cAMP is the main agonist of protein kinase A, which phosphorylates and activates the HSL. Rs, adrenoreceptor with stimulatory activity; Ri, adrenoreceptor with inhibitory activity; Gs, G-protein with stimulatory activity; Ser, phosphoserine residue; FFA, free fatty acids.

Figure 1.3.2 Hormonal regulation of lipolysis in adipocytes³¹⁴

Reprinted by permission from: John Wiley Sons Inc, Acta Physiologica. Regional differences of insulin action in adipose tissue: insights from in vivo and in vitro studies. Giorgino F, Laviola J, Eriksson W. Copyright © 2005.

1.3.4. Hormonal effects upon lipolysis

1.3.4.1. Insulin

The anti-lipolytic effects of insulin are well documented. It is believed that in animals, including humans, the postprandial rise in insulin promotes TG storage in the AT and inhibits lipolysis,³¹⁴ optimising storage of reserve energy through this route. However unexpectedly, in vivo fasting reduces systemic sensitivity to antilipolytic effects of insulin³²⁹ in contrast to findings in vitro.³³⁰

The anti-lipolytic effects of insulin occurs through the phosphorylation and subsequent activation of cAMP hydrolysing enzyme, phosphodiesterase (PDE) -3B^{314,331} resulting in decreased activation of protein kinase A (PKA) and HSL and therefore less hydrolysis of TG.^{332,333} Inhibition of PDE-3B abolishes the antilipolytic effects of insulin in human AT.³³⁴ PDE-3 stimulation by insulin requires PI 3-kinase in both the rat and humans.^{335,336} The mechanisms of insulin-stimulated glucose uptake in adipocytes are summarised in figure 1.3.4.1.³¹⁴

Omental fat has higher expression levels of specific signalling proteins and increased +/- earlier activation of Akt/GSK-3 and ERK signaling pathways in response to insulin.³³⁷ Subcutaneous tissue is more sensitive to these effects than omental AT,^{278,286} together with an increase in insulin receptor affinity in the subcutaneous adipocytes despite no difference in receptor number being found. In addition, insulin dissociation rate is increased in omental adipocytes.²⁷⁸

1.3.4.2. GIP

GIP reduces NEFA levels and stimulates lipolysis in rat adipocytes.¹²⁰ Rodent studies, suggest GIP stimulates lipolysis and increases NEFA reesterification but inhibited isoproterenol (ISO)-stimulated lipolysis by 43% suggesting it to have similar properties to insulin, an effect which was reversed by ANTIGIP.¹²⁰ GIP stimulates fatty acid incorporation into AT, this effect is enhanced in obese vs lean rodents.³³⁸ It stimulates glycerol release through stimulation of adenylyl cyclase and cAMP³³⁹ suggesting it should be lipolytic rather than lipogenic however, in steers GIP infusions increased plasma palmitate levels,³⁴⁰ effect not repeated in bovine AT in vitro.¹²⁰

A synergistic anti-lipolytic effect of the combination of GIP and insulin was not found in rat adipocytes although postulated.¹²⁰ The suggestion that GIP caused increased cellular insulin sensitivity (measured by insulin-stimulated glucose transport) and insulin receptor affinity in rat adipocytes.³⁴¹ Other theories that GIP and insulin share similar signalling components (such as PI-3 kinase, glycogen synthase kinase 3B, or PKB) and therefore compete for the action of adipocytes. We known that in 3T3-L1 cells, GIP-stimulated lipolysis was inhibited by insulin (this effect was blocked by the PI3K inhibitor, wortmannin).³³⁹

Effects of GIP in the presence of insulin, increased LPL activity and TG accumulation through pathways involving increased phosphorylation of PKB and reductions in phosphorylated LKB1 and AMP-activated protein kinase in mouse and cultured human subcutaneous adipocytes.³⁴²

To date no GIP lipolysis studies appear to have been performed using fresh human adipocytes.

1.3.4.3. GLP-1

GLP-1 is lipogenic at low concentrations and lipolytic at high concentrations.¹⁷⁰ cAMP being implicated as a second messenger for the lipolytic but not the anti-lipolytic effects of GLP-1 upon human adipocytes.¹⁷⁰ In rat liver and skeletal muscle GLP-1 effects glucose metabolism similarly to insulin but does not increase adenylate cyclase activity.^{343,344} GLP-1 has been shown to increase basal lipolysis in adipocytes from obese and lean subjects.³⁴⁵ Its effects upon lipolysis at concentrations equivalent to RYGB physiological levels and in combination with insulin are unknown.

1.3.4.4. PYY

In human subcutaneous adipocytes PYY inhibits lipolysis³⁴⁶ in a dosedependent manner, both basal (ADA) and stimulated (isoproterenol- and forskolin-induced lipolysis). This effect was reversed using *Bordetella pertussis* toxin (which blocks the effects on the GTP-binding regulatory proteins in human adipocytes,³⁴⁷ suggesting that this effect is likely mediated by adenylate cyclase inhibition.³⁴⁶

Y1 receptor mediates the antilipolytic effect of NPY and PYY in rodent adipocytes and conversely treatment with Y1 antagonists stopped weight gain through reduction in appetite and adipocyte cell size.³⁴⁸⁻³⁵⁰

1.3.4.5. Ghrelin

Ghrelin has been linked to lipolysis and glycaemic control through several mechanisms.

In adipocytes, ghrelin has been shown to stimulate insulin-induced glucose uptake in adipocytes.²³⁹ In vivo, ghrelin infusion induces lipolysis (as assessed by plasma NEFA levels and interstitial glycerol concentrations using a microdialysis technique) and IR, independently of growth hormone and cortisol³⁵¹ and has been reported to reduce the anti-lipolytic effect of hyperinsulinaemia.³⁵¹

The antilipolytic effect of both ghrelin isoforms has been reported in rodents through binding to a specific receptor, distinct from GHS-R1a (more accurately assessed against stimulation^{352,353} rather than non-ado basal).

Comparable results were found with cultured human subcutaneous adipocytes, which were lipogenic when incubated with Octanoyl-(OTG) and des-acyl (DSG) ghrelin (partly mediated through the Y1 receptor) and DSG was shown to alter lipolysis (not mediated through Y1 receptors), lipogenesis and leptin secretion.²⁹⁹



Figure 4 Mechanisms of insulin-stimulated glucose uptake in adipocytes. The intracellular signalling reactions mediating insulin stimulatory effect on glucose transporter translocation and glucose uptake in adipocytes are illustrated. Insulin binding to its transmembrane receptor recruits intracellular docking proteins (the IRS proteins) and activates a cascade of protein-protein interaction events and biochemical reactions (phosphorylation on tyrosine or serine/threonine residues), ultimately leading to the translocation of GLUT4 containing vesicles from intracellular quiescent pools to the plasma membrane, leading to enhanced glucose entry into the cell. PI, phosphatidylinositol; Y-P, phospho-tyrosine residue; SH2, src-homology 2 domain; R, regulatory subunit; C, catalytic subunit.

Figure 1.3.3 Mechanisms of insulin-stimulated glucose uptake in adipocytes³¹⁴

Reprinted by permission from: John Wiley Sons Inc, Acta Physiologica. Regional differences of insulin action in adipose tissue: insights from in vivo and in vitro studies. Giorgino F, Laviola J, Eriksson W. Copyright © 2005.

1.4. Hypothesis

The gastric bypass procedure results in remission of T2DM through alterations in postprandial secretion of incretins and insulin combined with improvements in insulin resistance.

I hypothesise that these postprandial hormonal alterations improve adipocyte insulin sensitivity through the peripheral effects of incretins, improving insulin resistance.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Summary of the study protocol

This is a prospective observational study designed to quantify the lipolytic and anti-lipolytic effects, in visceral and peripheral adipocytes, of the changes which occur in gut hormone levels around RYGB surgery, performed for obesity in people with and without T2DM pre-operatively.

<u>The primary endpoint</u> of this study is a statistical difference in lipolysis rates in human adipocytes between:

- a) pre- and post-RYGB plasma
- b) gut hormone levels approximating those seen pre- and post-surgery

The study protocol is summarised in figure 2.1.

- In order to quantify gut hormone response to a set meal challenge using a method which was both reliable and easily reproducible, enabling direct comparison of the same participants before and after surgery, ²⁰ participants underwent a mixed meal test (MMT) with frequent blood sampling on the day prior to their operation and on post-operative day 4
- At time of RYGB, visceral and peripheral adipose tissue was excised, placed into separate 30ml plastic flasks containing 0.9% saline or PBS buffer and transferred to the laboratory at room temperature immediately. The adipose tissue underwent adipocyte isolation and lipolysis experimentation (sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4).
- 3. Following this, all participants underwent routine postoperative bariatric care and follow-up arrangements through the NHS.
- 4. The study protocols were approved by the King's College Hospital Ethic Committee (LREC no: 08/H0808/83) and King's College Hospital's Research and Development department (08LG13) and all participants gave informed consent prior to enrolment.

2.2 Clinical participation

2.2.1 Recruitment and enrolmentThe study had 2 patient groups:Patients with T2DM (n=9)Patients without T2DM (NDM) (n=10)

All suitable patients being placed on the waiting list for gastric bypass surgery at King's College Hospital, London were approached regarding interest in participation in this study at this time.

At time of their routine surgical pre-assessment, potential participants in the NDM group underwent formal assessment of T2DM and insulin resistance with fasting blood glucose and insulin levels and an oral glucose tolerance test. Depending upon these results, participants were enrolled.



Figure 2.1 Effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study summary diagram

2.2.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria

- Meeting NICE criteria for bariatric surgery³⁵⁴
- 18 65 years old
- BMI >35
- Able to provide informed consent
- To understand spoken and written English
- Non-DM group FBG <6.1 mmol/l and OGTT 2hr BG <7.8mmol/l
- DM group FBG >or equal to 7.0 mmol/l and OGTT 2hr BG > or equal to 11.1mmol/l

Exclusion criteria

- Enrolled in other clinical study involving investigational drug or other surgical intervention
- Unstable diabetic retinopathy
- Stage 3 5 renal impairment
- Clinical evidence of cardiac failure
- Myocardial infarction in previous year
- Current angina or heart failure
- Liver function tests > 3 x normal
- Any condition where compliance unlikely e.g. anxiety disorder, inadequate comprehension
- Pregnancy and breastfeeding
- Immunosuppressive drugs inc. steroids
- Coagulopathy (INR>1.5 or plt<50)
- Anaemia (Hb<10)
- Recent history of cancer (<5 years)
- Any disorder of fat storage
- Any contraindication to bariatric surgery

2.2.3 Quantification of T2DM and IR

All NDM participants underwent formal assessment of their glycaemic control with fasting glucose and an oral glucose tolerance test. Fasting glucose and insulin levels were performed for measurement of HOMA-IR³⁵⁵ on all participants.

Participants were requested to attend for their surgical pre-assessment fasted for 12hr. They received instructions regarding the temporary cessation of medications which could potentially affect their T2DM/IR status assessment in advance, as follows:

- If you are taking metformin tablets please stop taking these 3 days prior to pre-assessment
- 2. Do not take any oral tablets for T2DM on the day of pre-assessment
- Bed-time insulin injections only do not take this the night before preassessment
- If you have 2 insulin injections a day take your usual evening insulin with your evening meal no later than 7:30pm the night before preassessment
- 5. If you have 4 insulin injections a day do not take your bed-time insulin the night before or the morning insulin prior to pre-assessment
- 6. If you are taking Lantus do not take this after 9am the day before the pre-assessment clinic

As part of national obesity guidelines,³⁵⁴ patients have had fasting glucose levels checked prior to referral for consideration of bariatric surgery. This was repeated at pre-operative assessment and for the purposes of this study an oral glucose tolerance test was performed in the NDM participants. World Health Organisation (WHO) diagnostic criteria for T2DM were used to define participants' endogenous glycaemic control:³⁵⁶

T2DM: fasting plasma glucose ≥7.0 mmol/l or 2hr plasma glucose* ≥
 11.1 mmol/l

- Impaired glucose tolerance (IGT): fasting plasma glucose < 7.0 mmol/l
 and 2hr plasma glucose* ≥ 7.8 and < 11.1 mmol/l
- Impaired fasting glucose (IFG): fasting plasma glucose 6.1 6.9 mmol/l and (if measured) 2hr plasma glucose* < 7.8 mmol/l
- NDM: fasting plasma glucose ≤ 6.0 mmol/l

* venous plasma glucose 2hr after ingestion of 75g oral glucose load
 If 2hr plasma glucose is not measured, status is uncertain as diabetes or IGT cannot be excluded.

All participants in the T2DM underwent repeat T2DM assessment including fasting glucose and insulin levels and an oral glucose tolerance test on post-operative day 7 as per the King's College Hospital bariatric unit protocol.

2.2.3.1 Fasting plasma glucose and insulin levels

Once confirmed that participants had fasted >10 hrs venous blood was collected for glucose analysis (4ml fluoride oxalate tubes) and insulin (6ml plasma tubes). The samples were promptly centrifuged at 3,000 x g for 10min at 4°C. The glucose samples were immediately assayed (see Appendix 2) and the plasma samples were transferred in separate labelled tubes and frozen at -80°C for batch insulin assaying (see Appendix 2).

2.2.3.2 Homeostasis Model Assessment – Insulin Resistance HOMA-IR is a simple, reproducible index of insulin resistance in both diabetic and non-diabetic subjects. HOMA-IR is also highly correlated with clamp-IR in T2DM subjects of normal (mean BMI 21.4 +/- 2.3) and moderate obesity (BMI 27.2 +/- 2.2).³⁵⁷

I used HOMA-1 for this study. HOMA1 is the original HOMA model it is calculated using the following formulae:³⁵⁵

- HOMA1-IR = (FPI x FPG) / 22.5

FPI is fasting plasma insulin concentration (mU/L) and FPG is fasting plasma glucose (mmol/l).

This calculation has been superseded with HOMA-2,³⁵⁸ a programme which is derived from fasting plasma glucose and insulin levels, calculated using a mathematical model which accounts for several variations including hepatic and peripheral glucose resistance, reduction of peripheral glucose-stimulated glucose uptake and renal glucose losses. It can be calculated using the HOMA calculator (version 2.2.2) downloaded from the Diabetes Trials Unit, University of Oxford website (<u>http://www.dtu.ox.ac.uk/homa</u>).^{359,360} Unfortunately, this model makes some specific presumptions such as plasma glucose must be between 3 and 25mmol/L and insulin must be between 2. And 57.6 μ U/ml. The programmers suggested that any figure out-with these ranges was abnormally high and therefore incorrect. Sadly, this does not allow for patients at the extremes of the insulin range i.e. morbidly obese with profound degrees of insulin resistance. Normally this HOMA-IR calculation would suffice but falls short of being able to analyse my patient cohort.

2.2.3.3 Oral glucose tolerance test

This test was carried out as per WHO guidelines 1999:³⁶¹ The test was preceded by >3 days of normal, unrestricted diet (>150g carbohydrate daily) with normal physical activity.

After fasting for 12hr, plasma glucose and insulin samples were taken. 75g anhydrose glucose in 250-300ml water was then drank over 5min. A repeat venous blood sample was then taken for glucose, 120min after starting the glucose drink.

I ensured the participant was in good health on the day of the study. During the course of the study they sat quietly, remained otherwise fasted and did not smoke.

2.2.4 Participants

Twenty participants were recruited into this study, T2DM (n=10) and NDM (n=10). As summarised in the study attrition diagram, figure 2.2.4, fasting data from 19 participants (10 NDM and 9 T2DM) and post-prandial data from 16 participants (9 NDM and 7 T2DM) was available for analysis.

There were no mortalities in this study. No procedures were converted to the open approach i.e. all RYGB were completed using the laparoscopic approach. Morbidity data was collected together with length of post-operative stay and time in Level II/III care.



Figure 2.2.4. Effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study attrition diagram

2.2.4.1 Participant characteristics

Participant characteristics are described in table 2.2.4.1. There was no difference in gender or age between the two groups. The participants in the T2DM group had a lower pre-operative weight than their comparators however there no difference in BMI. This may be a reflection of the NICE recommendations for consideration of bariatric surgery at the time of the study:³⁵⁴

BMI > 40 with no co-morbidities

BMI \geq 35 with co-morbidities related to obesity

All participants met the International Federation of Surgical Obesity (IFSO)/NICE recommendations for consideration of bariatric surgery prior to enrolment. Two of the T2DM participants had BMI 35-40.

2.2.4.2 RYGB procedure

Participants underwent laparoscopic RYGB surgery with formation of 30ml gastric pouch and 100-150cm Roux limb (p=0.1402). In one individual the Roux limb was fashioned using the retrogastric retrocolic position rather than antegastric antecolic due to the finding of a "tight" mesentery and subsequent unacceptable increased risk of gastrojejunal anastomotic tension. This slight variation in anastomotic location should not affect the study outcomes. Participants were fasted for three days post-operatively then a normal oral gastrograffin study was confirmed prior to fasting for 10hr for their post-operative day 4 (POD4) MMT study.

As per unit protocol, all T2DM participants were commenced on insulin sliding scale on the night prior to surgery. All other T2DM medications were not recommenced post-operatively prior to discharge from hospital. For participation in the study, the insulin sliding scale was stopped for 24h prior to the POD4 MMT study.

2.2.4.3 Controlling for weight loss

Although a difference in weight between the 4 groups (ANOVA p<0.05) was noted, paired analysis detected no difference in either the NDM group (p=0.3466) or the T2DM group (p=0.3666) from pre-op to POD4, figure 2.2.4.3. The difference detected by ANOVA analysis is perhaps reflective of the difference in weight between the NDM and T2DM pre-operatively.

2.2.4.4 Controlling for post-operative inflammatory response Plasma white cell count (wcc), serum C-reactive protein (CRP) and serum cortisol were measured pre-operatively and on POD4 in an attempt to quantify systemic inflammatory change which may directly impact upon the outcomes of this study.

There was no difference in the wcc between the four groups (p=0.2735). A highly significant difference in CRP levels was noted (p<0.0001), increasing post-operatively with no difference in the direction of change between the groups (p=0.6816). Fasting cortisol levels were also different between the groups (p<0.05), increasing post-operatively with no difference in the direction of change between the groups (p=0.6816).

As anticipated following complex major abdominal surgery, these results suggest that a degree of systemic inflammatory response was present on post-operative day 4. This could affect the data. Encouragingly there was no difference in the direction of change between the NDM and T2DM groups, which suggests direct comparison to be possible. Table 2.2.4.1Effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study participant demographics† (n=7)

Demographics	NDM (n=10)	T2DM (n=9)	p-value
Gender (m:f ratio)	2:8	3:6	0.5367
Age (years)	42 +/- 4	48 +/- 3	0.1953
Pre-operative weight (kg)	143.6 +/- 5.55	120.4+/-7.40	0.0211
Pre-operative BMI (kg/m ²)	50.3 +/- 1.7	46.0+/-2.7	0.1796
Pre-operative FPG (mmol/l)	5.35 +/- 0.46	10.16 +/- 5.31†	0.0112
Pre-operative HOMA-IR	7.00 +/- 1.47	16.37 +/- 3.49t	0.0143
Post-operative stay (days)	4 +/- 0.1	5 +/- 1	0.0352



Figure 2.2.4.3 Scatter plot of the effects of RYGB surgery upon weight between pre-operative and post-operative day 4 in participants with and without T2DM

2.2.4.5 Relevant medical history

As summarised in the table 2.2.4.5, the participants had a range of relevant concomitant medical conditions.

2.2.4.5.1 Duration of T2DM

The duration of T2DM was not controlled in this study. Four participants had been diagnosed with the last year, two within 5 years, one within 10 years and two had had T2DM \ge 10 years.

2.2.4.6 Drug History

Pre-operatively two participants in the NDM group (n=10) and five of the T2DM group (n=9) were taking statin medications. A further participant in the T2DM was taking fenofibrate as they had not tolerated a statin. This was slightly unexpected as lipid reducing medications convey a relative risk reduction of all-cause mortality in T2DM.³⁶²

One participant in the NDM group (n=10) was taking Metformin tablets preoperatively (for polycystic ovarian syndrome). Seven participants in the T2DM group (n=9) were taking Metformin tablets pre-operatively, three in combination with a sulfonylurea and one in combination with a thiazolidinedione. Two participants were using a GLP-1 analogue medication pre-operatively, both in combination with insulin injections. Of the four participants who were requiring insulin injections pre-operatively, three of these were taking two oral diabetic medications in addition to this.

2.2.4.7 Length of post-operative stay

The majority of the participants were discharged following participation in the POD4 research activities however the mean post-operative length of stay was longer in the T2DM group (n=9) at 5+/-1 days versus 4 +/- 0.1 days in the NDM group (n=10), p=0.0352. This is comparable with the literature regarding increased length of post-operative stay in T2DM patients.³⁶³
2.2.4.8 Morbidity and mortality

Bariatric surgery is complex major surgery performed on the morbidly obese patient group. Inherently it has a high expected perioperative morbidity (i.e. within the first 30 days of surgery) with overall complication rates for RYGB between 7 and 14% and a mortality rate 0.5%.³⁶⁴⁻³⁶⁶

Surgical complications are classified as major or minor. For the purposes of this study major complications included: anastomotic leak, pulmonary embolus, internal or ventral hernia or bowel obstruction requiring reoperation, fascial dehiscence, haemorrhage requiring reoperation or more than 1 unit of blood transfusion, myocardial infarction, stroke. Minor complications included wound infection, bleeding requiring one unit or less of blood transfusion, pneumonia, central venous catheter infections.³⁶⁷ Morbidity data was collected for up to 30 days following RYGB surgery.

The complications encountered during this study are shown in table 2.2.4.8. As per the surgical definitions all our complications were classified as minor and although the pressure sore incidence rate (all grade 1; International NPUAP-EPUAP Pressure ulcer classification system)³⁶⁸ was thought to be higher than anticipated in this patient group. This may be explained by the prospective data collection.³⁶⁹ There were no mortalities in this study. The only potential complications which could be attributed to the study participation were wound infection/haematoma and delayed wound healing. There were no severe adverse events or serious unexpected severe adverse events in this study. Table 2.2.4.5 Relevant medical conditions in participants of the effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study

Concomitant medical conditions	NDM (n=10)	T2DM (n=9)
Hypertension	3	5
Hyperlipidaemia	2	4
NAFLD	0	1
OSA	3	5
PCOS	1	3
Hypothyroidism	1	0
OA	4	3

Table 2.2.4.8 Morbidities in participants of the effects of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis study

Condition	No. of participants effected					
	NDM	T2DM				
Respiratory						
- CO ₂ retention	1	0				
- atelectasis	2	1				
- chest infection/pneumonia	0	3				
Genito-urinary						
- UTI	1	0				
Skin						
- wound	2	1				
infection/haematoma/blistering						
- delayed wound healing	0	1				
- pressure sore	1	2				
Musculo-skeletal						
- exacerbation of chronic	1	0				
back pain						
- rhabdomyolysis of gluteus	0	1				
maximus bilaterally						
Neurological						
- Frontal headache	1	0				
Other						
- transient pyrexia of	1	2				
unknown origin						
- idiopathic palmar oedema	1	0				

2.2.5 Quantification of post-prandial gut hormone and metabolite response

2.2.5.1 Mixed meal test

All study subjects participated in two MMT with frequent venous blood sampling, the day prior and on POD4.

MMT summary

- 1. Confirmation that participants continue to meet the inclusion/exclusion criteria was made
- 2. Participants were fasted for >10 hours
- 3. Weight (kg) was recorded
- A peripheral venous line was inserted using aseptic technique and basal bloods were taken for glucose, insulin, GLP-1, GIP, PYY, Ghrelin, CCK, NEFA, cortisol in pre-prepared, labelled bottles (see section 2.2.5.2)

[If NDM HOMA>3 – additional 50ml blood taken and stored as plasma in Lithium Heparin tubes with DPPIVi and Trasylol for use in adipocyte experimentation]

- A 420-kcal mixed meal was consumed over 5 min (150ml Belgium Chocolate ice-cream)
- Venous bloods were taken for: glucose, insulin, GLP-1, GIP, PYY, Ghrelin, CCK, NEFA at 15, 30, 60, 90, 120, 150, 180, 240, 300 and 360min
 [If NDM HOMA>3 – additional 50ml blood taken and stored as plasma at 60 min time-point]
- Participants were allowed to drink water after the 120 min samples were taken
- Once sampled blood was promptly centrifuged at 3,000 x g for 10 min at 4°C, transferred and pipetted for storage in separate pre-prepared and labelled tubes. Samples were stored at -80°C for analysis in batches (see Appendix 2).

9. The intra-venous line was removed if no longer required, after study completion

2.2.5.2 Study bottle preparation

The types of blood sampling tubes, additives and storage recommendations for the study blood samples is shown in table 2.2.5.2.

2.2.5.3 Choice of mixed meal

The incretin response to a mixed fatty and sugar load is greater than to glucose alone both in rats and humans.

The 420kcal fixed meal of 150ml Belgium Chocolate Hagen-Dazs® icecream is a well-tolerated choice of meal which results in satiety, reduces hunger and elicits a statistically significant change in glucose, insulin, and incretins when compared to fasting, normal and obese weight participants and participants after bariatric surgery (AGB and RYGB).²⁰ [Nutritional information regarding Belgium Chocolate Hagen-Dazs ice-cream, appendix 1]. Table 2.2.5.2 Mixed meal test bottle preparation

Test	Sample type	Conditions
Glucose	Fluoride oxalate	Cold spin & processed
		immediately
Insulin	Serum	Freeze immediately
NEFA	Serum	Freeze immediately
GLP-1	EDTA &	Cold spin and freeze
	DPPIVi (10ul/ml)	immediately
GIP	EDTA &	Cold spin and freeze
	DPPIVi (10ul/ml)	immediately
ССК	EDTA &	Cold spin and freeze
	Trasylol (100ul)	immediately
PPY	EDTA &	Cold spin and freeze
	Trasylol (100ul)	immediately
Ghrelin	EDTA &	Cold spin, add 1M HCL
	Trasylol (100ul)	(50µl for 450µl plasma)
NDM HOMA>3	Lithium Heparin & DPPIVi (50ul) &	Cold spin and freeze
Plasma storage	Trasylol (150ul)	immediately

2.2.5.4 Principles and description of assays used

The hormonal and metabolite assays were performed at the Biochemistry department in King's College Hospital, London as per their established protocols. All samples were assayed in duplicate.

- Glucose was measured using an automated glucose analyser, the Advia Centaur (Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Frimley, UK).
- Insulin was measured using the Advia Centaur (Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Frimley, UK). NEFA was measured using an automated analyser, the Prestige 24i (Cosmos Biomedical, Derbyshire, UK).
- Plasma Active GLP-1 (7-36 and 7-37 amide) was measured by ELISA (Linco Research) This assay measures active GLP-1 and detects changes of 2 pM; intra-assay and inter-assay CVs of 6-9% and <1-13%, respectively.
- Total GIP was measured by ELISA (Linco Research, Missouri, USA) with intra-assay and inter-assay CVs of 3-9% and 2-12 %, respectively and detects changes of 8.2pg/ml.
- Total PYY was measured by a previously described radioimmunoassay.³⁷⁰ The assay detection limit is 10pg/ml and interassay and inter-assay CVs were 3-9% and 6-9%, respectively.
- Ghrelin was measured by ELISA (SCETI KK Medical Section, DF Kuasumigaseki Place, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan). Intra-assay and inter-assay CVs were 3-9% and 2-12% respectively. CCK was measured by ELISA (Phoenix Pharmaceuticals Inc., CA, USA).
- Total cholesterol, HDL, LDL-cholesterol and triglycerides were measured using an automated analyser, the Advia 2400 (Siemens Medical Solutions Diagnostics Limited, Berkshire, UK), see appendix 2.

2.3 Adipose tissue and adipocytes

2.3.1 Adipose tissue biopsies

2.3.1.1 Extraction technique

At time of RYGB, with the subject under general anaesthetic, the skin was prepared with chlorhexidine or Betadine. Skin incisions were made and 7 laparoscopic ports inserted as per routine practice for laparoscopic RYGB. The subcutaneous adipose tissue biopsies were excised using a scalpel from the 12mm port-sites. 15mmHg CO₂ pneumoperitoneum was then established and a diagnostic laparoscopy performed prior to any GI transection. The visceral adipose tissue biopsy was taken from the greater omentum using either an Endoloop® with Endoshears® or Harmonic® scalpel technique and extracted through the port-site using a bag.

On removal from the participant, AT biopsies were placed into individually labelled 30ml plastic flasks containing either 0.9% Saline or PBS buffer at room temperature immediately.

2.3.1.2 Preparation of AT for isolation

AT biopsy samples were blotted dry, visible stromal tissue and vessels excised then weight recorded. At this time any additional tissue, not required for the purpose of this lipolysis experiments, was snap frozen and stored at -80°C for future research purposes (with ethical permission).

2.3.2 Adipose tissue receptor gene expression analysis

In order to confirm the presence of the relevant gut hormone and fatty acid receptors on human AT, both abdominal subcutaneous and visceral (n=6 for each), I performed gene expression analysis using established techniques from our laboratory. These involved insolation and purification of total RNA, proceeding to reverse transcription and Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) analysis.

2.3.2.1 Isolation of total RNA

2.3.2.1.1 Reagents

The reagents required for this experiment were:

- Trizol Reagent (Cat No. 15596-026, stored in fridge)
- Chloroform
- Isopropyl alcohol
- 75% ethanol (in distilled water for injection)
- DEPC (diethylpyrocarbonate) water

2.3.2.1.2 Cell lysis

AT samples not required for lipolysis experiments, snap frozen at time of adipocyte isolation, were used in these experiments.

The cells were lysed with 150ul Trizol/1x10⁶ cells and the pellet was vortexed. The samples were then incubated for 5min at room temperature to allow the complete dissociation of nucleoprotein complexes.

2.3.2.1.3 Phase separation

I then added 30ul chloroform (200ul per 1ml Trizol reagent used) and shook the tubes vigorously for 15 sec. The tubes were then incubated at room temperature for 2-3min, prior to centrifugation at 12,000 x g for 10min at 2-8°C. This resulted in separation of the mixture into a lower red, phenolchloroform phase, an interphase, and a colourless upper aqueous phase (RNA) in some tubes however some took on a light pink colour in the upper phase. In these tubes, the phase separation was repeated, and a colourless upper phase achieved.

2.3.2.1.4 RNA precipitation

This aqueous phase (the RNA) was then transferred to a new tube however at this time it included approximately 60% of the Trizol reagent used. The RNA was precipitated by mixing with 75ul Isopropyl alcohol (0.5ml per 1ml of Trizol reagent used) and the samples incubated for 10min at room temperature.

2.3.2.1.5 RNA wash

These pellets were centrifuged at 12,000xg for 10min at 2-8°C and to remove the supernatant, the pellet was washed with 180ul 75% ethanol (1-1.2ml per 1ml Trizol reagent used), vortexed then centrifuged at 7,5000 x g for 5min at 2-8°C. It was then possible to remove the supernatant and the samples were left to air-dry for 6min (but not completely, as this would decrease its solubility)

2.3.2.1.6 Dissolving the RNA

The pellet was dissolved in ~30ul sterile DEPC-water and incubated for 10min at 55-60°C, mixed with a brief spin and placed on ice. At this point the RNA concentration in the samples was checked to ensure the 260/280nm ratio was \geq 1.8 prior to storing the lysate at -80°C.

Normally DNase treatment of the total RNA would be undertaken at this point however the RNA pellets yielded from the above experiments were small volume and it was decided that the potential increased loss of DNA outweighed the minimal benefit of purification.

2.3.2.2 Reverse transcription reaction

The master mix was created first:

Buffer RT	88ul	+2ul
dNTP mix	88ul	+2ul
OligodT primer	44ul	+1ul
RNase inhibitor	11ul	+0.25ul
Omniscript RT	44ul	+1ul

I required 50ng RNA per reaction (therefore 20ul master mix). 2ul cDNA x 3 (triplicate) x 12 genes and as such 72ul was required and 80ul made to allow for pipetting error.

40ul was prepared and aliquoted into 4x 10ul tubes and stored in the -20°C freezer until use.

2.3.2.3 Qualitative real-time PCR

RT-PCR analysis was performed using Taqman assays for Ins-R, GLP1-R, GIPR, PYY-R (PYYR1), Ghrelin-R (GHS-R1 and NPY1R), GLUT-4 and fatty acid receptors (GPR43, GPR120, FFAR1, FFAR3) from both abdominal subcutaneous and omental human adipose tissue. B-actin was used as the housekeeper gene. Samples were analysed in triplicate.

In the experiment, an endogenous control was used, 18rRNA, and an internal control, no template control (NTC).

The machine was turned on to warm up prior to starting the assay and a new 96-well plate (Abiprism 96-well optical reaction plate, Applied Biosystems 4306737) was used for each experiment.

To minimise error a standardised plate template was used, table 2.3.2.3.

The following mixture was made for each probe:

- 2 x TaqMan Universal Master Mix 80ul
- Sterile dH2O 56ul
- Probe (added last)
 8ul

Then each well of the plate had the following mixture added:

- cDNA (or sterile dH2O for NTC) 2ul
- Master mix and probe solution
 18ul

The plates were then sealed and centrifuged at 2000rpm for 2min at room temperature.

I had created a template in the Applied Biosystems 7000 Real-Time PCR system for analysis with the wells and relevant probe tasks selected, in advance.

The plates were individually inserted into the machine, 40-50 cycles performed and the data analysed using 7000 System Sequence Detection software v.1.2.3. Applied Biosystems.

2.3.3 Adipocyte isolation

2.3.3.1 Adipocyte isolation technique

The visceral and peripheral AT biopsies were separately minced to approximately 5mg pieces using sharp scissors, to avoid crushing of the cells, and placed in a 1mg/ml Collagenase solution in 50-cc tubes.

Collagenase solution: Krebs-Ringer Bicarbonate buffer (KRB) – gassed with 95%O2:5%CO2 for 15 min 4%fatty-acid free Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) (PAA K41-002) D-glucose (Sigma G7528) Correct to pH 7.4 200nM Adenosine (Sigma A9251) Type 1 Collagenase (Sigma C1030)

AT samples were gassed prior to sealing with film and placing in a 37°C water-bath for max. 60 min until the solution had a "soupy" consistency. The solution was then passed through a 210um polypropylene mesh filter (Spectrum Labs 146428) using a cut-off syringe into a 30ml polypropylene flask. The cells were then washed 3 times with BSA buffer to separate the adipocyte fraction from stromal vascular fractions. The volume of fat cell yield was recorded and then diluted with 4% BSA buffer to make an approx. 1/10 solution in a polypropylene Erlenmyer flask. This methodology is described in more detail, see attached paper.³⁷¹

2.3.3.2 Quantification of fat cell diameter

0.1ml fat cell solution was prepared on a microscope slide well, using hydrophobic slide marker (BioGenex Rev. C503). Multiple digital photographs were taken of the images at magnification (x4 & x10). Image J software, a Java-based image processing program developed at the National Institutes of Health which is in the public domain, <u>http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/</u>. It was used to calculate the average diameter of >200 adipocytes.³⁷²

Using the average cell diameter the mean adipocyte mass was derived as follows:

Adipocyte radius (r) = diameter/2

Mean adipocyte mass = mean adipocyte volume (4/3 Ψ r³) x density (0.915) [assuming that the fat cell is spherical and is composed of mainly TG]³⁷³

2.3.3.3 Quantification of total triglyceride content

The Dole's extraction technique was used to quantify the total triglyceride content in the fat cell solution at time of each lipolysis experiment.³⁷⁴ I travelled to Prof. Fried's laboratory, Adipocyte Core, Boston Obesity Nutrition Research Center (BONRC) Boston University, USA to train in this and modified the technique to accommodate our laboratory resources:

In advance, I had prepared a standard Dole's solution (800ml Isopropyl alcohol, Sigma I9030; 200ml Heptane, Sigma 246654; 20ml 1N H₂SO₄, Sigma 320501),³⁵⁷ which was stored in a sealed glass jar, in the locked, flammable liquids cupboard at room temperature for use in these experiments.

At time of each lipolysis experiment, 0.5ml fat cell solution was placed into 4 15cc polyethylene conical centrifuge tubes with caps for Dole's extraction. A combination of Dole's solution, dH20 and Heptane were added to each tube, vortexed well to mix the phases then left to sit in the refrigerator overnight. Then the volume of upper phase was noted (should be 4 ml). 2ml of the upper phase was aliquoted into labelled and weighed 6 tared foil planchettes (2 controls) and left in the fume hood to evaporate overnight. All planchettes were then reweigh to calculate weight of lipid. 2 control planchettes were always used, to ensure the scale was accurate. In order to calculate mg lipid/ml of fat cells the following calculation was used: divide by volume of upper phase placed in the planchette and multiply by volume of upper phase. Then divide by the ml of fat cells suspension added. e.g. for 2 ml aliquot of 4ml upper phase, lipid weight x 2/0.5ml cells (dilution factor = 4) => mg lipid/ml fat cell suspension

2.3.3.4 Calculation of adipocyte cell number

The adipocyte cell number was extrapolated using the TG volume in the fat cell suspension and the mean cell diameter as per methodology described by Di Giralomo.³⁷⁵

As the adipocyte is predominantly composed of TG, the number of adipocytes per ml can be approximated by dividing the total TG in 1ml suspension by mean adipocyte mass.

As discussed earlier, the mean adipocyte mass was calculated as follows: Mean adipocyte mass = mean adipocyte volume (4/3 Ψ r³) x density (0.915) [assuming that the fat cell is spherical and is composed of mainly TG]³⁷³

Since 50ul volume was used for the glycerol assay, the number of adipocytes/ml was then divided by 20 to give the number of adipocytes per the 50ul.

This allowed the glycerol concentration data to be presented as glycerol release/2hr stimulation (nmol/10⁻⁵ cells/10⁵ adipocytes).

Visceral	Peripheral	Visceral		F	Peripheral		
18S	18S	GPR43			GPR43		
Ins-R	Ins-R	GPR120			GPR120		
GLP1-R	GLP1-R	FFAR1 FFAR1					
GIPR	GIPR	FFAR3		FFAR3			
GLUT4	GLUT4			18S	Ins-R	GLP1-	NTC
						R	
PYY1R	PYYR1			GIPR	GLUT4	PYY1R	
NPY1	NPY1			NPY1	GHSR	GPR43	
GHSR	GHSR			GPR120	FFAR1	FFAR3	

2.3.4 Adipocyte incubation

The AT weight and fat cell yield were recorded for each experiment. The initial adipocyte protocol had included centrifugation of the sample inbetween washes. However, it was noted that significant volumes of fat cells were lost during each spin (cell rupture). After discussion with the team at BONRC, modifications were made and subsequently published³⁷¹ including:

- A fine polypropylene tube was inserted through the fat cell layer into the supernatant. The sample was allowed to separate naturally on the bench (~2min). The tube was the used to aspirate the supernatant with minimal disturbance to the fat cells above.
- I ensured that the Bovine serum albumin (BSA) buffer wash was poured onto the side-wall of the flask, not directly onto the fat cells in order to minimise trauma. The polypropylene tube could then be used to mix the solution prior to re-aspiration, this process was repeated 3 times.

2.3.4.1 Adipocyte incubation technique

1.5ml polypropylene microcentrifuge tubes were pre-labelled and prepared with the freshly prepared volumes with or without pre-requisite experimental solutions as per protocol.

Immediately after the ~1/10 cell solution was prepared, continual fractal mixing of the cell solution was undertaken whilst 0.5ml cell solution was pipetted into each microcentrifuge tube. The filled capped tubes were then placed into a 37°C water-bath for 120min. At the end of this time the samples were placed on ice whilst the infranatant (i.e. without cells) was aspirated into pre-labelled micro-centrifuge tubes. I standardised this process to include a separate aspiration of a fixed volume 200ul sample from these tubes at this time, in preparation for first glycerol assay, however this could be left until a later time.

All samples were stored at -80°C until analysis.

2.3.4.2 Lipolytic experimental conditions

To ensure the results were robust and reproducible a number of internal controls were placed into this experimental protocol as follows.

2.3.4.2.1 Basal

The baseline group of experimental conditions for each experiment are shown in table 2.3.4.2.

2.3.4.2.1.1 Adenosine deaminase

Cell lysis occurs on removing AT from the adenosine rich environment of the body. By including 200nM exogenous adenosine in the buffer this cell lysis is greatly reduced.³⁷⁶ Adenosine deaminase (ADA) is added to all experimental conditions to remove the adenosine (Ado) [both endogenous and exogenous] and results in rapid elevation in lipolysis. With standard adipocyte experimental conditions 0.5units/ml ADA converted all of the Ado to inosine within 5s, measured using [³H]Ado.³⁷⁶ This "basal state" was designed for the testing of anti-lipolytic agents by quantifying their inhibition of lipolysis stimulated by ADA.³⁷⁷

2.3.4.2.1.2 N⁶-[R-(-)-1-methyl-2-phen-ethyl]adenosine

 N^6 -[R-(-)-1-methyl-2-phen-ethyl]adenosine (PIA) is an adenosine deaminase-resistant Ado receptor agonist which prevents the ADA-induced rise in activity through receptor-mediated inhibition of adenylate cyclase.³⁷⁶

As such a fixed concentration of 20nM PIA was used for tests of lipolytic agents. This baseline condition was designed to reveal any stimulation in lipolysis.

2.3.4.3 Stimulated

2.3.4.3.1 Isoproterenol

Isoproterenol (ISO) is a β -adrenergic agonist is a potent stimulator of lipolysis, capable of maximally stimulating lipolysis in the supra-maximal inhibitory condition of PIA, 100nM.³⁷⁷ As such a basic stimulated control

comparator condition of these experiments included a ADA & PIA20 & ISO condition – maximal lipolytic stimulation.

It was used in the basic experimental run as a comparator for two reasons: to ensure the fat cells in this experiment are capable of stimulation; as an indicator of the maximal stimulation achievable with these cells.

2.3.4.3.2 8-Bromo-cAMP

8-Bromo-cAMP is a stimulator of lipolysis through the non-receptor mitigated cAMP pathway. This substance stimulates lipolysis in a controlled reproducible concentration dependent manner.³⁷⁸ As such it can be used to partially stimulate a completely inhibited condition (e.g. ADA & PIA) in order to reveal small-order of change stimulations of lipolysis, which may otherwise be masked by the ADA alone or strong inhibitory effect of PIA.

2.3.4.4 Inhibited

2.3.4.3.1 Insulin

Insulin is a potent anti-lipolytic agent which inhibits lipolysis through cAMPrelated pathways³⁷⁹⁻³⁸¹ and cAMP-unrelated mechanisms.³⁸² A basic inhibited control comparator condition of these experiments included dose-response insulin curves (basal and stimulated), to ensure that the fat cell solution was capable of responding in such a manner. Concentrations comparable to human in-vivo plasma insulin concentrations and sub- and supraphysiological levels were used, table 2.3.4.3. Table 2.3.4.2 Lipolysis experimental control conditions

Tube no	Anti-lipolytic state	Tube no	Lipolytic state	Tube no	Partially stimulated lipolytic state
	Basic (30)				
1-2	ADA	11-12	ADA & PIA ₂₀	15-16	ADA & PIA ₂₀ & 1mM 8-Br-cAMP
3-4	" & Ins ₁₀			17-18	" & Ins ₁₀
5-6	" & Ins ₁₀₀			19-20	" & Ins ₁₀₀
7-8	" & Ins ₅₀₀			21-22	" & Ins ₅₀₀
9-10	" &Ins ₁₀₀₀			23-24	" & Ins ₁₀₀₀
		13-14	" & ISO (10 ⁻⁶)		
25-26	0' time				
27-28	Doles	29-30	Doles		

2.3.4.5 Gut hormones

The primary objective of this experiment was to quantify the lipolytic response of human adipocytes to gut hormone changes around RYGB. As such the experiment was designed to include: GLP-1, GIP, PYY and ghrelin hormonal conditions at 3 different concentrations, consistent basal and peak levels around RYGB surgery. These levels were calculated from the relevant gut hormone levels in fasting and post-prandial states pre- and post-RYGB in this study, table 2.3.4.4.

Each of these gut hormone conditions were studied with adipocytes both basally (ADA alone) and stimulated (ADA & PIA20 & 1mM 8-Bromo-cAMP - completely inhibited with mild stimulation).

In addition, several different concentrations of GIP were studied with ADA and ADA/PIA20/1mM 8-Bromo-cAMP (for a GIP dose-response curve, because there was no fresh human adipocyte lipolysis data available in literature previously for comparison).

2.3.4.5.1 Incretins +/- insulin

The combined effects of incretins and insulin upon lipolysis were studied using conditions of: 3 concentrations of GIP and GLP-1 combined with 3 concentrations of insulin.

Gut hormone	Mw	Highest and lowest	Pg/ml	Pmol/l	Ideal experimental range	Conc. in M	Actual exp conc. (M)	
		concentrations						
GLP-1	3297.63	рМ	n/a	5	1	1 x 10 ⁻¹²	1x 10 ⁻⁷	
(7-36)		Fasting – 2-5		10	10	1 x 10 ⁻¹¹	1x 10 ⁻⁹	
		PP – 10-36		50	50	5 x 10 ⁻¹¹	1x 10 ⁻¹²	
					100	1 x 10 ⁻¹⁰		
GIP	4983.6	Pg/ml	50	10	10	1 x 10 ⁻¹¹	1x 10 ⁻⁷	
		Fasting – 50-95	100	20	100	1x 10 ⁻¹⁰	1x 10 ⁻⁹	
		PP – 273-577	250	50	500	5x 10 ⁻¹⁰	1x 10 ⁻¹²	
			500	100				
			1000	200				
PYY	4310.1	Pg/ml	50	12	10	1 x 10 ⁻¹¹	1x 10 ⁻⁷	
		Fasting – 64-107	100	23	50	5 x 10 ⁻¹¹	1x 10 ⁻⁹	
		PP – 91-307	250	58	100	1 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	1x 10 ⁻¹²	
			500	116				
Ghrelin	3370.2	Pg/ml	300	89	100	1 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	1x 10 ⁻⁷	
		Fasting – 356-550	400	119	500	5 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	1x 10 ⁻⁹	
		PP – 417 - 620	500	148	1000	1 x 10 ⁻⁹	1x 10 ⁻¹²	
			750	223				
Insulin	N/A	mU/L	n/a	120	1	1x10 ⁻¹²	1x 10 ⁻⁹	
		Fasting - 8-35		750	100	1 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	5x 10 ⁻¹⁰	
		PP – 75-117			500	5x 10 ⁻¹⁰	1x 10 ⁻¹⁰	
					1000	1x 10 ⁻⁹	1x 10 ⁻¹¹	

Table 2.3.4.4 Experimental gut hormone concentration calculations

Conversion of pg/ml to pmol/l; Pg/ml divided by the Mw of substance to convert pg to pmol

2.3.5 Infranatant analysis

2.3.5.1 Glycerol assay

This protocol was modified from the BONRC General Glycerol Assay – unabridged (CH Glycerol Protocol 03/06), adapted for microplate fluorometer.³⁸³

Reagents needed on the day of experiment:

- Glycerol Kinase (GK): Sigma G0774
- α-Glycerol Phosphate Dehydrogenase (GPDH) Type 1: Sigma G6751
- Hydrazine Hydrate: Aldrich Hydrazine Monohydrate, 98% 207942
- Glycine Buffer (GB) frozen stock prepared ahead of time
- Imidazole-KCI-KOH stock prepared ahead of time and stored for 1 month at 4°C
- β-Nicotimamide adenine-dinucleotide (NAD⁺): Sigma N6522 minimum
 98% from yeast frozen stock prepared ahead of time
- Ice cold 20% Perchloric acid (PCA): Sigma 77233

The microplate fluorimeter used was Varioskan Flash 4.00.51 with Excitation:350 Emission:466

2.3.5.2 Principles of the glycerol assay

The glycerol assay used is a one-step fluorometric method³⁸⁴ based upon a reversible reaction, figure 2.3.5.2.

Above pH 8.5, in the presence of excess NAD, the reaction proceeds to the right. To ensure complete conversion of glycerol to dihydroxyacetone the equilibrium can be driven further to the right by the addition of the hydrazine (ketone-trapping) which irreversibly binds to dihydroxyacetone:

Dihydroxyacetone + hydrazine => dihydroxyacetone-hydrazone

The NADH is then measured spectrophometrically or fluorometrically.^{383.384}

2.3.5.3 BSA precipitation

Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) was present in the fat cell suspension (and therefore the adipocyte incubation's infranatant). As it contains lipids, it was essential that the BSA be extracted prior to performing the glycerol assay to minimise contamination.

To control for potential variability with this process, I made the glycerol standards using the same 4% BSA buffer used for the adipocyte isolation in advance (see reagent preparation table). This meant that the glycerol standards had to undergo BSA precipitation at the same time as the samples.

This was performed as follows:

- Samples (including a set of glycerol standards (all concentrations) & plain 4%BSA and KRB buffer control tubes) were thawed and arranged in order. The appropriate volume of ice cold 20%PCA was added to each sample tube and vortexed briefly (for 200ul samples, 30ul of PCA; 1ml samples, 150ul of PCA)
- Samples were then rested on ice for 20min
- To neutralize this extraction Imidazole-KCI-KOH solution was then added. The volume used was usually identical to volume of PCA however a few samples were checked to ensure ~pH7.4-8 was achieved prior to adding this to all samples (if too low, the volume of Imidazole solution was adjusted accordingly by 1ul at a time), amount used was recorded
- Samples were then vortexed for ~20s followed by centrifugation for 10min at 4°C, 13,200rpm

2.3.5.4 Glycerol assay technique

The Reaction Mix was prepared fresh on the day of experiment. Approx. 5ml reaction mix was required for a 1x96-well plate experiment. As such 50ml reaction mix was required for the standard 9 plate experiment.

To make 10ml Reaction mix I combined in order:

- 10ml GB
- 26ul GPDH
- 30.6ul GK
- 115ul Hydrazine Hydrate

A plate diagramme was prepared in advance. This standardised system was used for pipetting of each sample (including standards and KRB blanks) into wells.

The final volume was brought to 50ul using the extracted KRB from the blank i.e. to dilute sample by half, add 25ul sample & 25ul extracted KRB. These dilutions were determined in some instance to aim for fluorescence

values in the mid-range of the standard curve (to improve accuracy of derived glycerol results).

Reverse pipetting was used to avoid air bubbles.

50ul of room temperature reaction mix was added to all wells and plates were mixed on a shaking rotor plate for 5-10min at 200rpm.

The plates were read in the microfluorimeter (excitation: 350 emission: 466). This was the 0' time reading.

3ul NAD⁺ was then added to each well. It was imperative that NAD⁺ was added directly to the surface of the liquid at the bottom of the well, not stuck to the plastic on the side-wall. The plates were shaken on a rotor plate for 10min @ 200rpm.

The plates were then read on the fluorimeter and results reviewed:

- To ensure readings in samples are within range of standards and dilutions used are appropriate
- If samples were out of range or appeared to give unexpected/abnormal results (do to possible human error), new replicates were prepared with desired dilutions
- Ensure emission of samples has increased from 0'time readings. If not, they may not have received NAD⁺ and more can be added at this

time – adding extra NAD cannot effect outcome as 3ul should already be driving the reaction to completion.

Plates were then shaken for a further 20min then re-read at the 30min (total) time point.

Plate readings were cut and paste into a spreadsheet (Excel) and GraphPad PRISM software used for line (curve) fitting to extrapolate glycerol concentrations in each well.

2.3.5.5 Glycerol assay data analysis

Plate reading results transferred from the microfluorimeter were cut and pasted as follows:

Each plate's t=30 and t=0 readings with subsequent "t=30" – "t=0" were organised accordingly. The δ 1-3 for the glycerol standard curve were extracted first (Plate 1: rows 1-3, A-H) and arranged next to their known glycerol standard concentrations. These samples were then corrected for 0 and the average corrected glycerol standard values were acquired. Each other result was arranged next to its relevant tube no. and conditions and corrected for blank tube readings.

This data was entered into GraphPad PRISM with glycerol standard results as x-values with their corresponding mean y-values. All triplicate tube data was entered as y-values below this and analyses as both linear and non-linear exponential one-phase decay curves. An R2>0.95 was required in order for the data to be reliable. The graph of the assay was saved with the assay results.

The most accurate results were achieved with non-linear exponential one-phase decay curves as expected. These derived x-values were pasted into the Excel spreadsheet as glycerol (ul/0.5ml) 1-3. The dilution factor for the wells was entered into the corresponding rows laterally and the derived glycerol values were multiplied by the dilution factor accordingly.

At this time the average of the 0'time triplicates (i.e. volume of glycerol in the 0.5ml cell solution should no incubation be undertaken) was subtracted from all values. Abnormal triplicate results were removed at this time and mean per tube and condition was calculated.

The glycerol conc. (pmol/50ul) was then multiplied by "factor for 10^5 cells" to give the glycerol (pmol/ 10^5 adipocytes).

The data was converted to nmol by x1000 and presented as glycerol release (nmol/10⁵cells/2hr), 2hr being the duration of the experimental incubation.



Figure 2.3.5.2 Diagram of the glycerol assay reaction

2.4 Statistical calculations

2.4.1 Sample size calculations

Following the observed differences in incretin levels before and after RYGB surgery in experiment 1 (Table 1³⁶), the clinical portion of this study was designed to have power 80% to detect differences in mean GLP-1, GIP, insulin, for which 4 cases are required in each group.

In order to allow for the laboratory portion of the study, following the observed differences in glycerol release at different concentrations of GLP-1 (Figure 2^{345}), the laboratory experiments were designed to have power 95% to detect differences in lipolysis rates between pre- and post-RYGB incretin levels of 64 (standard deviation 24), 5 subjects are required. However, in order to detect differences in glycerol release between the visceral and peripheral fatty tissue in these experiments if we follow the observed differences in glycerol release at basal lipolysis from omental and subcutaneous fat (Table 2^{278} the lipolytic experiments were designed to have a power 80% to detect differences in glycerol release of 3.6 (standard deviation 3), for which 12 subjects will be required.

In order to calculate the sample size required to quantify the difference in lipolysis from both fatty tissue areas in patients with and without T2DM and IR: following the observed differences in glycerol release in response to basal and insulin responsiveness (Table 2²⁷⁸), the experiments were designed to have power 80% to detect differences in lipolysis rates of 4.2 (standard deviation 2.85), for which 8 subjects were required in each group.

For the GIP dose-response sub-study, following the observed differences in glycerol release at different GIP doses in rat adipocytes (Table 1¹²⁰) this substudy was designed to have power 80% to detect differences of 0.10 (standard deviation 0.09), for which 4 experiments in each condition would be required. Following the observed differences in GLUT4 receptor difference between subcutaneous and omental adipocytes,³²⁸ we design this study to have power 80% to detect differences in GLP-1 receptor protein expression levels between subcutaneous and omental adipocytes of 200%OD (standard deviation 120%), 6 samples are required per group.

For the laboratory studies:

- Gut hormone gene expression experiments (n=6)
- plasma and gut hormone experiments (n=5)
- visceral and peripheral adipocyte comparison experiments (n=12)
- NDM and T2DM comparison experiments (n=8)
- GIP sub-study experiments (n=4)

Targets for work

- A statistical difference of p<0.05 in the lipolytic effects of the pre- and the post-RYGB incretin concentrations
- A statistical difference of p<0.05 in the lipolytic effects of incretins upon the fatty tissue from visceral and peripheral regions
- No statistical difference in the lipolytic effect of incretins in patients with and without T2DM

2.4.2 Statistical analysis

Data are expressed as mean +/-sd, unless otherwise specified. Statistical significance was considered if p<0.05. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism® (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA).

2.4.2.1 Participant outcomes

Unpaired t-test was used to detect changes in participant demographics between the NDM and T2DM group.

- 2.4.2.2 Plasma outcomes
- 2.4.2.2.1 Changes in plasma hormones and metabolites around RYGB surgery

ANOVA with repeated measures was used to detect hormonal changes over time during the FMC study before and after RYGB in participants with and without T2DM. Paired *t* tests were used to compare data before and after RYGB surgery. The unpaired *t* test was used to compare NDM and T2DM group data. Mann-Whitney test was used to analyse the RYGB effect data.

2.4.2.2.1.1 Fasting

Plasma and serum hormonal and metabolite outcomes were assessed before and after RYGB, in the fasting state. This data was analysed using several different methods. Initially the complete data set (i.e. NDM and T2DM groups) was analysed to identify any potential effects of RYGB surgery using the largest sample size available. Then fasting levels were compared across both groups, pre- and post-RYGB. The effect of RYGB upon fasting hormonal and metabolite outcomes was calculated by subtracting the prefrom post-RYGB levels i.e. delta. The order of effect of RYGB upon fasting levels was compared between the NDM and T2DM groups.

2.4.2.2.1.2 Post-prandial

Hormonal and metabolite response to FMC stimuli was assessed in using several different measures. Crudely, the data was presented as diagrammatic form plotting mean FMC data at each time point. The peak response to food stimuli was analysed. In addition, the time to return to baseline for glucose was assessed. Early phase insulin secretory response was assessed using delta 0-15min insulin levels.³⁸⁵ Measurement of the hormonal response to the FMC stimulus was performed using AUC 0-180min for all outcome variables, calculated using the trapezoidal rule (total AUC, tAUC), which is strongly correlated with baseline levels.³⁸⁶ However as baseline levels are variable post-RYGB, to minimise bias to operative outcome analyses, when meal-stimulated increases were expected (glucose, insulin, GLP-1, GIP, PYY, CCK) the incremental AUC 0-180min (area above baseline), was calculated, which is strongly correlated with hormone changes to foods.³⁸⁶ When meal-stimulated responses decrease or no responses were expected (NEFA, Ghrelin), tAUC was used.

2.4.2.2.2 Calculation of the effect of RYGB upon the hormonal and metabolite responses

Comparison of the different hormonal and metabolite responses to RYGB surgery was calculated using a modification of the incretin effect calculation,³⁸⁷ whereby the difference in AUC post-RYGB was subtracted from AUC pre-RYGB, divided by the AUC pre-RYGB (as the denominator), then multiplied by 100 to give the ratio as a percentage.

(Post-RYGB AUC – Pre-RYGB AUC) * 100 Pre-RYGB AUC

2.4.2.3 Adipocyte outcomes

2.4.2.3.1 Adipocyte cell diameter

Data are expressed as means +/-sem. Differences in adipocyte cell diameter between the adipose tissue depots were directly compared for each participant using paired t-test.

2.4.2.3.2 Lipolysis and anti-lipolysis rates

Data are expressed as means +/-sem. The effects of plasma and different gut hormone conditions were determined by analysis of variance with repeated measures and post-hoc t-tests when main effects of interactions were significant.

2.5 Study management

2.5.1 Study duration

The total duration of the study was expected to be 18 months (with 200 pts undergoing bariatric surgery in our unit in 2010 and estimated 15% expected to agree with a sample size of 45). The expected duration of patient participation was 10 weeks (waiting list for operation 10 weeks).

Study enrolment commenced on 01/04/2009 and participation activities completed by 06/09/2010. The participant duration was exact.

2.5.2 Study involvement

Of the 20 participants recruited into this study, NDM (n=10) and T2DM (n=10), some unanticipated difficulties were encountered:

- Drop-out (5%)
- Declining operation (5%)
- Difficulty obtaining definitive intravenous access for venous sampling resulting in incomplete postprandial data (5%)
- Exogenous insulin contamination, plasma data excluded (5%)

Despite this, we achieved the sample size required in line with the plasma and gut hormone outcomes but not for the adipocyte NDM and T2DM comparator experiment study design. The human adipocyte lipolysis experiment sample size calculations had been derived from the best available data on human changes in lipolysis based upon insulin. As such, I undertook interim analysis following complete recruitment, to ensure statistical significance had been achieved with the primary outcomes prior to study completion.

3. The early effects of RYGB upon glycaemic control and insulin resistance

3.1 Introduction

IR is defined at a cellular level by the requirement for increasing insulin levels to enable glucose transport into cells via the GLUT protein family.³⁸⁸⁻³⁹⁰ The IR state progresses towards T2DM when the islet cells are unable to secrete sufficient insulin to prevent hyperglycaemia. T2DM first becomes apparent with postprandial hyperglycaemia. Fasting hyperglycaemia occurs when inadequate insulin secretion results in incomplete suppression of hepatic glucose production and decreased efficiency of liver and peripheral glucose uptake.⁷⁶ Islet cells in these individuals contain insulin and maintain the ability to synthesise insulin but can no longer be stimulated to do so.⁷

Hyperglycaemia triggers diabetic tissue damage through repeated acute changes in cellular metabolism and cumulative long-term changes in stable macromolecules, affecting cells which are unable to internally regulate their glucose concentration.³⁹¹⁻³⁹² Particular types of cells affected include retinal capillary endothelial cells, renal glomerular mesangial cells and neurons and Schwann cells in the peripheral nerves.³⁹³ IR increases NEFA flux from adipocytes into arterial endothelial cells.³⁹⁴ This increases FFA oxidation by the mitochondria in macrovascular endothelial cells, resulting in overproduction of ROS through β -oxidation of fatty acids and oxidation of FFA-derived acetyl CoA by the TCA cycle, generating NADH and FADH2. These are also the same electron donors generated by glucose oxidation in microvascular endothelial cells subjected to hyperglycaemia.³⁹³ It has been suggested that inhibition of FFA release from adipocytes or FFA oxidation in arterial endothelium will prevent the increased production of ROS and its damaging effects.³⁹³

Gastric surgery improves T2DM¹⁸ and RYGB has become an established treatment for T2DM.^{26,395-397} It alters glycaemic control through several mechanisms discussed previously, including: dietary intake, taste, transit time, sugar and fat absorption, bile acid mixing, gut flora, gut hormone alterations, insulin secretion, insulin resistance, fasting and stress effects, alteration in NEFA processing and weight loss (see Section 1.2.3). Longer-term studies have shown that RYGB result in a remission of T2DM rather than a cure, with an increase incidence after 10 years.^{12,356}

This study was designed to study the early effects of RYGB surgery upon insulin resistance and glycaemic control.

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Clinical methods

The methodology of this study is detailed in Chapter 2. Briefly, instructions were given to study participants regarding cessation of oral intake and current medication around the time of the study to minimise their impact upon outcomes. Venous blood was sampled following a 10h fast and at fixed time points after drinking a 420 k-cal mixed meal test (MMT), both before and four days after RYGB. The MMT constituents were (% kcal): 30.1 CHO, 23.3 fat and 5.0 protein (see Appendix 1).

These blood samples were placed in pre-primed sampling tubes (as per Table 2.4.1.1), centrifuged and stored at -20°C until analysis.

3.2.2 Assays

Automated assays were used to measure glucose and insulin (Advia Centaur, Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics, Frimley, UK).³⁹⁸ This was performed at the Biochemistry Department of King's College Hospital, London. See section 2.2.5.4 and appendix 2.

3.2.3 Statistical analysis

Outcome variables were plasma glucose and serum insulin concentrations. Assessment of response to MMT stimuli was performed using AUC 0-360' for all outcome variables. As meal-stimulated increases in glucose and insulin were expected, this was calculated as area above baseline (incremental area, iAUC), using the trapezoidal method.³⁸⁶ ANOVA with repeated measures was used to compare glucose and insulin changes over time during the MMT study before and after RYGB in participants with and without T2DM. Paired *t* tests were used to compare data around RYGB surgery. Comparison of the glucose and insulin responses to RYGB surgery were calculated using a modification of the incretin effect calculation,³⁸⁷ known as the RYGB effect calculation, see section 2. Mann-Whitney test was used to analyse the RYGB effect data. For the time to return to baseline plasma glucose levels calculations, some assumptions were made. Where 15min values were lower than the 0min values (presumed due to laboratory error) the 0 time result was taken as the result for the baseline assessment. If the curve did not return to baseline within the 360min test then for the purposes of data analysis it was presumed that the curves returned to baseline by 360 min.

Data are expressed as mean +/- sd. Statistical significance was considered p<0.05. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism® (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA). For further details regarding the statistical analyses see section 2.4.
3.3 Results

Eighteen participants underwent LRYGB in this study. As previously discussed, fasting data was available for analysis for 17 participants (10 NDM and 7 T2DM) and post-prandial data for 16 participants (9 NDM and 7 T2DM). No difference in weight was detected in either group by POD 4.

3.3.1 The early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma glucose and serum insulin levels

The early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma glucose and serum insulin and HOMA-IR(1) levels have been summarised, table 3.3.1.

3.3.1.1 Glucose

Analysis of the whole cohort revealed a reduction in fasting plasma glucose (FPG) levels by post-operative day 4 (p=0.0231). Analysis of the group data revealed a reduction in FPG levels between the groups (p=0.0007), figure 3.3.1.1. This reduction was present in the NDM group (p=0.0041) but despite a reduction from 10.16+/-2.01 to 7.66 +/-0.76 mmol/l in the T2DM group it did not reach significance (p=0.1055).

There was no difference in the direction of change of FPG levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.1219).

3.3.1.2 Insulin

In the whole cohort, there was a reduction in fasting serum insulin (FSI) levels by POD4 (p<0.0001). Analysis of the group data revealed a reduction in FSI levels between the groups (p=0.0017), with a reduction in both groups: NDM (p=0.0034) and T2DM group (p=0.0166), figure 3.3.1.2.

There was no difference in the direction of change of FSI levels between the NDM and T2DM groups was detected (p=0.8095).

3.3.1.3 HOMA-IR(1)

Analysis of the whole cohort showed a reduction in HOMA-IR by POD4 (p=0.0002). Analysis of the group data revealed a difference in HOMA-IR

between the groups (p<0.0001), with a reduction in both the NDM (p=0.0022) and the T2DM group (p=0.0074), figure 3.3.1.3i.

There was a difference in the direction of change of HOMA-IR(1) levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.0286), figure 3.3.1.3ii.

Table 3.3.1 Early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting glucose, insulin and HOMA-IR(1) levels

	Combined	Combined	NDM	NDM	T2DM	T2DM	ANOVA
	pre-op (n=17)	post-op (n=17)	pre-op	post-op (n=10)	pre-op (n=7)	post-op (n=7)	
			(n=10)				
Glucose	7.329 +/- 4.078	5.894 +/- 2.000 *	5.350 +/-	4.660 +/-	10.16 +/-	7.657 +/- 2.004	***
(mmol/L)			0.4577	0.5719 **	5.307	ns	
Serum	31.73 +/- 20.19	9.609 +/- 4.480 ****	29.52 +/-	8.283 +/- 3.720	34.89 +/-	11.50 +/- 5.063	**
insulin			20.40	**	21.06	*	
(mU/L)							
HOMA-IR(1)	10.86 +/- 8.177	2.591 +/- 1.735 ***	6.996 +/-	1.729 +/-	16.37 +/-	3.823 +/- 2.006	****
			4.656	0.8135 **	9.243	**	

Data are presented as mean and sd. Data analysis: paired t-test and ANOVA for analysis across the four groups.

*= p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; ***=p<0.001; ****=p<0.0001; ns = non-sign



Figure 3.3.1.1. Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma glucose in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.0001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 3.3.1.2 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting serum insulin in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 3.3.1.3i Scatter plot of the early effects of RYGB surgery upon HOMA-IR(1) in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 3.3.1.3ii. Box plot of delta HOMA-IR(1) pre-and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. Unpaired t-test was used for comparison, **=p<0.01.

**

3.3.2 The early effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial plasma glucose and serum insulin levels

3.3.2.1 Glucose

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon glucose levels are shown in figure 3.3.2.1i.

The peak post-prandial glucose levels were different between the groups (p=0.0008) being higher in the T2DM group both before and after surgery, p=0.0146 and p<0.0001 respectively. However, there was no difference around RYGB surgery in either group, NDM p=0.6287 and T2DM p=0.4297. The post-prandial glucose excursion was different between the groups (p=0.0019) but no difference around RYGB surgery was detected in either the NDM (p=0.4627) or the T2DM group (p=0.9422), figure 3.3.2.1ii. There was no difference in the RYGB effect upon post-prandial glucose levels between the two groups (p=0.3955).

A significant difference in time to return to baseline glucose levels existed between the 4 groups, p=0.0185, being quicker before RYGB surgery in both groups, NDM (p=0.0060) and T2DM group (p=0.1193), figure 3.3.2.1iii. There was no difference in the direction of change of time for postprandial plasma glucose levels to return to baseline around RYGB surgery, p=0.1357. This supports the theory that the prolongation of the time to return to baseline is more likely to be as a result of surgery than T2DM status.

3.3.2.2 Insulin

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon insulin levels are shown in figure

3.3.2.2i.

There was no difference in peak post-prandial insulin levels between the groups (p=0.1965). Delta 0-15min post-prandial insulin levels is a surrogate indicator of the first phase response of oral stimulation to insulin secretion.

There was no difference in delta 0–15min insulin levels between the groups (p=0.2862), supportive of the theory that improvements in post-prandial glycaemic control following RYGB surgery are not predominantly due to improvements in insulin secretion, figure 3.3.2.2ii.

There was no difference in the postprandial insulin secretion around RYGB surgery between the groups (p=0.6714), figure 3.3.2.2iii. There was no difference in the effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial insulin secretion between the two groups (p=0.7292).



Figure 3.3.2.1i Graph of the post-prandial plasma glucose levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 3.3.2.1ii Box plot of iAUC post-prandial plasma glucose levels after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. Paired t-test was used for pre- and post-operative and ANOVA for all group comparison. **=p<0.01; ns= non-significant.



Figure 3.3.2.1iii Box plot of time for plasma glucose levels to return to baseline following mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. Paired t-test was used for pre- and post-operative and ANOVA for all group comparison. *= p<0.05; **=p<0.01; ns= non-significant.



Figure 3.3.2.2i Graph of the post-prandial serum insulin levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 3.3.2.2ii Box plot delta 0-15min post-prandial serum insulin levels after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. Paired t-test and ANOVA were used for analysis, ns= non-significant.



Figure 3.3.2.2iii Scatter plot of iAUC post-prandial serum insulin levels after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups; ns= non-significant.

3.4 Discussion

Obesity and T2DM are associated with insulin resistance.³⁹⁹ As IR develops, insulin release increases to accommodate for the reduced efficiency of insulin action.^{6,400,401} When the B-cells are unable to fully compensate for this, T2DM (that is hyperglycaemia) develops.⁷

This process is closely linked with elevated NEFA levels, present in obesity and T2DM.^{77,78,402} Increased NEFA levels can induce IR, impair insulin secretion and reduce insulin biosynthesis.^{76,92,93,403} This is likely to occur because intracellular NEFA competes with glucose substrate oxidation, augmenting pyruvate dehydrogenase, phosphofructokinase and hexokinase II activity.⁴⁰⁴ In turn, fatty acid metabolite concentration increases, reducing activation of PI(3)K⁴⁰⁵ and diminishing events downstream of insulin-receptor signalling.⁷⁶

RYGB results in remission of T2DM and most patients are able to discontinue diabetes-related medications.^{9,12,18} There is considerable variability in the criteria and methods employed to diagnose T2DM remission following weight loss surgery. Standardisation of clinical and physiological outcomes after surgery for T2DM have not been established.⁴⁰⁶

In this chapter, I have looked at the impact of RYGB on fasted and postprandial glucose and insulin levels in both diabetic and non-diabetic states. The WHO diagnostic criteria for T2DM are: fasting plasma glucose \geq 7.0 mmol/l **or** 2hr plasma glucose* \geq 11.1 mmol/l; IGT: fasting plasma glucose < 7.0 mmol/l **and** 2hr plasma glucose* \geq 7.8 and < 11.1 mmol/l; IFG: fasting plasma glucose 6.1 - 6.9 mmol/l **and (if measured)** 2hr plasma glucose* < 7.8 mmol/l; NDM: fasting plasma glucose \leq 6.0 mmol/l. * venous plasma glucose 2hr after ingestion of 75g oral glucose load.³⁵⁶ As such, in order to confirm remission of T2DM, FPG and 2h oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) measurements are appropriate.^{385,407} Impairment in insulin secretion is more relevant in IFG, while deterioration in insulin sensitivity is more important to IGT.⁴⁰⁸ However there are concerns regarding the validity of the 2h OGTT post-RYGB.⁴⁰⁹

Although the effect of RYGB upon transit time remains controversial,^{66,101,410-}⁴¹² it does not appear to result in sugar malabsorption.⁶⁶ Irrespective of this, faster enteric absorption occurs,⁴¹³ supported by higher post-prandial peak glucose concentration⁴¹⁴ and a quicker return to baseline level.²³³

The OGTT study assesses the ability of the subject to optimally process dietary glucose. It reflects the first phase of insulin secretion, inhibiting hepatic glucose production with a poor or inappropriate first phase of insulin secretion being associated with unsuppressed postprandial glucose production, leading to subsequent higher postprandial glycaemia.⁴¹⁵ As such, an abnormal first phase insulin secretion is associated with increased risk of T2DM,⁴¹⁶⁻⁴¹⁸ making the OGTT the most effective test for the early diagnosis of T2DM.⁴¹⁹

Impaired β-cell function can alter post-prandial plasma glucose excursion, with the time to return to baseline being an important measurement.⁴²⁰ A 2hr OGTT can establish normal glucose tolerance (NGT), IGT or diagnose previously unrecognised T2DM. It can also establish whether an IFG subject has normal 2hr PG. This is an important finding, as the majority of IFG subjects with NGT have a better prognosis, suggesting their B-cell function is more efficient or better preserved.^{421,422} Although 1hr PG has a better predictive power to diagnose future diabetes than either FPG or 2hPG,⁴²² its variability is greater. Hence 2h plasma glucose is more reproducible and accurate as a standard diagnostic test.

In this study a MMT (with 30.1% CHO) rather than 75g glucose load was used. The time to return to baseline plasma glucose was longer post-RYGB. Although this finding conflicts with other studies,²³³ it does question the validity of 2h OGTT as an accurate method of assessing glucose tolerance post-RYGB. This issue of standardisation and accuracy is compounded by variation in the constituents of the MMT. Some studies used 50g glucose load, instead of 75g, citing concerns regarding dumping syndrome for this

variation.^{21,38,264} The reduction of the glucose load, in an attempt to avoid dumping symptoms in this patient group, is unnecessary and has augmented the confusion surrounding remission of T2DM post-RYGB.⁴²³ MMT is the optimal method of assessing post-prandial gut hormone secretion and should not be used for T2DM assessment.³⁸⁵ All T2DM participants in this study underwent formal T2DM assessment on POD7 using FPG and 2hr OGTT with 75g glucose load for clinical management purposes (mean FPG 8.73+/-4.92 mmol/L, 2hOGTT 12.78+/-4.32 mmol/L (n=6); four patients' T2DM status persisted as FPG≥7.0 mmol/l and two patients had IGT but, would have been classified as NDM without OGTT). Further studies using the standard 75g glucose load around RYGB in patients with and without T2DM are required to validate this test.

A less sensitive measure of glycaemic control is HbA1c. A value \geq 6.5% is diagnostic of diabetes while 5.7-6.4% should be considered high risk for future development.⁴²⁴ A high HbA1c value suggests the presence of fasting hyperglycaemia,⁴²⁵ whereas whilst borderline levels are associated with only post-prandial hyperglycaemia. There is no clear target HbA1c level after RYGB to define T2DM remission.^{385,407,426} A 2hOGTT should also be performed.⁴²¹ Medically-treated T2DM patients undergoing targeted treatment to reduce their HbA1c have been found to have higher mortality rates.⁴²⁷ Although of interest, the clinical relevance of HbA1c in this context is still unclear.

Despite the lack of standardisation in diagnosis of T2DM after RYGB, a number of comparative studies have shown that bariatric surgery (RYGB or sleeve gastrectomy) leads to improved glycaemic control and cardiovascular risk factors, compared with best medical therapy alone.⁴²⁸⁻⁴³⁰ Factors predicting remission of T2DM following bariatric surgery include greater weight loss and shorter history of diabetes following restrictive surgery,¹⁹ lower BMI and fasting C-peptide levels post-RYGB.⁴³¹

Relapse of T2DM does occur.^{12,432} Risk of relapse is increased by weight regain⁴³³ and reduced in patients with a shorter pre-surgery diabetes

duration.⁴³⁴ Patients should be counselled accordingly. They should be told clearly that remission of T2DM following RYGB may not be permanent, but bariatric surgery is associated with fewer micro- and macrovascular complications than non-operative management.⁴³⁴

The most widely reported assessment of T2DM around RYGB in FPG (see table).^{18,21,26,38,385,396,407,426} FPG is an important measurement in the diagnosis of T2DM,³⁵⁶ and both FPG and fasting serum insulin (FSI) reflect insulin resistance.³⁶⁰ RYGB reduces FPG and FSI in both the short- and long-term.⁴³⁵ I report similar findings by POD4 in this study.

This study shows improved insulin sensitivity by POD4, assessed using HOMA-IR, in participants with and without T2DM. This reflects improved hepatic insulin sensitivity.⁴³⁶ These findings are consistent with other studies, both within the first week post-RYGB³⁸⁵ and over a longer timeframe.^{11,20,95,385} Other groups have corroborated these results using hyperglycaemic clamp studies.⁴³⁷ When combined with isotope tracer studies, these investigations show that reduction in hepatic glucose production rather than improvements in peripheral insulin sensitivity (predominantly skeletal muscle) are responsible for remission of T2DM.⁴³⁸⁻⁴⁴⁰ The results of hyperinsulinaemic-euglycaemic clamp studies with tracer technique have also reached similar conclusions, showing an improvement in hepatic IR and also improved AT IR, although beta cell function is largely unchanged early post-RYGB.⁴⁴¹

Caloric restriction alone could explain these findings,^{27,442-445} as comparable results are reported following sleeve gastrectomy.⁴⁴⁶ Taken together with studies showing improvements post-AGB^{28,385} and improvement in IR post-RYGB disproportionate to diet at equivalent weight loss in T2DM,⁴⁴⁷ it is likely that other factors are responsible. Longer-term improvements in IR are associated with weight loss and improvements in peripheral insulin sensitivity are detected latterly.^{439,441} Changes in plasma TG levels (Chapter 4), and altered lipid processing are also implicated.^{88,448} A reduction in hepatic but

not muscle lipid content has been reported post-RYGB in rodents,⁴⁴⁹ suggesting that reduced lipotoxicity may have an effect.

The rate of hepatic glucose production and hepatic insulin sensitivity is inversely proportional to intrahepatic lipid content⁴⁵⁰⁻⁴⁵³ and both reduced energy intake and moderate weight loss can affect this.⁴⁵⁴⁻⁴⁵⁶ Conversely, high NEFA levels lead to insulin resistance^{88,402} and their reduction post-RYGB may improve IR and insulin secretion.⁷⁶

Post-prandial glucose excursions are a reflection of total carbohydrate intake, glucose absorption, glucose processing and insulin secretion.^{457,458} Following RYGB, dietary sugar intake is reduced,⁴⁵⁹ although there are no changes in monosaccharide absorption.⁶⁶ Studies are not consistent regarding potential alteration in transit time post-RYGB.^{66,101,410-412} In addition, the early post-operative dietary restrictions have been shown to improve glucose tolerance levels in T2DM, potentially affecting these results.^{27,442}

As anticipated, peak glucose levels were higher in participants with T2DM than NDM, with no difference in the effect of RYGB between the two groups. There were higher iAUC glucose levels in T2DM subjects, but no difference in post-prandial glucose excursions were detected in either group around RYGB surgery. Other authors have reported a reduction in post-prandial glucose levels after RYGB surgery.²¹ Diet-equivalent weight loss does not lower postprandial glucose levels to the same extent in patients with T2DM.³⁸ This disparity could be due to variations in meal challenge and data analysis (tAUC/iAUC). In addition, there was no difference between the two groups, supporting the assertion that there is no improvement in insulin secretion early post-RYGB.

Post-prandial insulin levels are a reflection of glucose absorption rate,⁴⁶⁰ beta-cell response and reserve,⁴⁶¹⁻⁴⁶⁴ and incretin responses.^{465,466} Enhanced insulin response and exaggerated incretin secretion alone may improve the response of beta-cells to changes in plasma glucose,^{21,437,439,467} with improvements occurring early post-RYGB.^{468,469}

This study reports no difference in post-prandial insulin secretion around RYGB surgery using peak insulin, iAUC insulin or the first phase insulin response, approximated using $\Delta 0$ -15min insulin, corroborating other studies.²⁶⁶ This differs from current dogma regarding gut hormone stimulation of insulin secretion post-RYGB. Theories of remission of T2DM post-RYGB hinge on improvements in IR and increased incretin secretion, due to the response of the distal small bowel to nutrients. This results in increased incretin stimulation (the hindgut theory),^{54,59-61} and subsequent insulin secretion. Increased post-prandial incretin secretion following RYGB has been shown^{20,21} and may be a potential mediator of improved insulin secretion.²¹ Other studies have reported increased insulin production post-RYGB ($\Delta 0$ -15m),³⁸⁵ which is different to this study.

Although an increased incretin effect upon post-prandial insulin has been shown one month post-RYGB in T2DM patients,²¹ the same study reported lower postprandial insulin levels post-RYGB. There was no difference in tAUC insulin one month after RYGB,^{21,38} corroborating my results. Hyperglycaemic clamp studies in RYGB patients have been used to assess insulin secretion.⁴⁷⁰ They have shown no change in the first phase insulin concentration after surgery and that the second phase insulin concentration is reduced by 40% at one and four weeks post-RYGB.^{428,437,471}

These data are not easy to understand. Insulin secretion is contingent upon insulin sensitivity and the requirement to impr ove intra-cellular glucose transport. Therefore, as insulin resistance has decreased by POD4, a larger volume of insulin secretion is no longer required to improve hyperglycaemia. Although much interest surrounds the reversal of the blunted incretin effect of T2DM following RYGB as the potential mediator of T2DM remission,²¹ it is most likely the improvements in insulin resistance, rather than increased incretin and tailored insulin secretion which are predominantly responsible for remission of T2DM after RYGB. There are other potential hypotheses to explain the remission of T2DM post RYGB. Reduction in oral intake of sugar either due to alteration in preferences,⁴⁷² changes in brain-reward response,^{473,474} dumping avoidance⁴⁷⁵ or simply reduction in caloric intake can all contribute to improved beta cell function and hepatic insulin sensitivity.⁴⁷⁶

Gut realignment is also very important. The entero-insular axis is designed to stimulate islets to secrete insulin in response to gut stimuli, via endocrine transmission, neuro-transmission and substrate stimulation.⁴⁷⁷ In T2DM, there is a reduced GIP response to oral glucose,⁴⁷⁸ which is not reversed by increased exogenous GIP.¹⁷⁶ The development of glucose intolerance has been linked to a defect in GIP signalling pathways, reducing the expression of GIPR and attenuating the effect of GIP, in T2DM.^{479,480} Post-RYGB, nutrients reach the distal gut causing increased post-prandial GLP-1 and GIP levels^{20,21,23,385} which could be a potential mediator of improved insulin secretion (the hindgut theory).⁴⁸¹ Although these changes occur prior to and independent of weight loss,^{38,385} diet-induced weight loss can increase GLP-1 levels.¹⁶⁷

Bypassing the proximal intestine directly ameliorates T2DM, independent of the effects on food intake, body weight, malabsorption, or nutrient delivery to the hindgut.⁵³ This was evident in diabetic patients undergoing gastrectomy and duodenal exclusion for oncological or emergency indications.^{18,54,55,482-484} When these operations are performed in NDM subjects, impaired glucose tolerance can still occur^{482,485-487} suggesting it disrupts the physiologic entero-insular axis, suggesting that some degree of duodenal-jejunal dysfunction may be associated with T2DM.⁵³

Additional support for the foregut theory are that studies involving a duodenal-jejunal plastic sleeve insertion, in effect creating a duodenal bypass, have shown improvements in glucose tolerance in patients with T2DM.^{62,488-490} These findings were not independent of GLP-1 changes,⁴⁸⁹ which supports the hypothesis that reduced caloric intake is not the primary mechanism of diabetes control.⁵³ Although RYGB alters fasting and post-

prandial gut hormone changes prior to weight loss,^{20,23,57} this is not the dominant mechanism of remission of T2DM, rather that improvements in IR predominate.

Pancreatic β-cell function improves early after RYGB.^{468,469} Changes in NEFA levels may be responsible for this. An acute negative energy balance study showed that improvements in hepatic insulin sensitivity and increased in beta cell function were associated with decreased pancreatic and liver TG concentrations, by releasing the beta cells from the chronic inhibitory effects of excess fatty acid exposure.⁴⁷⁶

Insulin resistance in adipose tissue is characterised by excess lipolysis, increased NEFA levels. This occurs despite the presence of hyperinsulinaemia, with impaired suppression of plasma NEFA levels.^{402,491-⁴⁹³ In healthy NDM subjects, elevated plasma NEFA causes hepatic and skeletal muscle IR.^{402,491-495} This may explain why pathologically increased rates of lipid turnover precede the development of T2DM in subjects with a family history of T2DM⁴⁹⁶⁻⁴⁹⁸ or non-diabetic obesity.^{499,500}}

Chronic exposure to NEFA is associated with marked impairments in glucose-stimulated insulin secretion and decreased insulin biosynthesis.^{92,93,501-505} Acute increases in NEFA levels can contribute to insulin resistance and impair compensatory β -cell response. This is consistent with the changes seen in obesity-related T2DM,⁴⁰³ with prolonged elevation in NEFA impairing β -cell function.⁵⁰⁶

NEFA changes after RYGB are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 and 5. The increased NEFA levels early post-RYGB are consistent with improved lipolysis arising from enhanced adipocyte insulin sensitivity in presence of large volume of fat mass.⁹⁵ This effect is reduced after weight loss.⁵⁰⁷ Differences in fasting and post-prandial NEFA and TG following RYGB have been reported, possibly due to low inhibition of lipolysis due to lower insulin levels.⁹⁵ Ultimately, the main aim for treatment of T2DM is reduction of microvascular and macrovascular complications and mortality. Intensive treatment of diabetes can decrease the development and/or progression of microvascular and macrovascular complications associated with the disease.^{29,508} Although therapy was focussed on lowering HbA1c levels,⁵⁰⁹ persistent elevation in postprandial blood glucose levels remains the primary pathophysiological problem.⁵¹⁰ Isolated reduction in HbA1c is associated with increased mortality. The goal of treatment should be prevention of complications, using a multi-faceted approach including hypertension control, lipid reduction and glycaemic control.⁴²⁷

Reassuringly end organ damage associated with diabetes can be halted or reversed. For example, after pancreas transplantation, diabetic neuropathy can be halted,⁵¹¹ diabetic nephropathy reversed⁵¹² but diabetic retinopathy is neither reversed nor progression halted.⁵¹³ Bariatric surgery leads to a reduction in all-cause mortality, and cardiovascular deaths, including a reduction in cardiovascular events in the pre-surgery T2DM group.⁵¹⁴⁻⁵¹⁶ RYGB is associated with cessation of the development of microvascular complications such as nephropathy⁵¹⁷ and reduced micro- and macrovascular complications of T2DM.^{434,517}

Obesity is associated with a chronic inflammatory state. There is extensive literature supporting this, including the finding of increased CRP in obese individuals.⁵¹⁹ The finding of microparticles in obese subjects may promote the expression of tissue factor-mediated athero-thrombotic vascular injury.⁵²⁰⁻⁵²² The reduction in T2DM-related end-organ damage might be linked to a reduction in microparticles after bariatric surgery in T2DM patients, with reduced inflammation.⁵²³ Reduction in microparticle concentrations (endothelial and tissue factor) occurs after bariatric surgery in patients with T2DM and is associated with falling HbA1c levels.⁵²³

Although the majority of T2DM patients undergoing RYGB develop improved glycaemic control, substantial aberrations in B-cell function and/or insulin sensitivity remain.^{447,524} Gut adaptation post-RYGB leads to increased GLP-2

and mucosal crypt cell proliferation, which may limit any malabsorptive effect of RYGB over the long-term, accounting for eventual weight regain.²⁷² The chance of relapse of T2DM, along with the potential for progression of endorgan damage, means that diabetic patients should continue to be followed up and managed actively, irrespective of the degree of T2DM remission or improvement.

The strengths of this study are that it is a prospective paired analysis, in participants with a similar degree of weight loss and includes separate subgroup analysis of subjects with and without T2DM. This study also has limitations. The sample size was small with gender and ethnic diversity. Subjects were in a negative energy balance in the early post-operative period and these results may not fully reflect what happens once a stable weight is reached. Both physical activity and pre-operative diet were not strictly controlled which can also introduce further biases.⁵²⁵

In summary, RYGB significantly improves glycaemic control and can result in improvements in micro- and macrovascular complications of T2DM. Remission of T2DM, as defined by 2h OGTT, occurs before any significant weight loss. In the first week after RYGB, there is a reduction in both fasting glucose and insulin levels, indicating that IR improves quickly after surgery. However, there was no change in postprandial glucose or insulin levels after RYGB. There was still a prolongation in the time required for glucose levels to return to baseline. Taken together with the wide variation in published methodology used to assess diabetic status after RYGB, highlights that our understanding of the true prevalence of T2DM remission is still unclear. Further multi-centre large scale studies using a standardised framework of diagnostic tests for T2DM are required.

3.5 Conclusion

By postoperative day 4, there is no effect upon postprandial glucose control in subjects with T2DM after RYGB. However, surgery improves insulin resistance and tailors insulin secretion.

The diagnosis of T2DM relies upon FPG and 2h OGTT results. Although currently there is no evidence to support the augmentation of the diagnostic criteria of T2DM in the post-RYGB cohort further investigation is likely to prove otherwise.

4. The effect of RYGB surgery upon gut hormones

4.1 Introduction

It is widely believed that gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery result in, or are at least a major contributor to, remission of T2DM. These gut hormones elicit their effects through taste,⁵²⁶ hunger and satiety,²⁰ food intake and choice,⁵²⁷ gut transit time,⁵²⁸ gut microflora symbiosis,^{529,530} and bile acid circulation.^{73,166,530,531} More recently, it has been recognised that their effect upon insulin secretion and subsequent augmentation of glycaemic control and fat cell breakdown may be at least as important.

Incretins are gut peptides which stimulate insulin secretion in response to orally-ingested nutrients, in the presence of glucose.¹⁰⁶ GLP-1 and GIP are the main incretins, responsible for 50-60% of post-prandial insulin secretion.¹⁰⁷ RYGB surgery alters incretin responses. The hindgut theory suggests that expedited delivery of undigested food to the distal intestine exaggerates GLP-1 secretion from the intestinal L cells, improving glycaemic control.^{54,59-61} However, animal models suggest duodenal exclusion is required in addition to gastro-jejunostomy to improve glucose tolerance, the foregut theory.⁵³

Although gut hormone responses to food ingestion around RYGB have been widely studied, there is a paucity of data regarding them in patients without T2DM. This prospective study was designed to quantify the gut hormone response to food stimuli before and after RYGB, prior to weight loss, and compare these effects in participants with and without T2DM.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 Clinical methods

The methodology of this study is detailed in chapter 2. In summary, venous blood was sampled following a 10hr fast and at fixed time points after drinking a 420 k-cal mixed meal test (MMT), constituents % kcal from carbohydrate, fat and protein were 30.1, 23.3 and 5.0 respectively (see appendix 1), both before and four days following RYGB surgery. These blood samples were placed in pre-primed sampling tubes (as per table 2.4.1.1), centrifuged and stored at -20°C until analysis.

4.2.2 Assays

All hormonal and metabolites assays were assayed in duplicate, this was performed at the Biochemistry department of Kings College Hospital, London. ELISA was used to measure active GLP-1 (7-36 and 7-37 amide) and total GIP (Linco Research, Missouri, USA), Ghrelin (SCETI KK Medical Section, DF Kuasumigaseki Place, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan) and CCK (Phoenix Pharmaceuticals Inc., CA, USA). Total PYY was measured by Radioimmunoassay (RIA) (Linco Research, Missouri, USA), see section 2.2.5.4 and appendix 2.

4.2.3 Statistical analysis

Outcome variables were plasma GLP-1, GIP, PYY, Ghrelin and CCK concentrations. Assessment of hormonal responses to the MMT stimuli was performed using AUC 0-180' for all outcome variables, calculated as total area (tAUC) and the area above baseline (incremental area, iAUC), using the trapezoidal method.³⁸⁶ iAUC was used when meal-stimulated increases were expected (GLP-1, GIP, PYY, CCK) and tAUC when meal-stimulated responses decrease or no responses were expected (ghrelin). ANOVA with repeated measures was used to compare hormonal changes over time during the MMT study before and after RYGB in participants with and without T2DM.

Paired *t* tests were used to compare data around RYGB surgery. Comparison of the different gut hormone responses to RYGB surgery (the RYGB effect) were calculated using a modification of the incretin effect calculation,³⁸⁷ whereby the difference in AUC post-RYGB was subtracted from AUC pre-RYGB, divided by the AUC pre-RYGB (as the denominator) the multiplied by 100 to give the ratio as a percentage, using iAUC or tAUC as per above.

(Post-RYGB AUC – Pre-RYGB AUC) * 100 Pre-RYGB AUC

Mann-Whitney test was used to analyse the RYGB effect data. Data are expressed as mean +/-sd. Statistical significance was considered p<0.05. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism® (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA). For further details regarding the statistical analyses see section 2.4.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 The early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma gut hormone levels

Participants were grouped according to T2DM status: NDM (n=10) and T2DM (n=9). Participant characteristics were similar between the groups, see section 2.2.4 for further details.

The early effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma gut hormone levels have been summarised, table 4.3.1.

4.3.1.1 GLP-1

The total participant group data were analysed first, revealing no difference in fasting plasma GLP-1 levels by post-operative day (POD) 4 (p=0.6300). Analysis of the group data revealed no difference in fasting GLP-1 levels between the groups (p=0.1659), figure 4.3.1.1. There was no difference in the direction of change of fasting GLP-1 levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.6860).

4.3.1.2 GIP

The total participant group data revealed a difference in fasting plasma GIP levels by POD 4 (p=0.0079) with a reduction from mean 82.74 +/- 38.44 to 55.86 +/- 20.52 pg/ml.

There was a significant difference in fasting GIP levels between the groups (p=0.0416) but this did not reach significance in either group: NDM mean 74.74 +/- 40.64 to 49.64 +/- 15.63 (p=0.0558) and T2DM mean 94.17 +/- 34.68 to 64.76 +/- 24.48 (p=0.0978), figure 4.3.1.2. There was no difference in the direction of change of fasting GIP levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.7107).

Table 4.3.1 Early effects of RYGB surgery upon	fasting plasma gut hormone levels
--	-----------------------------------

Plasma	Combined	Combined	NDM	NDM	T2DM	T2DM	ANOVA
gut	pre-op (n=17)	post-op (n=17)	pre-op (n=10)	post-op (n=10)	pre-op (n=7)	post-op (n=7)	
hormones							
GLP-1 (pM)	3.780 +/-	3.472 +/- 2.038	4.822 +/-	4.050 +/- 2.450	2.291 +/-	2.647 +/- 0.851	ns
	3.187	ns	3.777	ns	1.136	ns	
GIP (pg/ml)	82.74 +/-	55.86 +/- 20.52 **	74.74 +/-	49.64 +/- 15.63	94.17 +/-	64.76 +/- 24.48	*
	38.44		40.64	ns	34.68	ns	
PYY (pg/ml)	85.74 +/-	78.20 +/- 34.61	71.05 +/-	63.79 +/- 10.82	106.7 +/-	98.79 +/- 46.67	**
	28.40	ns	16.62	ns	29.38	ns	
Ghrelin	541.3 +/- 96.0	386.6 +/- 92.97	550.2 +/-	407.7 +/- 108.0	528.6 +/-	356.4 +/- 61.25	***
(pg/ml)		***	98.31	**	98.79	**	
CCK (ng/ml)	4.149 +/-	1.120 +/- 1.892	6.273 +/-	1.460 +/- 2.356	0.589 +/-	0.553 +/- 0.355	ns
	11.93	ns	14.97	ns	0.318	ns +	

⁺ n=6 for this category. Data analysis: paired t-test and ANOVA for analysis across the four groups.

*= p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; ***=p<0.001; ns = non-significant

Using unpaired t-test both pre- and post-operative fasting gut hormone levels were analysed for differences between the NDM and T2DM groups. A difference was detected both pre- and post-operatively with PPY levels, p=0.0059 and 0.0352 respectively. No differences were detected with the other gut hormones.



Figure 4.3.1.1 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma GLP-1 levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). ANOVA was used for comparison; ns = non-significant.



Figure 4.3.1.2 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma GIP levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). ANOVA was used for comparison; *= p<0.05.

4.3.1.3 PYY

The total participant group data showed no difference in fasting plasma PYY levels by POD 4 (p=0.2498). However, the analysis of the group data revealed a significant difference in fasting PYY levels between the groups (p=0.0066) with a reduction in fasting plasma PYY levels following RYGB which did not reach significance in either group individually: NDM from mean 71.05 +/- 16.62 to 63.79 +/- 10.82 (p=0.1521) and T2DM from 106.7 +/- 29.38 to 98.79 +/- 46.67 (p=0.6051), figure 4.3.1.3. There was no difference in the direction of change of fasting PYY levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.7212).

4.3.1.4 Ghrelin

The total participant group data showed a difference in fasting plasma ghrelin levels by POD4, p<0.0001 with a reduction from mean 541.3 +/- 96.0 to 386.6 +/- 92.97 pg/ml. The group data revealed a significant difference in fasting ghrelin levels between the groups (p=0.0005) with a reduction in both groups: NDM group from 550.2 +/- 98.31 to 407.7 +/- 108.0 (p=0.0039) and in the T2DM group from 528.6 +/- 98.79 to 356.4 +/- 61.25 pg/ml (p=0.0032), figure 4.3.1.4. No difference in the direction of change in fasting plasma ghrelin levels between the NDM and T2DM groups was detected (p=0.4575).

4.3.1.5 CCK

The total participant group data showed no difference in fasting plasma CCK levels by POD 4 (p=0.3167). Analysis of the group data revealed no difference in fasting CCK levels between the groups (p=0.4333), figure 4.3.1.5. No difference in the direction of change of fasting CCK levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.9634) was detected.



Figure 4.3.1.3 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma PYY levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). ANOVA was used for comparison; **= p<0.01.



Figure 4.3.1.4 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma ghrelin levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). ANOVA was used for comparison; ***= p<0.001.


Figure 4.3.1.5 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma CCK levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). ANOVA was used for comparison; ns = non-significant.

4.3.2 The early effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial plasma gut hormone levels

4.3.2.1 GLP-1

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon GLP-1 levels are shown in figure 4.3.2.1i.

The peak post-prandial GLP-1 levels were different between the groups (p=0.0018) being higher than pre-operatively in the both the NDM (p=0.0271) and T2DM groups (p=0.0290).

The post-prandial GLP-1 excursion was significantly different following RYGB (p=0.0004), being higher than pre-RYGB in both the NDM (p=0.0227) and T2DM groups (p=0.0161), figure 4.3.2.1ii.

There was no difference in the RYGB effect upon post-prandial GLP-1 secretion between the two groups (p=0.5197).



Figure 4.3.2.1i Graph of the post-prandial plasma GLP-1 levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 4.3.2.1ii Box plot of post-prandial response of GLP-1 (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. ANOVA was used for comparison, ***=p<0.001.

4.3.2.2GIP

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon GIP levels are shown in figure 4.3.2.2i.

The peak post-prandial GIP levels around RYGB surgery were different between the groups, p=0.0006. Following RYGB surgery the post-prandial peak of GIP levels was lower than pre- in both groups.

The post-prandial GIP excursion was significantly different following RYGB (p=0.0318), being lower than pre-RYGB in the NDM (p=0.0475) but not reaching significance in the T2DM group (p=0.0819), figure 4.3.2.2ii.

Despite this, there was no difference in RYGB effect upon post-prandial GIP secretion between the two groups (p=0.7292).



Figure 4.3.2.2i Graph of the post-prandial plasma GIP levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 4.3.2.2ii Box plot of post-prandial GIP response (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. ANOVA was used for comparison; *=p<0.05.

4.3.2.3 PYY

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon PYY levels is depicted in figure 4.3.2.3i.

The peak post-prandial PYY levels were different between the groups, p<0.0001, being higher than pre-operatively in both the NDM (p=0.0011) and T2DM groups (p=0.0154).

The post-prandial PYY excursion was significantly different following RYGB (p<0.0001). Post-operatively there was an increase in post-prandial PYY levels in both the NDM (p=0.0015) and T2DM groups (p=0.0063), figure 4.3.2.3ii.

There was no difference in the effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial PYY secretion between the two groups (p=0.8054).



Figure 4.3.2.3i Graph of post-prandial plasma PYY levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 4.3.2.3ii Box plot of post-prandial PYY response (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. ANOVA was used for comparison; ***=p<0.001.

4.3.2.4Ghrelin

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma ghrelin levels is depicted in figure 4.3.2.4i.

The peak post-prandial ghrelin levels were different between the groups, p=0.0029. Following RYGB surgery, there was a reduction in the post-prandial peak ghrelin levels in both the NDM (p=0.0407) and T2DM groups (p=0.0126).

Post-RYGB post-prandial ghrelin levels were reduced, p=0.0004. With a reduction in both the NDM (p=0.0017) and T2DM groups (p=0.0024), figure 4.3.2.4ii. However, the data was suggestive of an absence of any acute response but a change in the baseline level which was confirmed by analysis using iAUC, ANOVA p=0.5312.

There was no difference in the RYGB effect upon post-prandial ghrelin secretion between the two groups (p=0.8054).



Figure 4.3.2.4i Graph of the post-prandial plasma ghrelin levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 4.3.2.4ii Box plot of post-prandial ghrelin response (tAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. ANOVA was used for comparison; **=p<0.01.

4.3.2.5CCK

The post-prandial effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma CCK levels is depicted in the figure 4.3.2.5i.

There was no difference in the peak post-prandial CCK levels around RYGB surgery between the groups (p=0.3326).

Following RYGB surgery, the post-prandial CCK excursions were not significantly different (p=0.4920). There was one extreme outlier in the NDM pre-operative group but even if this data was excluded, there was no significant difference (p=0.6399), figure 4.3.2.5ii.

There was no difference in the effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial CCK secretion between the two groups (p=0.9391).



Figure 4.3.2.5i Graph of post-prandial plasma CCK levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



Figure 4.3.2.5ii Box plot of post-prandial CCK response (iAUC) after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. ANOVA was used for comparison; ns= non-significant.



4.4 Discussion

Gut hormones play a vital part in the relationship between organisms, their energy intake, utilisation and storage. Although it was originally believed that the RYGB procedure caused weight loss through restriction of gastric size and malabsorption,¹⁴ significant alterations in the food transit route through the gut results in changes in gut hormone secretion. This creates an opportunity to learn more about the pivotal role these hormones play, with an in vivo model. In this chapter, I have looked at the impact of T2DM on these responses finding an impact of RYGB on fasted concentrations of GIP, PYY and ghrelin in both diabetic and non-diabetic states and likewise an impact of surgery on GLP-1 and PYY responses to meal ingestion in both states.

GLP-1 is secreted from L-cells, which are distributed mostly in the distal ileum and colon.^{133,134} Similar to other studies,^{20,57,131} we found no difference in fasting GLP-1 between the four situations tested. PYY is also secreted by L-cells. After RYGB surgery there is an exaggerated postprandial response in GLP-1, in both NDM and T2DM groups. Direct stimulation of the L-cells in the distal bowel, which normally receive only later products of digestion, with nutrient rich foods explains this finding, consistent with other studies.^{20,21,36,131,410} It is this effect of the RYGB which is widely purported to be a main contributor to the remission of T2DM, reversible with GLP-1 antagonists.,^{36,128,532-534} Indeed there is a concern that the high GLP-1 responses may contribute to post-prandial hyperinsulinaemic hypoglycaemia.¹²⁸ Despite this, as shown in one previous study,⁵²⁴ the effect of RYGB surgery upon post-prandial GLP-1 secretion was not different between the NDM and T2DM groups.

GIP is a major incretin, responsible for the majority of nutrient-induced enteroinsular pancreatic beta-cell stimulation.¹¹⁷ It is secreted from the K cells in the duodenum and proximal jejunum¹¹⁴ in the presence of glucose and fat, dietary fat stimulating secretion more than sugars.¹²¹ In contrast to GLP-1, GIP's stimulation is more reliant upon rate of nutrient absorption than luminal content.¹¹⁵ Increased GIP secretion in both fasting and post-prandial states has been reported in T2DM^{115,122,125-127} but, in T2DM the insulinotropic effect of GIP is lost,¹⁰⁸ reversible by fasting.¹⁰⁶ The impact of RYGB is controversial.

In this study fasting GIP levels were reduced post-RYGB in both my groups, consistent with Clements et al,¹²⁹ others reporting no change,^{21,38} and some showing a reduction in T2DM but not NDM groups.⁵⁷ My study may have been underpowered to detect a difference between the NDM and T2DM groups, but importantly, no difference in the direction of change following RYGB, between the two groups was detected.

Post-RYGB food by-passes the duodenum and proximal jejunum and the absorption of fats is reduced.⁶⁶ This may explain why post-prandial GIP levels are reduced post-operatively in both groups, confirming a previous report.¹³¹ Some groups have reported no difference in post-prandial GIP levels around RYGB surgery however differing meal stimuli could explain this disparity.^{21,264} I found no difference in RYGB effect for postprandial GIP secretion between the NDM and T2DM groups.

PYY secretion in the distal ileum and colonic L-cells^{184,185} is vagally mediated in response to neuroendocrine mechanisms in the duodenum or through direct nutrient stimuli.^{187,192} As anticipated, there was no difference in fasting PYY levels following RYGB. Post-RYGB the duodenal stimuli route may be disrupted but the increased direct stimuli of nutrient rich food in the distal bowel explain the increase in post-prandial PYY levels in this and supporting studies.^{20,23,36,206,524,535}

Postprandial PYY levels are blunted in the early stage of the development of T2DM.²⁰⁴ This study confirmed a difference in PYY levels between the NDM and T2DM groups both pre- and post-operatively. However, no significant difference in the RYGB effect upon post-prandial PYY was noted between the NDM and T2DM groups. This may be because very little post-prandial effect was seen in either group in the pre-RYGB state as obesity alone blunts

the fasting and PYY response to a meal-stimulus.¹⁹⁸ RYGB resulted in exaggerated basal concentrations and postprandial responses in both groups however a non-obese surgical group would be required to investigate this further.

Ghrelin stimulates food intake through stimulation of hunger in the hypothalamus.^{213,214} Concentrations increasing in fasting and are suppressed post-prandially,²¹⁸⁻²²⁰ once nutrients reach the small bowel.^{156,219,221,222} Suppression of ghrelin in the post-prandial period is reliant upon active absorption of nutrients in the small bowel.²²¹ In obesity and insulin-resistance, both fasting and post-prandial suppression of ghrelin are reduced,^{227,236,237} and increased concentrations post-RYGB may be secondary to improvements in insulin resistance and a reduction in hyperinsulinaemia, increasing further as weight loss occurs. However current literature suggests a reduction or no difference in fasting and postprandial ghrelin levels following surgery.^{23,36} In agreement with this, we showed a reduction in fasting ghrelin levels by POD4 with no difference in effect between the NDM and T2DM groups.

I report a reduction in post-prandial ghrelin levels following a mixed meal after RYGB, perhaps related to the rapid transit of food to the jejunum,²²¹ which supports other reports.²³³ Further analyses of this data is more suggestive that the change in baseline ghrelin post-RYGB, rather than a change in the acute response, is more likely responsible for this finding. There was no difference in the effect when controlled for T2DM. This may be due to improvements in insulin sensitivity in both groups. Further studies are required to delineate this further.

CCK is predominantly secreted from the duodenal I-cells in response to intraluminal foods.^{240-243,263} As food bypasses the duodenum following RYGB surgery, one would expect to see CCK levels diminish post-operatively. My data are consistent with other studies investigating CCK levels around RYGB, showing no difference in the fasting state.^{57,264} However, conflicting results have been published including reports that show no significant difference in post-prandial CCK levels with glucose- or protein-only meal stimulation^{206,266} and increased post-prandial CCK levels following mixed meal stimulation.²⁶³⁻²⁶⁵ My study used a mixed meal stimulus, yet showed no difference in post-prandial CCK levels post RYGB. This may be because my study was undertaken on POD4, early after surgery, before there has been time for gut adaptation, which has been linked to increase in CCK levels.^{268,272}

The large number of reported variations in gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery lead to confusion. Many factors may contribute to this. There is no global consensus regarding optimal gastric pouch size, orientation and Roux limb length. Post-surgical vagal nerve disruption is variable. Timing of post-operative assessment, may have an impact upon stress response, gut adaptation and weight loss. Different gut hormone responses have been shown in obesity, T2DM and IR states. Many studies do not control for these variables. Results may be affected by the different types of test meals used to measure the gut hormone response.²⁶⁴

There is also much variation in the quality and suitability of the data analyses across the literature. Paired statistical analyses are preferable with postprandial assessment i.e. iAUC or tAUC for increasing and reducing postprandial responses respectively.³⁸⁶ Variation in timing and number of measurements to facilitate AUC analysis also exist. Heterogeneity between studies may be reduced by introduction of agreed standardised methodology in the in vivo assessment and reporting of gut hormone responses.

Timing of investigation is key. Remission of T2DM occurs within days of RYGB surgery, prior to weight loss.¹⁸ Previous studies into the early effects of RYGB surgery upon gut hormones confirmed that changes occurred up to 2 days post-operatively, coinciding with the improvements in glycaemic control.^{20,23} Post-operative assessments performed on day 4, to control for the effect of weight loss upon the outcomes (ns). This study is part of a larger project, designed to delineate the *early* effects of plasma and gut hormone changes following RYGB surgery upon lipolysis in human

adipocytes, controlling for T2DM and weight loss. The sample size was calculated to assess this primary outcome and as such may not have appropriate power to detect real differences in peptide responses between the NDM and T2DM groups. Nevertheless, participants served as their own controls and this increases the validity of the findings.

The prolonged post-operative fasting period may have an important confounding impact on these findings. GIP and ghrelin levels are reduced following fasting^{536,537} but no difference in PYY and CCK have been shown.^{538,539} The effect of fasting upon GLP-1 remains unreported. Although laparoscopic surgery in general may have little effect on gut transit and absorption in the early post-operative period,⁵⁴⁰ the RYGB procedure may increase transit times.^{66,410}

This study has shown that RYGB exerts specific effects on each of the various gut hormones studied. There is no evidence to support a concept of global suppression of the gut hormone response by POD4 following RYGB. Animal and human studies evaluating the in vivo effect of targeted inhibition of specific hormones would further illuminate our understanding of the effect of gut hormones on glycaemic and lipidaemic control and may give rise to novel treatments of T2DM.

Many complex explanations for the gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery have been proposed. The predominant reason is that re-routing of the food transit through the gut changes absorption, rate and volume, and direct and indirect stimulation of these hormones accordingly. Gut hormones are secreted (GLP-1, PYY, GIP, CCK) or inhibited (ghrelin) in the post-prandial period to impact food desire, intake, utilisation and storage. Post-RYGB, foods reach the distal bowel early, resulting in increased GLP-1 and PYY stimulation together with ghrelin suppression. The reduction in GIP secretion resulting from reduced duodenal food transit. Other mechanisms have a smaller impact.

4.5 Conclusion

RYGB surgery significantly changes post-prandial gut hormone secretion, independent of T2DM.

5. The effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma lipids

5.1 Introduction

The post-operative alterations in glycaemic control, including remission or improvement in T2DM, are increasingly being considered as the primary goal for RYGB, rather than weight loss per se.^{8,12,14,15,18,396,541} The changes in glucose metabolism are being widely investigated, with numerous mechanisms under consideration.^{396,542-544} Conversely, there is little interest in the improvements in hyperlipidaemia after RYGB.

Dyslipidaemia of obesity comprises: hypercholesterolaemia, hypertriglyceridaemia, lower HDL-cholesterol (HDL-C), normal to increased LDL-cholesterol (LDL-C) levels in the blood.⁵⁴⁵ Hyperlipidaemia is a risk factor for cardiac disease, independent of obesity. Increased total cholesterol and LDL-C is associated with atherosclerosis, plaque formation and rupture.⁵⁴⁶⁻⁵⁴⁸ Reduction of LDL-C with statins slows the rate of atherosclerotic disease progression and reduces major vascular events.⁵⁴⁹⁻⁵⁵² Changes in HDL-C are an independent predictor of changes in atheroma burden.⁵⁵³ The association between obesity and hyperlipidaemia is most likely a consequence of increased IR. Approximately 40% of morbidly obese patients undergoing bariatric surgery have hyperlipidaemia.⁵⁵⁴ Despite the increased risk of atherosclerosis,⁵⁵⁵ only 27% of morbidly obese patients are taking statins before weight loss surgery.⁵⁵⁶

The aim of this prospective study was to assess the early effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma lipid levels and post-prandial lipid fluxes, before weight loss occurs, in participants with and without T2DM. In addition, a systematic review and meta-analysis of the published literature was undertaken to assess the longer-term effects of RYGB upon plasma lipid levels.

5.2 Methods

5.2.1 Prospective study into the effects of RYGB upon fasting plasma lipids in the first post-operative week

The methodology of this study is detailed in chapter 2. In summary, venous blood was sampled following a 10hr fast and at fixed time points after drinking a 420 k-cal MMT, before and four days following RYGB surgery. Constituents of the MMT were CHO 30.1, fat 23.3 and protein 5.0 %kcal. In a sub-group of participants, fasting samples were also collected one week post-operatively. The participants' past medical and drug history was recorded. Lipid-lowering medications were not discontinued.

The blood samples were centrifuged and processed fresh for total cholesterol, LDL- and HDL-cholesterol and TG as per hospital assay protocols (see appendix 2). For the NEFA assay, samples were snap frozen at 4°C then analysed in batches.

Outcome variables were fasting plasma total cholesterol, LDL-C, HDL-C, triglycerides and NEFA concentrations and post-prandial NEFA concentrations. The data is reported as mean +/-sd. Assessment of NEFA responses to the MMT stimuli was performed using AUC 0-360min, calculated as total area (tAUC) using the trapezoidal method.³⁸⁶ Inter-group analysis was performed using ANOVA. Paired and unpaired t-tests were used for intra-group analyses. Results were considered statistically significant if p<0.05. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism® (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA). For further details regarding the statistical analyses see section 2.4.

5.2.2 Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of RYGB upon plasma lipids

5.2.2.1 Search strategy

A systematic review of the published medical literature was undertaken, using the electronic databases: Ovid, Medline (January 1946-March 2012), Pubmed (January 1960 to March 2012) and Embase (January 1980-March 2012). The databases were searched using the following search terms in various combinations: "obesity surgery", "bariatric surgery", "gastric bypass", "Roux-en-Y gastric bypass", "cholesterol", "lipids", "triglycerides" and "NEFA". Two reviewers (KC and AB) screened all retrieved articles and their reference lists to identify studies that fitted the selection criteria and independently assess their fit with the inclusion criteria. Any disagreement about inclusion between the two researchers was resolved by discussion.

5.2.2.2 Literature screening

Study selection was accomplished through 2 levels of study screening. At level 1 screening, abstracts were reviewed for the following exclusion criteria: publication of abstracts only, comments, reviews and editorials, animal or in vitro studies, languages other than English, not relevant. Full articles were then obtained for all studies accepted at level 1 and for any citations for which a determination could not be made from the abstract. For level 2 screening, inclusion required that the studies included patients with plasma lipid levels both before and after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery for morbid obesity; aged>18 years; n=10 or more.

5.2.2.3 Data extraction and analysis

All papers meeting level 2 screening were included in data extraction. The extracted articles could be of any design, published from 1960-March 2012 incorporating patients who had paired plasma lipid levels (any or all of: total cholesterol, LDL-cholesterol, HDL-cholesterol, triglycerides or NEFA) before and after RYGB.

Characteristics of included studies are presented in *Table 1*. Data extracted were: number of cases; patients' age and gender; BMI, plasma lipid levels (total cholesterol, LDL-cholesterol, HDL-cholesterol, triglycerides, NEFA) and time point when the outcome was measured. *Kin relationships*, defined as multiple publications describing the same or overlapping series of patients, were identified and entered into the database only once to avoid double-counting patients.

5.2.2.4 Definitions

Where the data included a range of time points >12m, they were excluded. If the data were pooled for a shorter time range e.g. 6-12m they were entered at the latest time point i.e. $12m.^{557,558}$

5.2.2.5 Statistical analysis

Analyses were performed only on the data from the studies in the data extraction subset. Study, patient, and plasma lipid data were summarised using descriptive statistics (simple counts and means+/- s.d.). On review of the literature, the majority of the data was presented as mg/dl therefore where data was presented as mmol/l this was converted to mg/dl prior to analysis. Where data was presented as mean +/- sem in order to minimise data loss this was converted to mean +/-sd assuming normal distribution data using the calculation sd = se x \sqrt{n}

Meta-analyses of efficacy outcomes were calculated within Review Manager 5 using a random-effects model (RevMan. Review Manager [computer program]. Version 5. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration. 2008.

5.3 Results

5.3.1 The early effect of RYGB upon fasting plasma lipids

Participants were grouped according to T2DM status: 10 NDM and 9 T2DM. Participant characteristics were similar between the groups, see section 2.2.4 for further details.

The early effect of RYGB upon fasting plasma lipid levels has been summarised in table 5.3.1.

The plasma lipid molecules are discussed individually in the subsequent subchapters.

5.3.1.1 Total cholesterol

In the whole cohort, there was a reduction in fasting total cholesterol levels from baseline by POD4 (p<0.0001). In both groups, there was a reduction in the fasting total cholesterol levels (NDM p<0.0001; T2DM p=0.0035, see figure 5.3.1.1). There was no difference in the direction of change of fasting total cholesterol levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.1383).

5.3.1.2 LDL-cholesterol

Analysis of the whole cohort showed a reduction in plasma LDL-C levels by POD4 (p<0.0001). Analysis of the group data revealed a reduction in the fasting LDL-C levels in the NDM group (p<0.0001) but this reduction was not statistically significant in the T2DM group (p=0.0993, see figure 5.3.1.2). This may reflect a sample size error for this outcome, as there was no difference in the direction of change of fasting LDL-C levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.9710).

5.3.1.3 HDL-cholesterol

Plasma HDL-C levels by POD4 were reduced (p<0.0001) in the whole cohort. There was also a significant reduction in both groups (NDM group p<0.01; T2DM group p<0.05; see figure 5.3.1.3.). There was no difference in the direction of change of fasting HDL-C levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.9860).

5.3.1.4 Triglycerides

Plasma triglyceride levels fell by POD4 (whole cohort p<0.05). Analysis of the group data showed a reduction in the fasting plasma triglycerides in the T2DM group (p<0.05) but not in the NDM group (p=0.3616, see figure 5.3.1.4i). There was a difference in the direction of change of fasting triglyceride levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.0163), figure 5.3.1.4ii.

5.3.1.5 NEFA

5.3.1.5.1 Fasting

Although analysis of the cohort as a whole showed that fasting serum NEFA levels fell significantly by POD4 (p<0.01), the falls in each group were not statistically significant (p=0.0875), see figure 5.3.1.5.1. There was no difference in the direction of change of fasting serum NEFA levels between the NDM and T2DM groups (p=0.8106).

Table 5.3.1 Early effects of RYGB upon fasting plasma lipid levels

Plasma lipids	Combined	Combined	NDM	NDM	T2DM	T2DM
	pre-op	post-op	pre-op	POD4	pre-op	POD4
	(n=19)	(n=18)	(n=10)	(n=10)	(n=9)	(n=8)
Total cholesterol						
- mmol/l	5.13+/-1.18	3.91+/-0.66***	4.83+/-0.86	3.85+/-0.60***	5.46+/-1.45	3.98+/-0.75**
- mg/dl	193.5+/-45.37	149.4+/-25.42	186.5+/-33.07	148.6+/-23.26	203.5+/-60.42	150.6+/-30.16
LDL-cholesterol	n=16				n=6	
- mmol/l	2.96+/-0.84	2.22+/-0.55	2.98+/-0.79	2.27+/-0.58***	2.92+/-1.01	2.15+/-0.55
-mg/dl	96.27+/-52.17	81.21+/-28.53	115.2+/-30.49	87.78+/-22.26	75.19+/-64.25	73.90+/-34.07
HDL-cholesterol	n=18				n=8	
- mmol/l	1.14+/-0.28	0.88+/-0.22	1.23+/-0.32	1.00+/-0.20**	1.03+/-0.16	0.74+/-0.14**
- mg/dl	41.66+/-14.48	32.31+/-11.31	47.49+/-12.48	38.61+/-7.722	35.18+/-14.37	25.31+/-10.77
Triglycerides						
- mmol/l	2.91+/-2.80	1.81+/-0.75*	1.43+/-0.57	1.34+/-0.37	4.56+/-3.39	2.39+/-0.70*
- mg/dl	259.2+/-258.6	154.6+/-64.36	126.5+/-50.07	118.6+/-32.37	448.8+/-321.4	206.1+/-64.97
NEFA		n=17				n=7
- mmol/l	0.71+/-0.30	0.51+/-0.30	0.62+/-0.27	0.45+/-0.30	0.81+/-0.31	0.58+/-0.30
- mg/dl	20.33+/-8.57	12.98+/-9.25	17.69+/-7.70	12.97+/-8.54	23.27+/-8.94	12.98+/-10.50

Data analysis: paired t-test and ANOVA for analysis across the four groups.

*= p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; ***=p<0.001; ns = non-significant

5.3.1.5.2 Post-prandial

The post-prandial effect of RYGB upon serum NEFA levels are shown in figure 5.3.1.5.2i.

The post-prandial NEFA excursion was significantly different following RYGB (p<0.05), being lower than pre-RYGB in the T2DM group (p<0.0001) but not in the NDM group (p=0.4111), figure 5.3.1.5.2ii.

There was a difference in the effect of RYGB upon the direction of change of the post-prandial NEFA levels between the two groups (p<0.01). There was a normalisation of the difference in post-prandial NEFA excursions between the NDM and T2DM groups pre-operatively and post-operatively (p=0.0320 and p=0.9830) respectively, figure 5.3.1.5.2iii.



Figure 5.3.1.1 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma total cholesterol levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 5.3.1.2 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma LDL-cholesterol levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 5.3.1.3 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma HDL-cholesterol levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 5.3.1.4i Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma triglyceride levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.0001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 5.3.1.4ii Box plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery (pre- and postoperative day 4) upon Δ fasting plasma triglyceride levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. Unpaired ttest was used for comparison, *=p<0.05.



Figure 5.3.1.5.1 Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting serum NEFA levels in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Preoperatively (pre-op) and POD4 (post-operative day 4). ANOVA was used for analysis, ns = non-significant.


Figure 5.3.1.5.2i Graph of the post-prandial serum NEFA levels at set time points after a mixed meal test, pre- and post-operative day 4 around RYGB surgery in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Data is plotted as mean with bars representing sd.



*

Figure 5.3.1.5.2ii Scatter plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery upon postprandial NEFA excursions, without baseline correction, in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Pre-operatively (pre-op) and POD4 (postoperative day 4). Paired t-test was used to compare the pre- and post-operative data and ANOVA for all groups. *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ****= p<0.0001; ns = non-significant.



Figure 5.3.1.5.2iii Box plot of the early effect of RYGB surgery (pre- and postoperative day 4) upon post-prandial Δ AUC NEFA, following a mixed meal test, in participants with [T2DM] and without T2DM [NDM]. Box plots showing median levels, boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. Unpaired t-test was used for comparison; **=p<0.01.

5.3.2 Systematic review of the effects of RYGB upon plasma lipids

5.3.2.1 Data retrieval

The original search yielded 2442 manuscripts for screening. Of these, 1976 were excluded after review of the abstracts. Of the remaining 466, 75 met the inclusion criteria (for which there were 7 kin relationships), figure 5.3.2.1.

5.3.2.2 Description of studies identified

Over 90% of the included papers were published after 1999, with 39 being published from 2010 onwards. 27 studies originated from North America, 28 from Europe, 13 from South America and 2 from other continents. The included papers comprised 5 randomised controlled trials, 42 nonrandomised trials or studies and 23 uncontrolled case series. The majority of the papers originated from single centres (65/70). Continuous outcomes time points >2 were only available in 29% of the manuscripts, the majority reporting ≤2, table 5.3.2.2.

5.3.2.3 Patient characteristics

Paired data is available for 7815 subjects who underwent RYGB for morbid obesity, with a female preponderance at 81% female (n=6079). The subjects were aged 42+/-4.597 years (n=4145) and baseline BMI was 47.88+/-3.511 kg/m² (n=2331).

2442 citations identified for screening

1976 studies rejected: 7 abstracts only 171 comments, reviews or editorials 292 animal or in-vitro studies 13 languages other than English 1492 not relevant



Figure 5.3.2.1A systematic review of the effects of RYGB surgery uponplasma lipid levels - study attrition diagram

Table 5.3.2.2 Study characteristics for included publications in the systematic review of the effects of RYGB surgery upon plasma lipids levels

	No. of studies	No. of RYGB patients*
Publication year		
- 1980 - 1989	3	235
- 1990 - 1999	2	69
- 2000 - 2009	28	2377
- 2010 - onwards	39	3856
Study location		
- Europe	28	1407
- North America	27	3744
- South America	13	1302
- Other	2	84
Study design		
- Randomised controlled	5	134
trial	42	2833
- Nonrandomised		
controlled trial or series	23	3570
- Uncontrolled case		
series		
Institutional setting		
- Single	65	5964
- Multicentre	5	573
Continuous outcomes		
time point	50	50145
-≤2	20	1523
- > 2		

* without omentectomy

5.3.2.4 The longer-term effects of RYGB surgery upon plasma lipids

5.3.2.4.1 Total cholesterol

Total cholesterol levels were assessed in 63 studies, figure 5.3.2.4.1i. After RYGB, the SMD (standard mean difference) in plasma total cholesterol levels was -0.91 (95% CI -1.11 to -0.2), p<0.00001. Heterogeneity among the studies was high ($I^2 = 97\%$, p<0.00001). Subgroup analyses revealed a SMD in total cholesterol levels of 0.9 by one month post-operatively (p<0.00001) which was maintained through all time points, see figure 5.3.2.4.1ii. There is relative symmetry of the data as depicted in the funnel plot which would support the lack of publication bias for this outcome, appendix 3.

5.3.2.4.2 LDL-cholesterol

LDL-cholesterol levels were reported in 48 studies, figure 5.3.2.4.2i. Following RYGB, plasma LDL-C levels were reduced (SMD -1.33, 95% CI -1.63 to -1.02, p<0.00001). Heterogeneity among the studies was high (I² =98%, p<0.00001). Subgroup analyses revealed a SMD in LDL-C by one month post-operatively (SMD -0.92, 95% -1.31 to -0.52, p<0.00001) which was maintained through all time points, see figure 5.3.2.4.2ii. There is relative asymmetry of the data as depicted in the funnel plot which would normally raise concern regarding publication bias for this outcome. However, these data have come from publications commenting upon all plasma lipid changes rather than LDL-cholesterol specific changes. It is unlikely to be a publication bias and more likely to be a true representation of an interesting effect of RYGB upon LDL-cholesterol, appendix 3.

5.3.2.4.3 HDL-cholesterol

HDL-cholesterol levels were reported in 47 studies, figure 5.3.2.4.3i. Following RYGB, plasma HDL-C levels increased (SMD 0.51, 95% CI 0.29 to 0.74, p<0.00001). Heterogeneity among the studies was high (I²=98%, p<0.00001). Subgroup analyses revealed an increase in HDL-C by one year post-operatively (SMD 1.10, 95%Cl 0.57 to 1.63, p<0.0001), figure 5.3.2.4.3ii. There is relative symmetry of the data as depicted in the funnel plot, which would support the lack of publication bias for this outcome, appendix 3.

3.2.1 1 month	Post-RY Mean S	GB D Total	Pro	e-RYGB SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI
lexandrides 2007	168 4	4 26	239	60	26	1.0%	-1.33 [-1.930.72]	
Bueter 2010 Pardina 2009c	158.3 61.0 149.4 45.4	5 10 8 34	204.63 204.6	85.47 53.64	10 34	0.9%	-0.60 [-1.50, 0.30] -1.10 [-1.61, -0.59]	<u></u> +
ilvestre 2004 ubtotal (95% CI)	185.33 57.9	2 125 195	220.08	50.19	125 195	1.0%	-0.64 [-0.89, -0.39] -0.90 [-1.26 -0.54]	
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.06	$Chi^2 = 5.96, d$	= 3 (P =	0.11); I²	= 50%	. 55	0.076	-0.00 [-1.20, -0.04]	•
2.2.3 months								
vron-Wisnewsky 2011	179.6 32.	6 34	197	29.4	34	1.0%	-0.55 [-1.04, -0.07]	
Boesing 2010	150.6 31.8	4 20	273.26	74.37	20	0.9%	-2.10 [-2.89, -1.31]	
Brethauer 2011 Buchwald 1981	168.5 38.	2 56	191.5	29.6	106	1.0%	-0.71 [-1.45, 0.03] -0.61 [-0.94, -0.28]	
Oppini 2006 Dillard 2011	161.9 33.	B 40 9 11	195.5 189.6	36.7	11	1.0%	-0.94 [-1.41, -0.48] -0.67 [-1.53, 0.19]	
leneghan 2011 luang 2011	172.9 35. 171.6 38.2	9 10 2 13	209.6 205.8	38 47.95	10 13	0.8% 0.9%	-0.95 [-1.89, -0.01] -0.76 [-1.56, 0.04]	
lusemann 1980 Sim 2011	185.71 167.57 29.2	0 96 8 71	209.65 183.78	39 39.04	96 71	1.0%	Not estimable -0.47 [-0.80, -0.13]	
lutch 2009 Jguyen 2006	166.02 43.3 157 4	4 14 6 95	181.47 223	43.34 39	14 95	0.9% 1.0%	-0.35 [-1.09, 0.40] -1.54 [-1.87, -1.22]	
Pardina 2009c Ribeiro 2009	151.2 46. 180.8 26.	1 34 6 80	204.6 198.7	53.6 52	34 80	1.0% 1.0%	-1.06 [-1.57, -0.55] -0.43 [-0.74, -0.12]	
ilvestre 2004 rakhtenbroit 2009	173.75 54.0	5 125 9 10	220.08	50.19 30.64	125 10	1.0%	-0.89 [-1.15, -0.63]	
voelnerhanssen 2011 Jubtotal (95% CI)	154.44 26.7	5 12 784	177.61	40.12	12 834	0.9%	-0.66 [-1.48, 0.17] -0.82 [-1.03, -0.62]	•
eterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.10$	$Chi^2 = 45.73$	3f = 16 (F	P = 0.000	1); I² = 65	%			
2.3 6 months		,						
ron-Wisnewsky 2011	168.9 27.	9 34 5 63	197	29.4	34	1.0%	-0.97 [-1.47, -0.47]	
avaresco 2010	177.9 33.	9 48	203.5	49.9	48	1.0%	-0.60 [-1.00, -0.19]	
rethauer 2011	147.61 30.3	5 15	273.26 200.2	47.7	15	0.9%	-2.17 [-2.96, -1.37] -0.78 [-1.53, -0.03]	
uchwald 1981 arrasco 2007	171.9 29. 155.6 30.	2 56 4 31	191.5 210.2	29.6 45.4	106 31	1.0%	-0.66 [-0.99, -0.33] -1.40 [-1.95, -0.84]	
hacon 2008 oppini 2006	173.75 30.8 154 2	9 61 8 40	200.77 195.5	50.19 36.7	61 40	1.0% 1.0%	-0.64 [-1.01, -0.28] -1.26 [-1.74, -0.78]	
arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 abib 2009	161.3 35. 154 35.3	2 114 6 50	211.2 188	40.6 42.43	114 50	1.0% 1.0%	-1.31 [-1.60, -1.02] -0.86 [-1.27, -0.45]	- <u> </u>
eneghan 2011 juang 2011	173.7 41. 163 48 1	8 10 5 12	209.6 205.8	38 47.95	10 13	0.9%	-0.86 [-1.79, 0.06] -0.86 [-1.69 -0.031	
usemann 1980 Innelli 2011	185.33 30.1	2 96 7 12	209.65	39	96 12	1.0%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.40]	-
amal 2011	179 32.	4 74 8 7	220	42.2	94	1.0%	-1.07 [-1.39, -0.74]]
Ioulin 2011	173.8 34.	7 28	211.8	34.8	28	1.0%	-0.07 [-0.95, -0.28] -1.08 [-1.64, -0.51]	
ardina 2009	169.88 43.3 168.5 53.	4 14 6 34	181.47 204.6	43.34 53.6	14 34	0.9%	-0.26 [-1.00, 0.48] -0.67 [-1.15, -0.18]	
erez-Romero 2010 ohle-Krauza 2011	141.31 34.7 157 54	5 96 4 256	193.05 191	38.61 651.6	96 294	1.0% 1.1%	-1.40 [-1.72, -1.09] -0.06 [-0.22, 0.11]	- +
ibeiro 2009 .ossi 2008	176.7 38. 154.4 32.	3 80 6 140	198.7 201.9	52 42.5	80 140	1.0% 1.0%	-0.48 [-0.79, -0.17] -1.25 [-1.51, -0.99]	
ilvestre 2004 endrell 2004	169.88 57.9 185.33 30.8	2 125 9 34	220.08 196.91	50.19 46.33	125 34	1.0% 1.0%	-0.92 [-1.18, -0.66] -0.29 [-0.77, 0.19]	
ubtotal (95% Cl) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.18	Chi ² = 154.90	1614 df = 25 (P < 0.000	001); I ² =	1752 84%	25.8%	-0.83 [-1.02, -0.64]	•
est for overall effect: $Z = 8$	61 (P < 0.000	51)						
2.5 12 months	178 4 33	e 04	201	27 E	94	1.0%	0 60 1 0 08 0 201	_
lexandrides 2007	190 4	4 12 4 007	239	60 155 29	26	0.9%	-0.86 [-1.58, -0.15]]
arteburn 2009	166 2	- 827 6 42	181	36	92	1.1%	-0.66 [-1.03, -0.28]	<u></u>]
avaresco 2010	133 2 171.2 33.	4 19 8 48	147 203.5	31 49.9	19 48	0.9%	-0.49 [-1.14, 0.15] -0.75 [-1.17, -0.34]	
enaiges 2011 oza 2011	1/6.5 31. 169 32.	- 95 9 786	201.1 197.3	35.6	95 786	1.0%	-0.73 [-1.03, -0.44] -0.78 [-0.88, -0.67]	
sroch 2010 Suchwald 1981	169.88 30.8 164.6 31.	9 63 6 51	189.19 191.5	35.52 29.6	63 106	1.0% 1.0%	-0.58 [-0.93, -0.22] -0.88 [-1.23, -0.54]	- -
uffington 1994 hangchien 2011	151.67 31.7 162.3	1 33 0 101	182.33 182.9	37.4 0	33 101	1.0%	-0.87 [-1.38, -0.37] Not estimable	
emssie 2012 onadelli 2011	200 169.4 40.	0 49 1 42	173.75	42.47 50.1	49 42	1.0%	Not estimable -0.56 [-1.000.13]	
arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 lans-Erik 2009	164 33. 177.61	1 114 0 21	211.2 196.91	40.6 38.61	114 21	1.0%	-1.27 [-1.56, -0.99] Not estimable	-
lofso 2010 Iusemann 1980	150.58 42.4	7 76	196.91	42.47	76 96	1.0%	-1.09 [-1.43, -0.74] -0.90 [-1 20 -0.61]	
annelli 2011	181.47 38.6	- 50 1 12 3 155	185.33	50.19	12	0.9%	-0.08 [-0.88, 0.72]	_ +-
Sim 2010	168.8 32	2 219	180.9	39.1	219	1.1%	-0.34 [-0.53, -0.15]	_
ligman 2008	165 2	9 97	202	39.04	97	1.0%	-0.37 [-0.70, -0.04] -1.11 [-1.41, -0.81]	
erez-Romero 2010	162.2 26. 139 34.7	- 34 5 96	204.6 193.05	53.6 38.61	34 96	1.0%	-0.99 [-1.50, -0.49] -1.47 [-1.79, -1.15]	
ihiajamaki 2010 ohle-Krauza 2011	175.68 33.5 162 428	9 29 4 191	195.75 191	30.89 651.6	29 294	1.0% 1.1%	-0.61 [-1.14, -0.09] -0.05 [-0.23, 0.13]	
libeiro 2009 Sears 2008	170.8 2 165.7 32	2 80 1 23	198.7 194.3	52 33.8	80 23	1.0% 1.0%	-0.70 [-1.01, -0.38] -0.85 [-1.46, -0.25]	
ilvestre 2004 ovik 2011	162.16 50.1 150.97	9 125 0 31	220.08 186.49	50.19 33.98	125 31	1.0%	-1.15 [-1.42, -0.88] Not estimable	-
oolabi 2011 ila 2011	168.5 3	0 60	203.5	31.1 26.46	60 28	1.0%	-1.14 [-1.52, -0.75] -1.01 [-1.57 -0.45]	<u> </u>
/ilarrasa 2007 Voelnerbanssen 2011	169.88 27.0	3 65	189.19	39.77	65 12	1.0%	-0.56 [-0.92, -0.21]	
Voodard 2010	161 1.	7 765	185.9	2.1	765	1.0%	-0.33 [-1.14, 0.47]	• 1
Johok 2005	170 2 22	. 96	194.6	30.4	96		-0.70 [-0.00 0.41]	[
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI)	170.3 33	4753	(B - 0 -	0011:15	4975	33.4%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67]	★
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% Cl) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4	170.3 33. Chi² = 2987.4 1.79 (P < 0.000	4753 3, df = 32 31)	(P < 0.00	0001); I² =	4975 - 99%	33.4%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67]	•
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months	170.3 33. ; Chi² = 2987.4 .79 (P < 0.000	4753 3, df = 32 01)	(P < 0.00	0001); I ² =	4975 = 99%	33.4%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67]	•
labek 2005 subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 'est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months iarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 ionen 1983	170.3 33. ; Chi² = 2987.4 0.79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22	(P < 0.00 211.2 188	35.2 52	4975 = 99% 114 22	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13]	
labek 2005 uibtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 lusemann 1980 in 2011	170.3 33. : Chi² = 2987.4 :.79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167	35.2 35.2 52 39 33	4975 = 99% 114 22 96 10	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 0.8%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.98 [-1.93, -0.04]	
labek 2005 uibtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 lusemann 1980 in 2011 ardina 2009c ohle-Krauza 2011	170.3 33. : Chi² = 2987.4 9.79 (P < 0.000) 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2 161 30. 161 43	4753 3, df = 32 31) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 6 26 2 144	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6	4975 = 99% 114 22 96 10 26 294	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 0.8% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.70 [-0.69, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.98 [-1.93, -0.04] -1.15 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months iarcia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 usemann 1980 in 2011 ardina 2002 erdina 2002 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0 19	170.3 33. : Chi² = 2987.4 1.79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2 161 43 : Chi² = 34.23	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 6 26 2 144 412 1f = 5 (P	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6	4975 = 99% 114 22 96 10 26 294 562	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.1% 5.9%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.81, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.98 [-1.93, -0.04] -1.15 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% Cl) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 usemann 1980 in 2011 ardina 2009c ohle-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (05% Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3	170.3 33. $Chi^2 = 2987.4$.79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2 161 30 161 43 $.61^2 = 34.23$, .512 (P = 0.002)	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 6 26 2 144 412 41 = 5 (P	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6 1); I ² = 85	4975 = 99% 114 22 96 10 26 294 562	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.1% 5.9%	-0.70 [-0.89, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.58 [-1.93, -0.04] -1.15 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.26, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% Cl) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 iarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 usemann 1980 in 2011 ardina 2009c ohle-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (95% Cl) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 iovardida 2007	170.3 33. $Chi^2 = 2987.4$.79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2 161 30. 161 43 .61 43 $.61i^2$ 43.2 .12 (P = 0.002) .207 4	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 6 26 2 144 412 3f = 5 (P	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6 1); I ² = 85	4975 = 99% 114 22 96 10 26 294 562 5%	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 0.8% 1.0% 5.9%	-0.70 [-0.89, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.05 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.78, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% Cl) = 1.82 set for overall affect: Z = 4 2.6 18 months arcia-Marinodriga 2012 onen 1983 arcia-Marinodriga 2012 onen 1983 n 2011 ardina 2009c hile-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (95% Cl) tetrogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 set for overall affect: Z = 3 2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 onadelli 2011	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4753 3, df = 32 51) 7 114 9 222 5 96 7 10 6 26 2 144 412 3f = 5 (P 5 9 8 422 5 9 4 26 5 9 5 10 5	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 239 195.2 209	35.2 52 39 40.8 651.6 1); I ² = 85 60 50.1	4975 = 99% 1114 22 96 294 562 562 562	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 0.8% 1.0% 1.1% 5.9% 0.9% 1.0%	-0.70 [-0.69, -0.41] -0.70 [-0.69, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.17]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (85% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 2.6 18 months arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 onen 1983 usemann 1980 ardina 2009e ohle-krauza 2011 ubtotal (85% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 onadelli 2011 uruya 2007 abib 2009	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4753 3, df = 32 51) 7 114 9 222 5 96 7 100 6 26 2 144 412 3f = 5 (P 5 9 8 42 4 18 5 28	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 239 195.2 208.16 188	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6 1); l ² = 85 60 50.1 47.13 42.33	4975 99% 114 22 96 10 26 294 562 294 562 294 562 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 2	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 5.9% 0.9% 0.9% 1.0%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.98 [-1.93, -0.04] -1.15 [-1.74, -0.55] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.10] -0.84 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.84 [-1.17, -0.09]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 2.6 18 months arcia-Mairrodriga 2012 onen 1983 usemann 1980 usemann 1980 usemann 1980 tetrogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 5 2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 uruya 2007 uruya 2007 abib 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 6 26 2 144 412 412 412 415 5 (P 5 98 8 422 5 98 4 18 5 98 5 98	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 239 195.2 208.16 188 193.05 200	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6 1); l ² = 85 60 50.1 47.13 42.33 38.61 34	4975 99% 114 22 96 294 562 294 562 2% 26 42 18 28 96 18 18	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 5.9% 0.9% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.570 [-0.59, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.58 [-1.93, -0.04] -1.15 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.74, -0.54] -0.55 [-1.32, -0.24] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.10] -0.54 [-1.67, -0.11] -0.54 [-1.47, -0.11]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall affect: Z = 4 arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 onen 1983 arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 onen 1983 arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 onen 1983 arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 onen 1983 arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 onen 2009 est for overall effect: Z = 3 2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 onadell 2011 urya 2007 abls 2009 abls 2009 abls 2009 abls 2009 abls 2009 livestre 2004 kroubis 2006	170.3 33. CPJ = 2987.4 179 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2 161 43 CDF = 34.23, 12 (P = 0.002 207 4 172.1 33, 12 (P = 0.002 207 4 172.2 7,0 7,24 7,0 7,24 7,0 1,26 7,0 1	4753 3, df = 32 51) 7 114 9 22 5 96 26 2 144 412 526 85 56 55 56 56	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 239 195.2 208.16 188 193.05 200.220.08 217.3	$\begin{array}{c} 35.2\\ 52\\ 39\\ 33\\ 651.6\\ 1); l^2 = 85\\ 60\\ 50.1\\ 47.13\\ 38.61\\ 32.33\\ 38.61\\ 34\\ 50.19\\ 51.28\end{array}$	4975 = 99% 1114 22 96 100 26 294 562 562 :% 26 429 8 428 96 428 96 18 125 565	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 0.8% 1.0% 1.0% 5.9% 1.0% 0.9% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.70 [-0.89, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.58 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.06 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.54 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.54 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.54 [-1.42, -0.05] -0.79 [-1.427, -0.11] -1.15 [-1.42, -0.61] -0.8 [-1.23, -0.50]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% C1) = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 set for overall effect: Z = 4 incria-Marinodriga 2012 ionen 1983 incria-Marinodriga 2012 ionen 1983 in 2011 ardina 2009 cohle-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (95% C1) ubtotal (95% C1) ubtotal (95% C1) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 ionadell 2011 lebb 2009 erez-Romero 2010 ioth 2009 livesite 2004 kroubis 2006 erez-Romero 2010 ioths 2009	170.3 33. CCN2 = 2987.4 .79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 193.82 18.1 136 2 161 30. 161 43 207 4 172.1 3 172.1 3 172.1 3 172.1 3 162.16 50.1 177.3 41.6 161 173.6 45.5 177.8 41.6 177.8 45.5 177.8 4	4753 3, df = 32 01) 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 6 26 7 10 6 26 2 144 412 df = 5 (P 5 98 8 42 4 18 5 98 8 42 2 df = 5 (P 5 16 5 9 8 42 2 df = 5 96 8 42 2 df = 5 96 5 96 5 96 8 42 2 df = 5 96 5	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 200.0 208.16 188 193.05 200.0 220.08 217.3 186.49 183	35.2 39 33 40.8 651.6 1); I ² = 85 60 50.1 47.13 42.33 38.61 34 50.19 51.28 33.86 33.98	4975 = 99% 1114 22 96 100 26 294 562 26 296 42 26 42 8 8 65 18 128 96 18 128 96 18 128 96 18 128 96 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1.0% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 0.9% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 0.9%	-0.70 [-0.69, -0.41] -1.74 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.56 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.10] -0.84 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.63 [-1.17, -0.95] -0.79 [-1.47, -0.11] -1.15 [-1.42, -0.86] -0.79 [-1.42, -0.80] -0.75 [-1.22, -0.80] -0.75 [-1.22, -0.80] -0.75 [-1.24, -0.61]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months iarcia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 usemann 1980 usemann 1980 ohle-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 .2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 ionadelli 2011 uruya 2007 ionadelli 2011 uruya 2007 ionadelli 2011 uruya 2007 ionadelli 2011 uruya 2007 iothe 2004 kroubis 2006 ovik 2011 rakhitenbhoi 2005 ubtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4753 3, df = 32 7 114 9 22 5 90 6 26 2 144 412 14 = 5 (P 5 9 8 42 144 412 14 412 18 5 96 3 18 9 122 28 5 96 3 18 9 122 18	(P < 0.00 211.2 2188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.00000 2208.16 188 193.05 220.9 220.9 193.05 220.9 193.05	35.2 52.2 52.2 39 33 40.8 651.6 60 50.1 42.33 38.61 42.33 38.61 50.1 50.1 42.33 38.61 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.2 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52	4975 = 99% 1114 22 966 100 266 294 562 562 562 562 562 10 266 422 18 18 125 310 185 310 185 310 185 317 197 185 197 197 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 10	1.0% 33.4% 33.4% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0	-0.50 [-0.59, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.52 [-1.93, -0.24] -0.65 [-1.93, -0.24] -0.65 [-1.92, -0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.10] -0.84 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.64 [-1.77, -0.09] -1.76 [-1.77, -0.01] -0.76 [-1.78, -0.68] -0.76 [-1.60, -0.67]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months iarcia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 usemann 1980 in 2011 1000 eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 .2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 onadelli 2011 uruya 2007 abib 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 ioth 2009 ioth 2009 oth 2009 ioth 2007 ioth 2009 ioth 2009 iot	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4753 3, df = 32 7 114 9 22 5 96 7 10 7 22 412 3f = 5 (P 412 3f = 5 (P 412 412 3f = 5 (P 412	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.66 107 203 203 191 < 0.00000 239 195.2 208.16 188.49 217.3 186.49 186.49 186.49 186.7 3	35.2 52.2 52.2 33.3 40.8 651.6 50.1 47.13 8.61 34.2 33.86 50.1 47.13 34.6 50.1 34.7 38.61 34.3 50.19 51.28 33.98 30.64 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 2 3	4975 = 99% 1114 22 966 100 266 294 562 562 :% 266 422 188 188 185 311 188 477	1.0% 33.4% 33.4% 1.0% 0.8% 0.8% 0.8% 0.8% 0.9% 1.0% 0.9% 1.0% 1.0% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9%	-0.30 [-0.29, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.56 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-1.26, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.64, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.10] -0.64 [-1.62, -0.15] -0.63 [-1.47, -0.11] -0.76 [-1.47, -0.11] -0.76 [-1.47, -0.11] -0.76 [-1.47, -0.11] -0.76 [-1.47, -0.11] -0.78 [-1.42, -0.51] -0.78 [-1.42, -0.51] -0.78 [-1.42, -0.51] -0.78 [-1.42, -0.51] -0.78 [-1.42, -0.52] -0.28 [-1.16, 0.61] -0.43 [-1.04, -0.62]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months iarcia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 usemann 1980 usemann 1980 usemann 1980 eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 .2.7 24 months lexanallide 2007 uruya 2007 abib 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 lexet 2004 kroubis 2006 rakhnebrott 2009 labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) eterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05 est for overall effect: Z = 7 .2.8 48 morths	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c} 4753\\ 3, df = 32\\ 51)\\ 7 & 114\\ 9 & 22\\ 5 & 96\\ 7 & 10\\ 6 & 26\\ 2 & 144\\ df = 5 (F)\\ 5 & 9\\ 8 & 42\\ 4 & 18\\ 5 & 28\\ 4 & 18\\ 5 & 96\\ 8 & 42\\ 4 & 18\\ 5 & 96\\ 8 & 42\\ 1 & 3\\ 1 & 5\\ 5 & 16\\ 2 & 8\\ 1 & 3\\ 1 & 3\\ 1 & 41\\ 1 & 457\\ ff = 9 (F)\\ 1)\\ \end{array}$	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.85 167 203 191 < 0.0000 239 195.2 208.16 188 217.3 186.49 22008 217.3 186.49 186.49 186.57 = 0.05); F	35.2 52 39 33 40.8 651.6 11); l ² = 85 60 50.1 47.13 42.33 38.61 42.33 50.19 51.28 30.64 30.64 32.2 2 = 47%	4975 99% 1114 22 96 10 26 294 562 294 562 294 562 294 562 294 562 31 10 18 477	1.0% 33.4% 33.4% 1.0% 1.0% 0.9% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0	-0.50 [-0.69, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.56 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, -0.24] -0.56 [-1.32, -0.25] -0.28 [-1.16, -0.61] -0.28 [-1.16, -0.62] -0.83 [-1.04, -0.62]	
labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau" = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6.18 months larcia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 in 2011 ardina 2009 colle-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (95% CI) eletrogeneity: Tal = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 .2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 ontadell 2011 labib 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2005 labek 2005 labek 2005 labek 2005 ubtotal (95% CI) est for overall effect: Z = 7 .2.9 48 months dams 2010	170.3 33. Chile 2087.4 .79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 103.82 18.1 136 2 161 30 161 43 161 20 161 43 179.22 7.0 164 31.7 179.22 7.0 164 31.7 179.22 7.0 164 31.7 179.23 4.7 177.3 34.5 177.6 54.6 177.6 34.5 173.6 34.5 174.6 34.5	4753 3, df = 32 3, df = 32 51) 7 1142 5 96 6 26 2 1444 31 = 5 (P 5 92 412 457 62 7 62 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 239 915.2 208.16 188 193.05 200.8 217.3 186.6 = 0.05); F 185.6	35.2 52 52 39 33 651.6 1); l ² = 85 60 50.1 47.13 42.33 38.61 342.33 38.61 342.33 38.61 32.2 2 42.33 30.64 32.2 2 2 47% 48.98 82 2	4975 99% 1114 22 96 10 26 294 562 9% 26 422 18 26 42 18 18 125 65 31 100 18 477 420	1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.70 [-0.69, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.93 [-1.21, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.58 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.64, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-1.64, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-1.64, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.23, -0.50] Not estimable -0.28 [-1.16, -0.56] -0.28 [-1.164, -0.56] -0.35 [-1.04, -0.56] -0.35 [-1.04, -0.56]	
Iabek 2005 iubical (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 2.6.6 18 months 3arcia-Marinrodriga 2012 3onen 1983 ancia-Marinrodriga 2012 3onen 1983 ancia-Marinrodriga 2012 iu-2011 'ardina 2009 Cohle-Krauza 2011 iubical (95% CI) est for overall effect: Z = 3 2.7.24 months Jerez-Romero 2010 toth 2009 iubical 2011 Uruya 2007 Verez-Romero 2010 toth 2009 iubical (95% CI) est for overall effect: Z = 7 2.9.48 months vertament effect: Z = 7 2.9.48 months vertament effect: Z = 7 2.9.48 months vertament effect: Z = 7 2.9.9.48 months vertament effect: Z = 7 2.9.9.4	$\begin{array}{c} 170.3 33.\\ 170.3 35.\\ 1.79 \ (P < 0.000 \\ 172.3 4 \\ 1962 18.1 \\ 136 \ 22 \\ 161 30. \\ 161 \ 30. \\ 161 \ 43 \\ 2017 4 \\ 172.1 \ 33. \\ 171 \ 164 \ 317. \\ 176.5 \ 41.6 \\ 173.1 \ 34.7 \\ 173.2 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 \\ 173.2 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 \ 34.7 $	$\begin{array}{c} 4753\\ 3, df = 32\\ 51) \\ 7 & 114\\ 9 & 22\\ 5 & 96\\ 7 & 100\\ 66 & 1264\\ 147 & 166\\ 146 & 126\\ 147 & 166\\ 146 & 166\\ 1$	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 167 203 191 < 0.0000 208.16 193.05 208.16 193.05 2208.16 193.05 2208.16 193.05 2209 183 186.49 188.67 = 0.05); F 185.66 239 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240 240	20001); 2 = 355.2 52 39 43 651.6 651.6 10; 2 = 85 60 50.1 47.13 38.61 33.64 32.2 2 = 477% 48.98 60 50 60 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 51.28 52.88 52.28 52	4975 999% 114 226 96 103 224 562 26 42 18 26 42 18 26 18 125 31 10 18 477 420 26 35	1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.50 [-0.59, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.56 [-1.93, -0.04] -0.56 [-1.93, -0.04] -0.56 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.16] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.56 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-0.97, -0.10] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.56 [-1.72, -0.08] -0.67 [-1.42, -0.68] -0.67 [-1.42, -0.68] -0.41 [-1.07, 0.25] -0.63 [-1.04, -0.62] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.70 [-1.45, 0.05]	
labek 2005 subtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months larcia-Marinrodriga 2012 Jancia-Marinrodriga 2012 Jancia-Marinrodriga 2012 Jancia-Marinrodriga 2012 Jancia 2009 tetorogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 .2.7 24 months Lexandrides 2007 Jonadelli 2011 Juruya 2007 Lebb 2009 Jonadell 2011 Juruya 2007 Lebb 2009 Jonadoll 2016 Lobolt 2009 Jonike State 2004 Skroubis 2006 Jook 2011 Takhtenbroit 2009 Jabetotal (95% CI) Leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05 est for overall effect: Z = 7 .2.9 48 months James 2009 James 2010	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c} 4753\\ 3, df = 32\\ 51\\ 7\\ 114\\ 9\\ 25\\ 5\\ 9\\ 25\\ 5\\ 6\\ 6\\ 26\\ 26\\ 26\\ 26\\ 26\\ 26\\ 26\\ 26\\ $	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 20956 203 167 203 191 203 195 20016 188 200 22106 22006 22006 2006 22006 2006 2	36.2 36.2 52 52 52 53 33 40.8 651.6 1); I = 85 60 50.1 47.13 38.61 32.2 3.3.861 32.2 42.33 38.61 32.2 42.33 38.61 32.2 48.98 60 50.4 50.1 47.13 42.33 38.61 32.2 48.98 60 38.8 38.8 38.8 38.8 38.6 3	4975 = 99% 114 226 96 126 296 296 296 296 296 296 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 2	1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.70 [-0.99, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.56 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.56 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.66 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.66 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.66 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.66 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.67, -0.10] -0.84 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.63 [-1.74, -0.91] -1.26 [-1.74, -0.92] -0.56 [-1.74, -0.92] -0.56 [-1.74, -0.95] -0.58 [-1.74, -0.95] -0.28 [-1.64, -0.65] -0.28 [-1.64, -0.65] -0.28 [-1.64, -0.65] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.70 [-1.45, 0.06] -2.11 [-2.70, -1.52] Not estimable -0.26 [-0.46, -0.04]	
labek 2005 iubitotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.82 est for overall effect: Z = 4 .2.6 18 months iarcia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 lusemann 1980 lusemann 1980 lusemann 1980 lusemann 1980 leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.19 est for overall effect: Z = 3 .2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 letable 2019 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 erez-Romero 2010 oth 2009 leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05 est for overall effect: Z = 7 .2.9 48 months dams 2010 lexandrides 2007 sendes 2009 abek 2005 est for overall effect: Z = 7 .2.9 48 months dams 2010 lexandrides 2007 sendes 2009 im 2010 ohle-Krauza 2011 ubtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c} 4753\\ 3, df = 32\\ 3, df = 32\\ 3, df = 32\\ 3, df = 32\\ 412\\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 9 \\ 2 \\ 14 \\ 412\\ 412\\ 5 \\ 9 \\ 4 \\ 412\\ 412\\ 412\\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 125\\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 125\\ 6 \\ 125\\ 125\\ 125\\ 125\\ 125\\ 125\\ 125\\ 12$	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 191 203 191 <0.0000 2208.16 208.16	20001); 2 - 36,2 52 52 53 33 40,8 651,6 1); 2 = 85 60 60,1 47,0 33 33,8,61 34,8 50,19 51,28 30,64 30,	4975 - 99% 114 296 100 264 296 264 265 264 422 188 188 188 188 125 663 18 105 219 296 219 296 211 219 295	1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 5.9% 0.9% 1.0% 1.0% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0.9% 0	-0.30 [-0.39, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.61, -0.23] -0.58 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-1.62, -0.10] -0.54 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.64 [-1.62, -0.10] -0.54 [-1.52, -0.15] -0.64 [-1.62, -0.10] -0.56 [-1.77, -0.95] -0.78 [-1.47, -0.11] -1.15 [-1.42, -0.80] -0.28 [-1.6, 0.61] -0.28 [-1.6, 0.61] -0.41 [-1.07, -0.52] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.70 [-1.45, 0.05] -2.11 [-2, 70, -1.52] -0.04 [-0.34, 0.26] -0.04 [-0.34, 0.26]	
labek 2005 uiblotal (95% CI) uiblotal (95% CI) est for overall effect: Z = 4 2.3.6 18 months ancia-Marinrodriga 2012 ionen 1983 in 2011 uiblotal uiblotal (95% CI) uiblotal (95% CI) uiblotal (95% CI) est for overall effect: Z = 5 2.7 24 months lexandrides 2007 ionital effect 2 = 7 2.9 48 months lexandrides 2007 lexandrides 2006 im 2010 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2001 onital 2009 im 2010 onital 2001 onital 2001	170.3 33. Chi² = 2687.4 .79 (P < 0.000 172.3 4 166 3 133.82 18.1 136 2 161 30 161 43 161 43 161 43 179.22 7.0 164 31.7 179.22 7.0 164 31.7 179.22 7.0 164 31.7 179.2 34.7 179.2 34.7 179.2 34.7 179.3 34.5 179.3 44.5 173.6 34.5 173.6 34.5 176.8 4.5 176.8 4.5 176.8 4.5 176.8 4.5 176.8 4.5 177.6 34.5 176.8 4.5 177.6 34.5 177.6 34.5 177.7 35 189.2 177.7 3 189.2 177.7 3 189.2 199.7 4 199.7 4 19	$\begin{array}{c} 4753\\ 3, df = 32\\ 51) \end{array}$	(P < 0.00 211.2 188 209.65 197 208.16 193.2 208.16 193.2 220.8 193.2 220.8 193.2 220.8 193.2 220.8 193.2 220.8 193.2 220.8 193.2 20.5 193.2 20.5 193.2 20.5 193.2 193.2 20.5 193.2 193.2 20.5 193.2 200.5 193.2 193.2 19	35.2 36.2 52 52 33 34 40.8 651.6 1); I ² = 85 60 50.1 47.13 36.34 42.33 36.34 50.19 51.28 30.84 30.22 2 = 47% 48.98 60 38.85 39.1 651.6 1); I ² = 91	49975 = 999% 1142 966 294 2662 968 2662 968 2662 968 2662 188 1265 311 10 10 2015 %	1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.50 [-0.69, -0.41] -1.14 [-1.61, -0.67] -0.47 [-1.07, 0.13] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.52 [-0.81, -0.23] -0.55 [-1.74, -0.56] -0.05 [-0.25, 0.15] -0.64 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, 0.22] -0.54 [-1.04, -0.24] -0.55 [-1.32, -0.24] -0.54 [-1.77, -0.95] -0.54 [-1.77, -0.95] -0.79 [-1.47, -0.11] -1.15 [-1.42, -0.88] -0.83 [-1.22, -0.86] -0.83 [-1.04, -0.62] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] -0.56 [-0.70, -0.42] Not estimable -0.25 [-0.46, -0.04] -0.65 [-1.08, -0.25] -0.65 [-1.08, -0.24]	

Figure 5.3.2.4.1i Forrest plot of the effects of RYGB surgery upon total cholesterol levels including all subgroups. Standard mean difference (with 95% confidence intervals)



Figure 5.3.2.4.1ii Graph of the mean plasma total cholesterol levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data). Unpaired t-test was used for analysis; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001.

and y or oungroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV Random 95% CI
5.1 1 month			10	1.40			1.00/	0.0011.00.000	
iexandrides 2007 ardina 2009c	105 91.3	41 39.65	18 34	148 128.1	54 36.73	26 34	1.3% 1.3%	-0.86 [-1.49, -0.23] -0.95 [-1.46, -0.45]	
ubtotal (95% CI)			52			60	2.6%	-0.92 [-1.31, -0.52]	◆
leterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.00$;	$Chi^2 = 0.$	05, df =	1 (P =	0.82); l²	= 0%				
est for overall effect. $Z = 4$.	.57 (F < 0	5.00001	,						
.5.2 3 months	105 7	27.7	24	110.0		24	1 29/	0 40 1 0 07 0 011	
ron-Wisnewsky 2011 Javaresco 2010	105.7	32.1	34 48	129.1	29.7	34 48	1.3%	-0.69 [-1.10, -0.28]	
irethauer 2011	98.5	27.1	15	124.5	38.3	15	1.3%	-0.76 [-1.51, -0.02]	
oppini 2006	95.4	28.1	40	122.2	32.8	40	1.3%	-0.87 [-1.33, -0.41]	
leneghan 2011	102.3	25.9	10	130.5	33.7	10	1.2%	-0.90 [-1.83, 0.03]	
luang 2011	100.5	27.04	13	128.8	39.3	13	1.2%	-0.81 [-1.62, -0.01]	
Iguyen 2006	107	6 32.07	95 34	159	3	95	1.1%	-10.92 [-12.06, -9.77]	·
libeiro 2009	107.8	21.9	80	122.9	41.7	80	1.3%	-0.45 [-0.77, -0.14]	
armento 2009	93.5	20.9	18	108.5	33.6	18	1.3%	-0.52 [-1.19, 0.14]	
rakhtenbroit 2009	103.9	29.92	10	112.56	31.02	10	1.2%	-0.27 [-1.15, 0.61]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	100.54	1.13	420	123.74	1.13	420	16.4%	-1.53 [-2.39, -0.68]	◆
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.32;	Chi ² = 32	20.81, di	1 = 12 (P < 0.00	001); l²	= 96%			
est for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	.52 (P = 0).0004)							
.5.3 6 months	07	05.4		110.0	00 7		4.00/	0.0014.00.0.001	
rteburn 2009	100	25.1	- 34 63	108	29.7	34 92	1.3%	-0.28 [-0.60, 0.05]	
avaresco 2010	109.1	33.7	48	129.1	40.9	48	1.3%	-0.53 [-0.94, -0.12]	
rethauer 2011	88.3	27.6	15	124.5	38.3	15	1.3%	-1.06 [-1.83, -0.28]	
/anasco ∠007 Shacon 2008	93.8 104.41	≥1.5 34.8	31 61	119.88	39.7 34.8	31 61	1.3%	-1.15 [-1.69, -0.61] -0.44 [-0.80, -0.08]	
oppini 2006	99	20	40	122.2	32.8	40	1.3%	-0.85 [-1.30, -0.39]	
arcia-Marirrodriga 2012	100	32.03	114	131.7	35.23	114	1.3%	-0.94 [-1.21, -0.66]	
ladid 2009 Ieneghan 2011	84 94 0	28.28 28	50 10	130.5	35.36 33.7	50 10	1.3%	-0.05 [-1.05, -0.25] -1.10 [-2.06 -0.14]	
luang 2011	91.4	28.06	12	128.8	39.3	13	1.2%	-1.05 [-1.90, -0.21]	— <u> </u>
annelli 2011	112.14	34.8	12	127.61	30.94	12	1.2%	-0.45 [-1.27, 0.36]	+
amai 2011 Ioulin 2011	106	23.8 28.6	94 28	135	34.2 31.7	94 28	1.3%	-0.98 [-1.28, -0.68] -1.07 [-1.63, -0.51]	<u> </u>
ardina 2009c	103.2	42.57	34	128.1	36.73	34	1.3%	-0.62 [-1.11, -0.13]	
erez-Romero 2010	85.07	27.07	96	131.48	34.8	96	1.3%	-1.48 [-1.80, -1.16]	-
libeiro 2009 Iossi 2008	106.8	39.2 27 0	80 140	122.9	41.7 37 ⊿	80 140	1.3% 1.4%	-0.40 [-0.71, -0.08] -0.95 [-1.20, -0.70]	
Jarmento 2009	84.3	21.3	18	108.5	33.6	18	1.3%	-0.84 [-1.53, -0.16]	
endrell 2004	108.28	0	34	131.48	27.07	34	24 00/	Not estimable	•
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07	Chi ² = 45	8.83. df	= 18 (P	= 0.000	1); l ² = f	33%	24.9%	-0.61 [-0.97, -0.64]	▼
est for overall effect: Z = 9	.67 (P < 0	0.00001)		,, .				
.5.4 12 months									
grawal 2008	101.9	35.3	94	112.7	32	94	1.3%	-0.32 [-0.61, -0.03]	-
lexandrides 2007	124	45	12	148	54	26	1.3%	-0.46 [-1.15, 0.24]	
repurn 2009 Asztalos 2010	96 81	23	42	108 92	30 29	92 19	1.3%	-0.43 [-0.79, -0.06] -0.68 [-1.33 -0.02]	
avaresco 2010	100.6	26.7	48	129.1	40.9	48	1.3%	-0.82 [-1.24, -0.40]	
enaiges 2011	102	25.8	95	123	29.5	95	1.3%	-0.75 [-1.05, -0.46]	
oza 2011 sroch 2010	90.8 88 94	28.8	786 63	116.5	34.8 30 94	786	1.4%	-0.80 [-0.91, -0.70] -0.79 [-1.16, -0.43]	<u> </u>
hangchien 2011	89.9	0	101	109	0	101		Not estimable	
onadelli 2011	101.7	34.3	42	120.9	42	42	1.3%	-0.50 [-0.93, -0.06]	
arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 lans-Erik 2009	92.4 104.41	37.37	50	131.7	35.23 0	50	1.3%	Not estimable	
lofso 2010	81.21	30.94	76	119.88	34.8	76	1.3%	-1.17 [-1.51, -0.82]	-
annelli 2011	104.41	27.07	12	127.61	30.94	12	1.2%	-0.77 [-1.61, 0.06]	1
.m 2010 Jiaman 2008	93.7	∠7.1 26	101	93.5	31.4	∠19 101	1.4%	-0.70 [-0.990.42]	<u> </u>
ardina 2009c	92.2	22.74	34	128.1	36.73	34	1.3%	-1.16 [-1.68, -0.65]	I
erez-Romero 2010	81.21	19.34	96	131.48	34.8	96	1.3%	-1.78 [-2.11, -1.44]	
iniajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009	10∠.86 99.8	27.2	29 80	122.97	32.48 41.7	29 80	1.3%	-0.63 [-1.16, -0.10] -0.65 [-0.97, -0.33]	
armento 2009	83.2	21.8	18	108.5	33.6	18	1.3%	-0.87 [-1.56, -0.19]	——I
oolabi 2011	98.2	20.8	60	123	24.6	60	1.3%	-1.08 [-1.47, -0.70]	
na ∠011 ⁄ilarrasa 2007	87 87 79	26.46	28 65	121	26.46	28 65	1.3% 1.3%	-1.27 [-1.84, -0.69] -0.80 [-1.15 -0.44]	
Voelnerhanssen 2011	100.54	7.73	12	123.74	7.73	12	1.1%	-2.90 [-4.10, -1.70]	
Voodard 2010	90.1	1.5	765	116.6	1.8	765	1.3%	-15.99 [-16.56, -15.41]	• _
labek 2005 Jubtotal (95% CI)	89.6	26.8	96 3157	111.5	31.7	96 3221	1.3% 32.9%	-0.74 [-1.04, -0.45] -1.47 [-2.17, -0.771	▲
leterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.11;	Chi ² = 28	308.92,	df = 24	(P < 0.0	0001); I	² = 99%		,	-
est for overall effect: $Z = 4$.13 (P < 0).0001)							
.5.5 18 months									
arcia-Marirrodriga 2012	96.6	42.71	114	131.7	35.23	114	1.3%	-0.89 [-1.17, -0.62]	<u> </u>
Pardina 2009c	93	36 15.3	22 26	119 127	42 25.5	22 26	1.3%	-0.38 [-0.97, 0.22] -1.59 [-2.22, -0.96]	
ubtotal (95% CI)			162			162	3.9%	-0.94 [-1.49, -0.39]	◆
leterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.17$; fest for overall effect: $Z = 2$	Chi ² = 7.	59, df =	2 (P =	0.02); l²	= 74%				
5 0 0 4 m									
.5.5 24 months	107	33	0	140	54	26	1.3%	-0.41 [-1 18 0 25]	
)onadelli 2011	1∠7 98.8	27.7	42	120.9	54 42	42	1.3%	-0.62 [-1.05, -0.18]	
uruya 2007	98.44	27.45	18	130.44	38.84	18	1.3%	-0.93 [-1.62, -0.24]	———————————————————————————————————————
labib 2009 Jauven 2006	84	31.75	28	101	37.04	28	1.3%	-0.49 [-1.02, 0.05]	•
erez-Romero 2010	81.21	7 27.07	96	131.48	3 34.8	95 96	1.3%	-1.61 [-1.93, -1.28]	· -
toth 2009	94	27	18	110	32	18	1.3%	-0.53 [-1.19, 0.14]	+
kroubis 2006	106.1	36.3	62	151.6	42.57	65	1.3%	-1.14 [-1.52, -0.77]	
rakntenbroit 2009 Jabek 2005	87.9	∠8.75 26	10	112.56	31.02 24.7	10	1.2%	-0.37 [-1.26, 0.51] -0.94 [-1.630.24]	
ubtotal (95% CI)	27.0		396			416	12.8%	-1.59 [-2.58, -0.60]	
leterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 2.43$;	$Chi^2 = 29$	€0.28, d	f = 9 (P	< 0.000	01); I ² =	97%			
and an energy of the state of t									
								0.541.0.55	
.5.7 48 months	90.32	34.84	420	109.3	39.55	420	1.4%	-0.51 [-0.65, -0.37]	
.5.7 48 months dams 2010	114	0	50	135.35	54	20 50	1.370	Not estimable	-
.5.7 48 months dams 2010 .lexandrides 2007 lans-Erik 2009	109.82	-	149	93.5	31.4	219	1.4%	0.01 [-0.20, 0.21]	+
.5.7 48 months .dams 2010 Jexandrides 2007 Ians-Erik 2009 .im 2010	109.82 93.7	26.2	1.17		00.00	152	1 4%	-0.36 [-0.58, -0.13]	
s.5.7 48 months .dams 2010 Jexandrides 2007 Ians-Erik 2009 im 2010 eslie 2012 Igunen 2006	109.82 93.7 82.9	26.2 25.89	152	93.1	30.82	05	1 204	=9 25 [=10 22 -9 27]	•
5.7 48 months .dams 2010 .lexandrides 2007 Ians-Erik 2009 .im 2010 esile 2012 Iguyen 2006 .ubtotal (95% CI)	109.82 93.7 82.9 109	26.2 25.89 7	152 95 876	93.1 159	30.82	95 962	1.2% 6.5%	-9.25 [-10.23, -8.27] -1.96 [-3.03, -0.90]	' 🔶
	109.82 93.7 82.9 109 Chi ² = 32	26.2 25.89 7 28.67, di	152 95 876 = 4 (P	93.1 159 < 0.000	30.82 3 01); l² =	95 962 99%	1.2% 6.5%	-9.25 [-10.23, -8.27] -1.96 [-3.03, -0.90]	· •
 .5.7 48 months .5.7 48 months .4dams 2010 .4exandrides 2007 Ians-Erik 2009 .3im 2010 eslie 2012 (guyen 2006) .1ubtotal (95% CI) leterogeneity: Tau² = 1.40; est for overall effect: Z = 3. 	109.82 93.7 82.9 109 Chi ² = 32 .61 (P = 0	26.2 25.89 7 28.67, df	152 95 876 = 4 (P	93.1 159 < 0.000	30.82 3 01); l² =	95 962 99%	1.2% 6.5%	-9.25 [-10.23, -8.27] -1.96 [-3.03, -0.90]	· •

Figure 5.3.2.4.2i Forrest plot of the effects of RYGB surgery upon plasma LDLcholesterol levels including all subgroups. Standard mean difference (with 95% confidence intervals)



Figure 5.3.2.4.2ii Graph of the mean plasma LDL-cholesterol levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data). Unpaired t-test was used for analysis; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001.

1411 month	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% Cl	IV. Random, 95% CI
				40.0					
Nexanariaes 2007 Pardina 2009c	32.7 33.5	67	18 34	43.2 47.2	9 12.24	26 34	1.1% 1.2%	-1.30 [-1.97, -0.64] -1.36 [-1.89, -0.83]	
Silvestre 2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	47.1	16.99	125 177	46.33	15.44	125 185	1.2% 3.5%	0.05 [-0.20, 0.30] -0.84 [-1.91, 0.23]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.83	; Chi ² = 3	31.52, df	= 2 (P	< 0.000	001); l² =	= 94%			-
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1$.55 (P =	0.12)							
3.4.2 3 months Aron-Wisnewsky 2011	55.7	14.4	34	55	18.2	34	1.2%	0.04 [-0.43, 0.52]	+
Bavaresco 2010	40.6	10.2	48	39.6	9.3	48	1.2%	0.10 [-0.30, 0.50]	<u>+</u>
Dillard 2011	41.6	10.7	11	44.3	15.2	11	1.1%	-0.20 [-1.04, 0.64]	
Heneghan 2011 Huang 2011	47.7	14.4 15.5	10 13	50 48 9	18 17 67	10 13	1.1%	-0.14 [-1.01, 0.74] -0.17 [-0.94, 0.60]	
Kim 2011	45.17	9.76	71	48.65	13.01	71	1.2%	-0.30 [-0.63, 0.03]	
Mutch 2009 Pardina 2009c	50.19 38.4	14.45 7	14 34	57.92 47.2	14.45 12.24	14 34	1.1%	-0.52 [-1.27, 0.24] -0.87 [-1.37, -0.37]	
Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009	49.2	13.8	80	46.3	20.2	80	1.2%	0.17 [-0.14, 0.48]	
Silvestre 2004	45.95	18.92	125	46.33	15.44	125	1.2%	-0.02 [-0.27, 0.23]	+
Trakhtenbroit 2009 Woelnerhanssen 2011	39.3 34.75	7.37 13.37	10 12	43.8 30.89	8.63 13.37	10 12	1.0% 1.1%	-0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] 0.28 [-0.53, 1.08]	
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau? – 0.03	Chi² – 1	18 75 df	495	P = 0.13	3) · 12 - 3	495	16.0%	-0.13 [-0.30, 0.03]	•
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1$.55 (P =	0.12)	(0.10	,,, = 0				
3.4.3 6 months									
Aron-Wisnewsky 2011 Arteburn 2009	59.3 44	15.3	34	55 47	18.2	34	1.2%	0.25 [-0.22, 0.73]	
Bavaresco 2010	45.9	12.9	48	39.6	9.3	48	1.2%	0.56 [0.15, 0.96]	
Brethauer 2011 Carrasco 2007	53.7 46.8	22.8 13.1	15 31	46.4 43.3	17.6 10.9	15 31	1.1%	0.35 [-0.37, 1.07] 0.29 [-0.21, 0.79]	
Coppini 2006	53.4	12.9	40	44 52.0	12	40	1.2%	0.75 [0.29, 1.20]	
Habib 2009	46 50	7.07	50	3∠.9 49	7.07	50	1.2%	0.14 [-0.25, 0.53]	+-
Heneghan 2011 Huang 2011	59.2 56.1	23.1 25.29	10 12	50 48.9	18 17.67	10 13	1.1% 1.1%	0.43 [-0.46, 1.31] 0.32 [-0.47. 1.11]	—
lannelli 2011 Kim 2011	50.19	11.58	12	50.19	7.72	12	1.1%	0.00 [-0.80, 0.80]	<u>+</u>
Moulin 2011	49.81 52.9	9.9	71 28	48.65 50.2	13.01	71 28	1.2%	0.09 [-0.24, 0.42] 0.25 [-0.28, 0.77]	Ŧ
Mutch 2009 Pardina 2009c	38.61 44 E	14.45 7	14 34	57.92 47 2	14.45 12.24	14 34	1.1% 1.2%	-1.30 [-2.12, -0.47] -0.27 [-0.75_0.21]	
Perez-Romero 2010	38.61	0.77	96	37.07	8.49	96	1.2%	0.25 [-0.03, 0.54]	+
Ponie-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009	42 54.5	9 10.1	187 80	46 46.3	13 20.2	215 80	1.2% 1.2%	-0.35 [-0.55, -0.16] 0.51 [0.20, 0.83]	
Rossi 2008 Sarmento 2009	44.9 51.8	11.9 12.9	140	47.3	10.9 15 7	140 18	1.2%	-0.21 [-0.44, 0.03]	1
Silvestre 2004	47.1	20.46	125	46.33	15.44	125	1.2%	0.04 [-0.21, 0.29]	±
vendrell 2004 Subtotal (95% CI)	46.33	19.31	34 1256	42.47	7.72	34 1314	1.2% 25.9%	0.26 [-0.22, 0.74] 0.07 [-0.10, 0.23]	→
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10 Test for overall effect: $Z = 0$; Chi ² = $\{$	30.73, df	= 21 (P < 0.00	0001); l²	= 74%			
		0.40)							
Agrawal 2008	52.7	16.8	94	49.8	12.4	94	1.2%	0.20 [-0.09, 0.48]	+
Alexandrides 2007 Ali 2009	48.4	9.2 63.27	12 827	43.2 46	9 74 77	26 827	1.1%	0.56 [-0.14, 1.26]	ţ
Arteburn 2009	50	11	42	47	9	92	1.2%	0.31 [-0.06, 0.68]	+-
Asztalos 2010 Bavaresco 2010	46 50.9	8 12	19 48	37 39.6	10 9.3	19 48	1.1% 1.2%	0.97 [0.30, 1.65] 1.04 [0.62, 1.47]	
Benaiges 2011 Boza 2011	59.5	14.3	95	50.7	12.5	95	1.2%	0.65 [0.36, 0.94]	1-
5028 2011	59.7	14.6	786 63	48.9 46.33	7.72	786	1.3%	0.79 [0.68, 0.89] 1.26 [0.87, 1.64]	
Broch 2010	61.76								
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012	49.4	12.3 17.08	42 114	38.9 52.9	9.6 12.81	42 114	1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39]	↓
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009	49.4 54.9 55.98	12.3 17.08 0	42 114 21	38.9 52.9 45.95	9.6 12.81 8.11	42 114 21	1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Iannelli 2011	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44	42 114 21 76 12	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72	42 114 21 76 12	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.1%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Iannelli 2011 Kim 2010	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.19	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09	42 114 21 76 12 219 71	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.6	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01	42 114 21 76 12 219 71	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Iannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Kiligman 2008	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hanse 200 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2008 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51 51 42.47	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45 45 47.2 37.07	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.53 [0.24, 0.82]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kiigman 2008 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51 42.47 52.51	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45 47.2 37.07 41.7	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.53 [-0.26, 0.82] 0.53 [0.24, 0.82] 1.15 [0.55, 1.71]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Iannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Kiligman 2008 Pardina 2009c Parez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51 42.47 52.51 51 55.8	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 140 80	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45 47.2 37.07 41.7 46 46.3	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 13 20.2	42 114 21 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 215 80	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49; 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82] 0.33 [0.24, 0.82] 1.15 [0.59, 1.71] 0.40 [0.18, 0.61] 0.57 [0.26, 0.89]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Iannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kiim 2011 Kiigman 2008 Pardina 2009c Parez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51 42.47 51 42.47 51 51 55.8 54.2 52.51	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 9.109 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71	42 114 21 219 71 101 34 96 29 140 80 18 125	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46 46.3 51.9 46.33	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 13 20.2 15.7 15.44	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 215 80 18 125	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.54 [-0.26, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.55 [0.24, 0.61] 1.40 [0.18, 0.61] 0.57 [0.26, 0.89] 0.17 [-0.48, 0.83] 0.30 [0.05 0 551]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribay 2009 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Solvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51 42.47 51 42.47 51 51 51 52.51 54.2 52.51 48.7	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4	42 114 21 219 71 101 34 96 29 140 80 18 125 60	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 40.3	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 13 20.2 15.7 15.44 6.6	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 215 80 18 125 60	1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ \text{Not estimable} \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.55, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.47 \left[0.26, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.37 \left[0.24, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.30 \left[0.57, \ 1.49 \right] \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Liannelli 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Pardana 2008 Pardina 2009c Parda 2009 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sairwento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51 42.47 52.51 42.47 55.8 54.2 52.51 48.7 62.93 46.33	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37	42 114 21 219 71 34 96 29 140 80 18 125 60 5 12	$\begin{array}{c} 38.9\\ 52.9\\ 45.95\\ 46.33\\ 50.19\\ 48.65\\ 45\\ 47.2\\ 37.07\\ 41.7\\ 46\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\ 48.26\\ 30.89\end{array}$	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11.24 8.49 9.65 13 20.2 15.44 6.6 10.81 13.37	42 114 21 219 71 101 34 96 29 215 80 125 605 12	1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.54 [-0.26, 0.62] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.53 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.57 [0.24, 0.82] 1.15 [0.59, 1.71] 0.40 (0.18, 0.61] 0.57 [0.24, 0.83] 0.30 [0.05, 0.55] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 0.99 [0.63, 1.36] 1.12 [0.24, 1.99]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kiigman 2008 Pardina 2009 Parez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamak 2010 Bihlaista 2011 Biblio 2020 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarraa 2007 Woolnorhanssen 2011 Woolnorhanssen 2011	49.4 54.9 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51.2 67.18 51.2 67.18 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2 51.2	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8	42 114 219 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 140 80 18 125 60 5 12 765 12 765	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 48.26 46.3 31.9 46.33 50.1 48.26 40.3 48.26 50.2 43.3 50.19 48.30 50.19 48.30 50.19 48.30 50.19 48.30 50.19 48.30 50.19 48.30 50.19 48.55 50.19 48.7 50.19 48.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.3 50.20 40.30 40.30 50.20 40.30 40.30 40.30 50.20 40.30 40.30 40.30 50.20 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.30 40.50 40.30 40.40 40.30 40.30 40.40 40.30 40.40 4	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11.22 8.49 9.65 13 20.2 15.44 6.6 10.81 13.37 0.6 13.37 0.6 11.8	42 114 219 76 12 219 71 101 34 29 215 80 125 605 12 765 12 765	1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.57 [0.24, 0.82] 1.15 [0.59, 1.71] 0.40 [0.18, 0.61] 0.57 [0.24, 0.83] 0.17 [-0.48, 0.83] 0.30 [0.05, 0.55] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 0.99 [0.63, 1.36] 1.12 [0.24, 1.99] 13.85 [13.35, 14.35] 0.94 [0.64 1 24]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Iannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Kilgman 2008 Pardina 20090 Parez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toollabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Woodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI)	61.73 49.4 55.98 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.18 51 42.47 52.51 51 55.8 54.2 52.51 55.25 54.2 52.51 48.7 62.93 46.33 53.1 61.7	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8	42 114 219 76 12 219 71 101 346 29 140 80 18 125 60 12 795 4162	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 48.26 46.33 50.1	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11.224\\ 8.49\\ 9.65\\ 13\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ 37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ 37\\ 0.6\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ 30\\ 10.8\\ 10.$	42 114 21 76 129 71 34 96 215 80 125 605 12 765 96 4301	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.62 \right] \\ 0.33 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.55 \left[0.24, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0.5 \left[0.24, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.37 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[0.15, \ 0.55 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.96 \left[0.34, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right] \\ 1.0 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Jaaria-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Bilvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Viarrasa 2017 Warrasa 2014 Viarrasa 2014 Viarrasa 2014 Viarrasa 2014 Viarrasa 2014 Viarrasa 2014 Viarrasa 2015 Substoal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99	49.4 49.4 55.98 55.98 54.05 61.78 51.18 51.51 51.55 51	12.3 17.08 0 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 1.58 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 29.22.13, 0.00011	42 114 21 76 129 71 34 96 29 140 80 180 185 605 625 12 766 4162 df = 2	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.67 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.3 51.9 46.33 50.1 48.26 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 13.02 15.7 15.44 6.6 10.81 13.37 0.6 11.8	42 114 21 76 129 71 34 96 215 80 125 605 65 12 765 96 4301 ; ² = 99	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.65, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.62 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.46, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.46, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.90 \left[0.52, \ 1.48 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.48 \right] \\ 1.9 \left[0.52, \ 1.48 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.38 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 1.9 \left[0.32, \ 1.43 \right] \\ 1.9 \left[0.32, \ 1.43 \right] \\ 1.9 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kigiman 2008 Pardina 2009 Parta 2009 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sairmento 2009 Sairmento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Woelnerthanssen 2011 Woelnerthanssen 2011 Woelnerthanssen 2011 Vilachex 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.45.18 months	61.74 49.4 55.98 54.95 55.98 51.2 67.18 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51	12:3 17:08 0 11:58 15:44 12:1 91:09 11:58 12 11:58 8:88 12 11:58 12:5 11:58 8:29 24:71 8:44 17:76 13:37 0.8 12:8 2912:13, 0.0001)	42 114 21 219 71 34 96 29 140 80 180 125 605 12 765 96 4162 df = 2	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.65 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.3 51.9 46.33 50.1 48.26 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 9.65 13 20.2 15.7 15.44 6.6 10.81 13.37 0.6 11.8	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 215 80 12 765 60 65 12 765 4301 ; ² = 95	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ \text{Not estimable} \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.55, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.89 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[0.63 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.072, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.20 \left[0.25, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 1.20 \left[0.25, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Pardina 2009c Pardina 2009c Parda 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Foolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woedrad 2010 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Fest for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months	61,74 49,4 55,98 55,98 51,26 61,78 51,2 67,18 51,2 67,18 51,2 67,18 51,2 51,51 52,51 42,47 52,51 52,51 42,47 52,51 48,7 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 53,51,2 62,93 54,51,2 54,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,51,	12:3 17:08 0 11:58 15:44 12:1 91:09 11:58 11:58 12 11:58 12 11:58 12 11:58 12 11:58 12 11:58 12 11:58 12 11:58 12 12:5 12:5 12:5 12:5 12:5 12:5 12:5 1	$\begin{array}{c} 42\\ 114\\ 21\\ 76\\ 219\\ 71\\ 101\\ 34\\ 96\\ 60\\ 18\\ 125\\ 60\\ 12\\ 765\\ 96\\ 4162\\ df=2 \end{array}$	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.65 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 48.26 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 13 20.2 15.7 15.44 6.6 10.81 13.37 0.6 11.8 .00001)	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 29 215 80 18 125 60 65 12 765 92 15 80 18 12 765 92 15 80 18 12 765 12 765 92 12 765 12 765 12 765 12 765 12 765 12 765 12 76 10 76 12 76 20 76 10 76 12 76 10 76 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 10 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 12 76 76 76 76 76 76 76 76 76 76 76 76 76	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.28 \left[-0.05, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.24, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.19 \left[0.65 \right] \\ 1.19 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.9 \left[0.65 \right] \\ 1.19 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.9 \left[0.65 \right] \\ 1.19 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.72 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodiga 2012 Holtos 2010 Holtos 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestirs 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vialaraas 2007 Woedard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Sonen 1983 Pardina 2009c	61.74 49.4 55.98 55.98 51.2 61.78 51.2 67.18 61.78 51.2 67.18 51.2 51.5 51.5 51.5 52.51 42.47 52.51 55.8 54.2 52.51 53.1 61.77 (Chi ² = 2 5.07 (P < 63.1 45 55	12.3 17.08 15.44 15.44 12.1 911 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 24.71 13.37 0.8 12.8 12.8 12.8 12.8 12.8 12.8 12.8 12	42 114 21 76 219 71 101 34 96 29 140 80 18 125 765 96 4162 df = 2 765 96 4162 df = 2	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 48.65 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46 46.3 51.9 46.33 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 12.5 13.01 11.12.24 8.49 9.65 13.20.2 15.7 15.44 6.66 10.81 13.37 0.6 10.8 11.8 .00001)	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 2215 80 125 60 65 125 96 4301 ; ² = 96 4301 ; ² = 96	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.28 \left[-0.05, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.33 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.55 \left[0.29, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 16 \left[50, 22, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 16 \left[50, 22, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 16 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.89 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[0.05, \ 0.55 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.38 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.38 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribejamaki 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Moedmanassen 2011 Woodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Substoal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1933 Pardina 2009 Partina 2009 Partina 2010 Substoal (95% CI)	61,74 54,98 55,98 55,98 51,98 51,28 61,78 61,78 67,51 67,51 51 51 52,52 52,51 53,51	12.3 17.08 17.08 15.84 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.44 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 2912.13, 2912.13, 10,0001) 28.83 10 10.2	42 114 21 762 219 711 101 34 96 229 140 80 185 65 125 966 4162 df = 2 114 226 4165 765	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.3 51.9 46.33 51.9 46.33 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 40 47.2 40.3 48.26 40.3 48.26 40.3 48.26 40.3 40.4 40 40.4 40.4 40.4 40.4 40.4 4	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11.1 2.24 8.49 9.65 13.20.2 15.44 8.49 9.65 13.20.2 15.44 13.37 0.6 10.81 13.37 0.6 11.8 10.81 11.2.81 10 10.2 2 13	42 114 21 76 12 219 711 101 34 96 215 80 125 60 65 125 96 4301 ; ² = 96 4301 ; ² = 96 215 377 50 114 226 215 377 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.05, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.47 \left[0.26, \ 0.62 \right] \\ 0.33 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.24, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.24, \ 0.89 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.48 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 1.36 \left[1.335, \ 1.4.35 \right] \\ 0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Holso 2010 Holso 2010 Holso 2010 Kim 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Partine 2004 Foolabi 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Babek 2005% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Fest for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtocal (95% CI)	61,744 54,98 55,98 55,98 54,06 61,78 51,2 67,18 61,78 52,51 55,8 54,2 52,51 55,8 54,2 52,51 55,8 54,2 52,51 55,8 54,2 52,51 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 61,7 62,93 53,1 64,1 64,1 64,1 64,1 64,1 64,1 64,1 64	17.08 17.08 17.08 15.84 15.44 12.1 10.5 11.58 8.88 11.6 9.9 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 2912.13, 0.0001) 28.83 10 10.2 14 3.29, df =	42 114 21 762 219 771 101 34 96 29 140 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45 47.2 37.07 46.3 37.07 46.3 31.9 46.33 40.3 40.3 51.9 46.33 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 47 6 52.9 40 47 52.9	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 12.81\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 12.24\\ 8.49\\ 9.63\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.65\\ 11.8\\ 0.0001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 200001)\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12\\ 8.49\\ 11.8\\ 0.0001)\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12\\ 12$	42 114 21 76 12 219 71 101 34 96 2215 80 122 765 122 765 122 765 122 765 122 765 122 71 101 34 96 4301 ; I ² = 95 114 225 377 114 225 377	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.55, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.16 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.62 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.30 \left[0.05, \ 0.55 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[1.33, \ 1.43 \right] \\ 1.36 \left[1.335, \ 1.43 \right] \\ 1.40 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 1.40 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.72 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.48, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[-0.16, \ 0.94 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[-0.16, \ 0.94 \right] \\ 0.38 \left[-0.16, \ 0.94 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Parlana 2008 Pardina 2009c Parlana 2009c Parlana 2009 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Bubtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 Sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6	6 + iga 4 6 + iga 4 6 + iga 6 5 +	11.38 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12.8 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 13.37 0.8 12.8 2912.13, 0.0001 28.83 10.2 29.84 10.2 29.85 10.2 29.85 10.2 20.2 20.2 20.2 20.85 10.2 20.85 10.2 20.2 20.2 20.2 20.2 20.2 20.2 20.2	$\begin{array}{c} 42\\ 144\\ 21\\ 76\\ 12\\ 219\\ 71\\ 101\\ 34\\ 96\\ 29\\ 140\\ 80\\ 105\\ 60\\ 80\\ 125\\ 60\\ 65\\ 125\\ 765\\ 96\\ 4162\\ 2765\\ 96\\ 4162\\ 267\\ = 3(P=1)\end{array}$	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 48.26 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 46 30.89 43.3 50.1	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 12.51 12.51 12.51 12.51 12.51 12.52 13.01 12.24 8.49 9.65 13.202 15.44 6.6 10.81 13.37 0.6 11.8 .000001) 12.811 10.2 13 12 13 10 10.2 13 12 10 10.2 13 12 12 10 10.2 13 12 10 10.2 13 12 10 10.2 13 12 10 10.2 13 12 10 10.2 13 12 10 10.2 13 10 10.2 13 10 10.2 13 10 10.2 13 10 10.2 13 10 10.2 13 10 10 10.2 13 10 10 10.2 10 10 10 10.2 10 10 10 10 10.2 10 10 10 10 10 10.2 10 10 10 10 10 10.2 10 10 10 10 10.2 10 10 10 10 10.2 10	$\begin{array}{c} 42\\ 114\\ 76\\ 6\\ 72\\ 219\\ 71\\ 34\\ 96\\ 29\\ 215\\ 80\\ 125\\ 60\\ 65\\ 125\\ 765\\ 96\\ 4301\\ 1^2 = 96\\ 4301\\ 1^2 = 96\\ 4301\\ 1^2 = 95\\ 216\\ 226\\ 377\end{array}$	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[-0.26, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.24, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.37 \left[0.24, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.19 \left[0.65, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.9 \left[0.65, \ 1.65 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.72 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.11, \ 1.09 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.440, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.440, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.440, \ 0.76 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Haras-Eik 2009 Haras-Eik 2009 Haras-Eik 2009 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribelow 2008 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Barmento 2000 Barmento 2000 Hotero 2010 Ularcasa 2007 Woodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 Garcia-Marirodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Butotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Carbie Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 6 34.6 24 months	6 49 4 9 4 5 4.96 5 5.98 5 4.05 6 1.78 5 1.22 6 7.18 5 1.2 6 7.18 5 1.2 6 7.18 5 1.2 6 7.18 5 1.2 6 7.18 5 4.2 5 2.51 4 2.47 5 2.51 5 2.51 6 4.3 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 4.2 5 2.51 6 4.3 5 5.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 4.2 5 2.51 6 4.3 5 5.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 4.2 5 2.51 6 4.3 5 5.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 3.5 5 4.2 5 2.51 6 3.3 5 3.1 6 3.1 6 3.1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	17.08 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 2912.13, 0.0001 28.83 10 10.2 14 3.29, df = 0.00001	42 114 766 219 71 101 34 96 122 219 71 34 96 4162 265 4162 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 265 2	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 46.3 37.07 46.3 40.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 51.9 40.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 46 52.9 40 47 46 52.9	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 12.24\\ 8.49\\ 9.65\\ 13\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12\\ 8.49\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12\\ 8.49\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 13\\ 12\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13\\ 13$	42 114 766 70 219 71 101 34 960 125 80 125 80 65 125 765 4301 ; ² = 95 215 4301 ; ² = 95 215 377	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.55 [0.24, 0.62] 0.40 [0.18, 0.61] 0.40 [0.18, 0.61] 0.57 [0.26, 0.89] 0.47 [-0.48, 0.83] 0.30 [0.05, 0.55] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 1.12 [0.24, 1.99] 1.385 [1.35, 14.35] 0.94 [0.64, 1.24] 1.10 [0.57, 1.63] 0.46 [0.19, 0.72] 0.49 [-0.11, 1.09] 0.39 [-0.16, 0.94] 0.75 [0.51, 0.99] 0.58 [0.40, 0.76]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Lannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Viarrisa anota 2010 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Conen 1983 Pardina 2002e Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2002e CI) Buttotal (95% CI) Buttotal (95% CI) Butto	494 494 54.96 54.96 54.96 54.96 54.06 61.78 51.2 67.18 51.2 67.18 51.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54	17.08 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 11.58 8.88 11.58 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.8001 24.71 24.71 0.0001 0.0001 28.83 10 10.2 14 10.2 14 10.2 10.2 10.2 10.2 10.2 10.2 10.2 10.2	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 114\\ 76\\ 122\\ 219\\ 71\\ 71\\ 34\\ 96\\ 60\\ 80\\ 10\\ 80\\ 10\\ 80\\ 125\\ 60\\ 65\\ 122\\ 765\\ 96\\ 60\\ 65\\ 122\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 99\\ 99\\ 42\end{array}$	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 45.7 48.65 45.7 46.3 37.07 46 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 46 = 0.35); 43.2 38.9	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11.2\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 12.249\\ 9.66\\ 10.8\\ 10.2\\ 10$	42 114 121 766 12 219 71 101 101 101 101 101 101 101	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.55, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.47 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.47 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.47 \left[0.48, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.19 \left[0.55 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[-0.11, \ 1.09 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, \ 2.10 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, \ 2.10 \right] \\ 1.87 \left[0.91 \right] \\ 1.87 \right] \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Pardina 2009c Pardina 2009c Parter-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Dotadard 200 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohla-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.5 4.5 4 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Carter 2007 Carter	6 4994 54.96 54.96 54.96 54.05 61.78 514.05 51.05 67.18 51 42.47 52.51 55.8 54.25 52.51 55.8 54.25 52.51 55.8 54.25 52.51 61.27 61.27 53.1 48.73 51 48.73 54.9 55.48 (P < 54.9 561.57 54.9 561.57 51.54 51.55 51.5	17.08 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 10.5 11.58 8.88 12.8 24.71 17.76 11.58 8.22 14.71 17.76 12.8 24.71 17.76 12.8 24.71 17.76 12.8 24.71 17.76 12.8 24.27 14 17.76 17.9 24.87 10 10.2 14 10.5 11.58 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5	422 114 21 114 219 71 134 46 29 29 76 29 20 76 4162 267 267 267 267 267 267 267 267 267 2	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47 48.65 47 48.65 46 37.07 41.7 46.3 46.3 46.3 46.3 46.3 46.3 46.3 46.3	9.6 12.81 8.11 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 13.25 13.01 11 12.24 8.49 9.65 10.81 10.81 10.81 10.81 10.81 10.2 13 12.81 10.2 13 12 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	422 114 21 114 219 71 131 46 29 29 215 80 0 65 52 215 377 226 215 377 226 215 377	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, 0.82 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, 0.81 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26, 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26, 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.24, 0.83 \right] \\ 0.30 \left[0.02, 0.55 \right] \\ 1.09 \left[0.63, 1.36 \right] \\ 1.19 \left[0.57, 1.63 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, 1.63 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, 0.72 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[-0.11, 1.09 \right] \\ 0.38 \left[-0.16, 0.94 \right] \\ 0.75 \left[0.51, 0.99 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, 0.76 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, 2.10 \right] \\ 1.39 \left[0.94 \right] \left[.27 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, 2.10 \right] \\ 1.39 \left[0.91 \right] \left[.27 \right] \\ 1.6 \left[0.57 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, 2.10 \right] \\ 1.98 \left[0.94 \right] \\ 0.97 \left[0.57 \right] \\ 1.99 \left[0.91 \right$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Hofso 2010 Hofso 2010 Hofso 2010 Pihlajamaki 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Salvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2007 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010	54.964 54.965 54.9655.98 54.065 54.065 51.26 51.26 51.26 51.2 51.42.477 52.51 55.8 54.25 52.51 55.8 54.25 52.51 53.3 53.31 61.77 62.93 46.33 53.1 61.77 62.93 53.48 (P < 54.9 55.48 51.2 55.48 54.25 56.75 62.55 50.19 50.19	12.3 17.08 17.08 15.44 12.1 91.09 11.58 8.88 8.88 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 9.4.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 14 10 10.2 10 10.2 10 10 28.83 10 10.2 8.89 10.2 10 10 28.83 10 10.2 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 28.83 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 211\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 219\\ 219\\ 219\\ 219\\ 140\\ 346\\ 60\\ 80\\ 81\\ 125\\ 60\\ 80\\ 81\\ 125\\ 60\\ 80\\ 81\\ 125\\ 26\\ 61\\ 122\\ 26\\ 61\\ 26\\ 114\\ 122\\ 26\\ 105\\ 26\\ 105\\ 105\\ 105\\ 105\\ 105\\ 105\\ 105\\ 105$	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.75 48.45 48.45 48.45 47.22 37.07 41.7 46.33 40.3 40.3 40.3 48.26 30.89 43.35 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 40 47 40 40 43 52.9 40 47 40 40 47 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.51\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 12.51\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 13.20\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.5\\ 10.2\\$	$\begin{array}{c} 42\\ 42\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 219\\ 71\\ 34\\ 46\\ 229\\ 215\\ 80\\ 182\\ 125\\ 66\\ 62\\ 182\\ 125\\ 66\\ 64\\ 301\\ 114\\ 422\\ 26\\ 64\\ 301\\ 114\\ 22\\ 26\\ 4301\\ 377\\ 226\\ 42\\ 22\\ 66\\ 377\\ 377\\ 226\\ 42\\ 22\\ 88\\ 88\\ 88\\ 88\\ 88\\ 88\\ 88\\ 88\\ 8$	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[-0.05, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.62 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.24, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.37 \left[0.24, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[0.65, \ 0.55 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.16 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.72 \right] \\ 0.49 \left[-0.11, \ 1.09 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.46, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.46, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 1.39 \left[0.91, \ 1.87 \right] \\ 2.06 \left[0.42, \ 1.38 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ 1.58 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ 1.54 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ $	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Eirk 2009 Hans-Eirk 2009 Hans-Eirk 2009 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribel 2017 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2009 Barmento 2000 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Post for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirodriga 2012 Bonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Butotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Pertez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Bilvestre 2004	6 6	12:3 17:08 17:08 11:58 15:44 12:1 91:09 11 10:5 11:58 8.8 9:9 9:4:71 8:4 17:76 13:37 0.8 12:8 2912:13, 0.00001 10:2 14 3:29, df = 0.00004 10:4 15:4 10:5 10:5 10:5 10:5 10:5 10:5 10:5 10:5	422 114 211 766 229 711 34 966 299 140 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 8	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.75 48.65 48.72 37.77 41.7 46.3 48.26 47.2 37.07 41.7 41.7 46.3 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 46 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 46 33.89 40 47 46 33.89 40 47 46 33.89 40 40 47 46 33.89 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.21\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.8\\ 10.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.8\\ 10.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.8\\ 10.2\\$	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 211\\ 76\\ 122\\ 92\\ 71\\ 101\\ 34\\ 92\\ 216\\ 80\\ 92\\ 216\\ 80\\ 80\\ 182\\ 60\\ 92\\ 216\\ 80\\ 182\\ 92\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 377\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 377\\ 377\\ 34\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 377\\ 34\\ 34\\ 226\\ 216\\ 377\\ 377\\ 34\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 377\\ 34\\ 34\\ 377\\ 377$	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.65, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.62 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.55 \left[0.29, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 16 \left[50, 29, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 16 \left[50, 29, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 16 \left[50, 29, \ 0.21 \right] \\ 17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.90 \left[0.55 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.75 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.75 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[0.46, \ 2.10 \right] \\ 1.39 \left[0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right] \\ 1.39 \left[0.94 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ 2.164 \right] \\ 1.09 \left[0.75 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ 2.164 \right] \\ 1.08 \left[0.75 \right] \\ 0.28 \left[0.75 \right] \\ 0.28 \left[0.73 \right] \\ 0.28 \left[0.73 \right] \\ 0.28 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Lannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribei 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Conen 193 Pardina 2007 Colle 193 Pardina 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 193 Pardina 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2006	c_{19} c_{19} c_{17} c_{1	12:3 17:08 17:08 11:58 15:44 12:1 91:09 11 10:5 11:58 8.82 24:71 10:5 11:58 8.82 24:71 10:5 11:58 8.82 24:71 12:8 29:12:13 0.00001 28:83 10 10:2 128 8 10 10:2 14 15 10 28:83 10 10:2 14 15 15 28:83 10 10:2 14 15 15 28:83 10 10:2 11 28:83 10 10:2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 122\\ 929\\ 99\\ 229\\ 100\\ 89\\ 99\\ 229\\ 100\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 38.9\\ 52.9\\ 52.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.19\\ 48.7\\ 48.65\\ 47.2\\ 74.6\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\ 40.3\\ 48.26\\ 30.89\\ 43.3\\ 50.1\\ 7(P<0\\ 46\\ 33.60\\ 10\\ 46\\ 33.5\\ 52.9\\ 40\\ 43.3\\ 50.1\\ 7(P<0\\ 40\\ 46\\ 33.5\\ 52.9\\ 40\\ 40\\ 46\\ 33.5\\ 52.9\\ 40\\ 46\\ 33.5\\ 52\\ 37.07\\ 46\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\ 46\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\ 46\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\ 46\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 12.249\\ 9.63\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.4\\ 6.6\\ 10.8\\ 10.6\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 19\\ 9.6\\ 8.11\\ 10.008\\ 19\\ 9.6\\ 8.11\\ 10.008\\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 122\\ 129\\ 71\\ 34\\ 96\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99\\ 99$	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.65, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right] \\ 0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.72 \right] \\ 0.49 \left[-0.11, \ 1.09 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ 1.64 \right] \\ 1.05 \left[0.75, \ 1.35 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.57 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.57 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40,$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Hofso 200 Restance 200 Pardina 2009c Pardina 2009c Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Colabi 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Colabi 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Colabi 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Colabi 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Colabi 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Poradelli 201 Ponadelli 201 Poradelli 201 Ponseleity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sikroubis 2006	6 19 a 6 19 a 54.96 54.96 54.96 54.05 61.78 51.2 67.18 51.2 67.18 51.2 67.18 51.2 61.77 52.51 51.4 51.2 52.51 51.4 61.77 52.51 51.4 85.4.2 51.2 52.51 51.4 85.4.2 53.4 62.93 53.4 61.77 54.25 54.2 55.8 54.25 55.8 56.57 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 54.9 56.75 5	17.08 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 11.58 24.61 17.76 0.8 12.8 2912.13, 0.0001) 24.81 17.76 12.8 2912.13, 0.0001) 28.83 10 10.2 14 3.29, df = 0.0001 1.5, 14 3.29, df = 0.40001 1.5, 14 19, 10 10, 10, 10 10,	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 219\\ 71\\ 134\\ 46\\ 229\\ 140\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 81\\ 82\\ 26\\ 765\\ 267\\ 765\\ 267\\ 765\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267$	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 41.7 41.7 41.7 41.7 41.7 41.7 41.7 41.	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 12.24\\ 8.49\\ 9.65\\ 13\\ 2252\\ 15.44\\ 10.66\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 10.81\\ 10.68\\ 11.8\\ .00001) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 114\\ 21\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 129\\ 219\\ 71\\ 34\\ 96\\ 2215\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 80\\ 65\\ 122\\ 266\\ 94301\\ 114\\ 22\\ 266\\ 94301\\ 114\\ 22\\ 266\\ 421\\ 114\\ 22\\ 266\\ 81\\ 377\\ 765\\ 100\\ 126\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 10$	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.05, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 0.33 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.82 \right] \\ 1.15 \left[0.59, \ 1.71 \right] \\ 0.40 \left[0.18, \ 0.61 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.46, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.42, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.42, \ 0.83 \right] \\ 0.19 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right] \\ 1.90 \left[0.62, \ 1.43 \right] \\ 1.90 \left[0.62, \ 1.43 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.99 \right] \\ 1.36 \left[13.35, \ 14.35 \right] \\ 0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19, \ 0.72 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.11, \ 1.09 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[-0.16, \ 0.94 \right] \\ 0.75 \left[0.51, \ 0.99 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right] \\ 1.28 \left[0.46, \ 2.10 \right] \\ 1.39 \left[0.42, \ 1.64 \right] \\ 1.05 \left[0.75, \ 1.35 \right] \\ 0.26 \left[1.24, \ 2.89 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[0.22, \ 0.73 \right] \\ 1.13 \left[0.75, \ 1.50 \right] \\ 0.88 \left[-0.04, \ 1.81 \right] \\ 1.62 \left[0.86, \ 2.39 \right] \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sairmento 2009 Sairmento 2009 Saireta 2011 Viarrasa 2007 Woolnerfhanssen 2011 Woolard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Foruya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sirvatis 2006 Silvestre 2006 Silvestre 2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Silvestre 2004 Sirvatis 2006 Silvestre 2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.45 Silvestre 2006 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.45 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.45 Subtotal (95% CI)	c high = 0 c high = 0	12.3 17.08 17.08 15.44 12.1 91.09 11.58 8.88 8.88 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 10 10 24.71 8.4 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 211\\ 766\\ 122\\ 199\\ 771\\ 101\\ 111\\ 34\\ 406\\ 299\\ 125\\ 600\\ 800\\ 800\\ 800\\ 800\\ 800\\ 800\\ 800$	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.75 48.45 48.45 48.45 47.2 37.07 41.7 46 46.3 30.89 443.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 46 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 46 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 46 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 13.25\\ 13.20\\ 20.2\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\$	422 114 21 114 21 12 117 11 11 34 219 219 20 80 80 219 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49 , 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13 , 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34 , 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07 , 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02 , 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.05 , 0.61 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.26 , 0.62 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24 , 0.82 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24 , 0.82 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24 , 0.82 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[0.24 , 0.83 \right] \\ 0.57 \left[0.26 , 0.89 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[-0.48 , 0.83 \right] \\ 0.37 \left[-0.24 , 0.83 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[0.65 , 1.36 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72 , 1.49 \right] \\ 0.94 \left[0.64 , 1.24 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57 , 1.63 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.46 , 0.76 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.19 , 0.75 \right] \\ 0.46 \left[0.17 , 1.094 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.46 , 0.76 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.46 , 0.76 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42 , 2.89 \right] \\ 0.98 \left[0.42 , 1.35 \right] \\ 0.26 \left[-0.39 \right] \\ 0.26 \left[-0.39 \right] \\ 0.26 \left[-0.39 \right] \\ 0.26 \left[-0.37 \right] \\ 1.13 \left[0.75 , 1.55 \right] \\ 0.26 \left[-0.37 \right] \\ 1.43 \left[0.22 , 0.73 \right] \\ 1.13 \left[0.75 , 1.81 \right] \\ 1.66 \left[0.67 , 1.37 \right] \\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Enk 2009 Hans-Enk 2009 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Sat.6 24 months Garcia-Marirodriga 2012 Gonean 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2007 Bolmero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sirvatis 2004 Sirvatis 2004 Sirvatis 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Task for overall effect: Z = 4 Conserverall effect: Z = 4 Subtotal (95% CI)	6 6	12:3 17:08 17:08 11:58 15:44 12:1 91:09 11 10:5 11:58 8:8 8:8 9:9 24:71 11:6 9:9 9:9 24:71 8:4 17:76 13:37 0.8 12:8 2912:13, 0.00001 10 28:83 10 10.2 8:8 10 10.2 8:8 10 10.2 14 3:29, df 9:0,00001 15:4 19 25:48 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:46 11:47 11:46 11:46 11:47 11:46 11:46 11:47 11:46 11:47 11:58 11:47 11:58	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 211\\ 76\\ 122\\ 219\\ 71\\ 101\\ 34\\ 66\\ 60\\ 80\\ 18\\ 8\\ 60\\ 66\\ 60\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 66\\ 105\\ 267\\ 766\\ 91\\ 4162\\ 266\\ 106\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 26$	$\begin{array}{c} 38.9\\ 52.9\\ 52.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.19\\ 48.7\\ 48.65\\ 47.2\\ 37.07\\ 41.7\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7.0\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7.0\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7.0\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7.0\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7.0\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7.0\\ 40.3\\ 4$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.21\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 13.01\\ 12.21\\ 13.20\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.8\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 10.$	422 114 21 176 1229 71 101 101 101 104 219 709 216 60 90 216 60 90 216 60 90 216 765 90 216 101 114 226 215 215 3777 226 422 114 226 90 215 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 1	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49 , 1.39 \right]\\ 0.13 \left[-0.13 , 0.39 \right]\\ Not estimable\\ 0.66 \left[0.34 , 0.99 \right]\\ 0.92 \left[0.07 , 1.77 \right]\\ 0.20 \left[0.02 , 0.39 \right]\\ 0.28 \left[-0.05 , 0.61 \right]\\ 0.54 \left[0.26 , 0.82 \right]\\ 0.33 \left[-0.15 , 0.81 \right]\\ 0.55 \left[0.26 , 0.21 \right]\\ 1.65 \left[0.26 , 0.21 \right]\\ 1.65 \left[0.26 , 0.21 \right]\\ 1.65 \left[0.26 , 0.89 \right]\\ 0.47 \left[-0.48 , 0.83 \right]\\ 0.17 \left[-0.48 , 0.83 \right]\\ 0.90 \left[0.53 , 1.36 \right]\\ 1.10 \left[0.72 , 1.49 \right]\\ 0.94 \left[0.64 , 1.24 \right]\\ 1.10 \left[0.57 , 1.63 \right]\\ 0.46 \left[0.19 , 0.72 \right]\\ 0.49 \left[-0.11 , 1.09 \right]\\ 0.39 \left[-0.16 , 0.94 \right]\\ 0.75 \left[0.51 , 0.99 \right]\\ 0.58 \left[0.40 , 0.76 \right]\\ 0.98 \left[0.42 , 2.69 \right]\\ 0.98 \left[0.42 , 2.69 \right]\\ 0.98 \left[0.42 , 2.69 \right]\\ 0.28 \left[0.46 , 2.76 \right]\\ 1.30 \left[0.57 , 1.53 \right]\\ 0.28 \left[-0.39 , 0.22 \right]\\ 0.48 \left[-0.41 , 1.37 \right]\\ 1.62 \left[0.86 , 2.39 \right]\\ 1.65 \left[0.076 , 1.37 \right]\\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Lannelli 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Moselnarhanssen 2011 Woodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1933 Pardina 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2007 Habib 2009 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2010 Silvestre 201	c_{19} c_{19} c_{17} c_{1	17.38 17.08 17.08 17.08 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.82 24.71 10.5 13.58 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 2912.13, 0.0001 10.2 28.83 10 10.2 14 3.29, df = 0.0001 14 8.82 14 8.82 14 15.14 15.14 15.14 15.14 10.0001 10.14 11.15	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 1229\\ 71\\ 34\\ 99\\ 299\\ 299\\ 299\\ 100\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 605\\ 122\\ 765\\ 94162\\ 267\\ 765\\ 94162\\ 267\\ 765\\ 100\\ 51\\ 267\\ 765\\ 99\\ 44162\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 99\\ 422\\ 18\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 102\\ 102\\ 102\\ 102\\ 102\\ 102\\ 102\\ 10$	$\begin{array}{c} 38.9\\ 52.9\\ 52.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.19\\ 48.7\\ 48.65\\ 47.2\\ 74.7\\ 48.65\\ 47.2\\ 74.7\\ 47.7\\ 47.7\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\ 40.3\\ 48.26\\ 30.89\\ 43.3\\ 50.1\\ 7(P < 0\\ 52.9\\ 40\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7(P < 0\\ 61.3\\ 70.7\\ 46\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.5\\ 52.9\\ 40\\ 40\\ 46.3\\ 30.89\\ 43.3\\ 50.1\\ 46.3\\ 30.89\\ 43.2\\ 37.07\\ 46\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 37.07\\ 46\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 37.07\\ 46\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 37.07\\ 46\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 37.07\\ 46\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.2\\ 38.9\\ 43.8\\ 43$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 12.24\\ 9.65\\ 13.01\\ 11\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.44\\ 6.6\\ 10.2\\ 15.7\\ 15.4\\ 6.6\\ 10.5\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10\\ 10.5\\ 8.419\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 8.411\\ 10.68\\ 8.49\\ 8.411\\ 10.68\\ 8.49\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.58\\ 8.6.8\\ 10.1; P = \end{array}$	422 114 21 114 21 219 71 10 114 34 66 60 65 12 765 66 4301 114 22 215 377 226 4301 114 22 215 377 377 226 42 114 225 215 377 377 226 42 114 219 710 110 110 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right]\\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right]\\ Not estimable\\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right]\\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right]\\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right]\\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.61 \right]\\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right]\\ 0.57 \left[-0.26, \ 0.82 \right]\\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right]\\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right]\\ 0.17 \left[-0.48, \ 0.83 \right]\\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right]\\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right]\\ 0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right]\\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right]\\ 0.49 \left[-0.11, \ 1.09 \right]\\ 0.49 \left[-0.11, \ 1.09 \right]\\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right]\\ 0.98 \left[0.42, \ 1.54 \right]\\ 1.05 \left[0.75, \ 1.35 \right]\\ 0.28 \left[0.39, \ 0.92 \right]\\ 0.48 \left[0.32, \ 0.32 \right]\\ 0.48 \left[0.34, \ 1.37 \right]\\ 1.06 \left[0.76, \ 1.37 \right]\\ 1.06 \left[0.76, \ 1.37 \right]\\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribei 2009 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Color 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohla-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Funuya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.7 48 months Alexandrides 2007	6 1994 9494 54.96 54.96 54.98 54.05 61.78 51.22 67.18 51.2 67.18 51.2 52.61 51.2 52.61 51.2 52.61 51.2 52.61 51.2 52.61 51.2 52.61 51.2 52.61 51.2 53.8 54.22 52.61 51.2 54.24 54.9 56.77 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.34 56.37 54.9 56.34 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.34 56.34 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.34 56.37 54.9 56.34 56.37 54.9 56.34 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 54.9 56.37 56.3	17.08 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 12.8 11.68 9.49 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.0001 24.83 10 10.2 14.78 12.8 29.21 10 10.2 14.7 10 10.2 14.7 10 10.2 14 10 8.83 10 10.2 14 10 8.83 10 10.2 14 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 114\\ 21\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 219\\ 71\\ 134\\ 96\\ 229\\ 140\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 125\\ 62\\ 140\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 125\\ 62\\ 140\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 82\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 82\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 82\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 81\\ 82\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80$	38.9 52.9 45.95 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 46.3 37.07 41.7 48.65 46.3 46.33 40.3 46.33 40.3 46.33 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 46 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 52.9 40 47 46 33.55 52 37.07 61 46.33 41.8 43.8 43.8 42.9 = 0.000(44.2 43.2)	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 11.2\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 9.65\\ 320.2\\ 20.2\\ 12.4\\ 10.57\\ 15.66\\ 10.5\\ 10.5\\ 10.2\\ 13.7\\ 0.6\\ 6.8.11\\ 10.7\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.8\\ 8.49\\ 10.8\\ 8.49\\ 10.8\\ 8.63\\ 6.8\\ 01); l^2 = \\ 15.78\\ 8.01\\ 10.7\\ 10.5\\$	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 42\\ 114\\ 21\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 129\\ 129\\ 134\\ 99\\ 229\\ 229\\ 229\\ 229\\ 229\\ 229\\ 229$	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49 , 1.39 \right] \\ 0.13 \left[-0.13 , 0.39 \right] \\ Not estimable \\ 0.66 \left[0.34 , 0.99 \right] \\ 0.92 \left[0.07 , 1.77 \right] \\ 0.20 \left[0.02 , 0.39 \right] \\ 0.54 \left[-0.55 , 0.61 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15 , 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15 , 0.81 \right] \\ 0.53 \left[-0.15 , 0.82 \right] \\ 0.15 \left[0.26 , 0.62 \right] \\ 0.15 \left[0.26 , 0.62 \right] \\ 0.15 \left[0.26 , 0.62 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26 , 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26 , 0.82 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26 , 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26 , 0.83 \right] \\ 0.17 \left[0.26 , 0.83 \right] \\ 0.19 \left[0.65 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.72 , 1.49 \right] \\ 0.99 \left[0.63 , 1.36 \right] \\ 1.12 \left[0.24 , 1.99 \right] \\ 1.36 \left[1.335 , 14.35 \right] \\ 0.94 \left[0.64 , 1.24 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.57 , 1.63 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[-0.16 , 0.94 \right] \\ 0.39 \left[-0.16 , 0.94 \right] \\ 0.75 \left[0.51 , 0.99 \right] \\ 0.58 \left[0.40 , 0.76 \right] \\ 0.88 \left[-0.39 , 0.92 \right] \\ 0.48 \left[-0.22 , 0.73 \right] \\ 1.10 \left[0.75 , 1.35 \right] \\ 1.65 \left[0.76 , 1.37 \right] \\ 0.60 \left[0.46 , 0.74 \right] \\ 0.61 \left[0.46 , 0.74$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Kim 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Woolnerfhanssen 2011 Woolnerfhanssen 2011 Woolnerfhanssen 2011 Woolnerfhanssen 2011 Woolnerfhanssen 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Test for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2009 Trakhtenbroit 2009 Trakhtenbroit 2009 Trakhtenbroit 2009 Trakhtenbroit 2009 Trakhtenbroit 2009 Trakhtenbroit 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.7 48 months Adams 2010 Alexandrides 2007 Hans-Erik 2009	$chi_{2} chi_{2} chi_$	12.3 17.08 17.08 15.44 12.1 91.09 11.58 8.88 8.88 8.88 12 11.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 12.4 17.6 13.37 0.00001 28.83 10 10.2 14 14 15.2 8.88 15.4 15.2 8.89 9.9 9.49 15.4 13.1 15.2 8.8 15.4 10 10.2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 4114\\ 211\\ 114\\ 219\\ 112\\ 219\\ 71\\ 111\\ 11\\ 34\\ 40\\ 629\\ 299\\ 140\\ 809\\ 800\\ 80\\ 809\\ 125\\ 600\\ 80\\ 809\\ 125\\ 600\\ 809\\ 125\\ 600\\ 267\\ 122\\ 80\\ 100\\ 80\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ $	$\begin{array}{r} 38.9\\ 52.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.19\\ 48.76\\ 48.45\\ 48.45\\ 48.45\\ 47.2\\ 37.07\\ 41.7\\ 46\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.33\\ 40.3\\$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 6.6\\ 13.20\\ 20.2\\ 15.4\\ 6.6\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 10.2\\ 15.78\\ 8.11\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 9.6\\ 8.11\\ 10.58\\ 8.49\\ 10.2\\$	422 114 21 114 21 176 122 19 77 10 11 34 22 60 60 29 215 60 60 62 216 60 60 62 12 78 66 60 65 12 78 66 60 65 12 216 78 66 60 65 12 26 40 20 19 77 77 77 77 77 77 78 9 215 78 9 215 77 77 78 9 20 9 215 78 9 20 9 215 78 78 60 60 29 20 9 20 9 20 9 20 9 20 9 20 9	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.62] 0.53 [0.24, 0.82] 0.53 [0.24, 0.82] 0.43 [0.24, 0.82] 0.40 [0.18, 0.61] 0.57 [0.26, 0.89] 0.17 [-0.48, 0.83] 0.30 [0.05, 0.55] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 0.99 [0.63, 1.36] 1.12 [0.24, 1.39] 1.38 [0.46, 1.24] 1.10 [0.57, 1.63] 0.49 [-0.11, 1.09] 0.58 [0.40, 0.76] 1.28 [0.46, 2.10] 1.39 [0.91, 1.87] 2.06 [0.12, 1.28] 0.26 [-0.39, 0.92] 0.48 [0.42, 1.54] 1.06 [0.75, 1.55] 0.26 [-0.39, 0.92] 0.48 [0.42, 1.54] 1.06 [0.75, 1.35] 0.26 [-0.39, 0.92] 0.48 [0.42, 1.54] 1.06 [0.75, 1.37] 0.60 [0.46, 0.74] 0.60 [0.46, 0.74] 0.82 [0.07, 1.58] Not estimable	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Enk 2009 Hans-Enk 2009 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2000 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Woodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Cast for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirodriga 2012 Gonen 1983 Pardina 2009c Pohle-Krauza 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Skroubis 2006 Strathtenoti 2009 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.7 48 months Adams 2010 Alexandrides 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Adams 2010 Alexandrides 2007 Kim 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011	6 6	12.3 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 111 10.5 11.58 8.88 12 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 1.5 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.8 29.9 24.71 8.4 17.8 29.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.6 9.9 24.71 8.4 17.76 13.37 0.00001 1.5 28.83 10.0000 1.5 28.83 10.00001 1.5 28.83 10.00000 1.5 28.83 10.00000 1.5 28.83 10.00000 1.5 28.83 1.5 2 8.89 9.9,9 9.49 15.44 1.9 25.48 1.5 2 8.89 9.49 15.44 1.9 25.48 1.5 2 8.89 9.49 15.44 1.9 25.48 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.83 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.5 1.5 4 1.5 2 8.5 1.5 2 8.5 1.5 4 1.5 2 1.5 1.5 2 8.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 211\\ 114\\ 21\\ 117\\ 6\\ 122\\ 19\\ 71\\ 101\\ 101\\ 34\\ 66\\ 60\\ 96\\ 90\\ 18\\ 66\\ 60\\ 105\\ 766\\ 60\\ 105\\ 766\\ 60\\ 105\\ 766\\ 60\\ 112\\ 266\\ 766\\ 60\\ 105\\ 267\\ 766\\ 9\\ 148\\ 226\\ 61\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267\\ 267$	$\begin{array}{c} 38.9\\ 52.9\\ 52.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.19\\ 48.7\\ 48.65\\ 422\\ 37.07\\ 41.7\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.3\\ 51.9\\ 46.33\\ 50.1\\ 7 (P < 0\\ 46.3\\ 30.89\\ 43.3\\ 50.1\\ 7 (P < 0\\ 46.3\\ 30.89\\ 43.3\\ 50.1\\ 7 (P < 0\\ 46.3\\ 30.89\\ 43.5\\ 52.3\\ 40.4\\ 47.4\\ 46.3\\ 42.9\\ 43.2\\ 43.5\\ 42.9\\ 43.5\\ 44.2\\ 43.2\\ 43.2\\ 43.5\\ 42.9\\ = 0.000(0\\ 44.2\\ 43.2\\ 45.95\\ 45.95\\ 48.7\\ 46.9\\ 45.$	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.5\\ 13.01\\ 12.13\\ 20.2\\ 15.7\\ 13.01\\ 20.2\\ 15.4\\ 6.6\\ 10.81\\ 13.37\\ 0.6\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10.\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10.\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10.\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.81\\ 10.\\ 10.2\\ 13\\ 12.5\\ 12.5$	422 114 21 114 21 12 219 71 11 34 9 215 60 60 62 215 3777 114 226 215 215 3777 226 215 3777 226 215 3777 2765 60 216 215 3777 2765 2755 2755 2755 2755 2755 2755 2	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.82] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.55 [0.26, 0.71] 1.65 [0.26, 0.71] 1.65 [0.26, 0.89] 0.17 [-0.48, 0.83] 0.30 [0.05, 0.55] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 0.94 [0.64, 1.24] 1.10 [0.57, 1.63] 0.44 [-0.11, 1.09] 0.58 [0.40, 0.76] 1.28 [0.46, 2.10] 1.39 [0.91, 1.87] 0.46 [0.19, 0.72] 0.49 [-0.11, 1.09] 0.58 [0.40, 0.76] 1.28 [0.46, 2.10] 1.39 [0.91, 1.87] 0.68 [0.42, 1.28] 0.26 [-0.39, 0.92] 0.48 [-0.41, 1.35] 0.26 [-0.39, 0.92] 0.48 [0.41, 1.37] 1.62 [0.86, 2.39] 1.06 [0.76, 1.37] 0.60 [0.46, 0.74] 0.62 [0.07, 1.63] Not estimable 0.71 [0.50, 0.93] 0.57 [0.22, 0.92]	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Ribei 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Pohla-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2017 Woelarhanssen 2011 Woodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Pest for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirodriga 2012 Gonen 1933 Pardina 2009 Fest for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2000 Silvestre 2000 Silvestre 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10 Silvestre 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Silvestre 2009 Silvestre 2006 Silvestre 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Silvestre 2009 Silvestre 2007 Silvestre 2007 Silvest	c_{10} c_{1	12.3 17.08 17.08 15.44 12.1 91.09 11.58 8.89 9.9 24.71 10.5 11.58 8.82 24.71 10.5 13.58 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.8 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.0001 10.2 14 3.29, df = 0.0001 8.89 9.49 15.44 13.2 14 8.89 9.49 15.44 13.1 14.51 13.2 7.51 df 14.51 13.2 14.61 14.51 13.2 14.61 14.51 13.2 14.61 14.51 15.7 15.9 9 15.9 15.9 15.9 15.9 15.9 15.9 15	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 42\\ 114\\ 21\\ 176\\ 122\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\ 9\\$	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.7 48.65 47.2 37.07 4.7 4.66 46.3 51.9 46.33 40.3 48.26 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 46 30.89 43.3 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 47 46 33.5 50.1 7 (P < 0 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	9.6 12.81 8.11 12.81 11.58 7.72 12.5 13.01 12.25 13.01 12.25 13.01 12.25 13.01 12.25 13.01 12.25 13.01 12.25 13.01 12.240 0.6 1.1.8 0.00001) 12.81 10.00001) 12.81 10.13 10.281 10.37 0.6 8.11 10.58 8.498 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 15.54 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 15.54 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 15.54 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 15.54 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 8.498 10.58 10.58 8.111 10.58 8.68 11.8 10.54 10.5	422 114 21 114 219 71 10 10 34 66 60 60 65 60 86 60 88 81 81 81 81 82 82 83 776 92 10 765 92 10 765 92 10 765 12 216 216 216 216 216 765 92 10 11 11 11 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	$\begin{array}{c} 0.94 \left[0.49, \ 1.39 \right]\\ 0.13 \left[-0.13, \ 0.39 \right]\\ Not estimable\\ 0.66 \left[0.34, \ 0.99 \right]\\ 0.92 \left[0.07, \ 1.77 \right]\\ 0.20 \left[0.02, \ 0.39 \right]\\ 0.54 \left[-0.26, \ 0.61 \right]\\ 0.53 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right]\\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.82 \right]\\ 0.33 \left[-0.15, \ 0.81 \right]\\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.89 \right]\\ 0.57 \left[0.26, \ 0.89 \right]\\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right]\\ 1.10 \left[0.72, \ 1.49 \right]\\ 0.99 \left[0.63, \ 1.36 \right]\\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.99 \right]\\ 1.12 \left[0.24, \ 1.99 \right]\\ 1.48 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right]\\ 0.94 \left[0.64, \ 1.24 \right]\\ 1.10 \left[0.57, \ 1.63 \right]\\ 0.48 \left[-0.11, \ 1.09 \right]\\ 0.58 \left[0.40, \ 0.76 \right]\\ 0.88 \left[0.041, \ 1.87 \right]\\ 2.06 \left[1.24, \ 2.89 \right]\\ 1.68 \left[0.32, \ 0.92 \right]\\ 0.68 \left[0.04, \ 1.87 \right]\\ 1.62 \left[0.86, \ 2.39 \right]\\ 1.66 \left[0.76, \ 1.37 \right]\\ 0.60 \left[0.46, \ 0.74 \right]\\ 0.82 \left[0.07, \ 1.58 \right]\\ Not estimable}\\ 0.57 \left[0.52, \ 0.93 \right]\\ 0.57 \left[0.52, \ 0.74 \right]\\ 0.63 \left[0.57, \ 0.74 \right]\\ \end{array}$	
Broch 2010 Donadelli 2011 Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Erik 2009 Hans-Carlo Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Robit-Krauza 2011 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarrasa 2007 Vilarrasa 2007 Vilarrasa 2007 Vilarrasa 2007 Vilarrasa 2007 Vilarrasa 2007 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1.99 Fest for overall effect: Z = 4 3.4.5 18 months Garcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Test for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Furuya 2007 Habib 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2004 Silvestre 2007 Silvestre 2007 Silvestre 2007 Silvestre 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.15 Fest for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.7 48 months Adams 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.05 Fest for overall effect: Z = 6 3.4.7 48 months Adams 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Falex 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Falex 2010 Pohle-Krauza 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 4 Subtotal (95% CI)	6 6	17.08 17.08 17.08 11.58 15.44 12.1 91.09 11 10.5 11.58 8.88 11.68 11.58 8.88 12.8 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.0001 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.0001 24.71 17.76 13.37 0.0001 10.2 14.14 8.88 15.2 8.89 9.49 15.44 132 19 25.48 11.44 132 1 22.83 10 10.2 14 14 13 1 32.73, df 0.00001 14.14 132 1 32.73, df 0.00001 14.12 13 12 14 14 12 15 19 20 20 10 11 12 12 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	$\begin{array}{c} 422\\ 421\\ 114\\ 211\\ 76\\ 1229\\ 711\\ 34\\ 96\\ 220\\ 140\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 8$	38.9 52.9 46.33 50.19 48.75 48.45 48.45 48.45 47.2 37.07 41.7 46.33 40.3 48.26 37.07 41.7 46.33 40.3 48.26 38.93 40.3 48.26 40 47 40.3 40.3 48.26 40 47 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.3	$\begin{array}{c} 9.6\\ 12.81\\ 8.11\\ 11.58\\ 7.72\\ 12.51\\ 13.01\\ 12.25\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 12.51\\ 13.01\\ 12.24\\ 6.61\\ 10.2\\ 13.36\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13.36\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13.36\\ 11.8\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13.6\\ 10.8\\ .0001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13.6\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ 13.6\\ .00001)\\ 12.81\\ 10.2\\ .000000\\ 13.6\\ .0000\\ 13.6\\ .00000\\ 13.6\\ .0000\\ 13.6\\ $	422 114 21 114 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2% 1.2%	0.94 [0.49, 1.39] 0.13 [-0.13, 0.39] Not estimable 0.66 [0.34, 0.99] 0.92 [0.07, 1.77] 0.20 [0.02, 0.39] 0.28 [-0.05, 0.61] 0.54 [0.26, 0.62] 0.33 [-0.15, 0.81] 0.53 [-0.15, 0.82] 1.15 [0.59, 1.71] 0.47 [0.28, 0.82] 1.16 [0.18, 0.61] 0.17 [0.24, 0.82] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 1.30 [0.05, 0.55] 1.10 [0.72, 1.49] 1.30 [0.64, 1.36] 1.12 [0.24, 1.99] 1.385 [1.335, 14.35] 0.94 [0.64, 1.24] 1.10 [0.57, 1.63] 0.39 [-0.16, 0.94] 0.39 [-0.11, 1.09] 0.39 [-0.16, 0.94] 0.58 [0.40, 0.76] 1.28 [0.46, 2.10] 1.39 [0.91, 1.87] 2.06 [1.24, 2.89] 0.48 [0.22, 0.73] 1.13 [0.75, 1.35] 0.28 [-0.39, 0.92] 0.48 [-0.24, 1.81] 1.05 [0.75, 1.35] 0.88 [-0.04, 1.81] 1.65 [0.76, 1.37] 0.60 [0.46, 0.74] 0.60 [0.46, 0.74] 0.62 [0.07, 1.58] Not estimable 0.77 [0.52, 0.93] 0.57 [0.22, 0.92] 0.63 [0.52, 0.74]	

Figure 5.3.2.4.3i Forrest plot of the effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma HDLcholesterol levels including all subgroups. Standard mean difference (with 95% confidence intervals)



Figure 5.3.2.4.3ii Graph of the mean plasma HDL-cholesterol levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data). Unpaired t-test was used for analysis; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ns= non-significant.

5.3.2.4.4 Triglycerides

Plasma TG levels were reported in 55 studies, figure 5.3.2.4.4i. Following RYGB, plasma TG levels were reduced (SMD -0.94, 95% CI -1.15 to -0.73, p<0.00001). Heterogeneity among the studies was high (I^2 =97%, p<0.00001). Subgroup analyses revealed a reduction in TG levels by three months post-operatively (SMD -0.57, 95%CI -0.76 to -0.37, p<0.00001) which reduced further at subsequent time points, see figure 5.3.2.4.4ii. There is relative symmetry of the data as depicted in the funnel plot which would support the lack of publication bias for this outcome, appendix 3.

5.3.2.4.5 NEFA

Plasma NEFA levels were reported in 9 studies, figure 5.3.2.4.5i. Following RYGB surgery, plasma NEFA levels were reduced (SMD -0.2, 95% CI -0.36 to -0.04, p=0.01). Heterogeneity of the studies was I² = 84%, p<0.00001. One month post-RYGB, there is a 3-fold increase in mean plasma NEFA levels however by three months this has returned to comparably pre-operative levels. At 6 and 12 months post-RYGB a significant reduction in plasma NEFA levels was noted but this was not maintained. There is no data available in the literature for plasma NEFA levels at 48 months post-RYGB, figure 5.3.2.4.5ii. There is relative symmetry of the data, which would support the lack of publication bias for this outcome, appendix 3.

	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	e-RYGB SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.3.1 1 month Nexandrides 2007 Pardina 2009c Silvestre 2004	151 147.1 153.98	46 61.81 76 99	26 34 125	191 146.9 168 14	78 71.72 89 38	26 34	1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.62 [-1.17, -0.06] 0.00 [-0.47, 0.48] -0.17 [-0.42, 0.08]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	$^{\circ}$ Chi ² = 2	89 df = 2	185 (P = 0	24): 12 =	31%	185	3.3%	-0.21 [-0.49, 0.06]	•
est for overall effect: $Z = 1$	1.52 (P = 0	0.13)		,, .					
.3.2 3 months Iron-Wisnewsky 2011	90.5	29.4	34	110.5	55.8	34	1.1%	-0.44 [-0.92, 0.04]	
Bavaresco 2010	111.5	44.7 24.37	48 20	166.6 156 13	86.9 57.82	48 20	1.1%	-0.79 [-1.21, -0.37] -1 46 [-2 17 -0 76]	
Brethauer 2011	114	48.5	15	146.1	64.5	15	1.0%	-0.55 [-1.28, 0.18]	
Soppini 2006	106.5	32.2	40	175.6	125	40	1.1%	-0.70 [-1.15, -0.25]	
Dillard 2011 Teneghan 2011	125 114.8	60.6 39.4	11 10	182.2 144.9	57.4 53.1	11 10	1.0% 1.0%	-0.93 [-1.82, -0.04] -0.62 [-1.52, 0.29]	
luang 2011 (im 2011 (1)	117.4 105.31	48.67 37.28	13 71	140.1 120.35	53.72 59.65	13 71	1.0% 1.1%	-0.43 [-1.21, 0.35] -0.30 [-0.63, 0.03]	
Autch 2009	97.35	33.11	14	115.04	66.22	14	1.0%	-0.33 [-1.07, 0.42]	
Pardina 2009c	130.2	51.9	34	146.9	71.72	34	1.1%	-0.26 [-0.74, 0.21]	
Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009	129.7 96.4	67.6 23.9	80 18	127.5 145.7	63.6 72.7	80 18	1.1%	0.03 [-0.28, 0.34] -0.89 [-1.58, -0.20]	——T
Silvestre 2004 Frakhtenbroit 2009	145.13 102.4	81.42 28.11	125 10	168.14 197.1	89.38 264.67	125 10	1.1% 1.0%	-0.27 [-0.52, -0.02] -0.48 [-1.37, 0.41]	
Voelnerhanssen 2011 Subtotal (95% CI)	115.04	30.66	12 706	141.59	30.66	12 756	1.0% 19.1%	-0.84 [-1.68, 0.00] -0.57 [-0.76, -0.37]	•
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.09$; Chi ² = 46 5 76 (P < 0	5.53, df = 0.0001	17 (P =	= 0.0001); I ² = 63%	6			
2.3.6 months	5.70 (F < C								
Aron-Wisnewsky 2011	82.5	43	34	110.5	55.8	34	1.1%	-0.56 [-1.04, -0.07]	
Arteburn 2009 Bavaresco 2010	117 97.8	43 34.5	63 48	177 166.6	98 86.9	92 48	1.1% 1.1%	-0.74 [-1.07, -0.41] -1.03 [-1.46, -0.61]	
Boesing 2010	104.2	58 47 4	20	156.13	57.82	20	1.0%	-0.88 [-1.53, -0.23]	
Buchwald 1981	119.9	45.5	56	175.6	98.4	106	1.1%	-0.66 [-0.99, -0.33]	
Coppini 2006	88.6	27.4	40	170.1	125	40	1.1%	-0.90 [-1.36, -0.44]	
∍arcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Habib 2009	96.1 101	39.51 42.43	114 50	132.3 170	56.59 91.92	114 50	1.1% 1.1%	-0.74 [-1.01, -0.47] -0.96 [-1.37, -0.54]	
Heneghan 2011 Huang 2011	115.1 105.5	49.6 51.27	10 12	144.9 140.1	53.1 53.72	10 13	1.0% 1.0%	-0.56 [-1.45, 0.34] -0.64 [-1.44, 0.17]	
annelli 2011 Iamal 2011	88.5	26.55	12	97.35	115.04	12	1.0%	-0.10 [-0.90, 0.70]	
Kim 2011	99.12	44.74	71	120.35	59.65	71	1.1%	-0.40 [-0.73, -0.07]	
Autch 2009	105.7 88.5	39.5 33.11	28 14	163.7	66.22	28 14	1.1%	-0.71 [-1.25, -0.17] -0.49 [-1.25, 0.26]	
Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010	115.4 79.65	51.31 28.32	34 96	146.9 123.89	71.72 44.25	34 96	1.1% 1.1%	-0.50 [-0.98, -0.02] -1.19 [-1.49, -0.88]	-
Ribeiro 2009 Rossi 2008	106.6	21.3 32.7	80 140	127.5 156.4	63.6 86.5	80 140	1.1% 1.1%	-0.44 [-0.75, -0.12]	
Samento 2009	84.3	26	18	145.7	72.7	18	1.0%	-1.10 [-1.81, -0.39]	
/endrell 2004	106.19	70.8	34	212.39	115.04	34	1.1%	-1.10 [-1.61, -0.59]	<u> </u>
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.04	; Chi² = 42	2.90, df =	1216 23 (P =	= 0.007);	l² = 46%	1319	26.1%	-0.76 [-0.88, -0.64]	•
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1$	12.46 (P <	0.00001)						
3.3.4 12 months	104	46	26	101	79	26	1 1 9/	1 24 [1 04 0 72]	
Ali 2009	126	287.58	827	209	632.67	827	1.2%	-0.17 [-0.27, -0.07]	-
Asztalos 2010	84	42 51	42	141	105	92 19	1.1%	-0.68 [-1.33, -0.02]	
3avaresco 2010 3enaiges 2011	88.4 80.2	35.3 27.9	48 95	166.6 134	86.9 82.2	48 95	1.1% 1.1%	-1.17 [-1.60, -0.74] -0.87 [-1.17, -0.58]	
Boza 2011 Broch 2010	93.6 79.65	42.4	786	156.4 150.44	87.7 61.95	786	1.2% 1.1%	-0.91 [-1.02, -0.81] -1.39 [-1.79, -1.00]	
Buchwald 1981	114.2	63.2	51	175.6	98.4	106	1.1%	-0.69 [-1.03, -0.35]	<u> </u>
Changchien 2011	80.1	36.25	101	148.3	94.96	101	1.1%	Not estimable	
Sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012	90.1 82.3	36.3	114	169.1 132.3	82.7 56.59	42 114	1.1%	-1.23 [-1.70, -0.76] -1.05 [-1.33, -0.77]	
Hans-Erik 2009 Hofso 2010	98.23 79.64	0 88.5	21 76	142.48 159.29	70.8 88.5	21 76	1.1%	Not estimable -0.90 [-1.23, -0.56]	-
		26.55	12	97.35	115.04	12	1.0%		
annelli 2011 Jones 1992	79.65 114	44.2	150	189	97.5	150	1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75]	-
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2011	79.65 114 126.9	44.2 77.7	219	189 208	97.5 160.5	150 219 71	1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Pardina 2009c	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24	219 71 34	189 208 120.35 146.9	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72	150 219 71 34	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Pardina 2009c Parez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55	219 71 34 96 29	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06	150 219 71 34 96 29	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.15 [-1.71, -0.59]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 76 71.8	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2	219 71 34 96 29 80 18	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.15 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Pardina 2009c Pihajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Silessero 2004	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 76 71.8 109.73 86 72	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 21	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75 2	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 21	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.0%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.15 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.03 [-1.38, -0.70] -1.04 [-1.38, -0.70] -1.05 [-1.38, -0.70] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2011 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Loolabi 2011	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 76 71.8 109.73 86.73 118.1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6	219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 147 180.7	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.0% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.48, -1.24] -1.15 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 /ilartasa 2007	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 76 71.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 123 87.61	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 84.66 47.79	219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 147 166.14 147 166 173.45	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.1% 1.1	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.02, 0.076] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.33 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.71 [-1.00, -0.61] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.60 [-0.95, -0.25]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2090 Philajamak 2010 Philajamak 2010 Sarmento 2009 Saivestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Toolabi 2011 Toolabi 2011 Via 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woedard 2010	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 76 71.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 123 87.61 88.5 93.1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 2.7	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 12 765	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 145.7 168.14 147 166 173.45 141.59 155	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 28 65	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.68 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.68 [-1.32, -0.75] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.53 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.67 [-0.95, -0.25] -0.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -0.47 [-2.62, -0.72]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Sardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Sartarto 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Jilaresa 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Subtotal (95% Ch)	79.65 114 126.9 95.1 70.8 93.81 76 71.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 123 87.61 88.5 93.1 91.9	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 2.7 45.3	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 12 765 65 4235	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 145.7 168.14 147 180.7 166 173.45 141.59 155 156.3	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 12 765 4340	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.82, -0.45] -0.64 [-0.82, -0.45] -0.62 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.59] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.76] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.60 [-0.96, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.57 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Sim 2010 Pardina 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Pihlajamaki 2010 Sibeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Jilaresa 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnethanssen 2011 Piabek 2005 Libek 205% CI) Heterogenelity Tat ² = 2.07	79.65 114 126.9 95.1 70.8 93.81 76.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 123 87.61 88.5 93.1 91.9 ; Chi ² = 28	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 2.7 45.3	219 219 71 34 96 29 80 125 31 60 28 65 12 765 96 4235 f = 28 (189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 147 166 173.45 141.59 155 156.3 P < 0.000	97.5 160.5 59.66 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9	150 219 711 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 5 12 765 4340 99%	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.83, -0.45] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.52] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.52] -1.25 [-1.22, -0.52] -1.03 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.03 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.03 [-1.26, -0.70] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.66] -0.60 [-0.95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.74 [-1.39, -0.82] -1.37 [-1.43, -0.82] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Pihajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sivestre 2004 Toolabi 2011 Vilarasa 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Hordig (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07. Fest for overall effect: Z = 5	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 70.8 93.81 109.73 86.73 86.73 86.73 87.18 109.73 86.73 93.1 93.1 91.9 ; Chi ² = 28 5.06 (P < 0	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 2.7 45.3 319.72, d	219 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 60 28 60 28 61 27 65 96 4235 f = 28 (189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 147 166 173.45 147.5 146 173.45 145.5 155.3 156.3	97.5 160.5 59.66 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 125 31 60 28 65 12 765 4340 99%	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 32.1%	-0.20 [-1.03, 0.66] -0.84 [-1.023, 0.76] -0.847 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.847 [-1.22, -0.53] -1.57 [-1.82, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.84, -0.70] -1.34 [-1.36, -0.70] -0.34 [-1.36, -0.70] -0.34 [-1.30, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -1.34 [-1.34, -0.72] -1.34 [-1.37, -1.300] -1.34 [-1.37, -1.300] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 20090 Philajamak 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbetto 2009 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Vialarcas 2007 Woelnerhanssen 2011 Woedard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (55% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 3.3.5 18 months Barcia-Marirodriga 2012	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 109.73 86.73 118.1 123 87.61 88.5 93.1 91.9 ; Chi ² = 28 5.06 (P < 0	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 84.66 47.79 30.66 47.79 30.66 319.72, d 0.00001) 39.51	219 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 12 765 96 4235 f = 28 (189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 145.7 168.14 145.7 168.14 145.7 168.3 147.45 173.45 173.45 156.3 P < 0.000	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 28 65 12 765 4340 99%	$\begin{array}{c} 1.1\%\\ 1.2\%\\ 1.2\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 32.1\%\\ 32.1\%\\ \end{array}$	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.76] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.26, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -1.03 [-1.44], -0.66] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -1.349 [-1.37, -1.300] -1.12 [-1.43, -0.82] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 ardina 2000c Dilata 2000 Ribeiro 2000 Sarmento 2000 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarveste 2004 Sovik 2011 Toolabi 2011 Jilarashanssen 2011 Moodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07. Fest for overall effect. Z = 5 3.3.5 18 months Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sancia Marirodriga 2012 Sancia Jaurirodriga 2012 Sancia Jaurirodriga 2012 Sancia Jaurirodriga 2012	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 170.8 93.81 109.73 86.73 86.73 87.61 83.19 91.9 91.9 91.9 91.9 91.9 91.9 91.9	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 84.66 84.66 84.66 84.66 84.65 30.66 2.7 45.3 319.72, d 3.00001) 39.51 44.4 21	219 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 122 765 96 4235 f = 28 (114 22 10	189 208 120.35 146.99 123.89 148.67 127.5 145.7 168.14 147 180.7 166 173.45 156.3 P < 0.000 132.3 146.4 168	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 930.66 5.9 66.9	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 31 60 28 65 27 65 99% 114 22 765 99%	$\begin{array}{c} 1.1\%\\ 1.2\%\\ 1.2\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 1.1\%\\ 3.1\%\\ 32.1\%\\ 32.1\%\\ 3.1.1\%$	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.647 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.647 [-1.22, -0.63] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.97 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.97 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.97 [-1.89, -1.24] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable +0.07 [-1.40, -0.66] -0.66 [-95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -0.74 [-1.35, -0.12] -1.41 [-2.41, -0.40]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 (im 2010 Paraz-Romero 2010 Illiajonako 0 Parez-Romero 2010 Illiajonako 0 Samento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Jilaresa 2007 Vocinerhanssen 2011 Vocinerhanssen 2011 Vocinerhanssen 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 s.3.5 18 months Barcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Sonen 1983 Jan 2011	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.81 77.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 23 87.61 88.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 91.9 (Ch)P < 2C 69.7 103.8 72 92 92	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.60 19.72,d 30.51 44.4 44.4 25.5	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 122 765 96 4235 f = 28 (114 20 20 26	$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 120.35\\ 146.9\\ 123.89\\ 148.67\\ 145.7\\ 127.5\\ 145.7\\ 168.14\\ 147\\ 180.7\\ 168.14\\ 147\\ 180.7\\ 166.3\\ 173.45\\ 156.3\\ 156.3\\ P < 0.000\\ 132.3\\ 146.4\\ 168\\ 145\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 97.5\\ 160.5\\ 59.65\\ 71.72\\ 44.25\\ 61.06\\ 63.6\\ 72.7\\ 89.38\\ 75.2\\ 74.3\\ 95.25\\ 194.69\\ 30.66\\ 5.9\\ 65.9\\ 65.9\\ 67.1\\ 90\\ 0001; \ l^2 = \end{array}$	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 125 765 99% 114 22 99% 114 210 26 172	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.68 [-0.82, -0.43] -0.68 [-0.82, -0.43] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.49] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.67 [-0.92, -0.72] -0.67 [-0.92, -0.72] -1.49 [-1.39, -1.300] -1.49 [-1.39, -1.300] -1.12 [-1.43, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -0.74 [-1.35, -0.12] -1.41 [-1.40, -0.49] -1.41 [-1.40, -0.49] -1.41 [-1.40, -0.49]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 (Sim 2010 Paralina 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Pinlajamaki 2010 Sarmarno 2009 Saivestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 /ilarasa 2007 Woelnerthanssen 2011 Woelnerthanssen 2011 Babek 2005 Test for overall effect: Z = 5 .3.5 18 months Barcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Sonen 1983 .in 2011 Paterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 deterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 70.8 93.5 70.8 93.5 70.8 93.5 70.8 93.5 70.8 93.5 70.8 93.5 70.8 93.5 70.8 86.73 118.1 123 87.61 88.5 93.1 91.9 91.9 (Chill = 22 92 (Chill = 22 92 (Chill = 22 92 (Chill = 22 92 (Chill = 22 92 (Chill = 22 92 (Chill = 22 (Chill = 22 (Chi	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 47.79 30.66 45.3 119.72,d 0.00001) 39.51 44.4 25.5 90,df = 3 90,df = 3	219 219 71 34 96 29 80 188 125 31 60 28 65 96 4235 f = 28 (114 222 100 26 172 38 (P = 0	$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 120.35\\ 146.9\\ 148.67\\ 148.67\\ 148.67\\ 148.67\\ 148.67\\ 148.7\\ 168.14\\ 147\\ 180.7\\ 166\\ 173.45\\ 156.3\\ 156.3\\ P < 0.000\\ 132.3\\ 146.4\\ 168\\ 145\\ 145\\ 145\\ 0.41); l^2 = \end{array}$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 0001); l ² =	150 2199 711 346 280 185 125 311 685 125 765 99% 99% 1114 220 266 172	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.99 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.64 [-0.82, -0.45] -0.64 [-0.82, -0.45] -0.62 [-1.42, -0.42] -0.22 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.33 [-2.08, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.74] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.66] -0.60 [-0.95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.34 [-1.35, -0.22] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -0.74 [-1.35, -0.12] -1.41 [-2.41, -0.40] -1.41 [-2.41, -0.40]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Sim 2010 Partal 2009c Perez-Romero 2010 Philajamaki 2010 Xibeiro 2009 Sammento 2009 Sovik 2011 Toolabi 2011 Viala 2011 Viala 2011 Viala 2011 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 2.07 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 3.35 18 months Sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Sonen 1983 Lin 2011 Pardina 2009c Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5	79.65 114 128.9 83.0 96.1 97.18 109.73 86.73 86.73 87.61 113.1 88.5 93.81 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.6 87.5 93.9 123 87.6 87.5 93.8 123 87.6 87.5 93.8 123 87.6 87.5 93.8 123 87.6 87.5 93.8 123 87.6 87.5 93.8 123 87.6 87.5	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 2.7 42.3 30.06 2.7 45.3 30.00001) 39.51 44.4 21 25.5 90, df = 3 0.00001)	130 219 71 34 96 29 98 80 188 125 31 60 28 65 12 765 5 96 4235 f = 28 (114 222 100 26 172 30 (P = 0	$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 120.35\\ 146.9\\ 123.89\\ 148.67\\ 127.5\\ 145.7\\ 168.14\\ 145.7\\ 168.14\\ 173.45\\ 141.59\\ 156.3\\ 156.3\\ 156.3\\ P < 0.000\\ 132.3\\ 146.4\\ 168\\ 145\\ 0.41); \ ^2 = \end{array}$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 95.25 97.27 90.06 95.25 97.27 90.06 97.27 90.06 97.27 97.29 97.25 97.55 97.5	150 2199 711 346 280 185 125 7856 4340 99% 1114 226 172	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.0% 1.1% 1.1	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.02, 0.076] -0.89 [-1.22, -0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.33 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.68, -0.61] -0.71 [-1.08] -0.60 [-0.95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.34 [-1.37, -1.300] -1.34 [-1.37, -1.300] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -0.74 [-1.36, -0.12] -1.44 [-1.26, -0.42] -1.44 [-1.26, -0.44] -1.44 [-1.26, -0.44] -1.44 [-1.44, -0.44] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.94]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2090 Philajamak 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Koodard 2010 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Sarbeito 2009 Carla Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia Marirodriga 2012 Sarbeito 2009 Carla	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 93.11 93.81 93.81 70.8 93.81 109.73 86.73 118.5 93.1 118.5 93.1 118.5 93.1 (0.6) (P < C (69.7 103.8 72.2 (0.6) (P < C (0.5) (P < C 133.8 72.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 73.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 73.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 73.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 75.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 75.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 75.5 (0.5) (P < C 133.8 (0.5) (P < C 133.8	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 7 2.7 45.3 30.66 7 2.7 45.3 30.65 47.79 30.65 45.3 30.51 44.4 21 25.5 90, df = 5 3,00001)	219 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 4235 f = 28 (114 22 106 126 172 3 (P = 0 26	189 208 120.35 146.97 123.89 148.67 145.7 148.67 145.7 168.14 147 180.7 156.3 156.3 156.3 156.3 156.3 156.3 141.59 156.3 146.4 146 146 145 146 145	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 89.38 89.38 89.38 89.38 89.38 89.38 95.25 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 0001); I ² = 56.59 67.1 90 66.29 0%	150 219 71 34 96 296 296 125 31 60 286 4340 99% 114 222 106 172 26	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.33 [-1.71, -0.59] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -1.34 [-1.20, -0.49] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.66] -0.60 [-0.95, -0.26] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -0.74 [-1.35, -0.12] -1.41 [-2.41, -0.40] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94]	
annelli 2011 Joines 1992 (Sim 2010 Partial 2009 Partial 2009 Partial 2009 Partial 2009 Partial 2009 Ribeiro 2009 Samento 2009 Samento 2009 Salvesto 2009 Salvesto 2009 Salvesto 2009 Salvesto 2009 Valaned 2010 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 J.3.5 18 months Barcia Marirodriga 2012 Diabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 J.3.5 18 months Barcia Marirodriga 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 J.3.6 24 months Newsandrides 2007	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 97.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 1221 87.9 118.1 1221 87.9 86.73 118.1 1221 87.9 93.1 91.9 (Chi ² = 22.).98 (P < C 131 82.4 82.4 82.4	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 30.3 2222 65.40 42.6 84.66 84.66 84.66 84.66 2.7 45.3 30.66 2.7 45.3 319.72, d 39.51 44.4 21 25.5 90, df = 2 90, df = 2 9.00001) 114 32.4 32.4	150 219 71 34 96 29 80 18 125 31 60 28 65 4235 f = 28 (114 22 10 26 172 3 (P = 0 26 422 12 26 422	189 208 120.35 146.9 123.89 123.89 145.7 145.7 168.14 145.7 168.14 147.166 173.45 156.3 P < 0.000 132.3 146.4 168 145.0 132.3	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 72.7 895.8 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 001); l² = 56.59 67.1 96.29 0%	150 219 71 34 96 296 296 310 280 125 31 265 4340 99% 114 22 176 60 4340 99% 114 22 172 26 172	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.68 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.68 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable -1.03 [-1.41, -0.66] -0.66 [-95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.74] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.24, -0.46] -1.40 [-1.62, -0.46] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.94] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.05] -1.37 [-1.88, -0.46]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 (Sim 2010 Paral, Romero 2010 Pinjajamaki 2010 Pinjajamaki 2010 Pinjajamaki 2010 Pinjajamaki 2010 Sovik 2011 Sovik 2011 Jilar 2011 Viastre 2004 Sovik 2011 Viastre 2007 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07. Fest for overall effect: 2 = 5 .3.5 18 months Barcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Sonen 1983 Lin 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00, Gest for overall effect: 2 = 5 .3.6 24 months Nexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Gruya 2007 Habb 2009 2005	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.17 77.68 109.73 86.73 118.1 1223 87.61 88.53 91.9 (Chi ² = 22 5.06 ($P < C$ 69.7 103.8 92 (Chi ² = 2.2 3.98 ($P < C$ 131 82.4 92.16 97.16	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 177.7 5.22 33.24 20.5 20.3 22.2 65.49 42.6 84.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.66 30.60 30.61 21 25.5 90.df = 3 39.51 44.4 21 25.5 90.df = 3 20.0001) 114 32.4 33.51 144 30.1 63.24 53.54 54.55	1219 219 734 929 808 1231 600 228 (42228 (114 226 172 120 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172	189 208 19,035 123,89 148,67 127,55 145,7 188,74 1847 1847 1847 1847 1847 1847 1847 18	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 63.6 72.7 72.7 72.7 72.7 72.7 72.7 93.0 5.9 93.0 66.9 90 67.1 90 66.29 0% 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78	15.0 219 36 29 29 30 29 30 18 125 31 60 28 65 27 65 512 765 4340 99% 114 226 172 26 422 172 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 20 26 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.75] -0.68 [-0.82, 0.45] -0.68 [-0.82, 0.45] -0.67 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.59] -1.33 [-1.26, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.67 [-2.92, -0.72] -1.49 [-1.397, -13,00] -1.49 [-1.397, -13,00] -1.12 [-1.43, -0.82] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.41 [-2.43, -0.12] -1.44 [-2.43, -0.42] -1.47 [-1.48, -0.94] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.05] -1.37 [-1.88, -0.89] -1.17 [-1.88, -0.48] -0.89 [-1.41, -0.56]	++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Cim 2010 Perez-Romero 2010 Philajamaki 2010 Nibeli 2 200 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2010 Via 2011 Vialatta 2010 Vialatta 2010 Vialatta 2010 Vialatta 2010 Ziabek 2007 Jabek	79.65 114 128.9 83.19 93.81 93.81 70.8 93.81 109.73 86.73 86.73 87.61 88.5 93.1 113 87.61 85.5 93.1 (ChiP ≥ 2 5.06 (P < C 131 82.4 92.16 91 132 123 134 124 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.75 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3	1509 219 714 966 229 802 26 26 4225 10 114 226 10 1772 26 4228 10 1772 26 4228 10 1772 26 4228 10 1772 26 1772 26 1772	$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 120,35\\ 120,35\\ 125,39\\ 123,89\\ 123,89\\ 123,89\\ 123,89\\ 123,89\\ 123,89\\ 144,57\\ 168,14\\ 146\\ 144\\ 155\\ 156,3\\ P<0.01\\ 132,3\\ 146,4\\ 145\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 145\\ 156\\ 170\\ 0\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 168\\ 170\\ 100\\ 123,389\\ .133\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ 100\\ $	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 6 0.06 6 0.6 6 0.6 72.7 72.7 95.25 194.69 30.66 9 30.66 9 30.66	150 219 74 34 96 29 80 125 131 60 28 125 4340 99% 114 226 172 26 242 172 26 242 172 26 242 180 996 172	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.0% 1.1% 1.1	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, 0.76] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.35 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.68, -0.61] -0.71 [-1.00, 0.66] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.30, -0.25] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.24] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.24] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.24] -1.37 [-1.36, -0.12] -1.47 [-1.41, -0.66] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.06] -1.47 [-1.48, -0.46] -1.47 [-1.48, -0.46] -1.45 [-1.77, -1.13]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2090 Philajamakro 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbento 2009 Sarbento 2009 Sovik 2011 Toolabi 2011 Hole 2010 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Sarcia Marirodriga 2012 Zancia Marirodriga 2012 Zancia Marirodriga 2012 Zancia Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia 2009 Sarcia 2007 Sarcia 2007 Sarcia 2007 Sarcia 2007 Sarcia 2006 Sarcia 2007 Sarcia 2	$\begin{array}{c} 79.65\\ 114\\ 126.9\\ 83.19\\ 93.81\\ 93.81\\ 70.8\\ 93.81\\ 70.8\\ 93.81\\ 109.73\\ 86.73\\ 118.5\\ 93.11\\ 116.3\\ 87.61\\ 87.2\\ 93.1\\ 69.7\\ 103.8\\ 722\\ 92\\ 100, 100, 100, 100\\ 100, 100, 100\\ 100, 100,$	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 20.3 20.3 20.2 22.2 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 84.66 84.66 47.79 30.66 2.7 30.00001) 39.51 44.4 215 25.5 30.00001) 39.65 4.2 4.3 30.14 215 25.5 30.00001) 114 32.4 30.14	1219 219 314 96 229 800 18 125 125 765 4235 f = 28 (12 765 4235 f = 28 (12 765 4235 f = 28 (12 12 765 4235 f = 28 (12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	189 208 120.35 136.90 136.80 136.80 136.80 146.97 147.7 168.14 147 180.7 168.14 145.7 168.14 173.45 156.3 P < 0.000 132.3 146.4 165 156.3 P < 0.000 132.3 146.4 165.1 154.8 154.8	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 89.38 89.38 89.38 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 0001); I ² = 0% 56.59 67.1 99.62,9 0%	150 219 74 34 96 29 80 125 31 60 28 65 4340 99% 114 22 176 54 4340 99% 114 26 172 26 242 172 26 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.76] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.64] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.26, -0.49] -1.37 [-1.26, -0.46] -1.41 [-1.62, -0.46] -1.41 [-1.62, -0.46] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.47 [-1.48, -0.46] -1.47 [-1.48, -0.46] -0.66 [-1.47, -0.56] -0.66 [-1.47, -0.56] -0.65 [-1.64, -0.26] -0.65 [-1.22, -0.69]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Pardina 2009 Pareza Romero 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Vilarasa 2007 Cabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07 Fest for overall effect Z = 5 3.3.5 18 months Carcia Marino Carcia Marino Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Fest for overall effect Z = 5 Jun 2011 Pardina 2009 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Fest for overall effect Z = 5 Jun 2011 Pardina 2009 Cabek 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Donadelli 2011 Parez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Skroubis 2009 Skroubis 2009	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 95.1 97.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 1221 87.1 81.9 118.1 1221 81.9 118.1 1221 81.9 93.8 91.9 1225 (Chi ² = 2. 9.98 (P < C 131 82.4 92.16 9.18 84.2 92.5 131 82.4 92.16 93.8 131 82.4 92.16 93.8 131 82.4 92.16 93.8 131 82.4 92.16 93.8 131 82.4 93.8 131 83.9 131 131 131 131 131 131 131 13	$\begin{array}{c} 44.2\\ 77.7\\ 5.22\\ 33.24\\ 17.7\\ 26.55\\ 39.23\\ 26.54\\ 0\\ 42.6\\ 84.66\\ 84.66\\ 84.66\\ 84.66\\ 2.7\\ 930.66\\ 2.7\\ 1000001\\ 30.61\\ 25.5\\ 90.df=2\\ 0.00001\\ 114\\ 32.4\\ 30.1\\ 114\\ 32.4\\ 30.4\\ 30.4\\ 32.4\\ 30.4\\ 30.4\\ 30.5\\ 114\\ 30.6\\ 54.6\\ 34\\ 65.7\\ 26\\ 56.9\\ 34\\ 65.7\\ 34\\ 65.5\\ 56\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 56\\ 95\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80\\ 80$	1219 219 321 36 9 9 80 125 31 60 28 5 4235 125 4235 126 9 6 4235 126 126 126 126 126 126 126 126 126 126	188 208 208 208 208 23.89 148.67 127.55 145.7 168.14 167 168.14 167 168.14 173.45 141.59 156.3 146.4 145 144.59 156.3 146.4 145 146.1 168 146.1 168 146.1 168 145.1 168.	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 63.6 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 30.66 5.9 66.9 001); I ² = 56.59 67.1 95.65 67.1 90.66 62.9 0% 78 82.7 69.53 91.92 44.25 89.38 91.92 44.25 89.38	$\begin{array}{c} 1609\\ 1219\\ 2714\\ 969\\ 819\\ 1231\\ 6285\\ 125940\\ 1231\\ 6285\\ 125940\\ 1220\\ 6285\\ 125940\\ 1220\\ 2652\\ 1220\\ 2428\\ 1265\\ 1$	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.67 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.67 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.67 [-1.22, -0.63] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.61 [-1.60, -0.26] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.74] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.74] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.74] -1.47 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.41 [-1.62, -0.46] -1.17 [-1.88, -0.45] -0.99 [-1.41, -0.58] -1.45 [-1.77, -1.13] -0.95 [-1.64, -0.25] -0.95 [-1.64, -0.25] -	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Parez-Romero 2010 Prez-Romero 2010 Phajamaki 0 Samento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Via 2011 Via 2011 Via 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07. Fest for overall effect: 2 = 5 3.3.5 16 months Sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Sonen 1983 Lin 2011 Gonen 1983 Lin 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Gonadelli 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Conadelli 2011 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2017 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2011 Subtotal 2005 Subtotal 2005 Subtotal 2005	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 96.1 76 771.8 109.73 86.73 115.1 1233 87.61 85.5 91.9 (ChiP = 22 5.06 ($P < C$ 69.7 103.8 92 (ChiP = 2.2 3.98 ($P < C$ 92 (ChiP = 2.2 3.98 ($P < C$ 93.81 82.46 92.2 (ChiP = 2.2 3.98 ($P < C$ 93.81 82.47 93.81 88.93 83.19 80.7 111.4	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 65.49 42.6 84.66 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 3		$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 168\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 108\\ 10$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 63.6 72.7 89.38 75.2 74.3 91.94.69 30.6.9 30.6.9 66.9 001): I ² = 56.59 67.1 90 66.29 0% 78 82.7 69.53 91.92 91.92 89.38 174.79 75.2 264.67 65.3	1500 219 71 319 71 30 800 800 800 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.75] -0.68 [-0.82, 0.75] -0.68 [-0.82, 0.43] -0.68 [-1.42, 0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.45] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.49] Not estimable -0.47 [-1.00, -0.46] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.66] -1.12 [-1.43, -0.82] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.05] -1.37 [-1.85, -0.84] -1.04 [-1.62, -0.46] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -0.51 [-1.24, -0.68] -1.35 [-1.24, -0.68] -0.50 [-0.85, -0.14] Not estimable -0.64 [-1.42, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.42, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.42, 0.36]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Cim 2010 Pardz-Romero 2010 Pinjajamaki 2010 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Salvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Vias 2011 Vias 2011 Vias 2010 Vias 2010 Tablek 2005 Action 2010 Tablek 2005 Sartia 2005 Const 1983 Const 2005 Const 2005	79.65 114 128.9 83.19 93.81 93.81 70.8 93.81 169.73 86.73 86.73 87.61 88.5 93.11 169.73 87.61 88.5 93.1 169.73 87.61 85.5 93.1 109.73 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 85.5 93.1 123 87.61 87.61 87.65 71.8 85.5 92.5 131 82.44 92.16 92.16 91.70.8 87.70 83.83 85.59 85.59 131 85.49 92.16 93.1 17.8 85.70 93.83 85.89 71.8 85.9 93.10 17.8 85.70 93.83 85.89 71.8 85.9 71.8 85.70 70.8 85.70 93.81 85.89 71.8 85.9 71.8 85.9 71.8 85.9 71.8 85.9 71.8 85.9 71.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 70.8 85.9 71.11 71.4 71.11 71.1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 30.3 22.2 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.49 65.45 30.27 45.3 319.72, d 5.00001) 39.61 44.4 25.5 590, df = 3 5.00001) 114 32.4 30.1 63.64 63.72 61.42 65.37 22.24, df =		$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 120, 35\\ 120, 35\\ 121, 50\\ 123, 89\\ 148, 67\\ 123, 50\\ 144, 57\\ 144, 57\\ 144, 57\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 55\\ 144, 56\\ 144, 156\\ 144, 168\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 60.06 60.06 72.7 95.25 194.69 66.9 66.9 0001): 2 = 56.59 67.1 90 66.29 0% 78 82.7 69.53 91.92 91	1500 219 71 4 966 800 800 288 31 1144 20 20 4340 999% 4340 999% 4340 999% 4340 999% 4340 86 28 4340 999% 4340 86 172 26 66 172 172 188 188 199 199 199 19 19 26 19 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.02, 0.076] -0.87 [-1.22, 0.076] -0.87 [-1.22, 0.076] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.20, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.30, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.367 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.36, -0.84] -1.41 [-1.41, -0.16] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.06] -1.41 [-1.42, -0.46] -1.45 [-1.45, -0.68] -1.47 [-1.85, -0.68] -1.47 [-1.85, -0.68] -1.45 [-1.41, -0.58] -1.45 [-1.42, -0.46] -0.96 [-1.41, -0.58] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.48, -0.71]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2090 Philajamak 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbeto 2009 Sovik 2011 Toolabi 2011 Harran Koodard 2010 Ziabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Heaterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08 Fest for overall effect: Z = 7 Catheropeneity: Tau ² = 0.08 Fest for overall effect: Z = 7 Subtotal (95% CI) Fest for overall effect: Z = 7 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal	$\begin{array}{c} 79.65\\ 114\\ 122.9\\ 33.19\\ 33.19\\ 93.81\\ 70.8\\ 93.81\\ 70.8\\ 93.81\\ 76.8\\ 93.81\\ 76.8\\ 93.81\\ 71.8\\ 86.7\\ 93.8\\ 71.8\\ 86.7\\ 93.1\\ 87.61\\ 87.2\\ 92.161\\ 82.4\\ 92.161\\ 92.8\\ 10.8\\ 87.2\\ 93.81\\ 82.4\\ 92.8\\ 88.7\\ 93.81\\ 88.93\\ 83.19\\ 88.7\\ 93.81\\ 88.93\\ 83.19\\ 80.7\\ 90.81\\ 82.7\\ 90.(P<0)\\ 111.4\\ 111.4\\ 111.4\\ 10.8\\ 80.7\\ 90.81\\ 80.7\\ 10.8\\ 80.7\\ 10.8\\ 80.7\\ 10.8\\ 80.7\\ 10.8\\ 80.7\\ 10.8\\ 80.7\\ 10.8\\ $	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 26.55 26.55 26.54 26.54 26.54 27.79 30.667 42.6 84.66 84.66 84.66 47.79 30.667 42.3 119.72,d 45.3 119.72,d 45.3 119.72,d 2.5 5.00001) 114 42.6 5.34 63.64 26.55 3.4 63.72 61.42 61.42 61.42 63.84 10 25.81 20 114 20 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 20 114 114 20 114 114 20 114 114 114 114 114 114 114 114 114 11		$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 120.35\\ 146.67\\ 147\\ 148.67\\ 147\\ 148.67\\ 147\\ 168.14\\ 147\\ 168\\ 144\\ 168\\ 144\\ 168\\ 146\\ 168\\ 168\\ 168\\ 168\\ 168\\ 168\\ 168\\ 16$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 62.7 89.38 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 0001); l ² = 0001); l ² = 0001); l ² = 0% 76.2 56.59 67.10 66.29 0% 78 82.7 89.38 174.79 91.02 44.25 58 89.38 174.79 75.2 284.67 76.5 38 89.38 174.79 75.2 284.67 76.5 38 89.38 28 80.38 174.79 75.2 284.67 76.5 38 80.38 82 76.2 8 80.38 80.59 80.50 8	1500 219 71 329 62 229 229 74 80 80 80 80 28 85 122 766 766 766 766 766 766 766 766 766 7	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.26, -0.72] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.48] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.64] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.65] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.90, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.26, -0.48] -1.37 [-1.26, -0.48] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.94] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.94] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.84] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.45] 0.05 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.50 [-1.23, -0.68] -0.50 [-1.24, -0.68] -0.50 [-1.43, -0.36] -0.55 [-1.43, -0.57]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2009c Philajamki 2020 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2007 Hole 2010 Clabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07, Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 3.3.5 18 months Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00 Fest for overall effect: Z = 6 3.3.6 24 months Alexandrides 2007 Donadelli 2011 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Sorb 2009 Sorbis 2004 Sorbis 2009 Sorbis 2004 Sorbis 2009 Sorbis 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08 Fest for overall effect: Z = 7 3.3.7 48 months	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 93.11 93.11 93.8 109.73 86.73 118.13 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.85 93.11 91.9 (Chi ^p = 22 0.506 (P ≤ C 1311 82.4 92.16 91 132.8 93.81 82.4 91 132.8 93.81 82.4 91 131.8 83.93 83.19 83.51 24.7 92 (Chi ^p = 22 7.00 (P ≤ C 1311 82.4 91 92.7 92 (Chi ^p = 22 7.00 (P ≤ C 1311 82.9 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.81 93.81 94.92 131 132.8 133.8 134.92 145.92 134.92 134.92 135.95 134.92 135.95 1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.65 30.32 65.49 0 42.6 84.66 47.79 30.66 2.7 44.4 45.3 47.79 30.66 2.7 44.4 42.4 25.5 30.00001) 114 32.4 30.4 30.4 30.4 32.4 30.4 32.4 30.4 63.84	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ 1$	189 208 1969 123,89 148,67 127,59 148,67 147,57 168,14 141,59 156,33 P < 0.000 132,3 146,4 145 144,59 156,33 146,4 145 144,59 168,14 168,1 146,1 168,1 169,1 153,89 133,168,14 168,13 168,14 147,153,2 197,11 153,2 0,008; F	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 89.38 89.38 99.32 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 30.66 5.9 66.9 30.66 5.9 66.1 90 66.29 0% 78 82.7 69.53 91.92 69.38 89.38 89.38 89.38 89.38 89.38 174.79 75.2 264.67 76.2 264.67 76.2 264.67 174.22	1500 219 71 4 966 29 80 80 81 22 765 92 86 28 86 125 765 99% 4330 99% 114 222 172 765 122 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 174 10 266 4330 99% 10 99% 10 90% 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -1.04 [-1.00, -0.49] -1.04 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.40] -0.60 [-0.95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.49] -1.71 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.49] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.49] -1.37 [-1.88, -0.45] -1.37 [-1.88, -0.45] -0.99 [-1.41, -0.58] -1.45 [-1.27, -1.13] -0.65 [-1.22, -0.66] -0.59 [-0.85, -0.14] Not estimable -0.54 [-1.43, -0.36] -0.55 [-1.48, -0.71] -0.95 [-1.48, -0.71] -0.95 [-1.48, -0.71] -0.95 [-1.48, -0.71]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Sim 2010 Pardina 2009 Parez-Romero 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Jilarrasa 2007 Voelnenhazsan 2011 Voelnenhazsan 2011 Voelnenhazsan 2011 Voelnenhazsan 2017 Pares 10 overall effect: 2 = 5 3.3.5 18 months Barcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Dibbotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00, Partor 2009 Partor 2009 Partor 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00, Partor 2007 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00, Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00, Partor 2009 Partor 2007 Habio 2009 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Skroubis 2006 Sovik 2011 Roth 2009 Slabeta (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08, Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08, Nexandrides 2007	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 96.1 97.1 109.73 86.73 118.1 1221 87.6 91.9 118.1 1221 87.6 91.9 118.1 1221 87.6 91.9 103.8 71.6 91.9 103.8 72. 69.7 103.8 92.5 105.06 ($P < C$ 103.8 92. 103.98 ($P < C$ 103.8 109.7 109.7 1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 65.49 65.49 0 42.6 30.65 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6 30.6		$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 208\\ 1000\\ 1000\\ 123.89\\ 148.67\\ 127.59\\ 148.57\\ 148.57\\ 147.7\\ 168.14\\ 144.59\\ 155.3\\ 155.3\\ 146.4\\ 168\\ 144\\ 168\\ 144\\ 168\\ 146\\ 144\\ 168\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 63.6 72.7 95.25 95.25 91.92 66.9 001): I ² = 56.59 67.1 90 66.29 07 66.29 07 66.29 00 67.1 90 66.29 00 67.1 90 66.29 00 66.29 00 66.29 00 66.20 20 66.32 91.92 66.53 91.92 66.54 91.92 66.54 91.92 66.54 91.92 66.54 91.92 65.54 65.54 91.92 65.54 65.54 65.54 91.92 65.54 65.55 65.54 65.55 65.54 65.54 65.	1500 219 714 36 969 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, -0.75] -0.687 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.687 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.687 [-1.22, -0.63] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.20, -0.61] -0.74 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.61 [-1.20, -0.61] -0.61 [-95, -0.25] -1.67 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.41 [-1.25, -0.12] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.05] -1.37 [-1.85, -0.49] -0.74 [-1.22, -0.46] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.17 [-1.40, -0.94] -0.65 [-1.22, -0.68] -0.95 [-1.42, -0.68] -0.95 [-1.42, -0.69] -0.95 [-1.18, -0.71] -0.42 [-0.56, -0.29] -0.42 [-0.56, -0.29] -0.44 [-1.30, -0.18] -0.44 [-1.40, -0.48]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Paral, Romero 2010 Prez-Romero 2010 Prez-Romero 2010 Phalajmaki 0 Samento 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Vilar 2011 Vilarasa 2007 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Voelnerhanssen 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07. Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 3.3.5 16 months Sarcia-Marirrodriga 2012 Jonen 1983 Jan 2011 Gonen 1983 Jan 2011 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00. Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 3.3.6 24 months Nexandrides 2007 Donadell 2011 Varuya 2007 Perez-Romero 2010 Roth 2009 Silvestre 2004 Skroubis 2006 Sovik 2011 Frakhtenbroit 2009 Zabek 2005 Joubtotal (65% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.08. Jetero 2007 Sovik 2011 Frakhtenbroit 2009 Jabetotal (65% CI) Jabetotal (79.65 114 126.9 83.19 96.1 771.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 1233 87.61 86.73 118.1 1233 87.65 86.73 118.1 1233 87.65 86.73 91.9 91.9 92. (Chi ² = 22 92. (Chi ² = 22 93.98 (P < C 131 88.93 83.19 80.7 111.4 122.4 123.4 123.4 123.4 123.4 123.4 124.4 124.4 125.4 124.4 125.4 124.4 125.4 124.4 125.4 124.4 125.4 124.4 125.4 124.4 1	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 25.2 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20		189 208 120,039 123,89 148,67 127,55 145,7 184,7 184,7 184,7 184,7 184,7 184,7 185,1 144,57 156,34 141,59 156,33 146,4 145,5 146,4 145,5 146,4 146,5 173,45 146,4 146,5 173,45 146,4 145,5 146,1 145,1 146,1 155,2 191,1 155,2 194,1 155,2 194,1 155,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 195,2 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1 194,1 195,2 194,1	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 63.06 73.7 95.27 74.3 95.25 194.69 30.59 67.1 90 66.29 0% 768 82.7 69.53 91.92 0% 778 89.53 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 264.67 65.3 91.92 265.5 91.92 265.5 91.92 265.5 91.92 265.5 91.92 265.5 91.92 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90 90	1500 219 71 34 966 200 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.0% 1.0% 1.1% 1.1	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.02, 0.076] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.53] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.41, -0.66] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -1.07 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.47 [-2.62, -0.72] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.84] -1.28 [-1.56, -0.99] -7.37 [-1.86, -0.64] -1.27 [-1.86, -0.64] -1.27 [-1.88, -0.49] -0.61 [-1.16, -0.65] -1.45 [-1.41, -0.46] -1.45 [-1.77, -1.13] -0.56 [-1.48, -0.45] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.43, 0.36] -0.54 [-1.28, 0.06] -0.54 [-1.30, 0.18] -0.64 [-1.30, 0.18] -0.64 [-1.90, -0.85] -0.64 [-0.90, -0.	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2090 Philajamak 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Silvestre 2004 Sovik 2011 Foolabi 2011 Foolabi 2011 Voodard 2010 Zlabek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07 Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 3.35 18 months Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia Sarcia-Sarcia Sarcia	$\begin{array}{c} 79.65\\ 114\\ 122.9\\ 114\\ 122.9\\ 23.16\\$	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 5.22 30.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 2	$\begin{array}{c} 0 > 0 \\ 0 > 1 \\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 120.35\\ 120.35\\ 120.35\\ 123.89\\ 148.67\\ 127.55\\ 145.7\\ 146.7\\ 156.14\\ 147\\ 156\\ 141.55\\ 156.3\\ P<0.01\\ 132.3\\ 146.4\\ 145\\ 145\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 145\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146\\ 146$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 160.6 171.72 72.7 82.7 95.25 194.69 30.66 90 66.9 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	1500 219 71 4 966 800 282 292 114 800 288 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125	1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1% 1.1%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, 0.75] -0.87 [-1.22, 0.75] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.89, -1.24] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.34 [-2.08, -0.61] -0.71 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, 0.06] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.64] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.84] -1.46 [-1.77, -1.13] -0.95 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.95 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.95 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.95 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.95 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.95 [-1.28, -0.14] Not estimable -0.63 [-0.84, -0.41] -0.63 [-0.84, -0.41] -0.71 [-1.02, -0.40]	
annelli 2011 Jones 1992 Kim 2010 Kim 2010 Sardina 2009c Philajamaki 2010 Ribeiro 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarmento 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2009 Sarbeito 2007 Koelarita 2011 Voolard 2010 Labek 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) 4eterogeneity: Tau ² = 2.07, Fest for overall effect: Z = 5 J.3.5 18 months Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Marirodriga 2012 Sarcia-Sarcia Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI)	79.65 114 126.9 83.19 93.11 70.8 109.73 86.73 118.1 71.8 87.61 93.81 87.61 87.73 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.1 87.61 93.2 10.6 (P < C 10.38 72.2 93.6 (P < C 10.38 72.2 93.6 (P < C 10.38 72.2 93.6 (P < C 10.38 72.2 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 82.4 93.81 83.59 83.59 83.19 83.57 93.81 84.53 93.81 11.14 12.4 13.4 12.4 13.4 12.4 13.4 12.4 13.4	44.2 77.7 5.22 33.24 17.7 26.55 26.55 26.55 26.549 0 42.6 84.66 84.66 84.66 84.66 47.79 30.667 47.79 30.0601) 39.51 44.4 215 25.5 30.00001) 114 32.5 30.00001) 114 32.4 63.72 61.42 0 58.91 2.24, df = 2.00001) 181.37 99 477 115.5 3.72, df = 3.72, df =		$\begin{array}{c} 189\\ 208\\ 208\\ 120.35\\ 146.67\\ 146.67\\ 147\\ 180.7\\ 187.48\\ 147\\ 166\\ 173.46\\ 156\\ 156.3\\ 141\\ 156\\ 156.3\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 141\\ 166\\ 156\\ 100\\ 123.89\\ 142\\ 168\\ 147\\ 153.2\\ 0.008\\ 11\\ 154.8\\ 147\\ 197.1\\ 155.2\\ 0.008\\ 11\\ 197.1\\ 154.2\\ 0.008\\ 11\\ 124.48\\ 208\\ 0.003\\ 11\\ 142.48\\ 208\\ 0.003\\ 11\\ 168\\ 148\\ 148\\ 148\\ 148\\ 148\\ 148\\ 148\\ 14$	97.5 160.5 59.65 71.72 44.25 61.06 82.7 89.38 89.38 77.3 95.25 194.69 30.66 5.9 66.9 0001); I ² = 0001); I ² = 0001); I ² = 0% 76.2 66.29 0% 78 89.38 174.79 75.2 264.67 65.3 ² = 60% 141.41 76 264.8 70.5 160.5 2 = 78%	1500 219 71 329 71 4 966 829 829 829 829 829 829 829 90% 114 220 172 726 726 726 726 726 726 726 726 726 7	1.1% 1.2% 1.1% 1.2%	-0.20 [-1.01, 0.60] -0.89 [-1.23, 0.76] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.87 [-1.22, -0.75] -0.92 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.57 [-1.42, -0.42] -1.03 [-1.36, -0.70] -1.03 [-1.26, -0.72] -1.03 [-1.26, -0.72] -1.03 [-1.26, -0.72] -1.04 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.49] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.61] -0.47 [-1.00, -0.64] -0.47 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.30, -0.84] -1.37 [-1.36, -0.94] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.37 [-1.40, -0.94] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.49] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.49] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.46] -1.37 [-1.86, -0.46] -0.50 [-0.85, -0.14] Not estimable -0.64 [-1.18, -0.65] -0.55 [-1.18, -0.71] -0.55 [-1.18, -0.71] -0.55 [-1.18, -0.71] -0.55 [-1.18, -0.71] -0.55 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.54 [-1.30, -0.18] -0.55 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.55 [-1.22, -0.69] -0.55 [-1.23, -0.61] -0.55 [-1.23, -0.61] -0.55 [-1.23, -0.63] -0.56 [-0.25] -0.56 [-0.25] -0.574 [-1.30, -0.18] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable -0.54 [-0.86, -0.24] -0.56 [-0.86, -0.44] -0.571 [-1.02, -0.46]	

Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 38.81, df = 6 (P < 0.00001), l² = 84.5% (1) Husemann - TG group split into normal type and type IV (unable to extract this outcome)

Figure 5.3.2.4.4i Forrest plot of the effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma triglyceride levels including all subgroups Standard mean difference (with 95% confidence intervals)



Figure 5.3.2.4.4ii Graph of the mean plasma triglyceride levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data). Unpaired t-test was used for analysis; ***= p<0.001; ns= non-significant.

	Po	st-RYGE		Pr	e-RYGB	}	S	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
3.1.1 1 month			_	_	_	_			
Pardina 2009c	29.2	24.49	34	16.3	18.67	34	10.6%	0.59 [0.10, 1.07]	
Lima 2010	96.16	45.4	9	56.4	25.94	9	2.5%	1.02 [0.03, 2.02]	⊢
Subtotal (95% CI)			43			43	13.1%	0.67 [0.23, 1.11]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.6	60, df = 1	(P = 0.4	4); l² =	0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.00 (P	= 0.003)						
3.1.2 3 months									
Trakhtenbroit 2009	29.328	8.026	10	22.84	8.026	10	3.0%	0.77 [-0.14, 1.69]	— —
Pardina 2009c	18.7	11.08	34	16.3	18.67	34	11.1%	0.15 [-0.32, 0.63]	
Huang 2011	11.28	10.17	13	19.74	10.17	13	3.9%	-0.81 [-1.61, -0.00]	
Heneghan 2011	11.28	5.64	10	16.92	5.64	10	2.9%	-0.96 [-1.89, -0.02]	
Bobbioni-Harsch 2000	17.7	1.3	20	15.4	1.3	20	4.6%	1.73 [1.00. 2.47]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			87	10.4	1.0	87	25.4%	0.24 [-0.07, 0.56]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 29	.95, df =	4 (P < 0.	00001)	; l² = 87	%			- ' "	ľ
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.51 (P	= 0.13)							
3.1.3 6 months									
Pardina 2009c	14.5	11.66	34	16.3	18.67	34	11.1%	-0.11 [-0.59, 0.36]	-+
lannelli 2011	14.1	8.46	12	19.74	8.46	12	3.7%	-0.64 [-1.47, 0.18]	+
Huang 2011	8.46	0.98	12	19.74	10.17	13	3.1%	-1.48 [-2.38, -0.58]	——
Heneghan 2011	8.46	5.64	10	16.92	5.64	10	2.5%	-1.44 [-2.44, -0.43]	
Bobbioni-Harsch 2000	14.1	1.4	20	15.4	1.3	20	5.8%	-0.94 [-1.60, -0.29]	- <u>-</u>
Subtotal (95% CI)			88			89	26.2%	-0.66 [-0.97, -0.35]	◆
3.1.4 12 months	(i		•,						
Pardina 2009c	15.6	16.33	34	16.3	18.67	34	11.1%	-0.04 [-0.51, 0.44]	+
Magkos 2010	12.803	2.45	10	15.85	3.102	10	2.8%	-1.04 [-1.99, -0.10]	
lannelli 2011	14.1	4.64	12	19.74	8.46	12	3.6%	-0.80 [-1.64, 0.04]	
Bobbioni-Harsch 2000	12	1	20	15.4	1.3	20	3.0%	-2.87 [-3.78, -1.97]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			76			76	20.5%	-0.73 [-1.08, -0.38]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 29 Test for overall effect: Z	97, df = = 4.09 (P	3 (P < 0. < 0.000	00001) 1)	; l² = 90	%				
3.1.5 18 months									
Pardina 2009c	17	20.4	26	18	20.4	26	8.5%	-0.05 [-0.59, 0.50]	-+-
Lin 2011	16.1	3.807	10	20.7	7.25	10	3.0%	-0.76 [-1.68, 0.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			36			36	11.5%	-0.23 [-0.70, 0.23]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1. Test for overall effect: Z	72, df = 1 = 0.98 (P	(P = 0.1 = 0.33)	9); l² =	42%					
3.1.6 24 months									
Trakhtenbroit 2009	21.996	5.35	10	22.842	8.026	10	3.3%	-0.12 [-1.00, 0.76]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			10			10	3.3%	-0.12 [-1.00, 0.76]	\bullet
Heterogeneity: Not appli	cable								
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.27 (P	= 0.79)							
Total (95% CI)			340			341	100.0%	-0.20 [-0.36, -0.04]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 11	3.56. df =	= 18 (P <	0.000	01): l² =	84%			- / •	
Test for overall effect 7	= 2.51 (P	= 0.01)		.,,.					-4 -2 0 2
Test for subaroun differe	ncee Ch	j2 <u>–</u> <u>4</u> 0 1	1 df –	5 (P - 1	000011	2 <u>-</u> 87	5%		

Figure 5.3.2.4.5i Forrest plot of the effect of RYGB surgery upon plasma NEFA levels using a fixed effects model including all subgroups. Standard mean difference (with 95% confidence intervals)



Figure 5.3.2.4.5ii Graph of the mean plasma NEFA levels at all time points following RYGB surgery (meta-analysis data). Unpaired t-test was used for analysis; **= p<0.01; ***= p<0.001; ns= non-significant.

5.4 Discussion

The effects of weight loss and subsequent reduction in adiposity upon plasma lipids is uncertain.⁵⁵⁹⁻⁵³⁶ Following bariatric surgery there is a reduction in cardiovascular mortality.^{564,565} This has been attributed to a reduction in plasma lipids, through as yet undetermined mechanisms. In non-obese patients, rising plasma insulin levels are normally associated with reduced lipolysis.³¹¹ This study presents novel data showing that this association appears to uncouple, as adiposity increases towards morbid obesity, whilst IR persists.⁵⁶⁶ This study group included ten participants with TC > 5 mmol/l⁵⁶⁷ (n=19); and ten participants with TG \ge 1.7mmol/l⁵⁶⁸ (n=19). Rising plasma insulin levels are normally associated with reduced lipolysis.³¹¹

In this chapter, I have looked at the impact of T2DM on fasting plasma lipid levels and post-prandial NEFA changes. I demonstrate that RYGB has an early impact on fasting concentrations of total cholesterol, LDL-C, HDL-C and NEFA in both diabetic and non-diabetic states. RYGB also has an effect on fasting TG levels and post-prandial NEFA excursions in the T2DM group alone. The meta-analyses show that clinically important improvements in plasma lipids following RYGB occur within one month of surgery, prior to substantial weight loss. Total cholesterol and LDL-C levels are reduced within one month, supporting the assertion that these changes are a direct consequence of the surgery rather than weight loss, *per se*. These effects persist throughout follow-up. In contrast, NEFA levels increase at one month then return to pre-operative levels by three months post-operatively. HDL-C levels increase after 12 months and the post-operative reduction in plasma TG levels occurs later, reaching significance after three months. The curve is similar to that of weight loss after RYGB,¹² although matching weight loss data was not available in all papers to allow a linear correlation analysis. One hypothesis is that compensatory mechanisms maintain plasma TG levels initially post-operatively, despite the reduction in fat and calorie intake after

RYGB. A number of plausible endogenous and exogenous mechanisms exist through which RYGB may reduce plasma lipid levels directly.

5.4.1 Exogenous

5.4.1.1 Food intake

Exogenous lipid sources are altered following RYGB. There is a global reduction in food intake,^{45,46,566} which has been linked to early satiety⁵⁶⁹ and a loss of appetite, associated with post-prandial increased PYY and GLP-1 levels.^{20,23} There is reduced preference for high-fat foods.⁵⁷⁰⁻⁵⁷² This persists in the long-term, despite a slowly increasing caloric intake, after an initial post-surgery reduction.^{571,573} These changes in food preference may be compounded by behavioural modifications to avoid dumping syndrome.^{574,575} This virtuous circle of positive reinforcement leads to long-term changes in dietary choices, with exclusion of calorie-dense foods and smaller portion-sizes.^{44,576}

5.4.1.2 Gut realignment

RYGB surgery creates a small gastric pouch, separated from the distal stomach and anastomosed to a jejunal loop using a Roux-en-Y configuration.^{14,15} This allows food to bypass the distal stomach, diminishing gastric acid and pancreatic enzyme secretion.⁴⁷² These effects are compounded by a delay in food mixing with gastrointestinal secretions, reducing emulsification and lipid absorption in the ileum. Intestinal cholesterol absorption is reduced at one year post-RYGB,⁵⁷⁷ corroborated by higher faecal fat levels in RYGB patients compared to obese controls in some studies.^{66,572,578} Reduced lipid absorption may be due to diminishing enterocyte contact time. This may occur because of alterations in intra-luminal viscosity, as higher fibre reduces bolus propulsion,⁵⁷⁹ and postprandial gut hormone transit effects.¹⁰³

5.4.1.3 Bile acids

Bile acids (BAs) are synthesised from cholesterol in the liver and excreted into bile.⁵²⁸ As lipids no longer traverse the duodenum post-RYGB, a reduction in BA secretion may be anticipated.⁵⁸⁰ Conversely fasting and postprandial BAs are increased post-RYGB, ^{73,581-583} possibly due to increased hepatic production of BAs. This finding suggests that production and conjugation of BA is upregulated⁵²⁸ in response to less cholesterol being absorbed.⁵⁷⁷

5.4.1.4 Gut microflora

Exogenous changes in diet, gut realignment and altered luminal pH may all modify gut microflora.^{531,584,585} Changes in gut microbiota have been linked with alterations in gut hormones⁵⁸⁶ and BA fractions post-RYGB.^{529,530} Various species of intestinal microbiota have also been shown to promote fatty acid absorption. Gut microbiota presence increases fat storage in AT in mice⁵⁸⁷⁻⁵⁸⁹ and can cause significant alterations in secondary lipid metabolites in serum, liver, and AT.^{590,591} Weight loss and fat mass reduction occurs when post-RYGB gut microbiota are transferred into non-operated germ-free mice.⁵⁹²

5.4.1.5 Dietary lipid absorption and re-absorption

Cholesterol synthesis is increased in obesity, which is associated with reduced HDL-C.⁵⁹³ Low levels of HDL-C are associated with increased cardiovascular events⁵⁹⁴ and increased HDL-C levels have been shown to reduce atherosclerosis.^{595,596} Weight loss reduces cholesterol synthesis.⁵⁹⁷ The delayed increase in HDL-C described in this meta-analysis, occurring one year post-RYGB is compatible with the benefit being secondary to weight loss, perhaps through altered cholesterol absorption and reduced synthesis.

Statins (HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors) may have an impact on this mechanism, by inhibiting cholesterol synthesis in the liver. This leads activation of LDL receptors and increased hepatic uptake of HDL from the circulation. Administration of statins is associated with a mean reduction in total cholesterol, LDL-C, TG by 20%, 28% and 13% respectively, with an

increase in HDL-C by 5%.⁵⁹⁸ In long-term cohort studies of patients treated with statins, there is a reduction in relative risk for major cardiovascular events by ~1% for every 1% reduction in LDL-C, in a linear relationship.⁵⁹⁹⁻⁶⁰² At present, no studies demonstrate that modification of HDL-C has a significant effect on.^{552,603} The data presented here show that RYGB has an important early effect. Mean total cholesterol, LDL-C and TG is 16%, 21% and 36% respectively with an increase in HDL-C by 11%, which is comparable to that of statin therapy.

Plasma triglyceride levels are increased in obese compared to lean humans.⁶⁰⁴ Alteration in dietary fat processing may occur prior to the development of T2DM, as siblings of two parents with T2DM have increased postprandial TG levels and blunted early postprandial lowering of NEFA.⁵⁹⁴ Post-RYGB, this effect may be reversed as this study demonstrates. There is a reduction in plasma TG levels post-RYGB in the T2DM but not in the NDM group, together with a difference in the direction of change between the two groups following surgery.

5.4.2 Endogenous

RYGB results in rapid lipid mobilisation from visceral and subcutaneous adipose depots as weight loss occurs.⁷⁹ In the post-prandial period, raised insulin levels enhance TG storage in adipose tissue and inhibit lipolysis.²⁸⁸ In addition, insulin has the ability to suppress the endogenous appearance rate of NEFA,^{314,605} intracellular adipose tissue lipolysis⁸⁷ and possibly stimulate esterification of NEFA in adipose tissue.⁸³ Chronic elevation of NEFA levels is associated with IR, leading to accumulation of lipids in insulin-responsive non-adipose tissues.⁸⁴ Changes in post-prandial insulin and other gut hormone levels post-RYGB may impact upon plasma lipid flux through lipolytic mechanisms.^{170,345,346,606,607} The importance of this mechanism is still in question. Hyperinsulinaemic-euglycemic clamp studies demonstrate that hepatic insulin sensitivity, rather than peripheral, improves following RYGB.¹²⁰

The explanation for the initial, and temporary, rise in NEFA levels by 1 month post-RYGB is not clear. Fasting NEFA are almost entirely produced from hydrolysis of TG within the adipocyte⁴⁴⁰ and are normally higher in the fasting state due to the anti-lipolytic effect of insulin.^{77,608,609} Thus fasting NEFA levels reflect endogenous flow. The increase seen at one month post-RYGB may reflect increased lipolysis. Once insulin sensitivity improves in the presence of a large adipose tissue volume, one might have expected to see fasting NEFA levels rise as weight loss occurred after surgery. However, these expected changes in post-RYGB NEFA levels are not seen. It may be due to a down-regulating feedback response, occurring one to three months after surgery. This feedback response may be gut hormone-mediated at a cellular or tissue level. Prospective long-term cohort studies are required to confirm this finding. At present, the significance of the findings of this meta-analysis are still uncertain given the small sample sizes and variabilities in NEFA standardisation amongst the included studies.^{610,611}

Similarly, the very early effect of RYGB upon post-prandial NEFA levels just four days post-surgery are remarkable and merit further attention. Although no difference in the postprandial NEFA in the NDM group, there was a reduction in the T2DM group. There is a difference in NEFA spillover rates between NDM and T2DM patients.^{83,612} This study suggests that RYGB may reverse this. Further investigation is required as the data presented here may have been affected by fasting and NEFA levels are known to increase in stress states.⁶¹³ At present there is no consensus on the impact of fasting on NEFA levels.⁶¹⁴⁻⁶¹⁹

5.4.3 Limitations

There was significant clinical and statistical heterogeneity amongst the included studies. Comprehensive evaluation of the heterogeneity observed was not possible as some of the studies did not fully report data on the population characteristics, including a lack of data regarding cardiovascular risk profiles. To minimise confounding factors, only papers with paired data were included. Some potentially relevant studies were excluded from the

analysis because of incomplete reporting on the outcome measure of plasma lipid levels, either pre- or post-operatively.

Post-operatively the participants were fasted for 4 days according to the standard management protocol for King's College Hospital, London. The rationale for the timing of this evaluation has been discussed previously, see Methods. These results could be confounded by surgical stress, inflammation or fasting. Similar studies including patients in the first few days after surgery suggest that these factors may not be important.^{11,20,620} All study participants were fasted for 10 hours prior to study activities, as TG levels vary with fasting although there is little difference between fasting and nonfasting levels of total cholesterol and HDL-C.³⁸⁵ Elevated postprandial TG levels persist for several hours.⁶²¹ As a consequence, reference values for lipid levels are given in the fasting state to establish cardiovascular risk.^{622,623} Non-fasting TG levels may be a more accurate predictor of cardiovascular risk compared to fasting TG.^{624,625} Post-prandial TG levels were not assessed in either study. It was not possible to control for fasting in the study design for the systematic review. Evaluation of the impact of RYGB upon postprandial TG would be pertinent, as multiple studies postulate that cellular changes in dietary fat processing is intimately connected with cardiovascular health.

Variable changes in physical activity following bariatric surgery between studies may be another important confounding variable. Exercise is associated with plasma TG reduction and increased HDL-C. Total cholesterol and LDL-C levels are not altered unless dietary fat intake is reduced and/or body weight lost.⁶²⁶ The current literature shows conflicting outcomes, with some studies showing physical activity did not change post-RYGB⁶²⁷ and others reporting improved weight loss with increased physical activity post-RYGB.^{628,629}

A wide variety of lipid-lowering medication regimens were employed in the included studies, and RYGB may have exerted varying effects on the pharmacokinetics of these drugs.⁶³⁰

5.5 Conclusion

RYGB surgery reverses the dyslipidaemia of obesity. Although the metaanalysis shows that improvements in TG and HDL-C levels are seen only after weight loss has occurred, long term changes in total cholesterol and LDL-C start to occur immediately after RYGB. This implicates weightindependent mechanisms.

This chapter provides evidence that RYGB surgery leads to a healthier lipid profile. Treatment with lipid reducing medications is known to convey a relative risk reduction of all-cause mortality in T2DM, including fatal and non-fatal myocardial infarcations.⁶³¹ Additional research is needed to determine whether there is any additional cardio-protective effect of statins in patients with or without T2DM, following RYGB surgery.

6. The lipolytic effects of plasma and gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery

6.1 Introduction

Lipolysis is the release of NEFA and glycerol from the adipocyte through an enzyme-dependent system. Insulin has been shown to effect lipolysis, in humans, by impairing the clearance of plasma NEFA, through the reduction of endogenous appearance rate of NEFA.⁸⁷ The morbidly obese have lower basal and stimulated lipolysis but a larger AT volume than lean subjects,³¹⁹ as such increased plasma NEFA levels occurs. It is likely that as adipocyte insulin resistance progresses, the suppression of endogenous NEFA is impaired, compounding this further.^{76-79,88-90,491-493}

The remission of T2DM post-RYGB occurs prior to weight loss, as IR improves. These improvements have been linked to changes in NEFA levels^{81,95,507} potentially altering dietary fat cell processing, NEFA re-esterification and improving islet cell function.⁷⁶

The adipocyte plays an important role in IR.²⁷⁶ Regional adipocyte variability has been established in: adipocyte size; hormone receptor expression; adipokine secretory profile; expression pattern.^{275,278,279} Accordingly, adipocytes from different AT depots respond differently to hormones e.g. insulin,^{276,278,280,281,286} linking visceral adiposity to IR.²⁷⁷ Following RYGB, as weight loss occurs, this disparity is evident; there is a reduction in visceral before peripheral AT mass, the former possessing a larger number of adrenergic receptors on the cell surface and higher lipolytic activity.^{288,302}

Human adipocytes have multiple hormone receptors on their surface which may alter fat cell processing. These include receptors for GLP-1,²⁹⁵ GIP,^{123,296} PYY,²⁹⁷ insulin,³²⁷ ghrelin.^{298,299} Little is known regarding the impact of changes in gut hormone levels upon weight loss, lipolysis and IR however, synthetic treatment of T2DM with GLP-1 is associated with weight loss,⁶³² improvements in insulin sensitivity and β -cell function, these effects were not independent of a reduction in fasting and post-prandial NEFA levels.⁶³³

This study was designed to assess the effect of fasting and postprandial plasma and gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral adipose tissue depots.

6.2 Methods

6.2.1 Human adipose tissue handling

The methodology of this study is detailed in chapter 2. In summary, at time of RYGB surgery, AT was excised from both the subcutaneous and omental regions. These samples were placed in separate 30ml plastic flasks containing PBS buffer and transferred to the laboratory at room temperature for experimentation.

AT from 8 females and 2 males (mean age 41.9+/-10.7 yr and BMI 47+/-6.75 kg/m²) were used. Any surplus AT was snap frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80°C for use in RT-PCR analysis.

6.2.2 Gene expression

To confirm the presence of the relevant gut hormone and fatty acid receptors on human AT, both abdominal subcutaneous and omental (n=6), I performed gene expression analysis using established techniques from our laboratory. Total RNA was extracted using TRIzol (Invitrogen) and reverse transcribed using a High capacity cDNA reverse transcription kit (Applied Biosystems). qPCR was performed on an ABI PRISM 7900HT sequence detection system (Applied Biosystems) with Taqman probes (Applied Biosystems): GLP-1R, GIPR, PYY (PYYR1), ghrelin (GHS-R1 and NPY1R), insulin (Ins-R), GLUT-4 and fatty acid receptors (GPR43, GPR120, FFAR1, FFAR3). 18S rRNA was used as a reference gene and B-actin was used as housekeeper gene. Samples were analysed in triplicate. Relative expression levels were calculated using 7000 System sequence detection software v.1.2.3. (Applied Biosystems). Relative expression compared with visceral AT were presented.

6.2.3 Lipolysis and anti-lipolysis experiments

The adipocytes were isolated, cell number extrapolated through quantification of the fat cell diameter and the total triglyceride content of the fat cell solutions calculated. Adipocytes from both visceral and peripheral depots were incubated with relevant lipolytic and anti-lipolytic experimental conditions, basal (with ADA) and stimulated (with ADA & PIA₂₀ & 1mM 8-BrcAMP), for 120min. These conditions included fasting and post-prandial plasma from participants before and POD4 around RYGB surgery and insulin, GLP-1, GIP PYY and ghrelin hormonal conditions consistent with basal and peak levels around RYGB surgery. In addition, the combined effects of incretins and insulin upon lipolysis were studied.

After 120min, the infranatant was aspirated and all samples were stored at -80°C until analysis. Glycerol accumulation in the infranatant was measured as an indicator of lipolysis. ADA and PIA were used to standardise any potential variations in adenosine levels. Basal lipolytic rates were defined as ADA (0.5U/ml) and stimulated lipolysis were measured with isoproterenol (10⁻⁶M) and 8-bromo-cAMP (1mM). The acute insulin anti-lipolysis (0,10,100,500,1000 pM) was measured against 8-bromo-cAMP (1mM). For the plasma experiments, in order to detect small order lipolytic effects, lipolysis was almost completely inhibited with ADA and PIA (basal state) and added 8-Bromo-cAMP (1mM) in the stimulated state. Both the basal and stimulated control samples had Lithium Heparin, Trasylol and DPPIVi added to control for the plasma experimental conditions. All calculations are presented as a % change from the control conditions.

6.2.4 Assays

The samples underwent BSA precipitation prior to performing the glycerol assay in triplicate using a one-step fluorometric method.³⁸⁴

6.2.5 Statistical analysis

Data are expressed as mean +/- sem. Difference between the AT depots were directly compared for each participant using paired t-test. Glycerol release was calculated using non-linear exponential one-phase decay curves using GraphPad PRISM. The effects of plasma and different gut hormone conditions were determined by analysis of variance with repeated measures, KW test and post-hoc t-test when main effects or interactions were significant (p<0.05). For further details, see section 2.4.

6.3 Results

6.3.1 Gene expression of gut hormone and fatty acid receptors in human adipose tissue from visceral and peripheral depots

Gene expression of gut hormone receptors for insulin (INS-R), GLP-1 (GLP1-R), GIP (GIP-R), PYY (PYY1R) and ghrelin (NPY1R and GHSR) and GLUT4 receptors were detected in human adipose tissue from both visceral and peripheral depots (n=12).

In addition, gene expression of fatty acid receptors (GPR43, GPR120, FFAR1, FFAR3) were detected in human adipose tissue from both visceral and peripheral depots (n=12).

These experiments showed increased gene expression for both the gut hormone and fatty acid receptors in peripheral adipose tissue relative to visceral with potential disparities in T2DM, see figure 6.3.1.

6.3.2 Lipolytic and anti-lipolytic effects of plasma and gut hormones in human adipocytes from visceral and peripheral depots

Lipolysis experiments were performed on human adipocytes, visceral and peripheral, from ten participants, five with T2DM. A difference in cell diameter was detected between the groups, p<0.0001 but no difference in cell size was detected between the either visceral or peripheral tissue depots, p=0.2123. There was a difference in the adipocyte cell size between the NDM and T2DM groups in both the peripheral and visceral depots, p<0.0001 for both. There is a difference between visceral and peripheral cell size in the NDM participants (p=0.0132) but not in the T2DM participants (p=0.9531), see figure 6.3.2.

6.3.2.1 Plasma

Adipocytes responded differently to plasma taken around RYGB in both the basal and stimulated states, p=0.0335 and p=0.0347 respectively. On closer analysis, fasting plasma pre- and post-RYGB had a difference in the lipolytic effect in peripheral adipocytes, p=0.0235 (n=8), in the basal state, not detected when stimulated, p=0.4287 (n=7), but not shown in visceral adipocytes (p>0.05 in both states).

When the adipocytes were stimulated with post-prandial plasma an increase in lipolysis was revealed following RYGB surgery in peripheral adipocytes (p=0.0205, n=8, in basal state and p=0.0012, n=7, in stimulated state). This effect was not detected in the visceral adipocytes in the basal state, p=0.1957 (n=7) but was detected when stimulated, p=0.0071 (n=7), figure 6.3.2.1.

No difference was detected in the effect of RYGB on meal suppression of lipolysis, p=0.6016.



Figure 6.3.1 Relative gene expression levels in human adipose tissue from visceral and peripheral depots. A – gut hormone receptors and GLUT4 in NDM; B – gut hormone receptors and GLUT4 in T2DM; C – fatty acid receptors in NDM; D – fatty acid receptors in T2DM. Total RNA was isolated, and mRNA expression levels were measured by RT-qPCR, n=6 in each group.



Figure 6.3.2 Box plot showing the median levels of human adipocyte cell diameter (μ m) from peripheral (p) and visceral (v) depots in participants with (T2DM n=5) and without T2DM (NDM, n=5). Boxes show interquartile ranges, and bars represent highest and lowest values. * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; **** p<0.001; **** p<0.0001, with paired t-test for comparison between the two groups and ANOVA.



Figure 6.3.2.1 Graph of the mean and sem of the effect of fasting and postprandial plasma taken around RYGB surgery upon basal lipolysis (%) in human adipocytes (visceral and peripheral). (p) = peripheral, n=8; (v) = visceral, n=7.* p<0.05, **p<0.01; *** p<0.001.

6.3.2.2 Gut hormones

6.3.2.2.1 Insulin

Insulin suppresses lipolysis in human adipocytes in both basal and stimulated conditions, p<0.0001. Increasing insulin concentrations suppresses lipolysis in a dose-dependent manner in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots, in both basal and stimulated conditions (all p<0.001), figure 6.3.2.2.1.

6.3.2.2.2 GLP-1

In this study, GLP-1 had no effect upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from either peripheral or visceral depots, in both basal and stimulated conditions (all p>0.05), figure 6.3.2.2.2.

6.3.2.2.3 GIP

In this study, GIP had no effect upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from either peripheral or visceral depots, in both basal and stimulated conditions (all p>0.05), figure 6.3.2.2.3.

6.3.2.2.4 PYY

PYY had a lipolytic effect on human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots in basal state, both p<0.0001, but no significant difference was detected in stimulated state, p>0.05. On closer analysis, PYY was lipolytic at 10^{-7} concentration (p<0.0001) in adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots in basal state but not at 10^{-9} or 10^{-12} M, p>0.5, figure 6.3.2.2.4.

6.3.2.2.5 Ghrelin

In this study, ghrelin had no effect upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from either peripheral or visceral depots, in both basal and stimulated conditions (all >p>0.05), figure 6.3.2.2.5.
6.3.2.2.6 Combined Insulin and incretins

When adipocytes are subjected to varying degrees of insulin and GLP-1 or GIP, in stimulated state, although a significant difference is detected between the groups (both peripheral and visceral depots, p<0.0001), no difference was detected between when the same insulin concentration data was analysed with different GLP-1 or GIP concentrations (all conditions p>0.05), figures 6.3.2.2.6.1 and 6.3.2.2.6.2 respectively.



insulin concentration (pM)

В



Figure 6.3.2.2.1 Box plot of the anti-lipolytic effect of insulin upon human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots.

Effects were insulin were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis at 0,10,100,500 and 1000 pM. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p<0.001 (n=9 peripheral, n=10 visceral). Data is presented as mean +/-SEM. Graph A is basal state and B is stimulated state. Clear box is peripheral adipocytes and shaded box is visceral adipocytes.



GLP-1 concentration (log M)

ns ns 150stimulated lipolysis 00 50 % 0 0 -12 -9 -7 0 -12 -9 -7



Figure 6.3.2.2.2 Box plot of the effect of GLP-1 upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots.

Effects were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis at 0, -12, -9, -7 logM. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p≤0.0001 (n=9 peripheral, n=10 visceral). Data is presented as mean +/- SEM. Graph A is basal state and B is stimulated state. Clear box is peripheral adipocytes and shaded box is visceral adipocytes.

В



GIP concentration (log M)





Figure 6.3.2.2.3 Box plot of the effect of GIP upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots.

Effects were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis at 0, -14 - -7 log M. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p≤0.0001 (n=9 peripheral, n=10 visceral). Data is presented as mean +/- SEM.

Graph A is basal state and B is stimulated state. Clear box is peripheral adipocytes and shaded box is visceral adipocytes.



PYY concentration (log M)



Figure 6.3.2.2.4 Box plot of the effect of PYY upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots.

Effects were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis at 0, -12, -9, -7 log M. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p≤0.0001 (n=9 peripheral, n=10 visceral). Data is presented as mean +/- SEM. Graph A is basal state and B is stimulated state. Clear box is peripheral adipocytes and shaded box is visceral adipocytes.



ghrelin concentration (log M)



ghrelin concentration (log M)

Figure 6.3.2.2.5 Box plot of the effect of ghrelin upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots.

Effects were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis at 0, -12, -9, -7 log M. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001, ****p \leq 0.0001 (n=9 peripheral, n=10 visceral). Data is presented as mean +/- SEM. Graph A is basal state and B is stimulated state. Clear box is peripheral adipocytes and shaded box is visceral adipocytes.

A

В



В



Figure 6.3.2.2.6.1 Graph of the antilipolytic effects of insulin in combination with GLP-1 at varying concentrations upon human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral depots

The combined antilipolytic effects of insulin (10, 100, 1000 pM) and GLP-1 (-12, -9, -7 log M) were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis. Data is presented as mean +/- SEM. ns = p>0.5.

Graph A is peripheral adipocytes, n=9 except for the insulin 1000pM & GLP-1 -12 logM condition, n=3.

Graph B is visceral adipocytes, n=10 except for the insulin & GLP-1 -9 and -7 log M conditions, n=9.

Α



В





The combined antilipolytic effects of insulin (10, 100, 1000 pM) and GIP (-12, -9, -7 log M) were measured against 8-bromo-cAMP-stimulated lipolysis. Data is presented as mean +/- SEM. ns = p>0.5.

Graph A is peripheral adipocytes, n=9 except for the insulin & GIP -12 and insulin & GIP -9 logM conditions, n=7.

Graph B is visceral adipocytes, n=10.

6.4 Discussion

The dramatic improvements in IR and tailoring of insulin secretion following RYGB surgery in the morbidly obese, occurs before weight loss.³⁹⁵ As previously discussed in earlier chapters, raised insulin levels in the postprandial period enhance TG storage in AT, inhibit lipolysis,^{288,319} and suppress the endogenous appearance rate of NEFA.^{83,314} Paradoxically, increased NEFA levels can induce IR, impair insulin secretion and reduce insulin biosynthesis.^{77,92,93,403} In turn, increasing lipolysis and driving NEFA levels higher as adipocyte insulin sensitivity deteriorates.^{288,491-493} Increased rates of lipid turnover precede the development of T2DM in subjects with a family history of T2DM⁴⁹⁶⁻⁴⁹⁸ or non-diabetic obesity,^{499,500} linking this with causation.

Changes in post-prandial insulin and other gut hormone levels post-RYGB can impact upon plasma lipid flux through lipolytic mechanisms.^{170,345,346,606} As a reduction in NEFA levels using the antilipolytic agent Acipimox has been shown to reverse IR,⁸¹ changes in the NEFA/insulin relationship around RYGB may support initial improvements seen in IR.^{11,20,95} The importance of this mechanism is still under debate as clamp studies demonstrate that hepatic insulin sensitivity, rather than peripheral, improves following RYGB.¹²⁰

In this chapter, I have established the presence of relevant gut hormone and fatty acid receptors gene expression on human AT from peripheral and visceral depots. In addition, I studied the impact of fasting and postprandial plasma and relevant gut hormone changes around RYGB upon lipolysis in human adipocytes from both peripheral and visceral AT depots.

6.4.1 Relevant gene expression

Adipocytes have multiple hormone receptors on their surface including adrenaline (β 1, 2, 3; α), insulin, growth hormone, insulin-like growth factor, GK-R (cortisol), PPAR.²⁹⁴ In addition the receptors for several gut hormones have been detected in human adipocytes: insulin,³²⁷ GLP-1,²⁹⁵ GIP,^{123,296,634} PYY,²⁹⁷ ghrelin,^{298,299} FFAR2 (GPR43)³⁰⁰ and GPR120.³⁰¹ This study corroborates these findings, confirming gene expression of gut hormone receptors for insulin, GLP-1, GIP, PYY and ghrelin in human adipose tissue from both visceral and peripheral AT depots. Gene expression of GLUT4 receptors and fatty acid receptors were also detected suggestive that they may play a role in fat cell processing.

Variation in hormone receptors between the AT depots supports the concept that adipocytes offer differing roles relating to site. The metabolically more active visceral adipocytes⁶³⁵ having larger number of adrenergic receptors on the cell surface,³⁰² higher GIPR gene expression levels³⁰³ and higher lipolytic activity.³⁰² GIPR gene expression has also been shown to be reduced in peripheral AT in obese-IR, resistant to moderate weight reduction, questioning the role of hyperinsulinaemia in regulating GIPR gene expression.³⁰³ Conversely, increased gene expression for both gut hormone and fatty acid receptors in peripheral AT relative to visceral was shown in this study, highlighting the need to perform quantitative gene expression and immunohistochemistry studies to further investigate these disparities.

6.4.2 The effect of RYGB surgery upon lipolysis

Rapid lipid mobilisation occurs post-RYGB, with a reduction in visceral⁶³⁶ but to a lesser extent subcutaneous AT depots. This results in elevations of NEFA due to enhanced lipid turnover.²⁸⁸ As visceral is more metabolically active than subcutaneous fat,⁶³⁷ this will explain the AT depot disparity. This study corroborates this effect, combined with a significant variability in the plasma visceral experiments, unfortunately highlighting an under-powering in this group, when studying these cells in further stimulated conditions. Although insulin is the most likely mediator of these effects, the ability of insulin to induce antilipolysis and stimulate NEFA re-esterfication is reduced in visceral adipocytes compared to peripheral, due to a reduction in insulin receptor autophosphorylation and signal transduction through an IRS-1 associated PI 3-kinase pathway.³²⁷

In agreement with my findings, other groups have noted initial increases in the basal lipolytic rate post-RYGB^{441,638,639} but, this reduced at six⁶⁴⁰ and twelve months.⁴⁴¹ This interestingly supports an augmentation of process however the short-term following RYGB is such a dynamic phase that there are many contributing factors to investigate e.g. weight loss, increased energy intake, hormone receptor upregulation, gut microbiota change, to name a few.

Mixed reports regarding the insulin effect upon lipolysis post-RYGB exist.^{638,641} In vivo clamp studies suggest that RYGB does not impact upon tissue-specific insulin resistance in the early post-RYGB period.^{439,441} In contrast, others groups have found an increase in lipolysis short term post-RYGB together with improvements in insulin stimulated anti-lipolysis and increased AT mitochondrial respiratory capacity through increases in the phosphorylation system ratio.⁶⁴² In addition, basal lipolytic rate per fat mass is unchanged following diet-induced weight loss but increased in parallel to a decrease in fasting insulin concentration with surgically induced weight loss post-RYGB.⁶⁴²

Camastra et al.⁴⁴¹ found that although early post-RYGB, tissue sensitivity to insulin is little changed, the sharp fall in insulin levels induced by the energy intake deficit reduces inhibition of lipolysis, whereby fatty substrates flood the circulation and force lipid oxidation and weight loss ensues. They postulated that these effects were due to the energy intake deficit reducing the plasma insulin levels and subsequent reduction in anti-lipolytic effect⁶⁴³ but I would argue that as shown in chapter 3, paired post-prandial insulin levels are

reduced post-RYGB irrespective of energy intake, most likely due to impact upon intestinal absorption, transit and gut flora changes.⁶⁶ Whilst extreme caution should be used attempting to relate the in vitro data of this study with in vivo metabolic states, the study showed no difference in the effect of early RYGB plasma on meal suppression of lipolysis, on a larger fat mass model and dynamic effects in vivo. Supportive that this effect may not be due to post-prandial dietary metabolites and/or gut hormone changes.

That being said, NEFA are increasingly considered as extracellular signalling molecules, no longer merely nutrients and metabolic substrates. Many studies reporting the effects of fatty acid upon glucose-stimulated insulin release with free fatty acid receptors (FFARs) and their potential role as drug targets for T2DM.⁶⁴⁴⁻⁶⁵³ Their effect upon lipolysis remains to be elucidated and repeat experiments with delayed time point sampling, to include higher fatty acid flux in the plasma and artificial manipulation studies would be of use.

6.4.3 The effect of gut hormones upon lipolysis

The anti-lipolytic effects of insulin are well documented, and supported by this study. As the antilipolytic effect of insulin occurs at a lower concentration than is required to stimulate glucose metabolism,⁶⁵⁴⁻⁶⁵⁶ many believe that this is its primary role. The post-prandial rise in insulin promotes TG storage in the AT and inhibits lipolysis,³¹⁴ and increases the rate of re-synthesis of TG from NEFA i.e. re-esterification,³²⁷ optimising energy storage. Adipocytes have marked increase in insulin sensitivity in the post-prandial period.⁶⁵⁷ This effect is present in obese subjects in the fasting state but unlike healthy weight subjects, no further increase in insulin sensitivity is demonstrated in the postprandial state,⁶⁵⁷ hinting that in obesity the adipocytes have defaulted to a storage/post-prandial state even when fasted. Despite this, in vivo, fasting reduces systemic sensitivity to antilipolytic effects of insulin³²⁹ in contrast to findings in vitro.³³⁰ Given the alterations in energy intake,

intestinal absorption, gut microbiota and transit following RYGB, this mechanism could contribute to the early increases in lipolysis post-RYGB.

Regional differences in the influence of obesity upon insulin binding of human adipocytes has been reported.⁶⁵⁷⁻⁶⁶⁰ The antilipolytic and re-esterification effects of insulin are reduced in visceral compared to peripheral adipocytes, presumed due to reduced insulin receptor autophosphorylation and signal transduction through an IRS-1 associated PI 3-kinase pathway adipocytes.³²⁷ This results in increased delivery of NEFA to the liver by the visceral fat depot and is believed to be an important pathophysiological factor contributing to several of the metabolic complications in obesity.⁶⁶¹⁻⁶⁶³

The effect of GLP-1 on lipolysis remains controversial. Synthetic GLP-1 treatment improves post-prandial lipidaemia and reduces plasma NEFA levels in concert with insulin secretion. It was proposed that this was a reflection of the antilipolytic effect of insulin.⁶⁶⁴ Nevertheless, in its own right groups purport GLP-1 to be lipogenic at low concentrations and lipolytic at high concentrations,¹⁷⁰ and lipolytic in other studies.³⁴⁵ This data suggests a tendency to increase lipolysis but it did not reach statistical significance. No synergistic effect was detected when GLP-1 was combined with insulin.

GIP has been shown to impair the insulin sensitivity of glucose uptake in human adipocytes,⁶⁶⁵ an effect which may be reduced post-RYGB as GIP levels are reduced, see chapter 4.^{57,129} In vitro, GIP stimulates lipolysis in both human³³⁹ and rodent adipocytes, reversible with ANTIGIP, and can increase NEFA reesterification.¹²⁰ Although this study suggested increased lipolysis with GIP stimulation, it failed to reach statistical significance. This effect is inhibited by insulin in rodents,³⁴⁷ and in agreement with this study, a synergistic anti-lipolytic effect of this combination with insulin was not detected.¹²⁰

PYY reduced basal lipolysis at high concentrations, partially corroborating previous studies but, we were not able to reproduce the inhibition of stimulated lipolysis, using 8-bromo-cAMP, previously reported with

isoproterenol- and forskolin-induced lipolysis.³⁴⁶ In that instance, this effect was reversed using *Bordetella pertussis* toxin, which blocks the effects on the GTP-binding regulatory proteins in human adipocytes,³⁴⁷ suggesting that this effect is likely mediated by adenylate cyclase inhibition.³⁴⁶ Post-RYGB, fasting PYY levels remain unchanged but elevated in the post-prandial period. The anti-lipolytic effect was only noted at high concentrations, as such an in-vivo effect cannot be presumed.

Ghrelin can stimulate insulin-induced glucose uptake in adipocytes.²³⁹ In vivo, Ghrelin infusion induces lipolysis (as assessed by plasma NEFA levels and interstitial glycerol concentrations using a microdialysis technique) and IR.³⁵¹ Perhaps more accurately, it reduces the anti-lipolytic effect of hyperinsulinaemia, in peripheral AT.³⁵¹ This antilipolytic effect occurs by binding to a specific receptor, distinct from GHS-R1a, rodent model.^{352,353} Although our data did not reach statistical significance, at lower concentrations ghrelin appeared to increase lipolysis. The corollary has also been shown using cultured human peripheral adipocytes, which were lipogenic when incubated with Octanoyl-(OTG) and des-acyl (DSG) ghrelin. DSG was shown to alter lipolysis, lipogenesis and leptin secretion.²⁹⁹ Most studies, ours included, have found a reduction or no difference in fasting and postprandial ghrelin levels post-RYGB.^{23,36} As such it is unlikely that it has a dominant effect upon lipolysis around this period.

6.4.4 Strengths and limitations

This prospective study is unique as it is the first in vitro study designed to investigate the link between lipolysis and plasma and gut hormone changes particular to RYGB, using human adipocytes. As differences exist in the lipolytic effects of hormones upon adipocytes from AT depots,^{327,666} both visceral and peripheral were assessed.

This study has limitations. Sample size calculations were designed to reach significance of 0.8. Despite this, the small number of cases in the time frame allowed for recruitment, availability and cost influenced the recruitment of subjects with diversity in both gender and ethnicity. Although gender should not effect lipolysis outcomes,⁶⁶⁶ ethnicity may.⁶⁶⁷ Nevertheless, participants served as their own controls for the gene expression levels and to standardise the lipolysis results for analysis, increasing the validity of the findings.

Subjects were in a negative energy balance in the early post-operative period and these results may not fully reflect what happens once a stable weight is reached. Both physical activity and pre-operative diet were not strictly controlled which can also introduce further bias. High- and low-fat diets have been shown to effect ISO-mediated stimulation of lipolysis in murine adipocytes.⁶⁶⁸ To minimise these confounding factors, paired gut hormone and plasma data was used and the AT samples were taken at the start of the surgical procedure to minimise the surgical stress and inflammatory insult.

It should also be noted that this series of experiments were performed to allow assessment of both lipolytic and anti-lipolytic effects as the effect of plasma around RYGB upon adipocytes was unknown. The basal activities in these studies, as well as the magnitude of stimulation achieved under experimental conditions described here, may not reflect those activities in vivo. The conditions are designed to permit comparisons of adipocyte behaviour. The so-called basal activities measure in the present studies are most likely artificially low and are designed to permit viewing of maximal stimulated activities.⁶⁶⁸

The basal experimental conditions studied here were performed without PIA. As there were no previous studies into the effect of RYGB plasma upon lipolysis and as such the lipolytic or anti-lipolytic effects of this plasma upon human adipocytes was unknown. It was thought that a fully inhibited basal condition (ADA and PIA) may have masked an anti-lipolytic response and was therefore not used. Following this study, further studies can be tailored accordingly.

These findings would support further studies controlling for gender, ethnicity and multiple time point post-RYGB. Assessing not only plasma changes, gut adaptation but adipocyte adaptive response over time.

This study achieved the primary objective of assessing the effect of fasting and post-prandial plasma and gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery upon human lipolysis. The increased basal lipolysis rate post-RYGB together with, or due to, improvements in insulin sensitivity, a reduced basal insulin and PYY levels will support the weight loss process. This initially will increase NEFA levels, due to increased fat mass, but reduces latterly,⁵⁰⁷ as adiposity and lipotoxicity are reversed. Sadly, this raises more questions than it answers as the pathways through which this occurs and the role of NEFA, as a passive or more likely active participant in lipolysis, remain to be elucidated.

6.5 Conclusion

Lipolysis is increased post-RYGB in both peripheral and visceral AT. This study shows that factors in the plasma following surgery may be responsible, if not contribute, to changes in lipid flow seen post-operatively. Gut hormone changes around RYGB, in particular insulin and PYY, rather than GLP-1 and GIP, are of interest with respect to lipolysis. The effects of NEFA themselves upon this process should be determined.

7. Conclusions

The closely intertwined relationship of the diet and subsequent disease manifestations such as obesity and T2DM, highlight the role with which both the dietary metabolites and the gut hormones play. The finding that RYGB surgery results in remission of T2DM and hyperlipidaemia, prior to weight loss, unhinges this link temporarily. This offers a unique opportunity to study this in more detail in a human model.

Dramatic improvements in insulin sensitivity globally following RYGB surgery improve core processes at the islet, hepatocyte and adipocyte level. This coupled with increased incretin secretion and changes in exogenous and endogenous lipid flow exacerbate these effects.

Although it is likely that post-prandial hormonal alterations improve adipocyte lipolysis through their peripheral effects, it is most likely the global reduction in insulin levels, thereby reducing the anti-lipolytic effect, and overall improvements in IR are responsible for these findings, not the peripheral effects of incretins. The role of fatty acid metabolites in this process remains of interest.

8. Future work

- Formal assessment of the effects of RYGB surgery upon fasting plasma glucose and 2h OGTT (currently used for diagnosis and T2DM) – ideally assessed as a prospective study into the effect of RYGB surgery upon fasting and 2h OGTT in participants with and without T2DM at several time points up to 1yr, with an obese NDM control group
- RYGB surgery reverses the dyslipidaemia of obesity. As such there
 maybe no benefit from the addition of a statin treatment to their longterm cardiovascular risk ideally assessed using a randomised
 controlled trial of continuing statin versus stopping statin treatment
 following RYGB surgery
- Quantification of the effect of RYGB upon dietary fat absorption using radiolabelled LCTG and MCTG assessed around RYGB surgery (ethical and R&D approval obtained)
- Quantification RT-PCR of gut hormone and free fatty acid receptors on human adipocytes from different AT depots and the impact of RYGB surgery upon this
- Immunohistochemistry analysis of gut hormone and free fatty acid receptors on human adipocytes from different AT depots and the impact of RYGB surgery upon this
- The lipolytic effect of plasma around RYGB surgery taken at later time points i.e. whether the changes seen in this experiment persist long-term or attenuate, consistent with weight loss plateauing
- The effect of plasma and gut hormone changes around RYGB surgery upon adipocyte re-esterification
- The effect of differing NEFA levels upon lipolysis and glucose uptake in human adipocytes

9. References

- World Health Organisation. Fact sheet No. 311:Obesity and overweight, September 2006
- Mokdad AH, Marks JS, Stroup DF, Gerberding JI. Actual causes of death in the United States, JAMA 2004; 291:1238-1245
- Chan J, Rimm EB, Colditz GA, Stampfer MJ, Willett WC. Obesity, fat districution, and weight gain as risk factors for clinical diabetes in men Diabetes Care 1994; 17: 961-969
- 4. Colditz GA, Willett WC, Rotnitzky A, Manson JE. Weight gain as a risk factor for clinical diabetes in women. Ann Intern Med 1995; 122:481-486
- Diabetes Atlas Committee, Diabetes Atlas 2nd edition: International Diabetes Federation 2003
- Kahn, SE, Prigeon RL, McCulloch DK, Boyko EJ, Bergman RN, Schwartz NW, et al. Quantification of the relationship between insulin sensitivity and B-cell function in human subjects. Evidence for a hyperbolic function. Diabetes 1993; 42: 1663–1672
- Kahn, S. E. The importance of β-cell failure in the development and progression of type 2 diabetes. J Clin Endocrinol Metab; 2001; 86:4047– 4058
- Maggard MA, Sugarman LR, Suttorp M, Maglione M, Sugerman HJ, Livingston EH, et al. Meta-analysis: Surgical treatment of Obesity. Ann Intern Med 2005; 142: 547-559
- Buckwald H, Avidor Y, Braunwald E, Jensen MD, Pories W, Fahrbach K, et al. Bariatric surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA 2004; 292: 1727-1737
- Adams TD, Gress RE, Smith SC, Halverson C, Simper SC, Rosamond WD. Long-term mortality after gastric bypass surgery. NEJM 2007; 357: 753-761
- 11. Wickremesekera K, Miller G, Naotunne TD, Knowles G, Stubbs RS. Loss of insulin resistance after RYGB surgery: a time course study. Obes Surg 2005; 15: 474-81

- Sjostrom L, Lindroos AK, Peltonen M, Torgerson J, Bouchard C, Carlsson B et al. Lifestyle, diabetes, and cardiovascular risk factors 10 years after bariatric surgery. NEJM 2004; 351: 2683-2693
- Buchwald H, Oien DM. Metabolic/Bariatric surgery worldwide 2008. Obes Surg 2009; 19: 1605-1611
- 14. Mason EE, Ito C. Gastric Bypass in Obesity. Surg Clin N Amer 1967; 47: 1345
- Griffen WO, Jr., Young VL, Stevenson CC. A prospective comparison of gastric and jejuno-ileal bypass procedures for morbid obesity. Ann Surg 1977; 186: 500
- Fobi MAL, Lee H, Flemming AW. The surgical technique of the banded Roux-Y gastric bypass. J Obes Weight Regul 1989; 8:99
- 17. Patel AG. Diagram of Gastric Bypass procedure (unpublished)
- Pories WJ, Swanson MS, MacDonald KG, Long SB, Morris PG, Brown BM. Who would have thought it? An operative proves to be the most effective therapy for adult-onset diabetes mellitus. Ann Surg 1995; 22: 339-352
- Dixon JB, O'Brien PE. Health outcomes of severely obese type 2 diabetic subjects 1 year after laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding Diabetes Care 2002; 25:356-363
- 20. Borg CM, le Roux CW, Ghatei MA, Bloom SR, Patel AG, Aylwin SJB. Progressive rise in gut hormone levels after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass suggests gut adaptation and explains altered satiety. BJS 2006; 93: 210-215
- 21. Laferrere B, McGinty J, Heshka S, Teixeira J, Wang K, Hart AB, et al. Incretin levels and effect are markedly enhanced 1 month after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery in obese patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2007; 30: 1709-1716
- 22. Meier JJ, Galasso R, Butler AE, Butler PC. Hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemia after gastric bypass surgery is not accompanied by islet hyperplasia or increased β-cell turnover. Diabetes Care 2006; 29: 1554-1559
- 23. Le Roux CW, Welbourn R, Werling M, Osborne A, Kokkinos A, Laurenius A, et al Gut hormones as mediators of appetite and weight loss after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Ann Surg 2007; 246: 780-785

- 24. Golden SH, Kao WHL, Peart-Vigilance C, Brancati FL. Perioperative glycaemic control and the risk of infectious complications in a cohort of adults with diabetes. Diabetes Care 1999; 22: 1408-1414
- 25. Himsworth H. Diabetes Mellitus: a differential into insulin-sensitive and insulin-insensitive types. Lancet 1936; 1: 127-130
- 26. Ballantyne GH, Waslelewski A, Saunders JK. The surgical treatment of type II disavete mellitus: changes in HOMA insulin resistance in the first year following laparoscopic Roux-e-Y gastric bypass (LRYGB) and laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB). Obes Surg 2009; 19: 1297-1303
- 27. Doar JWH, Thompson ME, Wilde CE, Sewell PFJ. Influence of treatment with diet alone on oral glucose-tolerance test and plasma sugar and insulin levels in patients with maturity-onset diabetes mellitus. Lancet 1975; 1263-1266
- 28. Lee WJ, Lee YC, Ser KH, Chen JC, Chen SC. Improvement of insulin resistance after obesity surgery: a comparison of gastric banding and bypass procedures. Obes Surg 2008; 18: 1119-1125
- 29. United Kingdom Prospective Study (UKPDS): Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). Lancet 1998; 352:837–853
- 30. DeFronzo RA: Pharmacologic therapy for Type 2 diabetes mellitus. Ann Intern Med 1999; 131:281–303
- 31. Fielding G, Ren C, Woodman G, Morton C, Barsoumian R, Geiss A, et al. A comparison of the percent excess weight loss with the LAGB among patients with and without diabetes: a retrospective study in five centers. Obesity Surgery 2009, proceedings from IFSO 2009 (Abstract)
- 32. Wing RR, Koeske R, Epstein LH, Nowalk MP, Gooding W, Becker D. Long-term effects of modest weight loss in type 2 diabetic patients. Arch Int Med 1987; 147:1749–1753
- 33. Kelley DE, Wing RR, Buonocore C, Sturis J, Polonsky K, Fitzimmons M: Relative effects of calorie restriction and weight loss in noninsulindependent diabetes mellitus. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1993; 77:1287– 1293

- 34. Weyer C, Hanson K, Bogardus C, Pratley RE. Long-term changes in insulin action and insulin secretion associated with gain, loss, regain and maintenance of body weight. Diabetologia 2000; 43: 36-46
- 35. Pattou F, Beraud G, Arnalsteen L, Seguy D, Pigny P, Fermont C, Romon M. La restauration de l'insulinosecretion après Gastric bypass chez le diabetique de type 2 est independante de la perte de poids et correlee a l'augmentation du GLP-1. Diabetes Metab 2007; 34:A23- 36
- 36. le Roux CW, Aylwin SJ, Batterham RL, Borg CM, Coyle F, Prasad V, Shurey S, Ghatei MA, Patel AG, Bloom SR. Gut hormone profiles following bariatric surgery favour an anorectic state, facilitate weight loss, and improve metabolic parameters. Ann Surg 2006; 243:108–114
- Vincent RP, le Roux CW. Changes in gut hormones after bariatric surgery. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 2008; 69: 173-179
- 38. Laferrere B, Teixeira J, McGinty J, Tran H, Egger JR, Colarusso A, et al. Effect of weight loss by gastric bypass surgery versus hypocaloric diet on glucose and incretin levels in patients with type 2 diabetes. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2008; 93: 2479-2485
- 39. Anderson JW, Kendall CWC, Jenkins DJA. Importance of weight management in type 2 diabetes: review with meta-analysis of clinical studies. J Am Coll Nutr 2003; 22: 331-339
- 40. Greenfield M, Kolterman O, Olefsky J, Reaven G. The effect of 10 days of fasting on various aspects of carbohydrate metabolism in obese diabetic subjects with significant fasting hyperglycemia. Metabolism 1978; 27:1839–1852
- Eagon JC, Miedema BW, Kelly KA. Postgastrectomy syndromes. Surg Clin North Am 1992; 72: 445-465
- 42. Hertz AF. The course and treatment of certain unfavourable after effects of gastroenterostomy. Ann Surg 1913; 58(4): 466-72
- 43. Mallory GN, Macgregor AM, and CS. The influence of dumping on weight loss after gastric restrictive surgery for morbid obesity. Obes Surg 1996;
 6: 474-478
- 44. Dietel M. The change in the dumping syndrome concept. Obes Surg 2008; 18: 1622-1624
- Brown EK, Settle EA, Van Rij AM. Food intake patterns of gastric bypass patients. J Am Diet Assoc 1982; 80: 437-443

- 46. Kenler HA, Brolin RE, Cody RP. Changes in eating behaviour after horizontal gastroplasty and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Am J Clin Nutr 1990; 52: 87-92
- 47. Thomas J, Marcus E. High and low fat food selection with reported frequency intolerance following Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Obes Surg 2008; 18: 282-287
- 48. Williams DL. Finding the sweet spot: peripheral vs. Central GLP-1 in feeding and glucose homeostasis. Endocrinology 2009; 150: 2997-3001
- 49. Miras AD, le Roux CW. Bariatric surgery and taste: novel mechanisms of weight loss. Curr Opin Gastroenterol 2010; 26: 140-145
- 50. Vidarsdottir S, Smeets PAM, Eichelsheim DL, van Osch MJP, Viergever MA, Romijn JA, et al. Glucose ingestion fails to inhibit hypothalamic neuronal activity in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes 2007; 56: 2547-2550
- 51. Cornier MA, von Kaenel SS, Bessesen DH, Tregellas JR. Effects of overfeeding on the neuronal response to visual food cues. Am J Clin Nutr 2007; 86: 965-971
- 52. Batterham RL, Ffytche DH, Rosenthal JM, Zelaya FO, Barker GJ, Withers DJ, et al. PPY modulation of cortical and hypothalamic brain areas predicts feeding behaviour in humans. Nature 2007; 450: 106-109
- 53. Rubino F, Forgione A, Cummings DE, Vix M, Gnuli D, Mingrone G, et al. The mechanism of diabetes control after gastrointestinal bypass surgery reveals a role of the proximal small intestine in the pathophysiology of type II diabetes. Ann Surg 2006; 244: 741-749
- 54. Cummings DE, Overduin J, Foster-Schubert KE. Gastric bypass for obesity: mechanisms of weight loss and diabetes resolution. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2004;89:2608 –2615
- 55. Rubino F, Gagner M. Potential of surgery for curing type 2 diabetes mellitus. Ann Surg. 2002;236:554 –559
- Pories WJ, Albrecht RJ. Etiology of type II diabetes mellitus: role of the foregut. World J Surg. 2001;25:527–531
- 57. Rubino F, Gagner M, Gentileschi P, Kini S, Fukuyama S, Feng J, et al. The early effect of the Roux-en-Y gastric bypass on hormones involved in body weight regulation and glucose metabolism. Ann Surg. 2004;240:236 –242

- 58. Mingrone G, Castagneto-Gissey L. Mechanisms of early improvements/resolution of type 2 diabetes after bariatric surgery. Diabetes Metab 2009; 35:518-523
- 59. Mason EE. The mechanism of surgical treatment of type 2 diabetes. Obes Surg. 2005;15:459–461
- Patriti A, Facchiano E, Sanna A, Guola N, Donini A. The enteroinsular axis and the recovery from type 2 diabetes after bariatric surgery. Obes Surg. 2004; 14:840–848
- 61. Mason EE. Ileal transposition and enteroglucagon/GLP1 in obesity surgery. Obes Surg. 1999;9:223–228
- 62. Rodriguez-Grunert L, Neto MPG, Alamo M, Ramos AC, Baez PB, Tarnoff
 M. First human experience with endoscopically delivered and retrieved duodenal-jejunal bypass sleeve. SOARD 2008; 4(1): 55-59
- Stearns AT, Balakrishnan A, Tavakkolizadeh A. Impact of RYGB surgery on rat intestinal glucose transport. Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol 2009; 297: G950-G957
- Emas S, Billings A, Grossman MI. Effects of gastrin and pentagastrin on gastric and pancreatic secretion in dogs. Scand J Gastroenterol 1968; 3: 234
- 65. Mason EE, Ito C. Gastric Bypass. Ann Surg 1969; 170(3): 329-336
- 66. Carswell KA, Vincent RP, Belgaumkar AP, Sherwood RA, Amiel SA, Patel AG, et al. The effect of bariatric surgery on intestinal absorption and transit time. Obes Surg 2014; 24:796-805
- 67. Borgstrom B, Dahlqvist A, Lundh G, Sjovall J. Studies of intestinal digestion and absorption in the human. J Clin Invest 1957; 36: 1521-1536
- Thomas C, Gioiello A, Noriega L, Strehle A, Oury J, Rizzo G. TGR5mediated bile acid sensing controls glucose homeostasis. Cell Metab 2009; 10: 167-177
- Edfalk S, Steneberg P, Edlund H. Gpr40 is expressed in enteroendocrine cells and mediates free fatty acid stimulation of incretin secretion.
 Diabetes 2008; 57: 2280-2287
- Hirawawa A, Tsumaya K, Awaji T, Katsuma S, Adachi T, Yamada M, et al. Free fatty acids regulate gut incretin glucagon-like peptide-1 secretion through GPR120. Nat Med 2005; 11: 90-94

- 71. Overton H, Babs A, Doel S, Ffye M, Gardnes L, Griffin G, et al. Deorphanisation of a G protein-coupled receptor for oleoylethanolamide and its use in the discovery of small molecule hypophagic agents. Cell Metab 2006; 3: 167-176
- 72. Shaham O, Wei R, Wang TJ, Ricciardi C, Lewis GD, Vasan RS, et al. Metabolic profiling of the human response to a glucose challenge reveals distinct axes of insulin sensitivity. Mol Syst Biol 2008; 4, 214
- 73. Patti ME, Houten SM, Bianco AC, Bernier R, Reed Larsen P, Holst JJ, et al. Serum bile acids are higher in humans with prior gastric bypass: potential contribution to improved glucose and lipid metabolism. Obesity 2009; 17: 1671-1677
- 74. Jenkins DJ, Wolever TM, Leeds AR, Gassull MA, Haisman P, Dilaware J, et al. Dietary fibres, fibre analogues, and glucose tolerance: importance of viscosity. BMJ 1978; 1:1392-1394
- 75. Maki KC, Carson ML, Miller MP, Turowshi M, Bell M, Wilder DM, et al. High-viscosity hydroxypopylmethylcellulose blunts postprandial glucose and insulin responses. Diabetes Care 2007; 30: 1039-1043
- 76. Khan SE, Hull RL, Utzschneider KM. Mechanisms linking obesity to insulin resistance and type 2 diabetes. Nature 2006; 444: 840-846
- 77. Reaven GM, Hollenbeck C, Jeng CY, Wu MS, Chen YD. Measurement of plasma glucose, free fatty acid, lactate, and insulin for 24h in patients with NIDDM. Diabetes 1988; 37: 1020-1024
- 78. Boden G. Role of fatty acids in the pathogenesis of insulin resistance and NIDDM. Diabetes 1997; 46: 3-10
- 79. Axelsen M, Smith U, Eriksson JW, Taskinen M, Jansson P. Postprandial hypertriglyceridemia and insulin resistance in normoglycemic first-degree relatives of patients with type 2 diabetes. Ann Intern Med 1999; 131: 27-31
- 80. Roden, M. et al. Mechanism of free fatty acid-induced insulin resistance in humans. J. Clin.Invest.1996; 97, 2859–2865
- 81. Santomauro, AT, Boden G, Silva ME, Rocha DM, Santos RF, Ursich MJ, et al. Overnight lowering of free fatty acids with Acipimox improves insulin resistance and glucose tolerance in obese diabetic and nondiabetic subjects. Diabetes1999; 48, 1836–1841

- Fielding BA, Frayn KN. Lipoprotein lipase and the disposition of dietary fatty acids. Br J Nutr 1998; 80: 495-502
- 83. Miles JM, Wooldridge, Greliner WJ, Windsor S, Isley WL, Klein S, Harris WS. Nocturnal and postprandial free fatty acid kinetics in normal and type 2 diabetic subjects. Diabetes 2003; 52: 675-681
- 84. Brassard P, Frisch F, Lavoie F, Cyr D, Bourbonnais A, Cunnane C, et al. Impaired plasma nonesterified fatty acid tolerance is an early defect in the natural history of type 2 diabetes. J Clin Endorinol Metab 2008; 93: 837-844
- 85. Evans K, Clark ML, Frayn KN. Effects of an oral and intravenous fat load on adipose tissue and forearm lipid metabolism. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 1999; 276: 241-248
- 86. Bickerton AST, Roberts R, Fielding BA, Hodson L, Blaak EE, Wagenmakers AJM, et al. Preferential uptake of dietary fatty acids in adipose tissue and muscle in the postprandial period. Diabetes 2007; 56: 168-176
- 87. Carpentier AC, Frisch F, Brassard P, Lavoie F, Bourbonnais A, Cyr D, et al. Mechanism of insulin-stimulated clearance of plasma nonesterified fatty acids in humans. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2007; 292: E693-E701
- Lewis GF, Carpentier A, Adeli K, Giacca A. Disordered fat storage and mobilisation in the pathogenesis of insulin resistance and type 2 diabetes. Endocr Rev 2002; 23: 201-229
- 89. Ravikumar B, Carey PE, Snaar JEM, Deelchand DK, Cook DB, Neely RDG, et al. Real-time assessment of postprandial fat storage in liver and skeletal muscle in health and type 2 diabetes. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2005; 288: 789-797
- 90. Binnert C, Pachiaudi C, Beylot M, Hans D, Vandermander J, Chantre P, et al Influence of human obesity on the metabolic fate of dietary long- and medium-chain triacylglycerols¹⁻³ Am J Clin Nutr 1998; 67: 595-601
- 91. Gravena C, Mathias PC, Ashcroft SJH. Acute effects of fatty acids on insulin secretion from rat and human islets of Langerhans. J Endocrin 2002; 173: 73-80
- 92. Sako Y, Grill VE. A 48-hour lipid infusion in the rat time-dependently inhibits glucose-induced insulin secretion and B cell oxidation through a

process likely coupled to fatty acid oxidation. Endocrinology 1990; 127: 1580-1589

- 93. Zhou YP, Grill VE. Long-term exposure of rat pancreatic islets to fatty acids inhibits glucose-induced insulin secretion and biosynthesis through a glucose fatty acid cycle. J Clin Invest 1994; 93: 870-876
- 94. Aprahamian CJ, Tekant G, Chen M, Yahmurlu A, Yang Y, Loux T, et al. A rat model of childhood diet-induced obesity: Roux-en-Y gastric bypass induced changes in metabolic parameters and gastric peptide ghrelin. Pediatr Surg Int 2007; 23: 653-657
- 95. Johansson HE, Ohrvall M, Haenni A, Sundbom M, Eden Engstrom B, et al. Gastric bypass alters the dynamics and metabolic effects of insulin and proinsulin secretion. Diabetes Medicine 2007; 24: 1213-1220
- 96. Faraj M, Jones P, Sniderman AD, Cianflone K. Enhanced dietary fat clearance in postobese women. J Lipid Res 2001; 42: 571-580
- 97. Ikeda I, Tomari Y, Sugano M, Watanabe S, Nagata J. Lymphatic absorption of structured glycerolipids containing medium-chain fatty acids and linoleic acid, and their effect on cholesterol absorption in rats. Lipids 1991; 26: 369-373
- 98. Hashim SA, Tantibhedyangkui P. Medium chain triglyceride in early life: effects on growth of adipose tissue. Lipids 1987; 22(6): 429-434
- Morinigo R, Moize V, Musri M, Lacy AM, Navarro S, Marin JL, et al. GLP PYY, hunger and satiety following gastric bypass surgery in morbidly obese subjects. J Clin Endocrin Metab 2006; doi:10.1210/jc.2005-0904
- 100. Horowitz M, Collins PJ, Harding PE, Shearman DJ. Gastric emptying after gastric bypass. Int J Obes 1986; 10:117–121
- 101. Naslund I, Beckman K-W. Gastric emptying rate after gastric bypass and gastroplasty. Scand J Gastroenterol 1987; 22:193–201
- 102. Pellegrini CA, Deveney CW, Patti MG, Lewin M, Way LW. Intestinal transit of food after total gastrectomy and Roux-en-Y esophagojejunostomy. Am J Surg 1986; 151: 177-125
- Gonlachanvit S, Coleski R, Owyang C, Hasler W. Inhibitory actions of a high fibre diet on intestinal gas transit in healthy volunteers. Gut 2004; 53: 1577-1582

- 104. Van de Laar FA, Lucassen PL, Akkermans RP, Van de Lisdonk EH, Rutter GE, van Weel C. Alpha-glucosidase inhibitors for patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2005; 28:154–162
- 105. Bernard C: Lecons sur le diabete. Paris: J. B. Baillere 1877
- Creutzfeldt W, Ebert R, Arnold R, Frerichs H, Brown JC. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide (GIP), gastrin and insulin: response to test meal in celiac disease and after duodeno-pancreatectomy. Diabetologia 1976; 12: 279-286
- 107. Bloom SE, Polak JM. Gut hormones. Adv Clin Chem 1980; 21: 177-244
- 108. Nauck MA, Heimesaat MM, Orskov C, Holst JJ, Ebert R, Creutzfeldt W. Preserved incretin activity of glucagon-like peptide 1 [7-36 amide] but not of synthetic human gastric inhibitory polypeptide in patients with type-2 diabetes mellitus. J Clin Invest 1993; 91: 301-307
- 109. Elahi D, McAloon-Dyke M, Fukagawa NK, Meneilly GS, Sclater AL, Minaker KL et al. The insulinotropic actions of glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide (GIP) and glucagon-like peptide-1 (7-37) in normal and diabetic subjects. Regul Pept 1994; 51: 63-74
- 110. Roberge JN, Gronau KA, Brubaker PL. Gastrin-releasing peptide is a novel mediator of proximal nutrient-induced proglucagon-derived peptide secretion from the distal gut. Endocrinology 1996; 137: 2383-2388
- Rocca AS, Brubaker PL. Role of the vagus nerve in mediating proximal nutrient-induced glucagon-like peptide-1 secretion.
 Endocrinology 1999; 140: 1687-1694
- 112. Vilsboll T, Krarup T, Deacon CF, Madsbad S, Holst JJ. Reduced postprandial concentrations of intact biologically active glucagon-like peptide 1 in type 2 diabetic patients. Diabetes 2001; 50: 609-613
- 113. Rask E, Olsson T, Soderberg S, Johnson O, Seckl J, Holst JJ, et al. Impaired incretin response after a mixed meal is associated with insulin resistance in non-diabetic men. Diabetes Care 2001; 24: 1640-1645
- 114. Baggio LL, Drucker DJ. Biology of incretins: GLP-1 and GIP. Gastroenterology 2007; 132:2131-2157

- 115. Creutzfeldt W, Ebert R, Willms B, Frerichs H, Brown JC. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide (GIP) and insulin in obesity: increased response to stimulation and defective feedback control of serum levels. Diabetologia 1978; 14:15-24
- 116. Ebert Aspect of GIP pathology In: Gut hormones. Bloom SR (Ed.):294-300. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone 1978
- 117. Gault VA, O'Harte FPM, Harriott P, Mooney MH, Green BD, Flatt PR. Effects of the novel (Pro3)GIP antagonist and exendin(9-39) amide on GIP- and GLP-1-induced cyclic AMP generation, insulin secretion and postprandial insulin release in obese diabetic (ob/ob) mice: evidence that GIP is the major physiological incretin. Diabetologia 2003; 46: 222-230
- 118. Ding WG, Gromada J. Protein Kinase A-dependent stimulation of exocytosis in mouse pancreatic beta-cells by glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide. Diabetes 1997; 46:615-62161
- 119. Salera M, Giacomoni P, Pironi L, Cornia G, Capelli M, Marini A, et al. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide release after oral glucose: relationship to glucose tolerance, diabetes mellitus and obesity. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1982; 55:329-336, 219
- Getty-Kaushik L, Song DH, Boylan MO, Corkey BE, Wolfe MM.
 Glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide modulates adipocyte
 lipolysis and reesterification. Obesity 2006; 14(7): 1124-1131
- 121. Falko JM, Crockett SE, Cataland S, Mazzaferri EL. GIP stimulated fat ingestion in man. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1975; 41: 260-5
- 122. Ross SA. Hypersecretion of gastric inhibitory polypeptide following oral glucose in diabetes mellitus. Diabetes 1977; 26: 525-529
- Miyawaki K, Yamada Y, Ban N, Ihara Y, Tsukiyama K, Zhou H, et al. Inhibition of gastric inhibitory polypeptide signalling prevents obesity. Nat Med 2002; 8:738-742
- Holst JJ, Gromada J, Nauck MA. The pathogenesis of NIDDM involves a defective expression of the GIP receptor. Diabetologia 40:984–986, 1997
- 125. Bloom SR. GIP in diabetes. Diabetologia 1975; 11: 334
- 126. Crockett SE. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide (GIP) in maturity-onset diabetes mellitus. Diabetes 1976; 25: 931-935

- 127. Eckel RH, Fujimoto WY, Brunzell JD. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide enhanced lipoprotein lipase activity in cultured preadipocytes. Diabetes 1979; 28: 1141-2
- 128. Goldfine A, Mun EC, Devine E, Bernier R, Baz-Hecht M, Jones DB, et al. Patients with neuroglycopenia post gastric bypass surgery have exaggerated incretin and insulin secretory responses to mixed meal. J Clin Endocrin Metab 2007; 92:4678-4685
- 129. Clements RH, Gonzales QH, Long CI, Wittert G, Laws HL. Hormonal changes after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass for morbid obesity and the control of type-II diabetes mellitus. Am Surg 2004; 70: 1-5
- Clements RH, Gonzalez QH, Foster A, Richards WO, McDowell J, Bondora A, et al. Gastrointestinal symptoms are more intense in morbidly obese patients and are improved with LRYGB. Obes Surg 2003; 13: 610-4
- 131. Korner J, Bessler M, Inabnet W, Taveras C, Holst JJ. Exaggerated glucagon-like peptide-1 and blunted glucose-dependent insulinotropic peptide secretion are associated with Roux-en-Y gastric bypass but not adjustable gastric banding. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2007; 3: 597-601
- 132. Holst JJ. On the physiology of GIP and GLP-1. Horm Metab Res 2004; 38:747-754
- 133. Drucker DJ. The biology of incretin hormones. Cell Metab 2006;3:153-165
- Holst JJ. The physiology of glucagon-like peptide 1. Physiol Rev 2007; 87:1409-1439
- Mentlein R. Dipeptidyl-peptidase IV (CD26) Role in the inactivation of regulatory peptides. Regul Pept 1999; 85:9-24
- Drucker DJ, Philippe J, Mojsov S, Chick WL, Habener JF.
 Glucagon-like peptide 1 stimulates insulin gene expression and increases cyclic AMP levels in a rat islet cell line. PNAS 1987; 84: 3434-3438
- 137. Hansen L, Deacon CF, Orskov C, Holst JJ. Glucagon-like peptide-1-(7-36)amide is transformed to glucagon-like peptide-1-(9-36)amide by dipeptidyl peptidase IV in the capillaries supplying the L cells of the porcine intestine. Endocrinology 1999; 140:5356-5363
- 138. Ruttimann EB, Arnold M, Hillebrand JJ, Geary N, Langhans W. Intrameal hepatic portal and intraperitoneal infusions of glucagon-like

peptide-1 reduce spontaneous meal size in the rat via different mechanisms. Endocrinology 2009; 150:1174-1181

- Punjabi M, Arnold M, Geary N, Langhans W, Pacheco-Lopez.
 Peripheral glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) and satiation. Physiol Behav 2011; 105:71-76
- 140. Abbott CR, Monteiro M, Small CJ, Sajedi A, Smith KL, Parkinson JR et al. The inhibitory effects of peripheral administration of peptide YY(3-36) and glucagon-like peptide-1 on food intake are attenuated by ablation of the vagal-brainstem-hypothalamic pathway. Brain Res 2005; 1044:127-131
- Meeran K, O'Shea D, Edwards CM, Turton MD, Heath MM, Gunn I, et al. Repeated intracerebroventricular administration of glucagon-like peptide-1 (7-36) amide or exendin (9-39) alters body weight in the rat. Endocrinology 1999; 140:244-250
- 142. Flint AA, Raben A, Astrup A, Holst JJ. Glucagon-like peptide-1 promotes satiety and suppresses energy intake in humans. J Clin Invest 1998; 101:515-520
- 143. Gutzwiller JP, Drewe J, Goke B, Schmidt H, Rohrer B, Lareida J, et al. Glucagon-like peptide-1 promotes satiety and reduces food intake in patients with diabetes mellitus type 2. Am J Physiol 1999; 276:R1541-R1544
- 144. Naslund E, Barkeling B, King N, Gutniak M, Blundell JE, Holst JJ, et al. Energy intake and appetite are suppressed by glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) in obese men. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 1999; 23:304-311
- 145. Naslund E, Gutniak M, Skogar S, Rossner S, Hellstrom PM. Glucagon-like peptide 1 increases the period of postprandial satiety and slows gastric emptying in obese men. Am J Clin Nutr 1998; 68:525-530
- 146. Long SJ, Sutton JA, Amaee WB, Giouvanoudi A, Spyrou NM, Rogers PJ, et al. No effect of glucagon-like peptide-1 on short-term satiety and energy intake in man. Br J Nutr 1999; 81:273-279
- Brennan IM, Feltrin KL, Horowitz M, Smout AJ, Meyer JH, Wishart J, et al. Evaluation of interactions between CCK and GLP-1 in their effects on appetite, energy intake, and antropyloroduodenal motility in

healthy men. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol 2005; 288:R1477-R1485

- 148. Baggio LL, Huang Q, Brown TJ, Drucker DJ. Oxyntomodulin and glucagon-like peptide-1 differentially regulate murine food intake and energy expenditure. Gastroenterology 2004; 127:546-558
- 149. Williams DL, Baskin DG, Schwartz. Evidence that intestinal glucagon-like peptide-1 plays a physiological role in satiety.Endocrinology 2009; 150:1680-1687
- Ruttimann EB, Arnold M, Geary N, Langhans W. GLP-1 antagonism with exendin (9-39) fails to increase spontaneous meal size in rats. Physiol Behav 2010; 100:291-296
- 151. Edwards CM, Stanley SA, Davis R, Brynes AE, Frost GS, Seal LJ, et al. Exendin-4 reduces fasting and postprandial glucose and decreases energy intake in healthy volunteers. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2001; 281:E155-E161
- 152. Larsen PJ et al. Central administration of glucagon-like peptide-1 activates hypothalamic neuroendocrine neurons in the rat. Endocrinology 1997; 138:4445-4455
- 153. Crawley JN, Beinfeld MC. Rapid development of tolerance to the behavioural actions of cholecystokinin. Nature 1983; 302:703-706
- 154. Feltrin KL, Little TJ, Meyer JH, Horowitz M, Smout AJ, Wishart J, et al. Effects of intraduodenal fatty acids on appetite, antropyloroduodenal motility, and plasma CCK and GLP-1 in humans vary with their chain length. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol 2004; 287:R524-R533
- 155. Pilichiewicz AN, Chaikomin R, Brennan IM, Wishart JM, Rayner CK, Jones KL, et al. Load-dependent effects of duodenal glucose on glyemia, gastrointestinal hormones, antopyloroduodenal motility, and energy intake in healthy men. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab. 2007; 293:E743-E753
- 156. Ryan AT, Feinle-Bisset C, Kallas A, Wishart JM, Clifton PM, Horowitz M, et al. Intraduodenal protein modulates antropyloroduodenal motility, hormone release, glucemia, appetite, and energy intake in lean men. Am J Clin Nutr 2012; 96:92-103

- 157. Elliott RM, Morgan LM, Tredger JA, Deacon S, Wright J, Marks V. Glucagon-like peptide-1 (7-36)amide and glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide secretion in response to nutrient ingestion in man: acute postprandial and 24-h secretion patterns. J Endocrinol 1993; 138:159-166
- 158. Brubaker PL, Anini Y. Direct and indirect mechanisms regulating secretion of glucagon-like peptide-1 and glucagon-like peptide-2. Can J Physiol Pharmacol 2003; 81:1005-1012
- 159. Feinle C, Chapman IM, Wishart J, Horowitz M. Plasma glucagonlike peptide-1 (GLP-1) responses to duodenal fat and glucose infusions in lean and obese men. Peptides 2002; 23:1491-1495
- Blom WA, Lluch A, Stafleu A, Vinoy S, Holst JJ, Schaafsma G, et
 al. Effect of a high-protein breakfast on the postprandial ghrelin response.
 Am J Clin Nutr 2006; 83:211-220
- Schirra J, Katschinski M, Weidmann C, Schafer T, Wank U, Arnold R, et al. Gastric emptying and release of incretin hormones after glucose ingestion in humans. J Clin Invest 1996; 97:92-103
- 162. Theodorakis MJ, Carlson O, Michopoulos S, Doyle ME, Juhaszova M, Petraki K, et al. Human duodenal enteroendocrine cells: source of both incretin peptides, GLP-1 and GIP. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2006; 290:E550-E559
- Beglinger S, Drewe J, Schirra J, Goke B, D'Amato M, Beglinger C.
 Role of fat hydrolysis in regulating glucagon-like peptide-1 secretion. J
 Clin Endocrinol Metab 2010; 95:879-886
- Delzenne N, Blundell J, Brouns F, Cunningham K, De Graaf K,
 Erkner A, et al. Gastrointestinal targets of appetite regulation in humans.
 Obes Rev 2010; 11:234-250
- Parker HR, Wallis K, le Roux CW, Wong KY, Reimann F, Gribble FM. Molecular mechanisms underlying bile acid-stimulated glucagon-like peptide-1 secretion. Br J Pharmacol 2012; 165:414-423
- 166. Katsuma S, Hirasawa A, Tsujimoto G. Bile acids promote glucagon-like peptide-1 secretion through TGR5 in a murine enteroendocrine cell line STC-1. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 2005; 329:386-390

- Verdick C, Toubro S, Buemann B, Lysgard Madsen J, Juul Holst J, Astrup A. The role of postprandial releases of insulin and incretin hormones in meal-induced satiety-effect of obesity and weight reduction. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 2001; 25:1206-1214
- 168. Fukase N, Igarashi M, Takahashi H, Manaka H, Yamatani K, Daimon M, et al. Hypersecretion of truncated glucagon-like peptide-1 and gastric inhibitory polypeptide in obese patients. Diabetes Med 1993; 10:44-49
- 169. Ruiz-Grande C, Alarcon C, Merida E, Valverde I. Lipolytic action of glucagon-like peptides in isolated rat adipocytes. Peptides 1992; 13:13-16
- 170. Villanueva-Penacarrillo ML, Marquez L, Gonzalez N, Diaz-Miguel
 M, Valverde I. Effect of GLP-1 on lipid metabolism in human adipocytes.
 Horm Metab Res 2001; 33:73-77
- 171. Flock G, Baggio LL, Longuet C, Drucker DJ. Incretin receptors for Glucagon-like peptide 1 and glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide are essential for the sustained metabolic actions of vildagliptin in mice. Diabetes 2007; 56: 3006-3013
- 172. Holst JJ. Prskov C, Vagn Nielsen OV, Schwartz TW. Truncated glucagon-like peptide 1, an insulin-releasing hormone from the distal gut. FEBS Lett 1987; 211: 169-174
- 173. Sancho V, Trigo MV, Gonzalez N, Valverde I, Malaisse WJ, Villanueva-Penacarrillo ML: Effects of GLP-1 and exendins on kinase activity, 2-deoxy-D-glucose transport, lipolysis and lipogenesis in adipocytes from normal and streptozotocininduced type 2 diabetic rats. J Mol Endocrinol 2005; 35:27-38
- Redondo A, Trigo MV, Acitores A, Valverde I, Villanueva-Penacarrillo ML: Cell signalling of the GLP-1 action in rat liver..Mol Cell Endocrinol 2003; 204:43-50
- Acitores A, Gonzalez N, Sancho V, Valverde I, Villanueva-Penacarrillo ML: Cell signalling of glucagon-like peptide-1 action in rat skeletal muscle. J Endocrinol 2004; 180:389-398
- 176. Nauck M, Sto[°]ckmann F, Ebert R, Creutzfeldt W: Reduced incretin effect in type 2 (non-insulin-dependent) diabetes. Diabetologia 1986; 29:46–54

- 177. Kreymann B, Williams G, Ghatei MA, Bloom SR. Glucagon-like peptide-1 7-36: a physiological incretin in man. Lancet 1987; 2:1300-1304
- 178. Edwards CM, Todd JF, Mahmoudi M, Wang Z, Wang RM, Ghatei
 MA, et al. Glucagon-like peptide 1 has a physiological role in the control of postprandial glucose in humans: studies with the antagonist exendin 9-39. Diabetes 1999; 48:86-93
- Giorgino F, Laviola L, Leonardini A, Natalicchio A. GLP-1: a new approach for type 2 diabetes therapy. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice 2006; 74: S152-S155
- Ahren B. GLP-1 based therapy of type 2 diabetes: GLP-1 mimetics and DPP-IV inhibitors. Current Diabetes Reports 2007; 7: 340-347
- 181. Vilsboll T. Liraglutide: a human GLP-1 analog for type 2 diabetes.Therapy 2009; 6: 199-207
- Service GJ, Thompson GB, Service FJ, Andrews JC, Collazo-Clavell ML, Lloyd RV. Hyperinsulinaemic hypoglycemia with nesidioblastosis after gastric-bypass surgery; NEJM 2005; 353:249-54
- 183. Z'graggen K, Guweidhi A, Steffen R, Potoczna N, Biral R, Walther
 F, et al. Severe recurrent hypoglycaemic after gastric bypass surgery.
 Obes Surg 2008; 18: 981-988
- Adrian TE, Ferri GL, Bacarese-Hamilton AJ, Fuessl HS, Polak JM, Bloom SR. Human distribution and release of a putative new gut hormone, peptide YY. Gastroenterology 1985; 89:1070-1077
- Adrian TE, Bacarese-Hamilton AJ, Smith HA, Chohan P, Manolas KJ, Bloom SR. Distribution and postprandial release of porcine peptide YY. J Endocrinol 1987; 113:11-14
- Medeiros MD, Turner AJ. Processing and metabolism of peptide-YY i: pivotal roles of dipeptidylpeptidase-IV, aminopeptidase-P, and endopeptidase-24.11. Endocrinology 1994; 134:2088-2094
- 187. Ballantyne GH. Peptide YY(1-36) and peptide YY(3-36): Part I.Distribution, release and actions. Obes Surg 2006; 16; 651-658
- 188. Dumont Y, Fournier A, St-Pierre S, Quirion R. Characterization of neuropeptide Y binding sites in rat brain membrane preparations using [125I][Leu31,Pro34]peptide YY and [125I]peptide YY3-36 as selective Y1 and Y2 radioligands. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 1995; 272:673-680
- Cummings DE, Overduin J. Gastrointestinal regulation of food intake. J Clin Invest 2007; 117:13-23
- Scott V, Kimura N, Stark JA, Luckman SM. Intravenous peptide YY3-36 and Y2 receptor antagonism in the rat. Effects on feeding behaviour. J Neuroendocrinol 2005; 17:452-457
- Batterham RL, Cowley MA, Small CJ, Herzog H, Cohen MA, Dakin CL, et al. Gut hormone PYY(3-36) physiologically inhibits food intake. Nature 2002; 418:650-654
- 192. Lin HC, Chey WY, Zhao X. Release of distal gut peptide YY (PYY) by fat in proximal gut depends on CCK. Peptides 2000; 21:1561-1563
- 193. MacIntosh CG, Andrews JM, Jones KL, Wishart JM, Morris HA, Jansen JB, et al. Effects of age on concentrations of plasma cholecystokinin, glucagon-like peptide 1, and peptide YY and their relation to appetite and pyloric motility. Am J Clin Nutr 1999; 69:999-1006
- 194. Brennan IM, Luscombe-Marsh ND, Seimon RV, Otto B, Horowitz M, Wishart JM, et al. Effects of fat, protein and carbohydrate, and protein load, on appetite, plasma cholecystokinin, peptide YY and ghrelin, and energy intake in lean and obese men. Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol 2012; 303:G129-140
- Degen L, Oesch S, Casanova M, Graf S, Ketterer S, Drewe J, et al. Effect of peptide YY3-36 on food intake in humans. Gastroenterology 2005; 129:1430-1436
- Schwartz MW, Woods SC, Porte D Jr, Seeley RJ, Baskin DG.
 Central nervous system control of food intake. Nature 2000; 404: 661– 671
- 197. Schwartz MW, Morton GJ. Obesity: keeping hunger at bay. Nature 2002; 418: 595–597
- 198. le Roux CW, Batterham RL, Aylwin SJ, Patterson M, Borg CM, Wynne KJ, et al. Attenuated peptide YY release in obese subjects is associated with reduced satiety. Endocrinology 2006; 147:3-8
- 199. Karra E, Chandarana K, Batterham RL. The role of peptide YY in appetite regulation and obesity. J Physiol 2009; 587:19-25
- 200. Hagan MM. Peptide YY: a key mediator of orexigenic behaviour.Peptides 2002; 23:377-382

- 201. Imamura M. Effects of surgical manipulation of the intestine on peptide YY and its physiology. Peptides 2002; 23:403-407
- 202. Pittner RA, Moore CX, Bhavsar SP, Gedulin BR, Smith PA, Jodka CM, et al. Effects of PYY[3-36] in rodent models of diabetes and obesity. Int J Obes Relat Metab Dis 2004; 28:963-971
- Batterham RL, Cohen MA, Ellis SM, Le Roux CW, Withers DJ,
 Frost GS et al. Inhibition of food intake in obese subjects by Peptide YY₃₋₃₆ NEJM 2003; 349: 941–948.10
- 204. Viardot A, Heilbronn LK, Herzog H, Gregersen S, Campbell LV. Abnormal postprandial PYY response in insulin sensitive nondiatbetic subjects with a strong family history of type 2 diabetes. Int J Obes 2008; 32:943-948
- 205. Korner J, Bessler M, Cirilo L, Conwell IM, Daud A, Restuccia NL et al. Effects of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery on fasting and postprandial concentrations of plasma. BJS 2006; 93: 210–215
- Korner J, Bessler M, Cirilo LJ, Conwell IM, Daud A, Restuccia NL, et al. Effects of RYGB on fasting and postprandial concentrations of ghrelin, peptide YY and insulin. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2005; 90: 359– 365
- 207. Koda S, Date Y, Murakami N, Shimbara T, Hanada T, Toshinai K, et al. The role of the vagal nerve in peripheral PYY 3-36-induced feeding reduction in rats. Endocrinology 2005; 146:2369-2375
- 208. van den Hoek AM, Heijboer AC, Corssmit EP, Voshol PJ, Romijn JA, Havekes LM, Pijl H. PYY3-36 reinforces insulin action on glucose disposal in mice fed a high-fat diet. Diabetes 2004; 53:1949-1952
- 209. Morinigo R, Vidal J, Lacy A, Delgado S, Casamitjana R, Gomis R. Circulating peptide YY, weight loss, and glucose homeostasis after gastric bypass surgery in morbidly obese subjects. Ann Surg 2008; 247: 270-275
- Cummings DE. Endocrine mechanisms mediating remission of diabetes after gastric bypass surgery. Int J Obes 2009; 33:Supl1:S33-S40

- Kojima M, Hosoda H, Date Y, Natazato M, Matsuo H, Kangawa K.
 Ghrelin is a growth hormone releasing acylated peptide from stomach.
 Nature 1999; 402:656-660
- 212. Fruhbeck G, Diez Caballero A, Gil MJ. Fundus functionality and ghrelin concentrations after bariatric surgery. NEJM 2004; 350:308-309
- Tschop M, Smiley DL, Heiman ML. Ghrelin induces adiposity in rodents. Nature 2000; 407: 908–913
- 214. Wren AM, Seal LJ, Cohen MA, Brynes AE, Frost GS, Murphy KG et al. Ghrelin enhances appetite and increases food intake in humans. J Clin EndocrinolMetab 2001; 86:5992
- Tschop M, Wawarta R, Riepl RL, Friedrich S, Bidlingmaier M, Landgraf R, et al. Postprandial decrease in circulating human ghrelin levels. J Endocrinol Invest 2001; 24:RC19-RC21
- Ueno H, Yamaguchi H, Kangawa K, Nakazato M. Ghrelin: a gastric peptide that regulates food intake and energy homeostasis. Regul Pept 2005; 126:11-19
- 217. Kirchner K, Heppner KM, Tschop MH. The role of ghrelin in the control of energy balance. Handb Exp Pharmacol 2012; 209:161-184
- 218. ShiiyaT, Nakazato M, Mizuta M, Date Y Mondal MS, Tanaka M, et al. Plasma ghrelin levels in lean and obese humans and the effect of glucose on ghrelin secretion. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2002; 87:240-244
- Williams DL, Cummings DE, Grill HJ, Kaplan JM. Meal-related ghrelin suppression requires postgastric feedback. Endocrinology 2003; 144:2765-2767
- Overduin J, Frayo RS, Grill HJ, Kaplan JM, Cummings DE. Role of the duodenum and macronutrient type in ghrelin regulation.
 Endocrinology 2005; 146:845-850
- 221. Feinle-Bisset C, Patterson M, Ghatei MA, Bloom SR, Horoqitz M. Fat digestion is required for suppression of ghrelin and stimulation of peptide YY and pancreatic polypeptide secretion by intraduodenal lipid. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2005; 289:E948-E953
- 222. Cukier K, Pilichiewicz AN, Chaikomin R, Brennan IM, Wishart JM, Rayner CK, et al. Effect of small intestinal glucose load on plasma ghrelin in healthy men. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol 2008; 295:R459-R462

- 223. Callahan HS, Cummings DE, Pepe MS, Breen PA, Metthys CC, Weigle DS. Postprandial suppression of plasma ghrelin level is proportional to ingested caloric load but does not predict intermeal interval in humans. J Clin Endo Metab 2004; 89:1319-1324
- 224. Cummings DE, Purnell JQ, Frayo RS, Schmidova K, Wisse BE,
 Weigle DS. A preprandial rise in plasma ghrelin levels suggests a role in meal initiation in humans. Diabetes 2001; 50:1714-1719
- 225. Gelling RW, Overduin J, Morrison CD, Morton GJ, Frayo RS, Cummings DE, et al. Effect of uncontrolled diabetes on plasma ghrelin concentrations and ghrelin-induced feeding. Endocrinology 2004; 145:4575-4582
- 226. Cummings DE. Ghrelin and the short- and long-term regulation of appetite and body weight. Physiol Behav 2006; 89:71-84
- 227. le Roux CW, Patterson M, Vincent RP, Hunt C, Ghatei MA, Bloom SR. Postprandial plasma ghrelin is suppressed proportional to meal calorie content in normal-weight but not obese subjects. J Clin Endo Metab 2005; 90:1068-1071
- 228. Cummings DE, Weigle DS, Frayo RS, Breen PA, Ma MK, Dellinger EP, et al. Plasma ghrelin levels after diet-induced weight loss or gastric bypass surgery. N Engl J Med 2002; 346:1623-1630
- 229. Geloneze B, Tambascia MA, Pilla VE, Geloneze SR, Repetto EM, Pareja JC. Ghrelin: a gut-brain hormone. Effect of gastric bypass surgery. Obes Surg 2003; 13:17-22
- Morinigo R, Casamitjana R, Moize V, Lacy AM, Delgado S, Gomis R, et al. Short-term effects of gastric bypass surgery on circulating ghrelin levels. Obes Res 2004; 12:1108-1116
- 231. Leonetti E, Silecchia G, Iacobellis G, Ribaudo MC, Zappeterreno
 A, Tiberti C, et al. Different plasma ghrelin levels after laparoscopic
 gastric bypass and adjustable gastric banding in morbid obese subjects.
 J Clin Endo Metab 2003; 88:4227-4231
- 232. Fruhbeck G, Rotellar E, Hernandez-Lizoain JL, Gil MJ, Gomez-Ambrosi J, Salvador J, et al. Fasting plasma ghrelin concentrations 6 months after gastric bypass are not determined by weight loss or changes in insulinemia. Obes Surg 2004; 14:1208-1215

- Rodieuz E, Giusti V, D'Alessio DA, Suter M, Tappy I. Effects of gastric bypass and gastric banding on glucose kinetics and gut hormone release. Obesity 2008; 16:298-305
- Holdstock C, Engstrom BE, Ohrvall M, Lind L, Sundbom M, Karlsson FA. Ghrelin and adipose tissue regulatory peptides: effect of gastric bypass surgery in obese human. J Clin Endo Metab 2003; 88:3177-3183
- 235. Ybarra J, Bobbioni-Harsch E, Chassot G, Huber O, Morel P, Assimacopoulos-Jeannet F, et al. Persistent correlation of ghrelin plasma levels with body mass index both in stable weight conditions and during gastric bypass induced weight loss. Obes Surg 2009; 19:327-331
- 236. McLaughlin T, Abbasi F, Lamendola C, Frayo RS, Cummings DE. Plasma ghrelin concentrations are decreased in insulin-resistant obese adults relative to equally obese insulin-sensitive controls. J Clin Endo Metab 2004; 89:1630-1635
- Pournaras DJ, le Roux CW. Ghrelin and metabolic surgery. Int J Peptides 2010; 1-5
- 238. Dezaki K, Sone H, Koizumi M, Nakata M, Kakei M, Nagai H, et al. Blockade of pancreatic islet-derived Ghrelin enhances insulin secretion to prevent high-fat diet-induced glucose intolerance. Diabetes 2006; 55: 3486-3493
- 239. Esler WP, Rudolph J, Claus TH, Tang W, Barucci N, Brown SE, et al. Small-molecule Ghrelin receptor antagonists improve glucose tolerance, suppress appetite and promote weight loss. Endocrinology 2007; 148: 5175-5185
- Gibbs J, Smith GP. Cholecystokinin and satiety in rats and rhesus monkeys. Am J Clin Nutr 1977; 30:758-761
- 241. Cuber JC, Bernard G, Fushiki T, Bernard C, Yamanishi R, Sugimoto E, et al. Luminal CCK-releasing factors in the isolated vascularity perfused rat duodenojejunum. Am J Physiol 1990; 259:G191-G197
- 242. Darcel NP, Liou AP, Tome D, Raybould HE. Activation of vagal afferents in the rat duodenum by protein digests requires PepT1. J Nutr 2005; 135:1491-1495

- 243. Foltz M, Ansems P, Schwartz J, Tasker MC, Lourbakos A, Gerhardt CC. Protein hydrolysates induce CCK release from enteroendocrine cells and act as partial agonists of the CCK1 receptor. J Agric Food Chem 2008; 56:837-843
- 244. McLaughlin JT, Lomaz RB, Hall L, Dockray GJ, Thompson DG, Warhurst G. Fatty acids stimulate cholecystokinin secretion via an acyl chain length-specific, Ca2+-dependent mechanism in the enteroendocrine cell line STC-1. J Physiol 1998; 513:11-18
- 245. McLaughlin J, Grazie Luxa M, Jones MN, D'Amato M, Dockray GJ, Thompson DG. Fatty acid chain length determines cholecystokinin secretion and effect on human gastric motility. Gastroenterology 1999; 116:46-53
- Matzinger D, Degen L, Drewe J, Meuli J, Duebendorfer R,
 Ruchstuhl N, et al. The role of long chain fatty acids in regulating food
 intake and cholecystokinin release in humans. Gut 2000; 46:688-693
- 247. Reidelberger RD, Varga G, Liehr RM, Castellanos DA, Rosenquist GL, Wong HC, et al. Cholecystokinin suppresses food intake by a nonendocrine mechanisms in rats. Am J Physiol 1994; 267:R901-R908
- 248. Moran TH, McHugh PR. Cholecystokinin suppresses food intake by inhibiting gastric emptying. Am J Physiol 1982; 242:R491-7
- Liddle RA, Goldfine ID, Rosen MS, Taplitz RA, Williams JA.
 Cholecystokinin bioactivity in human plasma. Molecular forms, responses to feeding, and relationship to gallbladder contraction. J Clin Invest 1985; 75:1144-1152
- Beglinger C. Effect of cholecystokinin on gastric motility in humans. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1994; 713:219-225
- 251. Blevins JE, Stanley BG, Reidelberger RD. Brain regions where cholecystokinin suppresses feeding in rats. Brain Res 2000; 860:1-10
- 252. Smith GP, Jerome C, Cushin BP, Eterno R, Simanshy KJ.
 Abdominal vagotomy blocks the satiety effect of cholecystokinin in the rat. Science 1981; 213:1036-1037
- 253. Edwards GL, Ladenheim EE, Ritter RC. Dorsomedial hindbrain participation in cholecystokinin-induced satiety. Am J Physiol 1986;
 251:R971-R977

- Gibbs J, Young RC, Smith GP. Cholecystokinin decreases food intake in rats. J Comp Physiol Psychol 1973; 84:488-495
- 255. Pi-Sunyer X, Kissifeff HR, Thornton J, Smith GP. C-Terminal octapeptide of cholecystokinin decreases food intake in obese man. Physiol Behav 1982; 29:627-30
- 256. Shaw MJ, Hughes JJ, Morley JE, Levine AS, Silvis SE, Shafer RB. Cholecystolinin octapeptide action on gastric emptying and food intake in normal and vagotomised man. Am N Y Acad Sci 1985; 448:640-1
- 257. Lieverse RJ, Jansen JB, Masclee AM, Lamers CB. Satiety effects of cholecystokinin in humans. Gastroenterology 1994; 106:1451-4
- 258. Lieverse RJ, Jansen JBM, Masclee AAM, Rovati LC, Lamers CBHW. Effect of a low dose of intraduodenal fat on satiety in humans: studies using the type A cholecystokinin receptor antagonist loxiglumide. Gut 1994; 35:501-505
- 259. Miller LJ, Hoicky EL, Ulrich CD, Wieben ED. Abnormal processing of the human cholecystokinin receptor gene in association with gallstones and obesity. Gastroenterology 1995; 109: 1375-1380
- 260. Moran TH, Katz LF, Plata-Salaman CR, Schwartz GJ. Disordered food intake and obesity in rats lacking cholecystokinin A receptors. Am J Physiol 1998; 274:R618-R625
- 261. Marchal-Victorian S, Vionnet N, Escrieut C, Dematos F, Dina C, Dufresne M, et al. Genetic, pharmacological and functional analysis of cholecystokinin-1 and cholecystokinin-2 receptor polymorphism in type 2 diabetes and obese patients. Pharmacogenetics 2002; 12:23-30
- 262. de Krom M, van der Schouw YT, Hendriks J, Ophoff RA, van Gils CH, Stolk RP, et al. Common genetic variations in CCK, leptin, and leptin receptor genes are associated with specific human eating patterns. Diabetes 2007; 56:276-280
- 263. Dirksen C, Jorgensen NB, Bojsen-Moller KN, Kielgast U, Jacobsen SH, Clausen TR, et al. Gut hormones, early dumping and resting energy expenditure in patients with good and poor weight loss response after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Int J Obes 2013; 37:1452-1459
- 264. Jacobsen SH, Olesen SC, Dirksen C, Jorgensen NM, Bojsen-Moller KN, Kielgast U, et al. Changes in gastrointestinal hormone

responses, insulin sensitivity, and beta-cell function within 2 weeks after gastric bypass in non-diabetic subjects. Obes Surg 2012; 22: 1084-1096

- 265. Peterli R, Steinert RE, Woelnerhanssen B, Peters T, Christoffel-Courtin C, Gass M, et al. Metabolic and hormonal changes after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass and sleeve gastrectomy: a randomized, prospective trial. Obes Surg 2012; 22: 740-748
- 266. Kellum JM, Kuemmerle JF, O'Dorisio TM, Rayfort P, Martin D, Engle K, et al. Gastrointestinal hormone responses to meals before and after gastric bypass and vertical banded gastroplasty. Ann Surg 1990; 211:763-71
- 267. Rehfeld JF. Incretin physiology beyond glucagon-like peptide 1 and glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide: cholecystokinin and gastrin peptides. Acta Physiol (Oxf) 2001; 201:405-11
- Mumphrey MB, Patterson LM, Zheng H, Berthoud HR. Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery increases number but not density of CCK-, GLP-1-, 5-HT-, neurotensin-expressing enteroendocrine cells in rats. Neurogastroenterol Motil 2013; 25;c70-c79
- Ockander L, Hedenbro JL, Rehfeld JF, Sjolund K. Jejunoileal bypass changes the duodenal cholecystokinin and somatostatin cell density. Obes Surg 2003; 13:584-90
- 270. Chan CB, Buchan AM, Green KA, Pederson RA. The effect of jejunoileal bypass (JIB) in the obese Zucker rat on a sub-group of enteroendocrine cells. Int J Obes 1987; 11:284-90
- 271. Nadreau E, Baraboi ED, Samson P, Blouin A, Hould FS, Marceau P, et al. Effects of the biliopancreatic diversion on energy balance in the rat. Int J Obes (Lond) 2006; 30:419-29
- 272. le Roux CW, Borg C, Wallis K, Vincent RP, Bueter M, Goodlad R, et al. Gut hypertrophy after gastric bypass is associated with increased glucagon-like peptide 2 and intestinal crypt cell proliferation. Ann Surg 2010; 252:50-6
- 273. Lundgren M, Svensson M, Lindmark S, Renstrom F, Ruge R, Eriksson J. Fat cell enlargement is an independent marker of insulin resistance and "hyperleptinaemia". Diabetologia 2007; 50: 625-633

- 274. Shadid S, Jensen MD. Effects of pioglitazone versus diet and exercise on metabolic health and fat distribution in upper body obesity. Diabetes Care 2003; 26: 3148-3152
- 275. Fruhbeck G. Overview of adipose tissue and its role in obesity and metabolic disorders. Methods in Molecular Biology: Adipose Tissue Protocols. 2nd edition Yang K (Ed.). Humana Press 2008.
- 276. Frayn KN. Visceral fat and insulin resistance causative or correlative? Br J Nutr 2000; 83 (suppl. 1); S71-77
- 277. Yang L, Samarasinghe YP, Kane P, Amiel SA, Aylwin SJ. Visceral adiposity is closely correlated with neck circumference and represents a significant indicator of insulin resistance in WHO grade III obesity. Clin Endocrinol (Odf). 2010; 73:197-200
- 278. Bolinder J, Kager L, Ostman J, Arner P. Differences at the receptor and postreceptor levels between human omental and subcutaneous adipose tissue in the action of insulin on lipolysis. Diabetes 1983; 32: 117-123
- Maeda, K. et al. Analysis of an expression profile of genes in the human adipose tissue. Gene 1997; 190: 227–235
- 280. Svedberg J, Bjorntorp P, Smith U, Lonnroth P. Free-fatty acid inhibition of insulin binding, degradation, and action in isolated rat hepatocytes. Diabetes 1990; 39: 570-574
- 281. Boden F. Free fatty acids (FFA), a link between obesity and insulin resistance. Front Biosci 1998; 3: D169-D175
- 282. Buren J, Lindmark S, Renstrom F, Eriksson JW. In vitro reversal of hyperglycaemic normalizes insulin action in fat cells from type 2 diabetes patients: is cellular insulin resistance caused by glucotoxicity in vivo? Metabolism 2003; 52: 239-245
- 283. McLaughlin T, Sherman A, Tsao P, Gonzalez O, Yee G, Lamendola C, Reaven GM, et al. Enhanced proportion of small adipose cells in insulin-resistance vs insulin-sensitive obese individuals implicates impaired adipogenesis. Diabetologia 2007; 50: 1707-1715
- 284. Moitra J. Life without white fat: a transgenic mouse. Genes Dev 1998; 12: 3168-3181

- Agarwal AK, Garg A. Congenital generalized lipodystrophy: significance of triglyceride biosynthetic pathways. Trends Endocrinol Metab 2003; 14: 214-221
- 286. Montague CT, O'Rahilly S. The perils of portliness: causes and consequences of visceral adiposity. Diabetes 2000; 49:883–888
- 287. Kim SP, Ellmerer M, Van Citters GW, Bergman RN. Primacy of hepatic insulin resistance in the development of the metabolic syndrome induced by an isocaloric moderate-fat diet in the dog. Diabetes 2003; 52: 2453–2460
- 288. Johannson L, Roos M, Kullberg J, Weis J, Ahlstrom H, Sundbom M, et al. Lipid mobilization following Roux-en-Y gastric bypass examined by magnetic resonance imaging and spectroscopy. Obes Surg 2008; 18:1297-1304
- Kotronen A, Westerbacka J, Bergholm R, Pietilainen KH, Yki-Jarvinen H. Liver fat in the metabolic syndrome. J Clin Endocrin Metab 2007; 92: 3490-3497
- 290. Seppala–Lindroos A, Vehkavaara S, Hakkinen AM, Goto T, Westerbacka J, Sovijarvi A, et al. Fat accumulation in the liver is associated with defects in insulin suppression of glucose production and serum free fatty acids independent of obesity in normal men. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2002; 87: 3023-3028
- 291. Tiikkainen M, Tamminen M, Hakkinen AM, Bergholm R, Vehkavaara S, Halavaara J, et al. Liver-fat accumulation and insulin resistance in obese women with previous gestational diabetes. Obes Res 2002; 10:859-867
- 292. Utzschneider KM, Kahn SE. The role of insulin resistance in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2006; 91: 4753-4761
- Rector RS, Thyfault JP, Wei Y, Ibdah JA. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and the metabolic syndrome: an update. World J Gastroenterol 2008; 14: 185-192
- 294. Rodbell M. The role of hormone receptors and GTP-regulatory proteins in membrane transduction. Nature 1980; 284: 17-22
- 295. Merida E, Delgado E, Molina LM, Villanueva-penacarrillo ML, Valverde I. Presence of glucagon and glucagon-like peptide-1 (7-36)

amide receptors in solubilised membranes of human adipose tissue. J Clin Endo Metab 1993; 77: 1654-1657

- 296. Ebert R, Creutzfeldt W. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide. Clin Gastroenterol 1980; 9: 69-698
- 297. Castan I, Valet P, Larroy D, Voisin T, Remaury A, Daviaud D, Laburthe M, Lafontan M. Distribution of PYY receptors in human fat cells: an antilipolytic system alongside the alpha 2-adrenergic system. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 1993; 265: E74-E80
- 298. Gnanapavan S, Kola B, Bustin SA, Morris DG, McGee P, Fairclough P, et al. The tissue distribution of the mRNA of Ghrelin and subtypes of its receptor, GHS-R, in humans. J Clin Endo Metab 2002; 87: 2988
- 299. Kos K, Harte L, O'Hare PJ, Kumar S, McTernan PG. Ghrelin and the differential regulation of des-acyl (DSG) and oct-anoyl Ghrelin (OTG) in human adipose tissue (AT). Clin Endo 2009; 70: 383-389
- 300. Dewulf EM, Ge Q, Bindels L, Sohet FM, Cani PD, Brichard SM, et
 al. Evaluation of the relationship between GPR43 and adiposity in
 human. Nutr Metab 2013; 10:11
- 301. Ichimura A, Hirasawa A, Poulain-Godefroy O, Bonnefond A, Hara
 T, Yengo L, et al. Dysfunction of lipid sensor GPR120 leads to obesity in both mouse and human. Nature 2012; 483:350-254
- 302. Arner P, Hellstrom L, Wahrenberg H, Bronnegard M. Betaadrenoceptor expression in human fat cells from different regions. J Clin Invest 1990; 86: 1595-1600
- 303. Rudovich N, Kaiser S, Engeli S, Osterhoff M, Gogebakan O, Bluder M, et al. GIP receptor mRNA expression in different fat tissue depots in postmenopausal non-diabetic women. Reg Pept 2007; 142: 2861-2870
- 304. Abel ED, Peroni O, Fim JK, Kim YB, Boss O, Hadro E, et al. Adipose-selective targeting of the GLUT4 gene impaires insulin action in muscle and liver. Nature 2001; 409: 729-733
- 305. Arner P. 8. The role of adipose tissue in lipoprotein metabolism.Atherosclerosis 1999; 146 Suppl. 1: S11-S12
- 306. Trayhurn P, Wood IS. Adipokines: inflammation and the pleiotropic role of white adipose tissue. Br J Nutr 2004; 92:347–55

- 307. Coppack SW. Pro-inflammatory cytokines and adipose tissue.Proc Nutr Soc. 2001; 60:349 –56
- 308. Klaus S. Adipose tissue as a regulator of energy balance. CurrDrug Targets. 2004; 5:241–50
- 309. Rajala MW, Scherer PE. Minireview: the adipocyte–at the crossroads of energy homeostasis, inflammation, and atherosclerosis. Endocrinology 2003; 144:3765–73
- 310. Trayhurn P. Adipocyte biology. Obesity reviews 2007; 8 (Suppl.1):41-44
- 311. Langin D. Adipose tissue lipolysis as a metabolic pathway to define pharmacological strategies against obesity and the metabolic syndrome. Pharmacol Res 2006; 53: 482-491
- 312. Havel PJ. Update on adipocyte hormones: regulation of energy balance and carbohydrate/lipid metabolism. Diabetes 2004; 53(Suppl1): S143-S151
- 313. Wajcchenberg BL, Giannella-Neto D, Silva MER, Santos RF. Dept-specific hormonal characteristics of sub-cutaneous and visceral adipose tissue and their relation to the metabolic syndrome. Horm Metab Res 2002; 34: 616-621
- 314. Giorgino F, Laviola L, Eriksson JW. Regional differences of insulin action in adipose tissue: insights from in vivo and in vitro studies. Acta Physiol Scand 2005; 183: 13-30
- 315. Stralfors P, Belfrage P. Phosphorylation of hormone-sensitive lipase by cyclic AMP-dependent protein kinase. J Biol Chem 1983; 258: 15146-15152
- 316. Hansen O, Johannson BW, Nilsson-Ehle P. Metabolic, electrocardiographic, and hemodynamic responses to increased circulation Adrenaline: effects of selective and non-selective Betaadrenoceptor blockade. Angiology 1990; 41: 175-188
- 317. Degerman E, Belfrage P, Manganiello VC. Structure, localization, and regulation of cGMP-inhibited phosphodiesterase (PDE3). J Biol Chem 1997; 272: 6823-6
- 318. Nicklas BJ, Rogus EM, Goldberg AP. Exercise blunts declines in lipolysis and fat oxidation after dietary-induced weight loss in obese older women. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 1997; 273: E149-E155

- 319. Cifuentes M, Albala C, Rojas CV. Difference in lipogenesis and lipolysis in obese and non-obese adult human adipocytes. Biol Res 2008; 41: 197-204
- 320. De Glisezinski I, Crampes F, Harant I, Berlan M, Hejinova J, Langin D, et al. Endurance training changes in lipolytic responsiveness of obese adipose tissue. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 1998; 275: E951-E956
- 321. Reynisdottir S, Dauzats M, Thorne A, Langin D. Comparison of Hormone-sensitive lipase activity in visceral and subcutaneous human adipose tissue. J Clin Endorinol Metab 1997; 82: 4162-4166
- 322. Tavernier G, Galitzky J, Valet P, Remaury A, Bouloumi A, Lafontan M, Langin D. Molecular mechanisms underlying regional variations of catecholamine-induced lipolysis in rat adipocytes. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 1995; 268: E1135-E1142
- 323. Tchernof A, Belanger C, Morisset AS, Christian R, Jacques M, Philippe L, et al. Regional differences in adipose tissue metabolism in women: minor effect of obesity and body fat distribution. Diabetes 2006; 55: 1353-1360
- 324. Mauriege P, Galitzky J, Belan M, Lafontan M. Heterogeneous distribution of beta- and alpha2-adrenoceptor binding sties in human fat cells from various depostis: functional consequences. Eur J Clin Invest 1987; 17: 156-165
- 325. Lonnqvist F, Krief S, Strosberg AD, Nyberg B, Emorine LJ, Arner
 P. Evidence for a functional 3-adrenergic receptor in man Br J Pharmacol 1993; 110: 929-936
- 326. Leibel RL, Edens NK, Fried SK. Physiologic basis for the control of body fat distribution in man. Annu Rev Nutr 1989; 9: 417-443
- 327. Zierath JR, Livingston KN, Thorne A, Bolinder J, Reynisdottir S, Lonnqvist F, et al. Regional difference in insulin inhibition of nonesterified fatty acid release from human adipocytes: relation to insulin receptor phosphorylation and intracellular signalling through the insulin receptor substrate-1 pathway. Diabetologica 1998; 41: 1343-1354
- 328. Lundgren M, Buren J, Ruge T, Myrnas T, Eriksson JW. Glucocorticoids down-regulate glucose uptake capacity and insulin-

signaling proteins in omental but not subcutaneous human adipocytes. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2004; 89: 2989-2997

- 329. Jensen MD, Haymond MW, Gerich JE, Cryer PE, Miles JM. Lipolysis during fasting. Decreased suppression by insulin and increased stimulation by epinephrine. J. Clin Invest. 1987; 79: 207-213
- 330. Arner P, Bolinder J, Engfeldt P, Ostman J. The antilipolytic effect of insulin in human adipose tissue in obesity, diabetes mellitus, hyperinsulinaemia, and starvation. Metabolism 1981; 30: 753:60
- 331. Degerman E, Mith CJ, Tornqvist H, Vasta V, Belfrage P, Manganiello. Evidence that insulin and isoprenaline activate the cGMPinhibited low-Km cAMP phosphodiesterase in rat fal cells by phosphorylation. PNAS 1990; 87: 533-537
- 332. Belfrage P, Fredrikson G, Nilsson NO, Stralfors P. Regulation of adipose-tissue lipolysis by phosphorylation of hormone-sensitive lipase. Int J Obes 1981; 5:635-641
- 333. Stralfors P, Honnor RC. Insulin-induced dephosphorylation of hormone-sensitive lipase. Correlation with lipolysis and cMP-dependent protein kinase activity. Eur J Biochem 1989; 182:379-385
- 334. Hagstrom-Toft E, Bolinder J, Eriksson S, Arner P. Role of phosphodiesterase III in the antilipolytic effect of insulin in vivo. Diabetes 1995; 44:1170-1175
- 335. Okada T. Essential role of phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase in insulininduced glucose transport and antilipolsis in rat adipocytes. Studies with a selective inhibitor wortmannin. J Biol Chem 1994; 269:3568-3573
- 336. Van Harmelen V, Reynisdottir S, Cianflone K, Degerman E, Hoffstedt J, Nilsell K, Sniderman A, Arner P. Mechanisms involved in the regulation of free fatty acid release from isolated human fat cells by acylation-stimulating protein and insulin. J Biol Chem 1999; 274:18243-18251
- 337. Laviola L, Perrini S, Cignarelli A, Natalicchio A, Leonardini A, De Stefano F, Cuscito M, et al. Insulin signalling in human visceral and subcutaneous adipose tissue in vivo. Diabetes 2006; 55:952-961
- Beck B, Max JP. Hypersensitivity of adipose tissue to GIP action in the obese Zucker rat. Cell Mol Bio 1987; 33:555-62

- 339. McIntosh CHS, Bremsak I, Lynn FC, Gill R, Hinke R, Gelling C, et al. Glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide stimulation of lipolysis in differentiated 3T3-L1 cells: wortmannin-sensitive inhibition by insulin. Endocrinol 1999; 140:398-404
- 340. Dawson JM, Greathead HM, Sessions VA, Tye FM, Buttery PJ. Effect of GIP on bovine fat metabolism. Comp Biochem Physiol 1999; 123:79-88
- Starich GH, Bar RS, Mazzaferri EL. GIP increases insulin receptor affinity and cellular sensitivity in adipocytes. Am J Physiol 1985; 249:E603-7
- 342. Kim SJ, Nian C, McIntosh CHS. Activation of lipoprotein lipase by glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide in adipocytes. J Biol Chem 2007: 282; 8557-8567
- 343. Valverde I, Morales M, Clemente F, Lopez-Delgado MI, Delgado
 E, Perea A, Villanueva-Penacarrillo ML. Glucagon-like peptide 1: a potent glycogenic hormone FEBS Lett 1994; 349:313-316
- 344. Villanueva-Penacarrillo ML, Alcantara AI, Clemente F, Delgado E, Valverde I. Potent glycogenic effect of GLP-1 (7-36) amide in rat skeletal muscle. Diabetologia 1994; 37:1163-1166
- 345. Sancho V, Trigo MV, Martin-Duce A, Gonzalez N, et al. Effect of GLP-1 on D-glucose transport, lipolysis and lipogenesis in adipocytes of obese subjects. International J Molecular Med 2006; 17:1133-1137
- 346. Valet P, Berlan M, Beauwille M, Crampes F, Montastruc JL, Lafontan M. Neuropeptide Y and peptide YY inhibit lipolysis in human and dog fat cells through a pertussis toxin-sensitive G protein. J Clin Invest 1990; 85:291-295
- 347. Rouot B, Carrette J, Lafontan M, Lan Tran P, Fehrentz JA, Obckaert J, Toutant M. The adipocyte G0 alpha-immunoreactive polypeptide is different from the alpha subunit of the brain G0 protein. Biochem J 1989; 260:307-310
- 348. Serradeil-Le Gal C, Lafontan M, Raufaste D, Pouzet B, Casellas
 P, et al Characteriation of NPY receptors controlling lipolysis and leptin secretion in human adipocytes. FEBS Lett 2000; 475:150-156

- 349. Labelle M, Boulanger Y, Fournier A, St-Pierre S, Savard R. Tissue-specific regulation of fat cell lipolysis by NPY in 6-OHDA-treated rats Peptides 1997; 18:801-808
- 350. Ishihara A, Kanatani A, Okada M, Hidaka M, Tanaka T, Mashiko S, et al. Blockade of body weight gain and plasma corticosterone levels in Zucker fatty rats sing an orally active neuropeptide Y Y1 antagonist. Br J Pharm 2002; 136:341-346
- 351. Vertergaard ET, Gormsen LC, Jessen N, Lund S, Hansen TK, Moller N, et al. Ghrelin infusion in humans induces acute insulin resistance and lipolysis independent of growth hormone signaling. Diabetes 2008; 57:3205-3210
- 352. Muccioli G, Pons N, Ghe C, Catapano F, Granata R, Ghigo E. Ghrelin and des-acyl Ghrelin both inhibit isoproterenol-induced lipolysis in rat adipocytes via a non-type 1a growth hormone sectetagogue receptor. Eur J Pharm 2004; 498:27-35
- Choi K, Roh SG, Hong YH, Shrestha YB, Hishikawa D, Chen C, et al. Ghrelin stimulates adipogenesis in rat. Endocrinology 2003; 144:754-759
- 354. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2006) Obesity CG43. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
- 355. Matthews DR, Hosker JP, Rudenski AS, Naylor BA, Treacher DF, Turner RC. HOMA: insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. Diabetologia 1985; 28:412-419
- Definition and diagnosis of diabetes mellitus and intermediate hyperglycaemia. WHO/IDF consultation 2006 (NLM classification: WK810)
- 357. Yokoyama H, Komatsu M, Emoto M, Tahara H, Fujiwara S, Shoji T, et al. Quantitative insulin sensitivity check index and the reciprocal index of HOMA in normal range weight and moderately obese type 2 diabetic patients. Diabetes Care 2003; 26:2426-2432
- 358. Levy JC, Matthews DR, Hermans MP: Correct homeostasis model assessment (HOMA) evaluation uses the computer program (Letter). Diabetes Care 1998; 21:2191-2192

- Rudenski AS, Matthews DR, Levy JC, Turner RC. Understanding
 "insulin resistance": both glucose resistance and insulin resistance are
 required to model human diabetes. Metabolism 1991; 40:908-917
- Wallace TM, Levy JC, Matthews DR. Use and abuse of HOMA modeling. Diabetes Care 2004; 27:1487-1495
- Definition, diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus and its complications. Part 1: Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. WHO/NCD/NCS/99.2
- 362. Ward S, Lloyd Jones M, Pandor A, Holmes M, Ara R, Ryan A, et al. A systematic review and economic evaluation of statins for the prevention of coronary events. Health Technol Assess 2007; 11:1-160
- 363. American College of Endocrinology position statement on inpatient diabetes and metabolic control. TACETFI Diabetes Metabolic Control. Endocrine Practice 2004
- Podnos YD, Jiminez JC, Wilson SE Stevens M, Nguyen NT.
 Complications after laparoscopic gastric bypass. Arch Surg 2003; 138:957-961
- 365. DeMaria EJ, Sugerman HJ, Kellum JM, Meador JG, Wolfe LG. Results of 281 consecutive total laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypasses to treat morbid obesity. Ann Surg 2002; 235;640-647
- 366. Nguyen NT, Goldman C, Rosenquist CJ, Arango A, Cole CJ, Lee SJ, et al.Laparoscopic versus open gastric bypass: a randomized study of outcomes, quality of life, and costs. Ann Surg 2001; 234:279-291
- 367. O'Rourke RW, Andrus J, Diggs BS, Scholz M, McConnell DB, Deveney CW. Perioperative morbidity associated with bariatric surgery. Arch Surg 2006; 141:262-268
- 368. International NPUAP-EPUAP Pressure ulcer classification system. European pressure ulcer advisory panel and national pressure ulcer advisory panel. Treatment of pressure ulcers: Quick reference guide. Washington DC: National Pressure Ulcer Advisory Panel; 2009. www.epuap.org/guidelines/Final Quick Treatment.pdf
- 369. Martin RCG, Brennan MF, Jaques DP. Quality of complication reporting in the surgical literature. Ann Surg 2002; 235:803-813
- 370. Savage AP, Adrian TE, Carolan G, Chatterjee VK, Bloom SR. Effects of peptide YY (PYY) on mouth to caecum intestinal transit time

and on the rate of gastric emptying in healthy volunteers. Gut 1987; 28;166-70

- Carswell KA, Lee MJ, Fried SK. Culture of isolated human adipocytes and isolated adipose tissue. Methods Mol Biol 2012; 806:203-214
- 372. Sjostrom, Bjorntorp P, Vrana J. Microscopic fat cell size measurements on frozen-cut adipose tissue in comparison with automatic determinations of osmium-fixed fat cells. J Lipid Res 1071; 12:521-530
- 373. Viswanadha S, Londos C. Determination of lipolysis in isolated primary adipocytes. Methods in molecular biology: Adipose Tissue Protocols. 2nd edition (Yang K (Ed.): Humana Press 2008
- 374. Dole VP. A relation between non-esterified fatty acids in plasma and the metabolism of glucose. J Clin Invest 1956; 35:150-154
- 375. Di Giralomo M, Mendlinger S, Fertig JW. A simple method to determine fat cell size and number in four mammalian species. Am J Physiol 1971; 221: 850-858
- 376. Honnor RC, Dhillon GS, Londos C. cAMP-dependent protein kinase and lipolysis in rat adipocytes 1. Cell preparation, manipulation and predictability in behaviour. J Biol Chem 1985; 260:15122-15129
- 377. Honnor RC, Dhillon GS, Londos C. cAMP-dependent protein kinase and lipolysis in rat adipocytes. II. Definition of steady-state relationship with lipolytic and antilipolytic modulators. J Biol Chem 1985; 260:15130-15138
- Wardzala LJ, Simpson IA, Rechler MM, Cushman SW. J Biol Chem 1984; 259: 8378-8383
- Butcher RW, Sneyd JGT, Park CR, Sutherland EW. J Biol Chem1966; 241:1651-1653
- 380. Park CR, Sneyd GT, Corbin JD, Jefferson LS, Exton JH. Diabetes, Proceedings of the 6th congress of the International Diabetes Foundation (Ostman J, and Milner RDG, eds) pp. 5-15, Excerpta Medica Foundation, Amsterdam 1969
- Butcher RW. Effects of lipolytic and antilipolytic substances on Adenosine 3',5'-monophosphate levels in isolated fat cells. J Biol Chem 1968; 243: 1705-1712

- 382. Londos C, Honnor RC, Dhillon GS. cAMP-dependent protein kinase and lipolysis in rat adipocytes. III. Multiple modes of insulin regulation of lipolysis and regulation of insulin responses by adenylate cyclase regulators. J Biol Chem 1985; 260: 15139-15145
- 383. Laurell S, Tibbling G. An enzymatic fluorometric micromethod for the determination of glycerol. Clin Chmi Acta 1966; 13: 317-322
- 384. Boobis LH, Maughan RJ. A simple on-step enzymatic fluorometric method for the determination of glycerol in 20ul of plasma. Clin Chim Acta 1983; 132: 173-179
- 385. Pournaras DJ, Osborne A, Hawkins SC, Vincent RP, Mahon D, Ewings P, et al. Remission of type 2 diabetes after gastric bypass and banding. Mechanisms and 2 year outcomes. Ann Surg 2010; 252:966-971
- 386. Le Floch JP, Escuyer P, Baudin E, Baudon D, Perlemuter L. Blood glucose area under the curve. Methodological aspects. Diabetes Care 1990; 13:172-175
- 387. Nauck MA, Homberger F, Siegel EG, Allen RC, Eaton RP, Ebert R, Creutzfeldt W. Incretin effects of increasing glucose loads in man calculated from venous insulin and C-peptide responses. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1986; 63:492-498
- Mueckler M. Facilitative glucose transporters. Eur J Biochem 1994; 219:713-725
- 389. Suzuki I, Kono T. Evidence that insulin causes translocation of glucose transport activity to the plasma membrane from an intracellular storage site. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1980; 77:2542-2545
- 390. Charron MJ, Brosius FD, Alper SL, Lodish HF. A glucose transport protein expressed predominantly in insulin-responsive tissues. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1989; 86:2535-2539
- 391. Kaiser N, Sasson S, Feener EP, Boukobza-Vardi N, Higashi S,
 Moller DE, et al. Differential regulation of glucose transport and
 transporters by glucose in vascular endothelial and smooth muscle cells.
 Diabetes 1993; 42:80-89
- 392. Heilig CW, Concepcion LA, Riser BL, Freytag SO, Zhu M, CortesP. Overexpression of glucose transporters in rat mesangial cells cultures

in a normal glucose milieu mimics the diabetic phenotype. J Clin Invest 1995; 96:1802-1814

- 393. Brownlee M. Banting Lecture 2004: The pathobiology of diabetic complications, a unifying mechanism. Diabetes 2005; 54:1615-1625
- 394. Diabetes Mellitus: a fundamental and clinical text. 3rd ed. LeRoith
 D, Taylor SI, Olefsky JM, Eds. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins
 2004:1441-1457
- 395. Keidar A. Bariatric Surgery for type 2 diabetes reversal: the risks.Diabetes Care 2011; 34:S361-S266
- Buchwald H, Estok R, Fahrbach K, et al. Weight and type 2
 diabetes after bariatric surgery: systematic review and meta-analysis. Am
 J Med 2009; 122:248-256
- 397. American Diabetes Association. Standards of medical care in diabetes 2011. Diabetes Care 2011; 34(Suppl 1):S11-S61
- 398. El Kenz H, Bergmann P. Evaluation of ICL assays for the measurement of insulin and C-peptide using the ADVIA Centaur. Clinical Laboratory 2004; 50:171-174
- 399. Reaven GM. Role of insulin resistance in human disease.Diabetes 1988; 37:1595-1607
- 400. Perley M, Kipnis DM. Plasma insulin responses to glucose and tolbutamide or normal weight and obese diabetic and nondiabetic subjects. Diabetes 1966; 15:867-874
- 401. Polonsky KS, Given BD Van Cauter E. Twenty-four hour profiles and patterns of insulin secretion in normal and obese subjects. J Clin Invest 1988; 81:442-448
- 402. Liang H, Tantiwong P, Sriwijitkamol A, Shanmugasundaram K, Mohan S, Espinoza S, et al. Effect of sustained reduction in plasma free fatty acid concentration on insulin signalling and inflammation in skeletal muscle from human subjects. J Physiol 2013; 591:2897-2909
- Carpentier A, Mittelman SD, Lamarche B, Bergman RN, Giacca A, Lewis GF, et al. Acute enhancement of insulin secretion by FFA in humans is lost with prolonged FFA elevation. Am J Physiol 1999;
 276:E1055-E1066

- 404. Randle PJ, Garland PB, Hales CN, Newsholme EA. The glucose fatty-acid cycle: its role in insulin sensitivity and the metabolic disturbances of diabetes mellitus. Lancet 1963i; 785-789
- 405. Shulman GI. Cellular mechanisms of insulin resistance. J Clin Invest 2000; 106:171-176
- 406. Rubino F, Kaplan LM, Schauer PR, Cummings DE. The Diabetes surgery summit consensus conference. Recommendations for the evaluation and use of gastrointestinal surgery to treat type 2 diabetes mellitus. Ann Surg 2010; 251:399-405
- 407. Hofso D, Nordstrand N, Johnson LK, Karlsen TI, Hager H,
 Jenssen T, et al. Obesity-related cardiovascular risk factors after weight
 loss: a clinical trial comparing gastric bypass surgery and intensive
 lifestyle intervention. Eur J Endocrinol 2010; 163:735-745
- 408. Carnevale Schianca GP, Rossi A, Sainaghi PP, Maduli E, Bartoli
 E. The significance of impaired fasting glucose versus impaired glucose tolerance. Importance of insulin secretion and resistance. Diab Care 2003; 317:371-5
- 409. Strumvoll M, Fritsche A, Haring H. The OGTT as test for beta cell function? Eur J Clin Invest 2001;31:380-1
- 410. Morinigo R, Moize V, Musri M, Lacy AM, Navarro S, Marin JL, et al. Glucagon-like peptide-1, peptide YY, hunger, and satiety after gastric bypass surgery in morbidly obese subjects. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2006;91:1735-1740
- Hedberg J, Hedenstrom H, Karlsson FA, Eden-Engstrom B,
 Sundbom M. Gastric emptying and postprandial PYY response after
 biliopancreatic diversion with duodenal switch. Obes Surg 2011;21:609 615
- 412. Horowitz M, Cook DJ, Collins PJ, Harding PE, Hooper MJ, Walsh JF, et al. Measurement of gastric emptying after gastric bypass surgery using radionuclides. Br J Surg 1982;69:655-657
- 413. Falken Y, Hellstrom PM, Holst JJ, Naslund E. Changes in glucose homeostasis after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery for obesity at day three, two months, and one year after surgery: role of gut peptides. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2001; 96:2227-35

- 414. Czupryniak L, Pawlowski M, Szymanski D, Olejniczak W, Saryusz-Wolska M, Loba J, et al. Plasma glucose after stomach or jejunum glucose infusion in Roux-en-Y gastric bypass patients – a possible implication for early satiety mechanism. Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes. 2001; 119:186-9
- 415. Calles-Escandon J, Robbins DC. Loss of early phase of insulin release in humans impairs glucose tolerance and blunts thermic effect of glucose. Diabetes 1987; 36:1167-1172
- 416. Del Prato S. Loss of early insulin secretion leads to postprandial hyperglycaemia. Diabetologia 2003; 46:M2-8
- 417. Gerich JE. The genetic basis of type 2 diabetes mellitus: impaired insulin secretion versus impaired insulin sensitivity. Endocr Rev 1998; 19:491-503
- 418. Kahn SE, Prigeon RL, Schwartz RS, Fujimoto WY, Knopp RH, Brunzell JD, Porte D, Jr. Obesity, body fat distributions, insulin sensitivity and islet beta-cell function as explanations for metabolic diversity. J Nutr 2001; 131:354S-360S
- 419. Fajans SS, Conn JW. Prediabetes, subclinical diabetes, and latent clinical diabetes: interpretation, diagnosis and treatment. In: Leibel BS, Wrenshall GA, editors. On the nature and treatment of diabetes: 1965.p641-56. New York; National Diabetes Data
- 420. Tschritter O, Fritsche A, Shirkavand F, Machicao F, Haring H, Strumvoll M. Assessing the shape of the glucose curve during an oral glucose tolerance test. Diab Care 2003; 26:1026-33
- 421. Bartoli E, Fra GP, Carnevale Schianca GP. The oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) revisited. Eur J Int Med 2011; 22:8-12
- 422. Abdul-Ghani MA, Williams K, De Fronzo R, Stern M. Risk of progression to type 2 diabetes based on relationship between post-load plasma glucose and fasting plasma glucose. Diab Care 2006; 29:1613-8
- 423. Cheng LS, Salmon YM, Chen C. A double-blind, randomised, cross-over study comparing the 50g OGTT and the 75g OGTT for pregnant women in the third trimester. Ann Acad Med Singapore 1992; 21:769-72
- 424. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diab Care 2010;33(Suppl 1):S62-9

- 425. Monnier L, Lapinski H, Colette C. Contributions of fasting and postprandial plasma glucose increments to the overall diurnal hyperglycaemia of type 2 diabetic patients: variations with increasing levels of HbA(1c). Diab Care 2003;26:881-5
- Lee WJ, Ser KH, Lee YC, Tsou JJ, Chen SC, Chen JC.
 Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y vs. mini-gastric bypass for the treatment of morbid obesity: a 10-year experience. Obes Surg 2012; 22:1827-1834
- 427. The Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study
 Group. Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes. NEJM 2008; 358:2545-2559
- 428. Schauer PR, Kashwap SR, Wolski K, Brethauer SA, Kirwan JP, Pothier CE, et al. Bariatric surgery versus intensive medical therapy in obese patients with diabetes. N Engl J Med 2012; 366:1567-1576
- Schauer PR, Bhatt DL, Kirwan JP, Wolski K, Brethauer SA,
 Navaneethan SD, et al. Bariatric surgery versus intensive medical
 therapy for diabetes 3-year outcomes. N Engl J Med 2014; 370:2002-2013
- 430. Ribaric G, Buchwald JN, McGlennon TW. Diabetes and weight in comparative studies of bariatric surgery vs conventional medical therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Obes Surg 2014; 24:437-455
- Dixon JB, Chuang LM, Chong K, Chen SC, Lambert GW,
 Stranznicky NE, et al. Predicting the glycemic response to gastric bypass
 surgery in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2013; 36:20-26
- 432. Adams TD, Davidson LE, Litwin SE, Kolotkin RL, LaMonte MJ, Pendleton RC, et al. Health benefits of gastric bypass surgery after 6 years. JAMA 2012; 308:1122-1131
- Brethauer SA, Aminiam A, Romero-Talamas H, Batayyah E,
 Mackey J, Kennedy L, Kennedy L, et al. Can diabetes be surgically cured?: long-term metabolic effects of bariatric surgery in obese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Ann Surg 2013; 258:628-637
- 434. Sjostrom L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, Ahlin S, Andersson-Assarsson J, Anveden A, et al. Association of bariatric surgery with longterm remission of type 2 diabetes and with microvascular and macrovascular complications. JAMA 2014; 311:2297-2304

- 435. Pereira JA, Lazarin MA, Pareja JC, de Souza A, Muscelli E. Insulin resistance in non-diabetic morbidly obese patients: effect of bariatric surgery. Obes Res 2003; 11:1495-1501
- 436. Turner RC, Holman RR. Insulin rather than glucose homeostasis in the pathophysiology of diabetes. Lancet 1976;1:1272-4
- 437. Kashyap SR, Daud S, Kelly KR, Gastaldelli A, Win H, Brethauer S, et al. Acute effects of gastric bypass versus gastric restrictive surgery on [beta]-cell function and insulinotropic hormones in severely obese patients with type 2 diabetes. Int J Obes (Lond) 2010; 34:462-471
- 438. Lima MM, Pareja JC, Alegre SM, Geloneze SR, Kahn SE, Astiarraga BD, et al. Acute effect of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass on wholebody insulin sensitivity: a study with the euglycemic-hyperinsulinemic clamp. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2010; 95:3871-3875
- 439. Campos GM, Rabl C, Peeva S, Ciovica R, Rao M, Schwarz JM, et al. Improvement in peripheral glucose uptake after gastric bypass surgery is observed only after substantial weight loss has occurred and correlates with the magnitude of weight loss. J Gastrointest Surg 2010; 14:15-23
- 440. Dunn JP, Abumrad NN, Breitmas I, Marks-Shulman PA, Flynn CR, Jabbour K, et al. Hepatic and peripheral insulin sensitivity and diabetes remission at 1 month after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery in patients randomized to omentectomy. Diabetes Care 2012; 35:137-142
- 441. Camastra S, Gastaldelli A, Mari A, Bonuccelli S, Scartabelli G, Frascerra S, et al. Early and longer term effects of gastric bypass surgery on tissue-specific insulin sensitivity and beta cell function in morbidly obese patients with and without type 2 diabetes. Diabetologia. 2011; 54:2093-102
- 442. Ash S, Reeves MM, Yeo S, Morrison G, Carey D, Capra S. Effect of intensive dietetic interventions on weight and glycemic control in overweight men with type II diabetes: a randomised trial. Int J Obes 2003; 27:797-802
- 443. Jazet IM, Pijl H, Frolich M, Romijn JA, Meinders AE. Two days of a very low calorie diet reduces endogenous glucose production in obese type 2 diabetic patients despite the withdrawal of blood glucose-lowering therapies including insulin. Metabolism 2005; 54:705-712

- 444. Isbell JM, Tamboli RA, Hansen EN, Saliba J, Dunn JP, Phillips SE, et al. The importance of caloric restriction in the early improvements in insulin sensitivity after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Diabetes Care 2010; 33:1438-1442
- 445. Wing RR, Blair EH, Bononi P, Marcus MD, Watanabe R, Bergman RN. Caloric restriction per se is a significant factor in improvements in glycemic control and insulin sensitivity during weight loss in obese NIDDM patients. Diabetes Care 1994; 17:30-36
- 446. Benaiges D, Flores Le-Roux JA, Pedro-Botet J, Chillaron JJ, Renard M, Parri A, et al. Sleeve gastrectomy and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass are equally effective in correcting insulin resistance. Int J Surg 2013; 11:309-313
- 447. Plum L, Ahmed L, Febres G, Bessler M, Inabnet W, Kunreuther E, et al. Comparison of glucostatic parameters after Hypocaloric diet or bariatric surgery and equivalent weight loss. Obesity 2011; 19:2149-2157
- 448. Delarue J, Magnan C. Free fatty acids and insulin resistance. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care 2007; 10:142-148
- 449. He B, Piao D, Yu C, Wang Y, Han P. Amelioration in hepatic insulin sensitivity by reduced hepatic lipid accumulation at short-term after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery in type 2 diabetic rats. Obes Surg 2013; 23:2033-2041
- 450. Ravikumar B, Gerrard J, Dalla Man C, Firbank MJ, Lane A, English PT, et al. Pioglitazone decreases fasting and postprandial endogenous glucose production in proportion to decrease in hepatic triglyceride content. Diabetes 2008; 57:2288-2295
- 451. Perseghin G, Bonfanti R, Magni S, Lattuada G, De Cobelli F, Canu T, et al. Insulin resistance and whole body energy homeostasis in obese adolescents with fatty liver disease. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2006; 291:E697-E703
- 452. Gastaldelli A, Cusi K, Pattiti M, Hardies J, Miyazaki Y, Berria R, et al. Relationship between hepatic/visceral fat and hepatic insulin resistance in nondiabetic and type 2 diabetes subjects. Gastroenterology 2007; 133:496-506

- 453. D'Adamo E, Cali AM, Weiss R, Santoro N, Pierpont B, Northrup V, et al. Central role of fatty liver in the pathogenesis of insulin resistance in obese adolescents. Diabetes Care 2010; 33:1817-1822
- 454. Perersen KF, Dufour S, Befroy D, Lehrke M, Hendler RE, Shulman GI. Reversal of non-alcoholic hypatic steatosis, hepatic insulin resistance, and hyperglycemia by moderate weight reduction in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes 2005; 54:603-608
- 455. Tiikkainen M, Bergholm R, Vehkavaara S, Rissanen A, Hakkinen AM, Taminen M, Teramo K, Yki-Jarvinen H. Effects of identical weight loss on body composition and features of insulin resistance in obese women with high and low liver fat content. Diabetes 2003; 52:701-707
- 456. Kirk E, Reeds DN, Finck BN, Mayurranjan SM, Patterson BW,
 Klein S. Dietary fat and carbohydrates differentially alter insulin sensitivity
 during caloric restriction. Gastroenterology 2009; 136:1552-1560
- 457. Gannon MC, Nuttal FQ, Westpahal SA, Fang S, Ercan-Fang N. Acute metabolic response to high-carbohydrate, high-starch meals compared with moderate-carbohydrate, low-starch meals in subjects with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 1998; 21;1619-1626
- 458. Pearce KI, Noakes M, KeoghJ, Clifton PM. Affect of carbohydrate distribution on postprandial glycose peaks with the use of continuous glucose monitoring in type 2 diabetes. Am J Clin Nutr 2008; 87:638-644
- 459. Ullrich J, Ernst B, Wilms B, Thurnheer M, Schultes B. Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery reduces hedonic hunger and improves dietary habits in severely obese subjects. Obes Surg 2013; 23:50-55
- 460. Jenkins DJA, Leeds AR, Gassull MA, Cochet B, Alberti GMM. Decrease in postprandial insulin and glucose concentrations by guar and pectin. Ann Int Med 1977; 86:1-20
- 461. Seltzer HS, Allen EW, Herron Jr AL, Brennan MT. Insulin secretion in response to glycemic stimulus: relation of delayed initial release to carbohydrate intolerance in mild diabetes mellitus. J Clin Invest 1967; 46:323-335
- 462. Dimitriadis G, Cryer P, Gerich J. Prolonged hyperglycemia during infusion of glucose and somatostatin impairs pancreatic A and B-cell responses to decrements in plasma glucose in normal man: evidence of induction of altered sensitivity to glucose. Diabetologia 1985; 28:63-69

- 463. Leahy JL, Cooper HE, Deal DA, Weir GC. Chronic hyperglycemia is associated with impaired glucose influence on insulin secretion. J Clin Invest 1986; 77:908-915
- 464. Pi-Sunyer FX. Weight and non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. Am J Clin Nutr 1996; 63(suppl):426S-9S
- 465. Vilsboll T, Krarup T, Madsbad S, Holst JJ. Both GLP-1 and GIP are insulinotropic at basal and postprandial glucose levels and contribute nearly equally to the incretin effect of a meal in healthy subjects. Regul Peptides 2003; 114:115-121
- 466. Willms B, Werner J, Holst JJ, Orskov C, Creutzfeldt W, Nauck MA. Gastric emptying, glucose responses, and insulin secretion after a liquid test meal: effects of exogenous glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1)-(7-36) amide in type 2 (noninsulin-dependent) diabetic patients. J Clin Endo Metab 2013; 81:327-332
- 467. Dirsksen C, Hansen DL, Madsbad S, Hvolris LE, Naver LS, Holst JJ, et al. Postprandial diabetic glucose tolerance is normalised by gastric bypass feeding as opposed to gastric feeding and is associated with exaggerated GLP-1 secretion: a case report. Diabetes Care 2010; 33:375-7
- 468. Gregor MF, Yang L, Fabbrini E, Mohammed BS, Eagon JC,
 Hotamisligil GS, et al. Endoplasmic reticulum stress is reduced in tissues
 of obese subjects after weight loss. Diabetes 2009; 58:693-700
- 469. Nannipieri M, Mari A, Anselmino M, Baldi S, Barsotti E, Guarino D, et al. The role of beta-cell function and insulin sensitivity in the remission of type 2 diabetes after gastric bypass surgery. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2011; 96:E1372-E1379
- 470. De Fronzo RA, Tobin JD, Andres R. Glucose clamp technique: a method for quantifying insulin secretion and resistance. Am J Physiol 1979; 237:E214-223
- 471. Dirksen C, Bojsen-Moller KN, Jorgensen NB, Jacobsen SH, Kristiansen VB, Naver LS, et al. Exaggerated release and preserved insulinotropic action of glucagon-like peptide-1 underlie insulin hypersecretion in glucose-tolerant individuals after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Diabetologia 2013; 56:2679-2687

- 472. Brolin RL, Robertson LB, Kenler HA, Cody RP. Weight loss and dietary intake after vertical banded gastroplasty and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Ann Surg 1994; 220:782-790
- 473. Shin AC, Zheng H, Pistell PJ, Berthoud H-R. Roux-en-Y gastric
 bypass surgery changes food reward in rats. Int J Obes 2011; 35:642 651
- 474. Scholtz S, Miras AD, Chhina N, Prechtl CG, Sleeth ML, Daud NM, et al. Obese patients after gastric bypass surgery have lower brainhedonic responses to food than after gastric banding. Gut 2014; 63:891-902
- 475. Tack J, Deloose E. Complications of bariatric surgery: dumping syndrome, reflux and vitamin deficiencies. Best practice & research clinical gastroenterology 2014; 28:741-749
- 476. Lim EL, Hollingsworth KG, Aribisala BS, Chen MJ, Mathers JC, Taylor R. Reversal of type 2 diabetes: normalisation of beta cell function in association with decreased pancreas and liver triacylglycerol. Diabetologia 2011; 54:2506-2514
- 477. Creutzfeldt W. The incretin concept today. Diabetologia 1979;
 16:75-85; Bernard C: Chiens rendus diabetique. C R Soc Biol (Paris)
 1849; 1:60
- 478. Creutzfeldt W, Ebert R, Nauck M, Stockmann F. Disturbances of the entero-insular axis. Scan J Gastroenterol 1983; 18 (Suppl 82):111-119
- 479. Schols AM, Creutzberg EC, Buurman WA, Bampfield LA, Saris WH, Wouters EF. Plasma leptin is related to proinflammatory status and dietary intake in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1999; 160:1220-1226
- 480. Miyawaki K, Yamada Y, Yano H, Niwa H, Ban N, Ihara Y, et al. Glucose intolerance caused by a defect in the entero-insular axis: a study in gastric inhibitory polypeptide receptor knockout mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1999; 96:14843-14847
- 481. Cummings DE, Overduin J, Foster-Schubert KE, Carlson MJ. Role of the bypassed proximal intestine in the anti-diabetic effects of bariatric surgery. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2007; 3:109-115

- 482. Friedman NM, Sancetta AJ, Magovern GJ. The amelioration of diabetes mellitus following subtotal gastrectomy. Surg Gynecol Obstet 1955; 100:201-204
- 483. Forgacs S, Halmos T. Improvement of glucose tolerance in diabetics following gastrectomy. Z Gastroenterol 1973; 11:293-296
- 484. Schauer PR, Burguera B, Ikramuddin S. Effect of laparoscopic
 Roux-en-Y gastric bypass on type 2 diabetes mellitus. Ann Surg 2003;
 238:467-484
- 485. Bittner R, Bittner B, Beger HG. Homeostasis of glucose and gastric resection: the influence of the food passage through the duodenum. Z Gastroenterol 1981; 19:698-707
- 486. Schattenmann G, Ebert R, Siiewert R, Creutzfeldt W. Different response of gastric inhibitory polypeptide to glucose and fat from duodenum and jejunum. Scand J Gastroenterol 1984; 19:260-266

- 488. Tarnoff M, Rodriguez L, Escalona A, Ramos A, Neto M, Alamo M, et al. Open label, prospective, randomized controlled trial of an endoscopic duodenal-jejunal bypass sleeve versus low calorie diet for pre-operative weight loss in bariatric surgery. Surg Endosc 2009; 23:650-656
- 489. de Jonge C, Berdam FJ, Rensen SS, et al. Endobarrier duodenaljejunal bypass liner rapidly improves diabetes parameters paralleled by increased postprandial GLP-1 and PYY levels in obese type 2 diabetic patients. Diabetologia 2011;54 (suppl1):S84, Abstract
- 490. Escalona A, Yanex R, Pimentel F, Galvao M, Ramos AC, Turiel D, et al. Initial human experience with restrictive duodenal-jejunal bypass liner for treatment of morbid obesity. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2010; 6:126-131
- 491. DeFronzo RE. Pathogenesis of type 2 diabetes: metabolic and molecular implications of identifying diabetes genes. Diabetes Reviews 1997; 5:177-269
- 492. Kelley D, Mandarino L. Fuel selection in human skeletal muscle in insulin resistance: a re-examination (Review). Diabetes 2000; 49:677-683

^{487.} Aldersberg D, Hammerschlag E. Post-gastrectomy syndrome.Surgery 1947; 21:720-729

- 493. McGarry J: Banting lecture 2001: Dysregulation of fatty acid metabolism the etiology of type 2 diabetes. Diabetes 2002:51:7-18
- 494. Ferrannini E, Barrett E, Bevilacqua S, DeFronzo RA. Effect of fatty acids on glucose production and utilization in man. J Clin Invest 1983; 72:1737-1747
- 495. Boden G, Jadali F. Effects of lipid on basal carbohydrate metabolism in normal men. Diabetes 1991; 40:686-692
- 496. Gulli G, Ferrannini E, Stern M, Haffner S, DeFronzo RA. The metabolic profile of NIDDM is fully estabolished in glucose-toleratnt offspring of tow Mexican-American NIDDM parents. Diabetes 1992; 41:1575-1586
- 497. Lillioja S, Mott D, Spraul M, Ferraro R, Foley JE, Ravussin E, Knowler WC, Bennett PH, Bogardus C. Insulin resistance and insulin secretory dysfunction as precursors of non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus. N Engl J Med 1993; 329:1988-1992
- Vauhkonen I, Niskanen L, Vanninen F, Kainulainen S, Uusitupa M,
 Laakso M. Defects in insulin secretion and insulin action in non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus are inherited. J Clin Invest 1997; 100:86-96
- Lilloja S, Bogardus C, Mott D, Kennedy A, Knowler W, Howard B.
 Relationship between insulin mediated glucose disposal and lipid
 metabolism in man. J Clin Invest 1985; 75c:1106-1115
- 500. Boradonna R, Groop I, Kraemer N, Ferrannini F, Del Prato S, DeFronzo RA. Obesity and insulin resistance in humans: a doseresponse study. Metabolism 1990; 39:452-459
- 501. Elks M. Chronic perifusion of rat islets with palmitate suppresses glucose-stimulated insulin release. Endocrinology 1993; 133:208-214
- 502. Bollheimer C, Skelly R, Chester M, McGarry J, Rhodes C. Chronic exposure to free fatty acid reduces pancreatic B-cell insulin content by increasing basal insulin secretion that is not compensated for by a corresponding increase in proinsulin biosynthesis translation. J Clin Invest 1998; 101:1094-1101
- 503. Igoillo-Esteve M, Marselli L, Cunha DA, Ladriere L, Ortis F, Grieco FA, et al. Palmitate induces a pro-inflammatory reponse in human pancreatic islets that mimics CCL2 expression by beta cells in type 2 diabetes. Diabetologia 2010; 53:1395-1405

- 504. Cnop M. Fatty acids and glucolipoltoxicity in the pathogenesis of type 2 diabetes. Biochem Soc Trans 2008; 36:348-352
- 505. Noushmehr H, D'Amico E, Farilla L, Hui H, Wawrowsky KA, Miynarski W, et al. Fatty acid translocase (FAT/CD36) is localized on insulin-containing granules in human pancreatic beta-cells and mediates fatty acid effects on insulin secretion. Diabetes 2005; 54:472-481
- 506. Kashyap S, Belfort R, Gastaldelli A, Pratipanawatr T, Berria R, Pratipanawatr W, et al. A sustained increase in plasma free fatty acids impairs insulin secretion in nondiabetic subjects genetically predisposed to develop type 2 diabetes. Diabetes 2003; 52:2461-2474
- 507. Carswell KA, Belgaumkar AP, Amiel SA, Patel AG. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of gastric bypass surgery on plasma lipid levels. Obes Surg 2015 Jul 26 [Epub ahead of print] DOI: 10.1007/s11695-015-1829-x
- 508. Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, Matthews DR, Neil HA. 10-year follow-up of intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 80). UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group N Engl J Med 2008; 359:1577-1589
- 509. Nathan DM, Buse JB, Davidson MB, Ferrannini E, Holman RR, Sherwin R, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes: a consensus algorithm for the initiation and adjustment of therapy: a consensus statement from the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes. Diabetes Care 2009; 32:193-203
- 510. Monnier L, Colette C, Dunseath GJ, Owens DR. The loss of postprandial glycemic control precedes stepwise deterioration of fasting with worsening diabetes. Diabetes Care 2007; 30:263-269
- 511. Kennedy WR, Navarro Z, Goetz FC, Sutherland DER, Najarian JS. Effects of pancreatic transplantation on diabetic neuropathy. N Enjl J Med 1990; 332:1031-1037
- Fioretto P, Steffes MW, Sutherland DER, Goetz FC, Mauer M.
 Reversal of lesions of diabetic nephropathy after pancreas transplantation. NEJM 1998; 339:69-75
- 513. Ramsay RC, Goetz EC, Sutherland DE, Mauer SM, Robison LL, Cantrill HL, et al. Progression of diabetic retinopathy after pancreas

transplantation for insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. N Engl J Med 1988; 318:208-214

- 514. Sjostrom L, Narbro K, Sjostrom CD, Karason K, Larsson B, Wedel H, et al. Effects of bariatric surgery on mortality in Swedish obese subjects. N Engl J Med 2007; 357:741-752
- 515. Sjostrom L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, Sjostrom CD, Karason K, Wedel H, et al. Bariatric surgery and long-term cardiovascular events. JAMA 2012; 307:56-65
- 516. Romeo S, Maglio C, Burza MA, Pirazzi C, Sjoholm K, Jacobson P, et al. Cardiovascular events after bariatric surgery in obese subjects with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2012; 35:2613-2617
- 517. Heneghan HM, Cetin D, Navaneethan SD, Orzech N, Brethauer SA, Schauer PR. Effects of bariatric surgery on diabetic nephropathy after 5 years of follow-up. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2013; 9:7-14
- 518. Johnston BL, Blackhurst DW, Latham BB, Cull DL, Bour ES, Oliver TL, et al. Bariatric surgery is associated with a reduction in major macrovascular and microvascular complications in moderately to severely obese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. J Am Coll Surg 2013; 216:545-558
- 519. Belza A, Toubro S, Stender S, Astrup A. Effect of diet-induced energy deficit and body fat reduction on high-sensitive CRP and other inflammatory markers in obese subjects. Int J Obesity 2009; 33:456-464
- 520. Sabatier F, Darmon P, Hugel B, Combes V, Sanmarco M, Velut JG, et al. Type 1 and type 2 diabetic patients display different patterns of cellular microparticles. Diabetes 2002; 51:2840-2845
- 521. Koga H, Sugiyama S, Kugiyama K, Watanabe K, Fukushima H, Tanaka T, et al. Elevated levels of VE-cadherin-positive endothelial microparticles in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and coronary artery disease. J Am Coll Cardiol 2005; 45:1622-1630
- 522. Koga H, Sugiyama S, Kugiyama K, Fukushima H, Watanabe K, Sakamoto T, et al. Elevated levels of remnant lipoproteins are associated with plasma platelet microparticles in patients with type-2 diabetes mellitus without obstructive coronary artery disease. Eur Heart J 2006; 27:817-823

- 523. Cheng V, Kashyap SR, Schauer PR, Kirwan JP, McCrae KR. Restoration of glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes following bariatric surgery is associated with reduction in microparticles. Surg Obes Relat Dis 2013; 9:207-212
- Morinigo R, Lacy AM, Casamitjana R, Delgado S, Gomis R, Vidal
 J. GLP-1 and changes in glucose tolerance following gastric bypass
 surgery in morbidly obese subjects. Obes Surg 2006; 16:1594-1601
- 525. Conn JW. Interpretation of the glucose tolerance test. The necessity of a standard preparatory diet. Am J Med Sci 1940; 199:555-564
- 526. Mathes CM, Bueter M, Smith KR, Lutz TA, le Roux CW, Spector AC. Roux-en-Y gastric bypass in rats increases sucrose taste-related motivated behaviour independent of pharmacological GLP-1 receptor modulation. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol 2012; 302:R751-67
- 527. Zheng H, Shin AC, Lenard NR, Townsend RL, Patterson LM, Sigalet DL, et al. Meal patterns, satiety and food choice in rat model of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol 2009; 297:R1273-R1282
- 528. Flint A, Raben A, Ersboll AK, Holst JJ, Astrup A. The effect of physiological levels of glucagon-like peptide-1 on appetite, gastric emptying, energy and substrate metabolism in obesity. Int J Obes 2001; 25:781-92
- 529. Li JV, Ashrafian H, Bueter M, Kinross J, Sands C, le Roux CW, et al. Metabolic surgery profoundly influences gut microbial-host metabolic cross-talk. Gut 2011; 60:1214-23
- 530. Knop FK. Bile-induced secretion of glucagon-like peptide-1: pathophysiological implications in type 2 diabetes? Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2010; 299:10-13
- 531. Nakatani H, Kasama K, Oshiro T, Watanabe M, Hirose H, Itoh H. Serum bile acid along with plasma incretins and serum high-molecular weight adiponectin levels are increased after bariatric surgery. Metabolism 2009; 58:1400-7
- 532. Jorgensen NB, Dirksen C, Jacobsen SH, et al. Glucagon-likepeptide-1 (GLP-1) is important for the improved B-cell function in type 2

diabetic subjects after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB). Diabetes 2012; 61(Suppl1):A474

- 533. Salehi M, Prigeon RL, D'Alessio DA. Gastric bypass surgery enhances glucagon-like peptide 1-stimulated postprandial insulin secretion in humans. Diabetes 2011; 60:2308-2314
- 534. Shah M, Law JH, Micheletto F, Santhananthan M, Dalla Man C, Cobelli C, et al. Contribution of endogenous glucagon-like peptide 1 to glucose metabolism after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Diabetes 2014; 63:483-493
- 535. Beckman LM, Beckman TR, Sibley SD, Thomas W, Ikramuddin S, Kellogg TA, et al. Changes in gastrointestinal hormones and leptin after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. J Parenter Enteral Nutr 2011; 35:169-180
- 536. Higashimoto Y, Opara EC, Liddle RA. Dietary regulation of glucose-dependent insulinotropic peptide (GIP) gene expression in rate small intestine. Comp Biochem Physiol C Pharmacol Toxicol Endocrinol 1995; 110:207-14
- 537. Huda MSB, Dovey TM, Wong SP, English PJ, Halford JC, McCulloch P, et al. Ghrelin does not orchestrate the metabolic changes seen in fasting but has significant effects on lipid mobilisation and substrate utilisation. Eur J Endocrinol 2011; 165:45-55
- 538. Gelegen C, Chandarana K, Choudhury AI, Al-Qassab H, Evans IM, Irvine EE, et al. Regulation of hindbrain Pyy expression by acute food deprivation, prolonged caloric restriction and weight loss surgery in mice. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2012; 303:E659-E668
- 539. Folsch UR, Dreessen UW, Talaulicar M, Willms B, Creutzfeldt W. Effect of long-term fasting of obese patients on pancreatic exocrine function, gastrointestinal hormones and bicarbonate concentration in plasma. Z Gastroenterol 1984; 22:357-64
- 540. Naitoh T, Garcia-Ruiz A, Vladisavljevic A, Matsuno S, Gagner M. Gastrointestinal transit and stress response after laparoscopic vs conventional distal pancreatectomy in the canine model. Surg Endosc 2002; 16:1627-30

- 541. Lee WJ, Chong K, Chen CY, Chen SC, Lee YC, Ser KH, et al. Diabetes remission and insulin secretion after gastric bypass in patients with BMI<35 kg/m². Obes Surg 2011; 21:889-95
- 542. Meijer RI, can Wagensveld BA, Siegert CE, Eringa EC, Smulders YM. Bariatric surgery as a novel treatment for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. Arch Surg 2011; 146:744-750
- 543. Ferchak CV, Meneghini LF. Obesity, bariatric surgery and type 2
 diabetes a systematic review. Diabetes Metab Res Rev 2004; 20:438-45
- 544. Dixon JB, Zimmet P, Alberti KG, Rubino F. Bariatric surgery: an IDF statement for obese type 2 diabetes. Diab Med 2011; 28:628-642
- 545. Howard BV. Obesity and dyslipidaemia. Endocrinol Metab Clin N Am 2003; 32:855-67
- 546. Keys A, Menotti A, Aravanis C, Blackburn H, Djordevic BS, Buzina R, et al. The seven countries study: 2,289 deaths in 15 years. Prev Med 1984; 13:141-54
- 547. Williams KJ, Tabas I. The response to retention hypothesis of early atherogenesis. Arterioscler Thromb 1995; 15:551-61
- 548. Nishi K, Itabe H, Uno M, Kitazato KT, Horiquchi H, Shinno K, et al. Oxidized LDL in carotid plaques and plasma associates with plaque instability. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol 2002; 22:1640-54
- 549. Nissen SE, Tuzcu EM, Schoenhagen P, Brown BG, Ganz P, Vogel RA, et al. Effect of intensive compared with moderate lipid-lowering therapy on progression of coronary atherosclerosis: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2004; 291:1071-1080
- 550. Hensen LO, Thayssen P, Pedersen KE, Stender S, Haghfelt T. Regression of coronary atherosclerosis by simvastatin: a serial intravascular ultrasound study. Circulation 2004; 110:265-270
- 551. Okazaki S, Yokoyama T, Miyauchi K, Shimada K, Kurata T, Sato H, et al. Early statin treatment in patients with acute coronary syndrome: demonstration of the beneficial effect on atherosclerotic lesions by serial volumetric intravascular ultrasound analysis during half a year after coronary event: the ESTABLISH Study. Circulation 2004; 110:1061-1068

552. Baigent C, Keech A, Kearney PM, Blackwell L, Buch G, PollicinoC, et al. Efficacy and safety of cholesterol-lowering treatment.

Prospective meta-analysis of data from 90, 056 participants in randomized trials of statins. Lancet 2005; 366:1267-78

- 553. Nicholls SJ, Tuzcu EM, Sipahi I, Grasso AW, Schoenhagen P, Hu
 T, et al. Statins, High-Density Lipoprotein cholesterol, and regression of coronary atherosclerosis. JAMA 2007; 297:499-508
- 554. Buchwald H, Estok Z, Fahrback K, Bane ID, Sledge I. Trends in mortality in bariatric surgery. Surgery 2007; 142:621-635
- 555. Thomas CB, Cohen BH. The familial occurrence of hypertension and coronary artery disease, with observations concerning obesity and diabetes. Ann Intern Med 1955; 42:90-127
- 556. The Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (LABS) Consortium. Peri-operative safety in the longitudinal assessment of bariatric surgery. N Engl J Med 2009; 361:445-454
- 557. Buffington CK, Cowan GSM, Hughes TA, Smith H. Significant changes in the lipid-lipoprotein status of premenopausal morbidly obese females following gastric bypass surgery. Obesity Surgery 1994; 4:328-35
- 558. Cowan GS Jr, Buffington CK. Significant changes in blood pressure, glucoe, and lipids with gastric bypass surgery. World Journal of Surgery 1998; 22:987-92
- Brolin RE, Kenler HA, Wilson AC, Kuo PT, Cody RP. Serum lipids after gastric bypass surgery for morbid obesity. Int J Obes 1990; 14:939-50
- 560. Wolf AM, Beisiegel U, Kortner B, Kuhlmann HW. Does gastric restriction surgery reduce the risks of metabolic diseases? Obes Surg 1998; 8:9-13
- 561. Kelly TM, Jones SB. Changes in serum lipids after gastric bypass surgery. Lack of a relationship to weight loss. Int J Obes 1986; 10:443-52
- 562. Gleysteen JJ, Barboriak JJ. Improvement in heart disease risk factors after gastric bypass. Arch Surg 1983; 118:681-3
- 563. Gonen B, Halverson JD, Schonfeld G. Lipoprotein levels in morbidly obese patients with massive, surgically-induced weight loss. Metabolism 1983; 32:492-6
- 564. Buchwald H, Varco RL, Matts JP, Long JM, Fitch LL, Campbell GS. Effect of partial ileal bypass surgery on mortality and morbidity from
coronary heart disease in patients with hypercholesterolemia. Report of the Program on the Surgical Control of the Hyperlipidemias (POSCH). N Engl J Med 1990; 323:946-55

565. Christou NV, Sampalis JS, Liberman M, Look D, Auger S, McLean AP, et al. Surgery decreases long-term mortality, morbidity, and health care use in moribly obese patients. Ann Surg 2004; 240:416-424

566. Dixon JB, O'Brien P. A disparity between conventional lipid and insulin resistance markers at body mass index levels greater than 34 kg/m². Int J Obes Metab Dis 2001; 25:793-7

567. Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network 97: Risk estimation and the prevention of cardiovascular disease. February 2007 <u>www.sign.ac.uk</u>

- 568. Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults. Executive Summary of the Third Report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert Panel on Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Cholesterol in Adults (Adult Treatment Panel III). JAMA 2001; 285:2486-97
- 569. Kruseman M, Leimgruber A, Zumbach F, Golay A. Dietary, weight, and psychological changes among patients with obesity, 8 years after gastric bypass. J Am Diet Assoc 2010; 110:527-534
- 570. Neary et al. Peptide YY 3-36 and Glucagon-like peptide-1 7-36 inhibit food intake additively. Endocrinol 2005; 146:5120-5127
- 571. Thirlby RC, Bahiraei F, Randall J, Drewnoski A. Effect of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass on satiety and food likes: the role of genetics. J Gastrointest Surg 2006; 10:270-277
- 572. Olbers T, Bjorkman S, Lindroos A, Maleckas A, Lonn L, Sjostrom L, et al. Body composition, dietary intake, and energy expenditure after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass and laparoscopic vertical banded gastroplasty: a randomized clinical trial. Ann Surg 2006; 244:715-722
- 573. Odstrcil EA, Martinez JG, Santa Ana CA, Xue B, Schneider RE, Steffer KJ, et al. The contribution of malabsorption to the reduction in net energy absorption after ling-limb Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Am J Clin Nutr 2010; 92: 704-13
- 574. Coughlin K, Bell RM Bivins BA, Wrobel S, Griffen WO Jr. Preoperative and postoperative assessment of nutrient intakes in patients

who have undergone gastric bypass surgery. Arch Surg 1983; 118:813-816

- 575. Matthews DH, Lawrence Jr W, Poppell JW et al. Change in effective volume during experimental dumping syndrome. Surgery 1960; 48:185-94
- 576. Dapri G, Cadiere GB, Himpens J. Laparoscopic reconversion of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass to original anatomy: technique and preliminary outcome. Obes Surg 2011; 21:1289-1295
- 577. Ito C, Mason EE. Gastric bypass and pancreatic secretion. Surgery 1971; 69:526-32
- 578. Pihlajamaki J, Gronlund S, Simonen M, Kakela P, Moilanen L, Paakkonen M, et al. Cholesterol absorption decreases after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass but not after gastric banding. Metabolism 2010; 59:866-72
- 579. Kumar R, Lieske JC, Collazo-Clavell ML, Sarr MG, Olson ER, Vrtiska TJ, et al. Fat malabsorption and increased intestinal oxalate absorption are common after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Surgery 2011; 149:654-61
- 580. Werling M, Vincent RP, Cross GF, Marschall HU, Fandriks L, Lonroth H, et al. Enhanced fasting and post-prandial plasma bile acid responses after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Scand J Gastroenterol 2013; 48:1257-1264
- Ponsky, TA, Brody F, Pucci E. Alterations in gastrointestinal physiology after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Am J Coll Surg 2005; 201:125-130
- 582. Kohli R, Bradley D, Setchell KD, Eagon JC, Abumrad N, Klein S. Weight loss induced by Roux-en-Y gastric bypass but not laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding increases circulating bile acids. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2013; 98:708-12
- 583. Simonen M, Dali-Youcef N, Kaminska D, Venesmaa S, Kakela P, Paakkonen M, et al. Conjugated bile acids associate with altered rates of glucose and lipid oxidation after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Obes Surg 2012; 22:1473-1480
- Zhang H, DiBaise JK, Zuccolo A, Kudrna D, Braidotti M, Yu Y, et al. Human gut microbiota in obesity and after gastric bypass. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2009; 106:2365-2370

- 585. Wang PY, Caspi L, Lam CK, Chari M, Li X, Light PE, et al. Upper intestinal lipids trigger a gut-brain-liver axis to regulate glucose production. Nature 2008; 452:1012-6
- 586. Kong LC, Tap J, Aron-Wisnewsky J, Pelloux V, Basdevant A, Bouillot JL, et al. Gut microbiota after gastric bypass in human obesity: increased richness and associations of bacterial genera with adipose tissue genes. Am J Clin Nutr 2013; 98:16-24
- 587. Cani PD, Osto M, Geurts L, Everard A. Involvement of gut microbiota in the development of low-grade inflammation and type 2 diabetes associated with obesity. Gut Microbes 2012; 3:279-88
- 588. Backhed F, Ding H, Want T, Hooper LV, Koh GY, Nagy A, Semenkovich CF, Gordon JI. The gut microbiota as an environmental factor that regulates fat storage. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2004; 101:15718-15723
- 589. Backhed F, Manchester JK, Semenkovich CF, Gordon JI. Mechanisms underlying the resistance to diet-induced obesity in germfree mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2007; 104:979-984
- 590. Rabot S, Membrez M, Bruneau A, Gerard P, Harach T, Moser M, et al. Germ-free C57BL/6J mice are resistant to high-fat-diet-induced insulin resistance and have altered cholesterol metabolism. FASEB J; 2010:24:4948-4959
- Martin FP, Sprenger N, Yap IK, Wang Y, Bibiloni R, Rochat F, et al. Panorganismal gut microbiome-host metabolic crosstalk. J Proteome Res 2009; 8:2090-2105
- 592. Velagapudi VR, Hezaveh R, Reigstad CS, Gopalacharyulu P, Yetukuri L, Islam S, et al. The gut microbiota modulates host energy and lipid metabolism in mice. J Lipd Res 2010; 51:1101-1112
- 593. Liou AP, Paziuk M, Luevano Jr JM, Machineni S, Turnbaugh PJ, Kaplan LM. Conserved shifts in the gut microbiota due to gastric bypass reduce host weight and adiposity. Sci Transl Med 2013; 5:178ra41. Doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3005687
- 594. Miettinen TA, Gylling H. Cholesterol absorption efficiency and sterol metabolism in obesity. Atherosclerosis 2000; 153:241-248
- 595. Chapman MJ, Ginsberg HN, Amarenco P, Andreotti F, Boren J, Catapano AL, et al. Triglyceride-rich lipoproteins and high-density

lipoprotein cholesterol in patients at high risk of cardiovascular disease: evidence and guidance for management. Eur Heart J 2011; 32:1345-61

- 596. Taylor AJ, Villines TC, Stanek EJ, Devine PJ, Griffen L, Miller M, et al. Extended-release niacin or ezetimibe and carotid intima-media thickness. N Engl J Med 2009; 361:2113-22
- 597. Lee JM, Robson MD, Yu LM, Shirodaria CC, Cunnington C, Kylintireas I, et al. Effects of high-dose modified-release nicotinic acid on atherosclerosis and vascular function: a randomized, placebo-controlled, magnetic resonance imaging study. J Am Coll Cardiol 2009; 54:1787-94
- 598. Miettinen TA. Detection of changes in human cholesterol metabolism. Ann Clin Res 1970; 2:1-21
- 599. La Rosa JC, He J, Vupputuri S. Effect of statins on risk of coronary disease: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. JAMA 1999; 282:2340-6
- 600. Shepherd J, Blauw GJ, Murphy MB, Bollen EL, Buckley BM,
 Cobbe SM, et al. Pravastatin in elderly individuals at risk of vascular disease (PROSPER): a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2002; 360:1623-30
- 601. Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group. MRC/BHF Heart
 Protection Study of cholesterol lowering with simvastatin in 20,536 high-risk individuals: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2002;
 360:7-22
- 602. ALLHAT Officers and Coordinators for the ALLHAT collaborative research Group. The antihypertensive and lipid-lowering treatment to prevent heart attach trial. Major outcomes in moderately hypercholesterolemic, hypertensive patients randomised to pravastatin vs usual care: the antihypertensive and lipid-lowering treatment to prevent heart attack trial (ALLHAT-LLT). JAMA 2002; 288:2998-3007
- 603. Mahdy Ali K, Wonnerth A, Huber K, Wojta. Cardiovascular disease risk reduction by raising HDL cholesterol – current therapies and future opportunities. Br J Pharmacol 2012; 167:1177-1194
- 604. AIM-HIGH Investigators. Boden WE, Probstfield JL, Anderson T, Chaitman BR, Besvignes-Nickens P, Koprowicz K, et al. Niacin in patients with low HDL cholesterol levels receiving intensive statin therapy. N Engl J Med 2011; 365:2255-67

- Rebelos E, Seghieri M, Natali A, Balkau B, Golay A, Piatti PM, et al. Influence of endogenous NEFA on beta cell function in humans.
 Diabetologia 2015; 58:2344-51
- 606. Yki-Jarvinen II. Ectopic fat accumulation: an important cause of insulin resistance in humans. J R Soc Med 2002; 95(Suppl 42):39-45
- 607. Beck B. Gastric inhibitory polypeptide: a gut hormone with anabolic functions. J Mol Endocrinol 1989; 2:169-174
- 608. Lafontan M, LanginD. Lipolysis and lipid mobilisation in human adipose tissue. Prog Lipid Res 2009; 48:275-297
- 609. Singer P, Godicke W, Voigt S, Ilajdu I, Weiss M. Postprandial hyperinsulinaemia in patients with mild essential hypertension.
 Hypertension 1985; 7:182-186
- 610. Ruge T, Hodson L, Cheeseman J, Dennis AL, Fielding BA, Humphreys SM, et al Fasted to fed trafficking of fatty acids in human adipose tissue reveals a novel regulatory step for enhanced fat storage. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2009; 94:1781-1788
- 611. Widjaja A, Morris RJ, Levy LC, Frayn FN, Manley SE, Turner RC.
 Within- and between-subject variation in commonly measured anthropometric and biochemical variables. Clin Chem 1999; 45:561-566
- 612. Magkos F, Patterson BW, Mittendorfer B. Reproducibility of stable isotope-labeled tracer measures of VLDL-triglyceride and VLDLapolipoprotein B-100 kinetics. J Lipid Res 2007; 48:1204-1211
- 613. Marinou K, Adiels M, Ilodson L, Frayn KN, Karpe F, Fielding BA. Young women partition fatty acids towards ketone body production rather than VLDL-TAG synthesis, compared with young men. Br J Nutr 2011; 105:857-865
- 614. Normand-Lauziere F, Frisch F, Labbe SM, Bherer P, Gagnon R, Cunnane SC, et al. Increased postprandial nonesterified fatty acid appearance and oxidation in Type 2 diabetes is not fully established in offspring of diabetic subjects PIoS ONE 2010; 5:E10956
- 615. Bakewell L, Burdge GC, Calder PC. Polyunsaturated fatty acid concentrations in young men and women consuming their habitual diets. Fr J Nutr 2006; 96:93-99

- 616. Shadid S, Kanaley JA, Sheehan MT, Jensen MD. Basal and insulin-regulated free fatty acid and glucose metabolism in humans. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2007; 292:E1770-E1774
- 617. Magkos F, Patterson BW, Mohammed BS, Klein S, Mittendorfer B. Women produce fewer but triglyceride-richer very low-density lipoproteins than men. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2007; 92:1311-1318
- 618. Stefan N, Kantartzis K, Celebi N, Staiger H, Machann J, Schick F, et al. Circulating palmitoleate strongly and independently predicts insulin sensitivity in humans. Diabetes Care 2010; 33:405-407
- Soeters MR, Sauerwein HP, Groener JE, Aerts JM, Ackermans
 MT, Glatz JF, et al. Gender-related differences in the metabolic response
 to fasting. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2007; 92:3646-3652
- 620. Taggart P, Carruthers M. Endogenous hyperlipidaemia induced by emotional stress of racing driving. Lancet 1971; 1:363-366
- 621. Sidhu D, Naugler C. Fasting time and lipid levels in a communitybased population. Arch Intern Med 2012; 172:1707-1710
- 622. Campose H, Khoo C, Sacks FM. Diurnal and acute pattern of postprandial apolipoprotein B-48 in VLDL, IDL and LDL from normolipidemic human. Atherosclerosis 2005; 181:345-51
- 623. Third report of the National Cholesterol Education Program (NCEP) Expert panel on detection, evaluation and treatment of high blood cholesterol in adults (adult treatment panel III) final report. Circulation 2002; 106:3143-3421
- 624. De Backer G, Ambrosioni E, Borch-Johnsen K, Brotons C, Cifkova R, Dallongeville J, et al. European guidelines on cardiovascular disease and prevention in clinical practice. Atherosclerosis 2003; 171:145-55
- 625. Bansal S, Buring JE, Rifai N, Mora S, Sacks FM, Ridker PM. Fasting compared with nonfasting triglycerides and risk of cardiovascular events in women. JAMA 2007; 298:309-16
- 626. Nordestgaard BG, Benn M, Scnohr P, Tybjaerg-Hansen A. Nonfasting triglycerides and risk of myocardial infarction, ischemic heart disease and death in men and women. JAMA 2007; 298:299-308
- 627. Durstine JL, Grandjean PW, Cox CA, Thompson PD. Lipids, lipoproteins, and exercise. J Cardiopulm Rehabil 2002; 22: 385-98

- 628. Tamboli RA, Hossain HA, Marks PA, Eckhauser AW, Rathmacher JA, Phillips SE, et al. Body composition and energy metabolism following Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Obesity 2010; 18:1718-1724
- 629. Hatoum IJ, Stein HK, Merrifield BF, Kaplan LM. Capacity for physical activity predicts weight loss after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Obesity 2008; 507:1-8
- 630. Welch G, Wesolowski C, Piepul B, Kuhn J, Romanelli J, Garb J.
 Physical activity predicts weight loss following gastric bypass surgery: findings from a support group survey. Obes Surg 2008; 18:517-524
- 631. Skottheim IB, Stormark K, Christensen H, Jakobsen GS,
 Hjelmesaeth J, Jenssen T, et al. Significantly altered systemic exposure to atorvastatin acid following gastric bypass surgery in morbidly obese patients. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2009; 86:311-318
- 632. Vilsboll T, Christensen M, Junker AE, Knop FK, Gluud LL. Effects of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists on weight loss: systematic review and meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. BMJ 2012; 344;1-11
- 633. Zander M, Madsbad, Madsen JL, Holst JJ. Effect of 6-week
 course of glucagon-like peptide 1 on glycaemic control, insulin sensitivity,
 and B-cell function in type 2 diabetes: a parallel-group study. Lancet
 2002; 359:824-830
- 634. Weaver RE, Donnelly D, Wabitsch M, Grant PJ, Balmforth AJ. Functional expression of glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide receptors is coupled to differentiation in a human adipocyte model Int J Obes 2008; 32:1705-1711
- 635. Arner P. Human fat cell lipolysis: biochemistry, regulation and clinical role. Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab 2005; 19:471-82
- 636. Bazzocchi A, Ponti F, Cariani S, Diano D, Leuratti L, Albisinni U, et al. Visceral fat and body composition changes in a female population after RYGBP: a two year follow-up by DXA. Obes Surg 2015; 25: 443-451
- 637. Ravussin E, Smith SR. Increased fat intake, impaired fat oxidation, and failure of fat cell proliferation result in ectopic fat storage, insulin resistance, and type 2 diabetes mellitus. Ann NY Acad Sci 2002; 967: 363-78

- 638. Jacobsen SH, Bohsen-Moller KN, Dirksen C, Jorgensen NB, Clausen TR, Wulff BS, et al. Effects of gastric bypass surgery on glucose absorption and metabolism during a mixed meal in glucose-tolerant individuals. Diabetologia 2013; 56:2250-2254
- 639. de Weijer BA, Aarts E, Janssen IM, Berends FJ, van de Laar A,
 Kaajager K, et al. Hepatic and peripheral insulin sensitivity do not
 improve 2 weeks after bariatric surgery. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2013;21:
 1143-1147
- 640. Klein S, Mittendorfer B, Eagon JC, Patterson B, Grant L, Feirt N, et al. Gastric bypass surgery improves metabolic and hepatic abnormalities associated with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease.
 Gastroenterology 2006; 130;1564-1572
- 641. Curry TB, Roberts SK, Basu R, Basu A, Schroeder D, Joyner MJ, et al. Gastric bypass surgery is associated with near-normal insulin suppression of lipolysis in nondiabetic individuals. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2011; 300:E746-E751
- 642. Hansen M, Lund MT, Gregers E, Kraunsoe R, Van Hall G, Helge JW, et al. Adipose tissue mitochondrial respiration and lipolysis before and after a weight loss by diet and RYGB. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2015; 23:2022-2029
- 643. Ferrannini E, Camastra S, Coppack SW, Fliser D, Golay A,
 Mitrakour AI. Insulin action and non-esterified fatty acids. The European
 Group for the study of insulin resistance (EGIR). Proc Nutr Soc 1997;
 56:753-761
- 644. Briscoe CP, Peat AJ, McKeown SC, Corbett DF, Goetz AS,
 Littleton TR, et al. Pharmacological regulation of insulin secretion in MIN6 cells through the fatty acid receptor GPR40: identification of agonist and antagonist small molecules. Br J Pharmacol 2006; 148:619-628
- 645. Latour MG, Alquier T, Oseid E, Tramblay C, Jetton TL, Luo J, et al. GPR40 is necessary but not sufficient for fatty acid stimulation of insulin secretion in vivo. Diabetes 2007; 56:1087-1094
- 646. Burant CF. Activation of GPR40 as a therapeutic target for the treatment of type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Care 2013; 36:S175-S179
- 647. Leifke E, Naik H, Wu J, Viswanathan P, Demanno D, Kipnes M, et al. A multiple-ascending-dose study to evaluate safety, pharmacokinetics,

and pharmacodynamics of a novel GPR40 agonist, TAK-875, in subjects with type 2 diabetes. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2012; 92:29-39

- 648. Tan CP, Feng Y, Zhou YP, Eiermann GJ, Petrov A, Zhou C, et al. Selective small-molecule agonists of G protein-coupled receptor 40 promote glucose-dependent insulin secretion and reduce blood glucose in mice. Diabetes 2008; 57:2211-2219
- 649. Doshi LS, Brahma MK, Sayyed SG, Dixit AV, Chandak PG,
 Pamidiboina V, et al. Acute administration of GPR40 receptor agonist potentiates glucose-stimulated insulin secretion in vivo in the rat.
 Metabolism 2009; 58:333-343
- 650. Pang Z, Wu N, Zhang X, Avallone R, Croci T, Dressler H, Palejwala V, et al. GPR40 is partially required for insulin secretion following activation of beta3-adrenergic receptors. Mol Cell Endocrinol 2010; 325:18-25
- Lin DC, Zhang J, Zhuang R, Li F, Nguyen K, Chen M, et al. AMG
 837: a novel GPR40/FFA1 agonist that enhances insulin secretion and lowers glucose levels in rodents. PLoS ONE 2011; 6:e27270
- 652. Luo J, Swaminath G, Brown SP, Zhang J, Guo Q, Chen M, et al. A potent class of GPR40 full agonists engages the enteroinsular axis to promote glucose control in rodents. PLoS ONE 2012; 7:e46300
- 653. Tsujihata Y, Ito R, Suzuki M, Harada A, Negoro N, Yasuma T, et al. TAK-875, an orally available G protein-coupled receptor 40/free fatty acid receptor 1 agonist, enhances glucose-dependent insulin secretion and improves both postprandial and fasting hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetic rats. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 2011; 339:228-237
- 654. Zierler KL, Rabinovitz B. Effect of very small concentrations of insulin on forearm metabolism. Persistence of its action of potassium and free fatty acids weithout its effect on glucose. J Clin Invest 1964; 43:450-962
- 655. Schade DS, Eaton RP. Dose-response to insulin in man:
 Differential effects on glucose and ketone body regulation. J Clin
 Endocrinol Metab 1977; 44:1038-1053
- 656. Jacobsson B, Holm G, Bjorntorp P, Smith U. Influence of cell size on the effects of insulin and noradrenaline on human adipose tissue. Diabetologia 1976; 12:69-72

- 657. Arner P, Bolinder J, Ostman J. Marked increase in insulin sensitivity of human fat cells one hour after glucose ingestion. J Clin Invest 1983; 71:709-714
- 658. Pederson O, Hjollund E, Sorensen NS. Insulin receptor binding and insulin action in human fat cells: effects of obesity and fasting. Metab Clin Exp 1982; 31:884-895
- 659. Olefsky JM. Insulin binding to adipocytes and circulating monocytes from obese patients. J Clin Invest 1976; 57:1165-1172
- 660. Bolinder J, Engfeldt P, Ostman J, Arner P. Site differences in insulin receptor binding and insulin action in subcutaneous fat of obese females. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1983; 57:455-461
- 661. Kissebah AH, Krakower GR. Regional adiposity and morbidity.Physiol Rev 1994; 9:417-443
- 662. Lemieux S, Despres JP. Metabolic complications of visceral obesity: contribution to the aetiology of Type II diabetes and implications for prevention and treatment. Diabetes Metab 1994; 20:375-393
- 663. Abat N, Garg A. Heterogeneity in adipose tissue metabolism: causes, implications and management of regional adiposity. Prog Lipid Res 1995; 34:53-70
- 664. Meier JJ, Gethmann A, Gotze O, Gallwitz B, Holst JJ, Schmidt WE, et al. Glucagon-like peptide 1 abolishes the postprandial rise in triglyceride concentrations and lowers levels of non-esterified fatty acids in human. Diabetologia 2006;49:452-458
- 665. Timper K, Grisouard J, Sauter NS, Herzog-Radimerski T, Dembinski K, Peterli R, et al. Glucose-dependent insulinotropic polypeptide induces cytokine expression, lipolysis, and insulin resistance in human adipocytes. Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab 2013; 304:E1-13
- 666. Hellmer J, Marcus C, Sonnenfeld T, Arner P. Mechanisms for differences in lipolysis between human subcutaneous and omental fat cells. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1992; 75:15-20
- 667. Fried SK, Tittelbach T, Blumenthal J, Sreenivasan U, Robey L, Yi J, et al. Resistance to the antilipolytic effect of insulin in adipoctyes of African-American compared to Caucasian postmenopausal women. J Lipid Res 2010;51:1193-1200

668. Viswanadha S, Londos C. Optimized conditions for measuring lipolysis in murine primary adipocytes. J Lipid Res 2006; 47:1859-1864

10. Appendices

- Appendix 1 Nutritional information for Belgium chocolate Haagen-Dazs ice-cream
- Appendix 2 King's College Hospital relevant biochemical assay protocols
- Appendix 3 Funnel plots of the meta-analysis of the effects of RYGB upon plasma lipids

Appendix 1 – nutritional information for Belgium Chocolate Haagen-Dazs ice-cream

Belgium Chocolate ice-cream

	Per 100ml serving
ENERGY	1155kJ / 277kcal
Protein	3.9g
Carbohydrate	23.8g
of which sugars	19.6g
Fat	18.4g
of which saturates	11.1g
Fibre	1.7g
Sodium	0.06g

Ingredients

Fresh cream (29%), skimmed milk, sugar solution (sugar, water), dark Belgian Chocolate (13%) (cocoa mass, sugar, emulsifier: soya lecithin, natural flavouring: vanilla), chocolate chunks with vegetable oil (10%) (chocolate [sugar, cocoa mass, cocoa butter, emulsifier : soya lecithin, natural flavouring : vanilla], cottonseed oil, coconut oil), egg yolk, cocoa powder, sugar, natural flavouring: vanilla.

Contains milk, egg and soya ingredients.

Information obtained from website: www.haagen-dazs.co.uk (23/01/10)

Appendix 2 - King's College Hospital relevant biochemical assay protocols

<u>Glucose</u>

Glucose reagent supplied by Bayer Diagnostics Europe Ltd, Bayer House, Strawberry Hill, Newbery, Berks. RG14 1JA

Method

The Bayer Advia method for the measurement of glucose uses an endpoint enzymatic reaction. Glucose is converted to gluconic acid and hydrogen peroxide using the enzyme glucose oxidase. In the presence of peroxidase, the hydrogen peroxide then reacts with 4-aminophenazone and phenol to produce a red quinoneimine dye. Absorbance is measured at 596/605 nm.

Technical

Testing of the precision of the assay has been performed prior to this study it the following way.

Each sample was assayed 2 times per run, 2 runs per day, for at least 10 days. Precision estimates computed by the manufacturer according to CLSI document EP05-A2, Evaluation of Precision Performance of Quantitative Measurement Methods; Approved Guideline.

	Within-Run		Total	
Level	SD	CV (%)	SD	CV (%)
(mg/L)				
4.4	0.02	0.6	0.07	1.6
16.3	0.08	0.5	0.19	1.2

Standardization

The ADVIA glucose oxidase method is traceable to the CDC Reference Method, which uses reference materials from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), via patient sample correlation and verified with NIST Reference serum. Assigned values of Bayer Chemistry Calibrator, Bayer Assayed Chemistry Controls, and ADVIA Chemistry Urine Controls are traceable to this standardization.

INSULIN CENTAUR (IRI)

The Advia Centaur Insulin assay is a two-site sandwich immunoassay using direct chemiluminescent technology which uses constant amounts of two antibodies. The first antibody, the Lite Reagent, is a monoclonal mouse anti-insulin antibody labelled with acridinium ester. The second antibody , in the solid phase, is a monoclonal, mouse anti-insulin antibody, which is covalently coupled to paramagnetic particles.

A direct relationship exists between the amount of insulin present in the patient sample and the amount of relative light units (RLU) detected by the system.

The system automatically performs the following steps:

- 1. Dispenses 25 uL of sample into a cuvette
- 2. Dispenses 50 uL of Lite Reagent and incubates for 5 minutes at 37°C
- 3. Dispenses 250 uL of solid phase and incubates for 2.5 minutes at 37°C
- 4. Separated, aspirates and washes the cuvettes with reagent water
- 5. Dispenses 300 uL each of acid reagent and base reagent to initiate the chemiluminescent reaction.

Technical Data

Dilutions

Samples with Insulin concentrations greater than 300 mU/L must be diluted and retested.

High dose Hook Effect

Patient samples with high insulin concentrations can cause a paradoxical decrease in the RLU. In this assay, patient samples with insulin concentrations as high as 3000 mU/L will assay greater than 300 mU/L.

Heterophilic antibodies

Heterophilic antibodies in human serum can react with reagent immunoglobulins, interfering with in vitro immunoassays. Patients routinely

exposed to animals or animal serum products can be prone to this interference and anomalous results may be observed.

Interferences

Specimens that are	Demonstrate < 6% change in results up to
Haemolysed	125 mg/dL
Lipaemic	1000 mg/dL
Icteric	20 mg/dL
Proteinemic	12 g/dL

Specificity

The cross-reactivity of the Adivia Centaur was determined by spiking serum samples with the following compounds at the indicated concentrations. These compounds did not have a significant effect on the insulin measurement:

Substance	Amount added	Mean % recovery
Proinsulin	1 ug/mL	100.8
C-peptide	500 ng/mL	95.1
Gastrin-1	1 ug/mL	96.6
Glucagon	1 ug/mL	100.2
Secretin	1 ug/mL	101.6

Sensitivity and assay range

The Advia Centaur Insulin assay measures insulin concentrations up to 300 mU/L with a minimum detectable concentration of 0.5 mU/L.

Dilution Recovery

Five human serum samples in the range of 129.7 to 237.8 mU/L of insulin were serially diluted 1:2, 1:4 and 1:8 with insulin diluent and assayed as shown below:

Sample	Dilution	Observed	Expected	Recovery %
		(mU/L)	(mU/L)	

1	-	129.7		
	1:2	55.8	64.9	86.0
	1:4	21.4	32.4	84.6
	1:8	13.9	16.2	85.8
	Mean			58.5
2	-	192.7	96.4	
	1:2	105.5	48.2	109.4
	1:4	47.0	24.1	97.5
	1:8	24.1		100.0
	Mean			102.3
3	-	237.8	118.9	
	1:2	127.4	59.4	107.1
	1:4	56.1	29.7	94.4
	1:8	29.2		98.3
	Mean			99.9

4	-	229.9		
	1:2	114.9	114.9	100.0
	1:4	51.3	57.5	89.3
	1:8	25.2	28.7	87.8
	Mean			92.4
5	-	154.0		
	1:2	74.2	77.0	96.4
	1:4	33.6	38.5	87.2
	1:8	18.2	19.3	94.3
	Mean			92.6
Mean				94.6

Spiking recovery

Sample	Amount added	Observed	Expected	Recovery %
1	-	2.9		
	25.7	30.3	28.6	105.9
2	-	2.6		
	51.4	58.4	53.9	108.1
3	-	4.8		
	25.7	33.2	30.5	108.9
4	-	4.3		
	51.4	61.3	55.7	110.1
5	-	8.1		
	25.7	35.1	33.8	103.8
6	-	7.2		
	51.4	66.7	58.6	113.8
Mean				108.4

Precision

Three samples were assayed twice in 3 runs, on 3 systems (n=72 for each sample) over a period of 4 days. The following results were obtained:

Mean Insulin	Within run % CV	Run-to-run % CV	Total % CV
mU/L			
14.68	4.6	5.9	7.5
45.72	3.2	2.6	6.5
124.51	3.3	4.8	6.3

<u>Glucagon-like-peptide-1 (active)</u> Method

Linco Research. 6 Research Park Dr. St Charles, Missouri 63304 USA.

This kit is for non-radioactive quantification of biologically active forms of Glucagon-Like Peptide-1 [i.e. GLP-1 (7-36 amide) and GLP-1 (7-37)] in plasma and other biological media. It is highly specific for the immunologic measurement of active GLP-1 and will not detect other forms of GLP-1 (e.g. 1-36 amide, 1-37, 9-36 amide or 9-37). The GLP-1 sequence is highly conserved between the species, with no sequence variation occurring in all mammals.

This assay is based, sequentially, on: 1) capture of active GLP-1 from the sample by a monoclonal antibody, immobilised in the wells of a microwell plate, that binds specifically to the N-terminal region of active GLP-1 molecule, 2) washing to remove unbound materials, 3) binding of an anti-GLP-alkaline phosphatise detection conjugate to the immobilised GLP-1, 4) washing off unbound conjugate, and 5) quantification of bound detection conjugate by adding MUP (methyl umbelliferyl phosphate) which in the presence of alkaline phosphatise forms the fluorescent product of umbelliferone. Since the amount of fluorescence generated is directly proportional to the concentration of active GLP-1 in the unknown sample, the latter can be derived by interpolation from a reference curve generated in the same assay with reference standards of known concentrations of active GLP-1.

TECHNICAL DATA

Intra-assay precision

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Ν	8	8	8	8	8
Mean	4	8	12	28	76
(pg/mL)					
CV%	8	7	6	7	9

Inter-assay precision

Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 L	Level 4 Level 5	
---------------------------	-----------------	--

Ν	8	8	8	8	8
Mean	4	8	12	28	76
(pg/mL)					
CV%	13	12	7	7	<1

Sensitivity

The minimal detectable GLP-1 concentration is 2 pM

Human Gastric Inhibitory Polypeptide (GIP) (total)

Method

Linco Research. 6 Research Park Dr. St Charles, Missouri 63304 USA.

This kit is for non-radioactive quantification of human GIP in human serum, plasma, tissue extract and cell culture samples. This kit has 100% cross reactivity to human GIP (1-42) and GIP (3-42).

This assay is a Sandwich ELISA based, sequentially, on: 1) capture of human GIP molecules

from samples to the wells of a microtiter plate coated by a pre-titered amount of anti-GIP

monoclonal antibodies, 2) wash away of unbound materials from samples, 3) binding of a second biotinylated anti-GIP polyclonal antibody to the captured molecules, 4) wash away of unbound materials from samples, 5) incubation of streptavidin-Horseradish peroxidase conjugate to bind to the immobilized biotinylated antibodies, 6) wash away of free enzyme conjugates, and 7) quantification of immobilized antibody-enzyme conjugates by monitoring horseradish peroxidase activities in the presence of the substrate 3,3',5,5' tetramethylbenzidine. The enzyme activity is measured spectrophotometrically by the increased absorbency at 450 nm, corrected from the absorbency at 590 nm, after acidification of formed products. Since the increase in absorbency is directly proportional to the amount of captured human GIP in the unknown sample, the latter can be derived by interpolation from a reference curve generated in the same assay with reference standards of known concentrations of human GIP.

TECHNICAL DATA

Intra-assay precision

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
N	6	6	6	6
Mean (pg/mL)	279	185	21	15
CV%	3.0	8.8	7.3	6.7

Inter-assay precision

Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Level 4	
---------------------------------	--

N	6	6	6	6
Mean (pg/mL)	166	134	50	26
CV%	11.8	2.3	3.3	6.1

Sensitivity

The minimal detectable GIP concentration is 8.2 pg/mL

Peptide YY (PYY) (total)

Explanation of the test

Peptide YY (P-YY), a novel 36 amino-acid amidated hormone is a component of the complex neuroendocrine control process. This gut hormone (fragment 3-36) when infused into subjects has been shown to reduce food intake in normal weight and obese individuals. PYY infusion also reduced the plasma levels of the hunger-promoting hormone ghrelin. PYY levels have been shown to drop pre-meal and then increase post prandially. In circulation, PYY exists at least in two molecular forms: 1-36 and 3- 36.

Method

Linco Research. 6 Research Park Dr. St Charles, Missouri 63304 USA.

Millipore's PYY (Total) Radioimmunoassay (RIA) Kit utilizes an antibody, which recognizes both the 1-36 and 3-36 forms of Human PYY. Sensitivity of 10 pg/mL can easily be achieved when using a 100µl serum or plasma sample in a two-day, disequilibrium assay (400 µl Total Volume).

In radioimmunoassay, a fixed concentration of labeled tracer antigen is incubated with a constant dilution of antiserum such that the concentration of antigen binding sites on the antibody is limited, for example, only 40%-50% of the total tracer concentration may be bound by antibody. If unlabeled antigen is added to this system, there is competition between labeled tracer and unlabeled antigen for the limited and constant number of binding sites on the antibody. Thus, the amount of tracer bound to antibody will decrease as the concentration of unlabeled antigen increases. This can be measured after separating antibody-bound from free tracer and counting one or the other, or both fractions. A standard curve is set up with increasing concentrations of standard unlabeled antigen and from this curve the amount of antigen in unknown samples can be calculated. Thus, the four basic necessities for a radioimmunoassay system are: a specific antiserum to the antigen to be measured, the availability of a radioactive labelled form of the

antigen, a method whereby antibody-bound tracer can be separated from the unbound tracer, and finally, an instrument to count radioactivity.

The Millipore PYY (Total) assay utilizes 125I-labeled PYY and a PYY antiserum to determine the level of total PYY in serum, plasma or tissue culture media by the double antibody/PEG technique.

Technical Data

Sample requirements

Samples should be processed as quickly as possible and kept on ice to retard the breakdown of PYY. Treatment of the blood with Aprotinin is recommended at a final concentration of 500 KIU/mL of blood.

A maximum of 100 μ L per assay tube of serum of plasma should be used. Tissue culture and other media may also be used. Care must be taken when using heparin as an anticoagulant, since excess will provide falsely high values. Use no more than 10 IU heparin per mL of blood collected. For longer storage, specimens should be aliquoted and stored at \leq -20 °C.

Multiple freeze/thaw cycles should be avoided.

Intra-assay precision

Sample no. Mean pg/m		%CV
1	82.7	9.4
2	111.1	2.9
3	542.6	3.6

Inter-assay precision

Sample no.	Mean pg/mL	%CV
1	82.7	8.5
2	111.1	7.1
3	542.6	5.5

Sensitivity

The lowest level of PYY that can be detected by this assay is 10 pg/mL when using a 100 μ L sample size.

<u>High Dose Hook</u>

Reference Range

Interpretation of Results

Performance

The following parameters of assay performance are expressed as Mean + Standard Deviation.

 $ED80 = 36 \pm 5$ $ED50 = 103 \pm 12$ $ED20 = 300 \pm 38$

Specificity

The specificity (also known as selectivity) of an analytical test is its ability to selectively measure the analyte in the presence of other like components in the sample matrix.

PYY RIA Crossreactivity

PYY 1-36 human 100% PYY 3-36 human 100% [Pro34] PYY 100% [Leu31, Pro34] PYY 100% Rat/Porcine PYY 1-36 <0.1% Rat/Porcine PYY 3-36 <0.1% HPPP <0.1% NPY <0.1% Human Leptin * Glucagon * Human Ghrelin * Human Insulin * GLP-1 * *-Not detectable

Precision

Sample No	Mean pg/mL	Within %CV	Between %CV
1	82.7	9.4	8.5
2	111.1	2.9	7.1
3	542.6	3.6	5.5

Within and Between Assay Variation

Within and between assay variations were performed on three human plasma samples containing varying concentrations of Human PYY. Data (mean and %CV) shown are from one assay with eight duplicate determinations of each plasma sample for intra-assay precision. For inter-assay precision, data are generated using eight separate assays run for the three samples in duplicate.

Recovery

Spike and Recovery of PYY in Human Plasma

Sample No	PYY added pg/mL	% recovery
1	40	111
2	320	96
3	1280	83

Varying concentrations of Human PYY were added to three different human plasma samples and the PYY content was determined by RIA. Mean of the observed levels from duplicate determinations in one assay are shown. Percent recovery was calculated as the observed over expected multiplied by 100.

Linearity

Effect of Plasma Dilution

Sample	Volume	Observed	Expected	%
No	sampled (uL)	pg/mL	pg/mL	expected
1	100	161	161	100

	75	162		101
	50	170		105
	25	180		112
2	100	156	156	100
	75	167		107
	50	169		7108
	25	179		115
3	100	199	199	100
	75	220		111
	50	217		109
	25	246		124
4	100	124	124	100
	75	125		101
	50	133		107
	25	155		125

Aliquots of pooled Human Plasma containing varying concentrations of PYY were analyzed in the volumes indicated. Dilution factors of 1, 1.33, 2, and 4 representing 100_I, 75_I, 50_I, and 25_I respectively, were applied in calculating observed concentrations.

<u>Human Active Ghrelin</u> Method

SCETI K.K. Medical Section, DF Kuasumigaseki Place, 3-6-9 Kuasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

This kit is for non-radioactive quantification of human active Ghrelin human plasma samples.

Ghrelin a novel growth hormone releasing peptide is an acylated peptide that stimulates the release of growth hormone from the pituitary gland. It was isolated from rat stomach and the structure was determined as a peptide consisting of 28 amino acids by Dr Kenji Kankawa. The Ser3 residue of ghrelin is modified by noctanoic acid, a modification necessary for hormone activity.

This active ghrelin Elisa kit measures the active form of ghrelin based on the principle of 2 site sandwich enzyme linked immunosorbent assay. It can detect not only octanoylated human ghrelin but also octanoylated rat/mouse ghrelin. This kit is manufactured using the high specific antibody pairs generated by Dr Kangawa

TECHNICAL DATA

Intra-assay precision

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
N	6	6	6	6
Mean (pg/mL)	279	185	21	15
CV%	3.0	8.8	7.3	6.7

Inter-assay precision

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Ν	6	6	6	6

Mean (pg/mL)	166	134	50	26
CV%	11.8	2.3	3.3	6.1

Sensitivity

The minimal detectable GIP concentration is 8.2 pg/mL

<u>Cholecystokinin Octapeptide (CCK)</u> Method

Phoenix Pharmaceuticals, Inc. 330 Beach Road, Burlingame, California 94010.

The immunoplate in this kit is pre-coated with secondary antibody and the nonspecific binding sites are blocked. The secondary antibody can bind to the Fc fragment of the primary antibody (peptide antibody) whose Fab fragment will be competitively bound by both biotinylated peptide and peptide standard or targeted peptide in the samples. The biotinylated peptide interacts with streptavadinhorseradish peroxidise (SA-HRP) which catalyses the substrate solution. The intensity of the yellow colour is directly proportional to the amount of biotinylated peptide-SA-HRP complex but inversely proportional to the amount of peptide in standard solutions or samples. A standard curve of know concentration can be established accordingly. The unknown concentration in samples can be determined by extrapolation to this standard curve.

TECHNICAL DATA

Sensitivity

The minimal detectable CCK concentration is 0.06 ng/mL

Appendix 3 – Funnel plots of the meta-analysis of the effects of RYGB surgery upon plasma lipids

Total cholesterol

Funnel plot of total cholesterol changes including all subgroups (random effects model)



LDL-cholesterol

Funnel plot of LDL-cholesterol changes after RYGB including all subgroups (random effects model)



HDL-cholesterol

Funnel plot of HDL-cholesterol including all subgroups (random effects model)



Triglycerides

Funnel plot of plasma triglyceride changes including all subgroups (random effects model)



NEFA

Funnel plot of the effect of RYGB upon plasma NEFA levels including all subgroups (random effects model)


11. Papers, presentations and awards

Book chapter

 Carswell KA, Lee MJ, Fried SK. Isolation and culture of human adipocytes and adipose tissue. Human Cell Culture Protocols, Methods in Molecular Biology Vol. 806 3rd edition (Ed. Mitry RR, Hughes RD), Humana Press 2012 (ISBN 978-1-61779-366-0)³⁷¹ (see supplementary material)

Papers

- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar AP, Amiel SA, Patel AG. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of gastric bypass surgery on plasma lipid levels. Obesity Surgery 2016; 26:843-855 (see supplementary material)
- Carswell KA, Vincent RP, Belgaumkar AP, Sherwood RA, Amiel SA, Patel AG, le Roux CW. The effect of bariatric surgery on intestinal absorption and transit time. Obesity Surgery 2014; 24:796-805⁶⁶ (see supplementary material)

Abstracts

- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Amiel SA, Patel AG. The systematic review and meta-analysis of plasma lipid levels around gastric bypass surgery. Obesity Surgery 2015
- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, Le Roux C, Amiel SA, Patel AG. Mechanism of remission of type 2 diabetes mellitus following gastric bypass surgery. BJS online 2011; 98 (S7):10
- Carswell KA, Vincent R, Belgaumkar A, Amiel SA, Patel AG, Le Roux CW. Absorption of nutrients after bariatric surgery. BJS online 2011; 98 (S7):2 and Obesity Surgery 2012
- Carswell KA, Belguamkar A, Dew T, Amiel S, Patel AG. Obesity surgery can impact upon lipid-induced insulin resistance. Obesity Surgery 2011; 21:1072

- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, Le Roux C, Amiel S, Patel AG. The lipolytic effects of gastric bypass surgery in patients with and without type 2 diabetes mellitus. Obesity Surgery 2011; 21: 1098
- Carswell K; Belgaumkar A; Patel AG. Systematic review of post-prandial hypoglycaemia after gastric bypass. Obesity Surgery 2009; 19: 972

Presentations

Oral presentations

- Carswell K, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, le Roux C, Amiel SA, Patel AG. The effects of RYGB surgery upon glycaemic and lipidaemic control. Rank Prize Funds, Grasmere, UK 19-22/10/15
- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Amiel SA, Patel AG. The systematic review and meta-analysis of plasma lipid levels around gastric bypass surgery. IFSO, Vienna, Austria 2015
- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, Le Roux C, Amiel SA, Patel AG. Mechanism of remission of type 2 diabetes mellitus following gastric bypass surgery. AUGIS 2011.
- Carswell K, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, Le Roux C, Amiel SA, Patel AG. The lipolytic effects of gastric bypass surgery in patients with and without type 2 diabetes mellitus. Rank Prize Funds, Grasmere, UK 09/03/11
- Carswell KA, Vincent R, Belgaumkar A, Amiel SA, Patel AG, Le Roux CW. Absorption of nutrients after bariatric surgery. AUGIS 2011 and IFSO
 European Chapter, Barcelona 2012
- Carswell K; Belgaumkar A; Patel AG. Systematic review of post-prandial hypoglycaemia after gastric bypass. IFSO, Paris 2009

Poster presentations

 Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, le Roux CW, Amiel SA, Patel AG. Mechanism of remission of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus following gastric bypass surgery. Alfred Benzon Symposium - adipose tissue in health and disease, Copenhagen Denmark 2012

- Carswell KA, Belguamkar A, Dew T, Amiel S, Patel AG. Obesity surgery can impact upon lipid-induced insulin resistance. IFSO, Hamburg, Germany 2011.
- Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, Le Roux C, Amiel S, Patel AG. The lipolytic effects of gastric bypass surgery in patients with and without type 2 diabetes mellitus. IFSO Hamburg, Germany 2011.

Awards

- British Journal of Surgery best paper prize AUGIS Belfast 2011
 Carswell KA, Vincent R, Belgaumkar A, Amiel SA, Patel AG, Le Roux
 CW. Absorption of nutrients after bariatric surgery
- International Federation of Surgical Obesity poster prize competition 1st prize, Hamburg 2011
 Carswell KA, Belgaumkar A, Mitry R, Dew T, Le Roux C, Amiel S, Patel AG. The lipolytic effects of gastric bypass surgery in patients with and without type 2 diabetes mellitus