medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Title: Dose-response relationship between protein supplementation and muscle mass increase: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Author names: Ryoichi Tagawa, Daiki Watanabe, Kyoko Ito, Keisuke Ueda, Kyosuke Nakayama, Chiaki Sanbongi, and Motohiko Miyachi

Author affiliations: *R. Tagawa, K. Ito, K. Ueda, K. Nakayama,* and *C. Sanbongi* are with the Nutrition Research Department, Food Microbiology and Function Research Laboratories, R&D Division, Meiji Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan. *D. Watanabe* is with the Section of Healthy Longevity Research, National Institute of Health and Nutrition, National Institutes of Biomedical Innovation, Health and Nutrition, Tokyo, Japan. *M. Miyachi* is with the Department of Physical Activity Research, National Institute of Health and Nutrition, National Institutes of Biomedical Innovation, Health and Nutrition, Tokyo, Japan.

Corresponding author:
M. Miyachi,
Department of Physical Activity Research, National Institute of Health and Nutrition, National Institutes of Biomedical Innovation, Health and Nutrition, 1-23-1 Toyama, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8636, Japan
E-mail: miyachi@nibiohn.go.jp.
Telephone: +81-3-3203-8061

Abstract:
Background: Muscle mass is essential for health promotion and maintenance; however, consensus regarding the effectiveness of protein interventions in increasing muscle mass is still lacking.
Objective: To evaluate the dose-response relationship in the effects of protein on lean body mass (or fat-free mass).
Data Sources: PubMed and Ichushi-Web databases were searched. A manual search of the references of the literature included in this study and of that included in other meta-analyses was conducted.
Study Selection: Randomized controlled trials evaluating the effect of supplementary protein intake on lean body mass were included.
Data Extraction: Two researchers independently screened the abstracts and five, reviewed the full-texts.
Results: A total of 5411 subjects in 105 articles were included. Dose-response analysis using a multivariate-adjusted spline model showed that lean body mass significantly improved with

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

about 5 g/day of supplementary protein intake; this effect further increased with > 50 g/day supplementary protein intake.

Conclusions: Increasing daily protein intake can help sustain and improve muscle mass in various populations, irrespective of sex, age, and exercise habits.

Key words: protein, body composition, diet

INTRODUCTION

Skeletal muscle, which is responsible for movement and activity, is the largest organ in the human body, accounting for 40% of the total body weight. In young and middle-aged adults, a decrease in muscle mass increases the risk of chronic metabolic diseases such as type 2 diabetes and obesity.[1, 2] Moreover, in the elderly, a progressive decrease in muscle mass (sarcopenia) with age is a risk factor for fractures, physical disabilities, and frailty.[3] Accordingly, sustaining and increasing muscle mass is extremely important for the promotion and maintenance of health across all populations, including the young and the elderly.[4]

Protein, one of the energy-producing nutrients, is a major component of skeletal muscle in living organisms, and is involved in the regulation of metabolism.[5, 6] Decreased muscle mass may be accelerated by a decline in the assimilation response to insufficient protein intake.[7] According to a meta-analysis of nitrogen delivery tests to evaluate the required amount of protein, protein requirement in adults was reported to be 0.66 g/kg body weight/day.[8] However, although some randomized controlled trials (RCTs) reported an increase in skeletal muscle mass following intake of more than the required amount of protein,[9-15] no consistent results have been demonstrated.[12]

The dose-response relationship between protein intake and muscle mass has been reported in a recent meta-analysis of RCTs.[14] But since this report mainly demonstrates the magnitude of effect in the dose-response curve, the dose-response relationship between increased muscle mass and protein intake cannot be estimated from confidence intervals (CI). Consequently, the purpose of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to quantitatively evaluate the dose-response relationship between differences in various supplementary protein intake and an increase in lean body mass or fat-free mass. Protein and amino acid ingestion strongly stimulates muscle protein synthesis,[16] and digested and absorbed proteins and amino acids also act as structural components of muscle hypertrophy.[5] Therefore, the hypothesis in this study was that ingesting small amounts of protein is effective in increasing muscle mass, and that increased protein intake would result in a significant increase in muscle mass. This study is the first meta-analysis examining the dose-response relationship between differences in a wide range of supplementary protein intake and the increase in muscle mass. Findings of this study contain recommendations for appropriate amounts of supplementary protein intake which is required for sustaining and improving muscle mass in a diverse population,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

irrespective of sex, age, and exercise habits.

METHODS

Protocol

This study was registered in UMIN-CTR (Registration No. R000044150).

Reporting

This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted in accordance with the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines.[17]

Data sources

A systematic review of published literature was conducted using the PubMed and Ichushi-Web (online database of academic articles in Japan) databases (last accessed on May 27th, 2019). Results were limited to English and Japanese language RCTs. The combinations of search terms and search parameters are shown in Supplementary Table S1. Moreover, a manual search of the references of the literature included for this study and of that included in other meta-analyses was conducted.

Study identification and data extraction

Two authors (R.T and K.N) independently screened titles and abstracts of all the search results, and eligibility was judged based on the eligibility criteria described later. Any disagreement regarding eligibility was resolved through deliberations. Articles judged to be potentially eligible in the primary screening, and articles for which no such decision could be made, were subjected to secondary screening to determine eligibility using the full-text version. Data on subjects' attributes, intervention conditions, and the target outcome, were extracted from the articles judged to be eligible during secondary screening. If a trial had more than one intervention group, each group was treated as a separate trial. Measurement results in the middle of the intervention period were excluded, and only one result before and after the full intervention was utilized. When data required for creation of a forest plot could not be collected, the article's corresponding author was contacted. In cases where numerical data were not available and responses on the inquiry could not be obtained from the corresponding author, but the data were available as graphs, numerical values were obtained using WebPlotDigitizer version 4.1 (Ankit Rohatgi, TX, USA).[18] Five authors (K.I., K.U., R.T., C.S., and K.N.) conducted the secondary screening and data extraction, and two authors (K.I. and K.U.) conducted the verification.

Eligibility

RCTs that studied the effects of supplementary protein intake on lean body mass (or fat-free

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

mass), where it was possible to compare the results between groups, were selected for analysis. The population, intervention, comparison, outcome, and setting (PICOS) criteria were used to define the research questions (Table 1). The target population was limited to subjects who did not have any serious illness. The protein intervention period was set as two weeks or more. Supplementary protein intake that was either clearly set in advance prior to the intervention (not the dietary survey results), or that could be calculated, was set in units of g/day. Trials with inter-group differences in the amounts for interventions with muscle hypertrophy promoters (leucine, beta-hydroxy-beta-methylbutyrate, creatine, etc.) or vitamin D were excluded. When there was more than one control group, priority was given to the control group with equal energy intake and with larger differences in supplementary protein intake. Control groups with different conditions other than nutrition (such as exercise) were excluded.

Outcomes

When extracting data on muscle mass, muscle strength, and body fat mass as outcomes, the target of analysis in this systematic review and meta-analysis was lean body mass or fat-free mass. For those articles where both lean body mass and fat-free mass were mentioned, only the results of lean body mass were included.

Quality assessment

Two authors (K.I. and K.N.) independently conducted the evaluation of the quality of selected articles using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool.[19] Any disagreement on judgement was resolved through discussions with a third author (R.T.). In order to avoid bias, those articles with detailed descriptions which are usually excluded (compared to articles with less detailed descriptions), all articles were evaluated, including the ones containing high risk items.

Statistical analysis

A meta-analysis was conducted on the effect of supplementary protein intake on lean body mass (or fat-free mass). Analysis was conducted using mean change and standard deviation (SD) of change (SD_{change}). In cases where SD_{change} was not reported, it was calculated using the equations given below, following the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.[19] In cases where all data for SD before intervention ($SD_{baseline}$), SD after intervention (SD_{final}), and SD_{change} were available, correlation coefficient (Corr) was calculated using the following equation:

$$Corr = (SD_{baseline}^2 + SD_{final}^2 - SD_{change}^2)/(2 \times SD_{baseline} \times SD_{final}).$$

In cases where SD_{change} was unknown, but $SD_{baseline}$ and SD_{final} were available, SD_{change} was calculated using the following equation:

$$SD_{change} = \sqrt{(SD_{baseline}^2 + SD_{final}^2 - 2 \times Corr \times SD_{baseline} \times SD_{final})}.$$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

In cases where all the above data were not available, SD_{change} was obtained by contacting the corresponding author.

Point estimation of the results was expressed by the magnitude of effect and the 95% CI using a forest plot. The analysis was performed using a random-effects model assuming that trial errors were included, since the trials were selected using a wide range of conditions and were not limited by sex, age, and exercise conditions. Statistical heterogeneity was evaluated using the inconsistency index (I^2) and χ^2 test, but the entire analysis was performed even if the heterogeneity was high, based on the assumption that corrections for confounding factors would be incorporated later. Publication bias was visually evaluated using a funnel plot analysis.

Moreover, a multivariate-adjusted spline model was used to evaluate the dose-response relationship between supplementary protein intake and lean body mass. This multivariate-adjusted model included age, sex, race (East Asians, Caucasians, others), body mass index (BMI), weight change rate, presence or absence of diseases, intervention period, type of protein intervention (supplement or modification of meal content), presence or absence of resistance exercise, and the presence or absence of conflict of interest (COI). The missing values of these covariates (of all the 105 selected trials; sex in eight cases, age in one case, weight after intervention in 15 cases, BMI in two cases) were substituted with average values (for the weight change rate only, missing values were substituted with 0) of all the included trials. Results for these analyses were expressed as the effect size and the 95% CI, with the former being calculated relative to the control group. In the results of the analysis, when the 95% CI of the magnitude of effect did not straddle 0, it was estimated that $p < 0.05$. When the 95% CI of the magnitude of effect straddled 0, it was estimated that $p \geq 0.05$.

Statistical significance was considered when both sides were less than 5%. All analyses were conducted using Review Manager (RevMan) version 5.3 (The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, CPH, Denmark) and STATA MP, version 15.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA).

Results

Study selection

The literature search results are shown in Figure 1. In the literature search conducted through May 27th, 2019, a total of 1700 potentially relevant articles were identified. Primary screening of titles and abstracts identified 295 articles that were either found to be potentially eligible, or for which no clear judgement could be made. Secondary screening using the full-text versions of the articles identified 149 eligible articles. On narrowing down the search according to the target outcome for analysis in this meta-analysis, data on 105 articles, 138 intervention groups, and 5411 subjects were obtained.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Study characteristics

Supplementary Table S2 summarizes the features of the 105 selected articles. The RCTs comprised 68 trials evaluating lean body mass only, 35 trials evaluating fat-free mass only, and two trials evaluating both lean body mass and fat-free mass. There were 66 trials where protein supplementation (test food) was added to regular meals, and 39 trials where the meal content itself was changed. The intervention period comprised a wide range, varying from 2 weeks to 18 months, with a mean of 19.8 weeks. As for training status, 62 trials were performed in the groups without any accompanying resistance exercise, 39 trials were performed in the groups with accompanying resistance exercise, and four trials were performed in both groups. With respect to energy balance, 41 trials accompanied aggressive weight loss, two trials accompanied aggressive weight gain, and 62 trials accompanied neither. With regards to sex, 2459 subjects were female, 2422 subjects were male, and 530 subjects were unknown. The mean age of the subjects varied widely in each of the trial groups, ranging from 19 to 81 years, with an overall mean of 47.2 years.

Risk of bias

Assessment of risk of bias has been summarized in Supplementary Figure S1. High risk of bias was judged for the following: blinding of participants and personnel in 58 trials, incomplete outcome data in seven trials, random sequence generation in three trials, and allocation concealment in three trials. Publication bias was not noticed in the funnel plot (Supplementary Figure S2).

Meta-analysis

Supplementary Figure S3 shows the forest plot consolidating the results of the trials for 138 intervention conditions. Protein intake was significantly effective in improving lean body mass or fat-free mass (weighted average difference 0.50, 95% CI 0.36-0.65, $p < 0.01$). For statistical heterogeneity, the $I^2 = 74\%$, and χ^2 tests demonstrated statistical significance ($p < 0.01$).

Dose-response curves

A multivariate-adjusted spline model was used to evaluate the dose-response curves showing the relationship between supplementary protein intake and lean body mass (or fat-free mass) (Figure 2). In the case of the unadjusted spline model, lean body mass increase was significant starting from supplementary protein intake of around 5 g/day, showed no significant change between around 5 g/day to 50 g/day, and then showed a greater increase in lean body mass with increasing supplementary protein intake of > 50 g/day (Figure 2a). These relationships were also observed after corrections for confounding factors, but the magnitude of effect of protein intake in the dose-response relationship tended to be lower compared to that for the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

unadjusted case (Figure 2b). Factors showing significant associations with the dose-response relationship included sex, race, age, weight change rate, presence or absence of disease, intervention period, type of protein used in intervention, and presence or absence of COI. Moreover, the multivariate-adjusted spline model performed only on trials with ≤ 50 g/day of protein, revealed that lean body mass was further increased when the intervention was combined with resistance exercises (Supplementary Table S3). Notably, the magnitude of effect on lean body mass increase was higher in subjects without COI.

DISCUSSION

Primary findings

The purpose of this study was to elucidate the dose-response relationship using a meta-analysis of RCTs investigating the effect of protein supplementation on lean body mass (or fat-free mass). The primary findings of the present study are described below. First, according to a multivariate-adjusted spline model, lean body mass significantly increased by about 1.2 kg, corresponding to as little as around 5 g of protein supplementation per day over a period of several months (average of 4 to 5 months). Secondly, no change in lean body mass increase was observed for protein supplementation within the range of around 5 g/day through 50 g/day. Thirdly, for protein supplementation of > 50 g/day or more, for each increase of 10 g/day, lean body mass increased by about 50 g. This study is the first meta-analysis examining the dose-response relationship between the differences in a wide range of amounts of protein supplementation and the increase in lean body mass, using multivariate-adjusted spline analysis. This study generated new findings on the dose-response relationship concerning muscle mass increase due to protein intake in a diverse population, irrespective of sex, age, and exercise habits.

Effects with low doses

The results demonstrated that the intake of additional amounts of protein of as little as around 5 g/day, resulted in an unadjusted average increase in lean body mass of about 500 g, and on adjusting for confounding factors, an average increase in lean body mass of about 1200 g was seen. Water accounts for about 76% of muscle,[20] and considering that 80% of the dry weight is made up of protein, the amount of muscle protein assimilated during the intervention period is estimated to be approximately 240 g (multivariate-adjusted model results). Since in those studies with protein interventions of < 10 g/day energy balance was not negative in all subjects, if 5 g/day of supplementary protein was digested and absorbed at an absorption rate of 81%,[21] it takes approximately 59 days (eight weeks), assuming that all absorbed amino acids are used in increasing lean body mass. Eight weeks is close to the average intervention period (10 weeks) for trials with < 10 g/day of supplementary protein intake, and considering that the actual absorption rate varies according to age and amount of protein intake,[22] findings

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

suggest that at around 5 g/day of supplementary protein intake, a major amount of absorbed amino acids were utilized in lean body mass increase. One physiological mechanism of efficient lean body mass increase by such a small amount of supplementary protein intake may be that, when proteins are digested and absorbed, and when blood amino acids (especially leucine concentrations) increase, the mTOR signaling pathway of muscle cells is activated and muscle protein synthesis is promoted.[23, 24] It has been reported that an additional intake of 5 g of protein, which corresponds to 2.5 g of essential amino acids, stimulates rapid protein assimilation.[7] Accordingly, the results of this study suggest that even in certain populations such as the elderly, people with dysphagia, patients, and people with financial constraints; the addition of one egg (protein amount: 6-8 g) or one cup (200 ml) of milk (protein amount: 6.8 g) per day to regular meals may be promising for increasing muscle mass.

Effects with high doses

The results demonstrate that a plateau for an increase in lean body mass was reached for supplemental protein intake at a range of around 5 g/day to 50 g/day. One likely reason behind this is that protein assimilation at one point becomes saturated in the younger population at > 20 g of protein intake, and in the elderly population at > 40 g of protein intake.[7] Moreover, in this study, when supplemental protein intake exceeded around 50 g/day, for each 10 g/day increase, lean body mass increased linearly by about 110 g in the unadjusted model, and by about 50 g in the confounders adjusted model. On the other hand, a recent meta-analysis suggested that the increase in muscle mass levels off at a total protein intake of 1.6 g/kg/day[14]. The likely factors for differences in results between the present study and the previous study are the variations in statistical methods (multivariate adjusted spline vs biphasic regression) and exposure factors (add-on protein intake vs total intake). Moreover, the previous meta-analysis utilized only protein intervention studies with resistance training. In the present study, by describing the magnitude of effect including the CI for each amount of supplementary protein intake using the multivariate adjusted spline model, we were able to elucidate the relationship between intervention amount and magnitude of effect while minimizing the impact of systematic errors. The main finding of this study, that supplementary protein intake exceeding 50 g/day induces even larger increases in muscle mass, suggests that this may be effective for patients and athletes who required an increase in muscle mass accompanied by muscle hypertrophy.

Strengths and limitations

This study has the following strengths. First, we included a large number of selected studies (trials) and subjects. To the best of our knowledge, the numbers in the present study are 2-3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

times higher than those in previous meta-analyses[9-15]. Second, dose-reactivity was described using a multivariate adjusted spline model. Surprisingly, although numerous meta-analyses have been published to date, only a few analyzed dose-response relationships, despite major interests and concerns regarding the amount of protein intervention and its effect size.

This study has some limitations. First, included studies were limited to those published in English and Japanese languages only. Notably, risk of bias was minimized by measures such as the inclusion of race as a confounding factor. Secondly, for articles in which the magnitude of effect on lean body mass was not mentioned in either the text or tables, the corresponding authors were contacted, but the response rate was low (seven out of 36 cases only). However, of the 29 articles where no response was obtained from the authors, 18 articles contained related graphs, and WebPlotDigitizer was used to extract data from these graphs. Thirdly, bias related to blinding was high. Double-blinded trials are difficult to perform in dietary protein interventions, since it is necessary to provide meals with different content. However, as most studies on protein intervention are not double-blinded, excluding them could result in large deviations from the current status of protein intervention studies. Consequently, studies that were not double-blinded were also included in this meta-analysis.

Perspectives

A future large-scale RCT is necessary to examine the dose-response relationship of multiple protein intervention amounts under the same conditions. This way, it will be possible to more accurately elucidate the relationship between protein intervention amount and muscle mass increase. In fact, only four articles out of the 105 articles included in the present meta-analysis examined the dose-response relationship under the same conditions. Moreover, intervention studies including subjects with severely insufficient protein intake (such as frailty and sarcopenia) are warranted. In developed and developing countries, sarcopenia and frailty in the elderly and kwashiorkor in young children, respectively, comprise some global health issues which need to be resolved. Therefore, more well-designed and multi-faceted studies are necessary to further clarify the relationship between protein intake and muscle mass.

Conclusion

This study is the first meta-analysis examining the dose-response relationship between the differences in a wide range of supplemental protein intake and the increase in lean body mass (or fat-free mass). Increasing protein intake only by around 5 g/day significantly increases muscle mass. When protein intake is increased by > 50 g/day, lean body mass increases linearly with additional protein intake. The findings of this study implicate that in diverse populations, ranging from patients to elderly people and athletes, appropriate protein intake is crucial in sustaining and improving muscle mass, irrespective of sex, age, and exercise habits,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Aya Yoshimura, Yuri Saito and Kae Yamazaki, researchers of Meiji Co., Ltd. for their support in data extraction.

Author contributions. R.T. and D.W. are co-first authors and M.M. is the corresponding author. All authors contributed to the conception of research. M.M., R.T., and D.W. designed the research. R.T. and K.N. performed screening. K.I., K.U., R.T., C.S. and K.N. performed data selection and extraction. K.I. and K.N. performed quality assessment. M.M., D.W. and R.T. conducted the analyses and drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the critical review of the manuscript. M.M. had primary responsibility for the final content of the manuscript.

Funding/support. No external funding supported this work.

Declaration of interest. R.T., K.I., K.U., K.N. and C.S. are employees of Meiji Co., Ltd.

Supporting Information

The following Supporting Information is available through the online version of this article on the publisher's website.

Supplementary Table S1 **Search strategy for PubMed and Ichushi-Web**

Supplementary Table S2 **Summary of characteristics of included studies**

Supplementary Table S3 **Summary of nutrition surveys**

Supplementary Table S4 **Summary of assigned protein amounts and differences between groups**

Supplementary Table S5 **Summary of conditions of the studies' interventions**

Supplementary Table S6 **Influence of covariates on the lean body mass or fat-free mass, stratified by supplementary protein intake.**

(a) ≤ 50 g supplementary protein intake,

(b) > 50 g supplementary protein intake.

Supplementary Figure S1 **Risk of bias assessment**

Supplementary Figure S2 **Funnel plot of all the included studies for changes in lean body mass or fat-free mass**

Supplementary Figure S3 **Forest plot assessing the effect of supplementary protein intake on changes in lean body mass or fat-free mass**

REFERENCES

1. Park SW, Goodpaster BH, Strotmeyer ES, et al. Accelerated loss of skeletal muscle strength in older adults with type 2 diabetes: the health, aging, and body composition

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

study. Diabetes Care. 2007;30:1507-1512.

2. Wolfe RR. The underappreciated role of muscle in health and disease. Am J Clin Nutr. 2006;84:475-482.
3. Walrand S, Boirie Y. Optimizing protein intake in aging. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2005;8:89-94.
4. Tieland M, Trouwborst I, Clark BC. Skeletal muscle performance and ageing. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2018;9:3-19.
5. Makovicky P, Makovicky P, Jilek F. Short review of some properties of muscular proteins. Cesk Fysiol. 2008;57:10-14.
6. Peyrollier K, Hajduch E, Blair AS, Hyde R, Hundal HS. L-leucine availability regulates phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase, p70 S6 kinase and glycogen synthase kinase-3 activity in L6 muscle cells: evidence for the involvement of the mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR) pathway in the L-leucine-induced up-regulation of system A amino acid transport. Biochem J. 2000;350 Pt 2:361-368.
7. Breen L, Phillips SM. Skeletal muscle protein metabolism in the elderly: interventions to counteract the 'anabolic resistance' of ageing. Nutr Metab (Lond). 2011;8:68.
8. Li M, Sun F, Piao JH, Yang XG. Protein requirements in healthy adults: a meta-analysis of nitrogen balance studies. Biomed Environ Sci. 2014;27:606-613.
9. Hou L, Lei Y, Li X, et al. Effect of protein supplementation combined with resistance training on muscle mass, strength and function in the elderly: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Nutr Health Aging. 2019;23:451-458.
10. O'Bryan KR, Doering TM, Morton RW, Coffey VG, Phillips SM, Cox GR. Do multi-ingredient protein supplements augment resistance training-induced gains in skeletal muscle mass and strength? A systematic review and meta-analysis of 35 trials. Br J Sports Med. 2019.
11. Hanach NI, McCullough F, Avery A. The impact of dairy protein intake on muscle mass, muscle strength, and physical performance in middle-aged to older adults with or without existing sarcopenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Adv Nutr. 2019;10:59-69.
12. Ten Haaf DSM, Nuijten MAH, Maessen MFH, Horstman AMH, Eijsvogels TMH, Hopman MTE. Effects of protein supplementation on lean body mass, muscle strength, and physical performance in nonfrail community-dwelling older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Clin Nutr. 2018;108:1043-1059.
13. Tieland M, Franssen R, Dullemeijer C, et al. The impact of dietary protein or amino acid supplementation on muscle mass and strength in elderly people: individual participant data and meta-analysis of RCT's. J Nutr Health Aging. 2017;21:994-1001.
14. Morton RW, Murphy KT, McKellar SR, et al. A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of the effect of protein supplementation on resistance training-induced

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

gains in muscle mass and strength in healthy adults. Br J Sports Med. 2018;52:376-384.

15. Xu ZR, Tan ZJ, Zhang Q, Gui QF, Yang YM. The effectiveness of leucine on muscle protein synthesis, lean body mass and leg lean mass accretion in older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Nutr. 2015;113:25-34.
16. Holwerda AM, Paulussen KJM, Overkamp M, et al. Dose-dependent increases in whole-body net protein balance and dietary protein-derived amino acid incorporation into myofibrillar protein during recovery from resistance exercise in Older Men. J Nutr. 2019;149:221-230.
17. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med. 2009;6:e1000097.
18. Drevon D, Fursa SR, Malcolm AL. Intercoder reliability and validity of WebPlotDigitizer in extracting graphed data. Behav Modif. 2017;41:323-339.
19. Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Available at: http://handbook.cochrane.org/. Accessed on December 7, 2019.
20. Lorenzo I, Serra-Prat M, Yebenes JC. The role of water homeostasis in muscle function and frailty: a review. Nutrients. 2019;11.
21. Bingham SA, Cummings JH. Urine nitrogen as an independent validatory measure of dietary intake: a study of nitrogen balance in individuals consuming their normal diet. Am J Clin Nutr. 1985;42:1276-1289.
22. Campbell WW, Johnson CA, McCabe GP, Carnell NS. Dietary protein requirements of younger and older adults. Am J Clin Nutr. 2008;88:1322-1329.
23. Lane MT, Herda TJ, Fry AC, Cooper MA, Andre MJ, Gallagher PM. Endocrine responses and acute mTOR pathway phosphorylation to resistance exercise with leucine and whey. Biol Sport. 2017;34:197-203.
24. Miyazaki M, Esser KA. Cellular mechanisms regulating protein synthesis and skeletal muscle hypertrophy in animals. J Appl Physiol (Bethesda, Md : 1985). 2009;106:1367-1373.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table legends

Table 1 **PICOS criteria for inclusion of studies**

Figure legends.

Figure 1 **Flow diagram of the literature search process.**

Figure 2 **Dose-response relationship between supplementary protein intake and muscle mass increase.** Multivariate adjusted spline curves illustrating the associations of supplementary protein intake and change in lean body mass or fat-free mass without adjustments (a) or adjusted for age, sex, race (East Asians, Caucasians, others), BMI, weight change rate, presence or absence of diseases, intervention period, type of protein intervention (supplement or modification of meal content), presence or absence of resistance exercise, and the presence or absence of COI (b). The solid line and dashed line represent the mean differences and 95% confidence intervals.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; COI, conflict of interest.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.21.20026252; this version posted February 23, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Parameter	Description
Population	Adult participants (not critically ill)
Intervention	Supplementary protein intake, supplemented for ≥ 2 weeks
Comparator	Placebo or no intervention
Outcomes	Lean body mass or fat-free mass
Study design	Randomized controlled trial

Table 1 **PICOS criteria for inclusion of studies**


Identification
Articles identified through PubMed search (n=1170)
Articles identified through Ichushi-Web search (n=520)
Articles identified through manual search (n=10)
Screening
Titles and abstracts screened (n=1700)
Articles excluded (n=1405)
Full-text articles screened (n=295)
Eligibility
Full-text articles excluded (n=146)
- Assigned protein amount (g/day) is not clear (n=43)
- Difference in other hypertrophic agents or vitamin D between groups (n=23)
- Comparison between different kinds of protein (n=21)
- Secondary analysis (n=14)
- Unable to retrieve data (n=11)
- No appropriate control group (n=10)
- Duplication (n=6)
- No appropriate outcomes (n=6)
- Extended study (n=4)
- Review or pooled analysis (n=2)
- Other (n=6)
Articles screened for lean or fat-free mass (n=149)
Included
Full-text articles excluded (n=44)
Excluded whole-body lean body mass or fat-free mass (n=44)
Articles included in quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) (n=105)

(a)


2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
Change in FFM or LBM (kg)
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
200
Add on protein intake (g/day)

(b)


2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
Change in FFM or LBM (kg)
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
200
Add on protein intake (g/day)