

Title page

Title: Restricting carbohydrates and calories in the treatment of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review of the effectiveness of 'low carbohydrate' interventions with differing energy levels

Authors' names: Anna P Nicholas¹, Adrian Soto Mota², Helen Lambert¹ & Adam L Collins¹

¹ Department of Nutritional Sciences, University of Surrey

² Department of Physiology, Anatomy & Genetics, University of Oxford

Author responsible for correspondence about manuscript:

Anna Nicholas

56 Highland Road, Wimborne, Dorset BH21 2QN

annapnicholas@gmail.com

07724303532

Shortened version of title: Carbohydrates and calories in type 2 diabetes

Key words or phrases: diabetes, obesity, low carbohydrate diet, low energy diet


Abstract

There are two proven dietary approaches to shift type 2 diabetes (T2D) into remission: low energy diets (LED) and low carbohydrate diets (LCD). These approaches differ in their rationale and application yet both involve carbohydrate restriction, either as an explicit goal or as a consequence of reducing overall energy intake. The aims of this systematic review were to identify, characterise and compare existing clinical trials that utilised 'low carbohydrate' interventions with differing energy intakes. Electronic databases CENTRAL, CINAHL, Embase, MEDLINE and Scopus were searched to identify controlled clinical trials in adults with T2D involving low carbohydrate intake (defined as <130g carbohydrate/day) and reporting weight and glycemic outcomes. The initial database search yielded 809 results, of which 18 studies met the inclusion criteria. 12/18 studies utilised low carbohydrate diets with moderate or unrestricted energy intake. Six trials utilised low energy diets (<1200kcal/day), with all except one incorporating meal-replacements as part of a commercial weight loss programme. Interventions using both restricted and unrestricted (*ad libitum*) energy intakes produced clinically significant weight loss and reduction in HbA1c at study end-points. Trials that restricted energy intake were not superior to those that allowed *ad libitum* low carbohydrate feeding at 12 and 24 months. An association was observed across studies between average weight loss and reduction in HbA1c, which strengthened with trial length, indicating that sustained weight loss is key to T2D remission. Further research is needed to specifically ascertain the weight-independent effects of carbohydrate restriction on glycemic control in T2D.

Word count: 246/250

23 Graphical abstract

24



25

26 Introduction

27

28 The prevalence of type 2 diabetes (T2D) has reached epidemic proportions and is a major global
 29 concern. According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), more than 422 million people have
 30 diabetes worldwide, representing a global prevalence among adults of 8.5% (1). In the UK alone,
 31 over 3.9 million people are diagnosed with diabetes, 90% of which have T2D, and this figure is
 32 anticipated to rise to more than 5 million by 2025 (2). T2D is a major risk factor for other health
 33 conditions including cardiovascular disease (CVD), kidney failure, neuropathy and blindness (1). It
 34 has also recently emerged as a significant risk factor for Covid-19 (3).

35

36 T2D used to be considered a chronic progressive disease typically managed by escalating
 37 pharmacotherapy to maintain normoglycemia and mitigate disease complications. However, the
 38 paradigm of treatment is changing with recognition that T2D can be put into remission (4). This
 39 remission, it seems, can occur up to a point, beyond which the pancreatic beta-cells are unable to
 40 recover (5). Definitions for remission vary but it is generally defined as achieving fasting plasma
 41 glucose (FPG) <7mol/L or glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) <6.5% (48mmol/mol) for a sustained period
 42 of time (2 to 12 months) and in the absence of antidiabetic medications (4).

43

44 There are currently two proven non-surgical ways to achieve T2D remission: low energy diets (LED)
 45 and low carbohydrate diets (LCD) (6–8). These two approaches focus on operating different
 46 metabolic levers: energy restriction and carbohydrate restriction. Given both factors are interlinked
 47 (Figure 1), it is not clear which is driving T2D remission and hence which offers the most effective
 48 interventional approach.

49

50




Figure 1: Interrelationship between energy restriction, weight loss and carbohydrate restriction in improved glycemic control.

Carbohydrate and energy restriction are interrelated. A) In obese individuals with T2D, weight loss is associated with improved glycemic control (9). This is in accordance with the twin cycle hypothesis, whose central tenet is that excess lipids within the liver and the pancreas drive T2D pathogenesis (10). B) In studies of low energy feeding, glycemia improves within days of energy restriction, before significant weight loss has occurred (11). C) Carbohydrate restriction improves glycemia by reducing postprandial glucose rises. While failed repression of gluconeogenesis and glycogenolysis are major causes of hyperglycemia (12), dietary carbohydrate intake is the largest driver of postprandial glucose rises. D) Carbohydrate restriction is also associated with weight loss. This may occur as a function of spontaneous energy restriction or there may be independent effects arising from reduced insulin secretion. Whether or not carbohydrate restriction has independent effects on body weight remains a matter of contentious debate (hence depicted as dashed line) (13,14).

LEDs restrict energy intake to induce rapid weight loss (15). They characteristically provide between 800 and 1200 kcal/day utilising either total diet replacement (TDR) or some inclusion of conventional foods as a partial diet replacement (16). LEDs have gained attention for their use in diabetes management after the 2011 Counterpoint study demonstrated reversal of abnormalities underlying T2D using an 8 week 600kcal/day diet (17). In 2018, the DiRECT trial demonstrated that an intensive weight management programme using TDR could achieve T2D remission in 46% of participants after one year (7).

LCDs specifically aim to restrict carbohydrate intake, either as a percentage of total energy or as an absolute intake (grams per day). Definitions of what constitutes 'low carbohydrate' have been inconsistent over time and between studies, but the definitions proposed by Feinman et al (18) are becoming more widely accepted. Specifically, this defines low carbohydrate as less than 130g CHO/day and very low carbohydrate ketogenic diets as less than 50g/day.

78

79 There is currently much interest in the application of LCDs to T2D (19). Over the past five years, 10
80 meta-analyses, based on nearly 50 randomised controlled trials (RCTs), have aimed to address the
81 question of whether diets low in carbohydrates produce greater improvements in weight and
82 glycemic control compared to higher carbohydrate control diets (20–29). The majority of these
83 meta-analyses have found a beneficial effect from carbohydrate restriction (20–26), and none have
84 favoured higher carbohydrate comparators, although several studies have found no difference
85 between diets (27–29).

86

87 The table below highlights the similarities and differences between LCDs and LEDs. It is clear that,
88 despite their different aims, carbohydrate restriction is common in both: LCDs restrict carbohydrates
89 as an explicit goal, whereas LEDs restrict carbohydrates as a consequence of achieving low energy
90 intake.

91

92 *Table 1: Generalised similarities and differences between Low Carbohydrate Diets and Low Energy*
93 *Diets*

94 CHO, carbohydrate

	Low Energy Diets	Low Carbohydrate Diets
Meal format	Usually meal replacements soups, shakes and bars	Usually food-based
Energy restriction	Energy restricted to ≤ 1200 kcal/day	Variable. Some allow <i>ad libitum</i> feeding to satiety; others include moderate energy restriction (>1200 kcal/day)
Carbohydrate restriction	Variable carbohydrate content but usually at least 50g CHO/day	Restricted to <130 g CHO/day; VLCKD restricted to 20-50g CHO/day
Duration	Necessarily restricted to short periods of up to 3 to 5 months	No limit on duration

95

96 Study aims

97 Systematic reviews of carbohydrate restriction interventions to date have focussed on traditional
98 LCDs but have not included LEDs that are also ‘low carbohydrate’ in absolute terms. Moreover, most
99 have also used a range of definitions for LCDs, from $<25\%$ to $<50\%$ TE (20,27). This review takes an
100 alternative approach to the existing evidence-base by recognising the commonality between these
101 two approaches “clamped” by carbohydrate intake. Specifically, it aims to review, characterise and

- 102 compare the clinical trials that have used low carbohydrate (<130g/day) approaches with different
103 levels of energy intake.

Methods

Data sources and searches

The present systematic review was performed with reference to the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (30) and reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (31). A protocol was registered with PROSPERO in advance (CRD42020197257) (32).

An electronic search was performed using the databases Medline, EMBASE, CINAHL, Scopus and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). The search was performed on 7th July 2020 and no date limits were applied. Search terms included keywords and subject headings related to T2D, low energy or low carbohydrate diets, glycemic outcomes and clinical trials (see Supplemental Materials). A manual search of reference lists of key systematic reviews and reports was also conducted to identify any additional relevant studies. Search results were independently reviewed by A.N and A.S.M and any conflicts over inclusion were resolved by discussion.

Study selection

Studies were eligible for inclusion if they were controlled trials including adults diagnosed with T2D, involving a low carbohydrate diet (defined as <130g/day or <26% of total energy) and reporting change in weight and glycemic control. Non-randomised trials were eligible to allow inclusion of trials in more ecologically valid settings, such as those utilising very low energy weight loss diets. Control diets that stipulated any other type of dietary intervention such as low fat, 'healthy eating' and Mediterranean, or usual diabetes care were permitted. All countries and languages were eligible. For full inclusion and exclusion criteria, see Table 2.

Table 2: Study inclusion and exclusion criteria

CCTs, controlled clinical trials; CHO, carbohydrate; CVD, cardiovascular disease; RCTs, randomised controlled trials; T1D, type 1 diabetes; T2D, type 2 diabetes; TE, total energy

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
RCTs and CCTs using low CHO diets or very low energy diets with <130g/day or <26% TE from CHO in adults (≥18 y) with T2D	Studies that included people with other chronic diseases (except hypertension or CVD) or taking systemic corticosteroids, or had any progressive disease requiring hospital care
Control is any other type of dietary intervention or usual care	Studies involving participants undergoing surgery
Data from crossover trials with washout periods of ≥4 weeks between interventions. In absence of adequate wash-out period, data from these trials only included if able to extract relevant data for 1st phase	Studies of T1D, prediabetes or gestational diabetes
Studies of individuals with and without T2D only if subgroup analysis available for participants with T2D	Studies with enteral or parenteral feeds
Studies reporting change in weight and markers of glucose control	Participants aged <18 y or pregnant/lactating women
Provided macronutrient goals/CHO goals as TE or g/day	Treatment diet poorly defined; unclear whether low CHO criteria were met
	Studies involving intermittent fasting protocols
	Study duration <1 week
	Studies based on medication co-intervention not applied to all groups

Data extraction and quality assessment

Data were extracted by A.N. Data items included: study characteristics, participant characteristics, details of the intervention (including prescribed and reported energy and macronutrient composition), dietary adherence and outcome data for HbA1c and weight loss at 3, 6, 12, 24 months (where available) and study-end points. HbA1c only was collected as it is the most widely used marker of T2D remission and medication changes and quality of life were not reported due to lack of consistency across studies. These represent minor deviations from the protocol submitted to

PROSPERO. The mean percentage weight loss from baseline and mean absolute reduction in HbA1c were calculated for intervention arms. Absolute rather than relative change in HbA1c was used since therapeutic goals are based on a threshold value and not relative reduction (33). Risk of Bias was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (34).

Data synthesis and analysis

A narrative synthesis was undertaken to explore characteristics of the included studies. HbA1c and weight loss outcome data were compared between intervention and control arms within studies at the longest duration time-point.

In order to compare weight and HbA1c outcomes between studies, percentage weight loss and HbA1c change at study end-point and at specific time points (3, 6, 12 and 24 months) were plotted graphically in scatter plots. Meta-analysis was not considered appropriate due to high clinical heterogeneity between studies. The association between average weight loss and HbA1c change was examined using correlation analysis and computation of R-squared values in Prism 8 for OS X Version 8.4.3 (35).

Results

Search results

Figure 2 shows the selection of studies, in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines (31). The initial database search yielded 809 studies, of which 223 were duplicates. Following title and abstract screening, 91 studies were retrieved for full text screening. A total of 18 studies met the inclusion criteria.




Figure 2: Study screening and selection

Study characteristics

This review yielded a highly heterogenous set of studies that fulfilled criteria for 'low carbohydrate'. The characteristics of the 18 controlled trials are summarised in Table 3. The publication period covered 2006 to 2020, study duration ranged from 3 to 24 months, and study sample sizes ranged from 6 to 262 participants in the intervention arm. Of the included studies, 16 were randomised controlled trials (RCT) and 2 were non-RCT. Of the two non-RCT, one was randomised at the level of GP practice rather than participant level.

Variable approaches to energy and carbohydrate restriction

Studies were categorised into three groups based on their prescribed energy intakes: unrestricted (*ad libitum* feeding), moderately restricted (1200 to 2000 kcal/day) or severely restricted (<1200 kcal/day) (Figure 3).




Figure 3: Prescribed daily carbohydrate and energy intakes in included studies.

Where a maximum allowance of carbohydrate or energy was prescribed, this value was used. Where a range of carbohydrate or energy intakes was prescribed, the mid-point value was taken. Where energy intake was

unrestricted, a value of 2000kcal/day was assigned. Squares, no energy restriction (ad libitum feeding); circles, moderate energy restriction (1200-2000kcal/day); triangles, severe energy-restriction (<1200kcal/day).

A total of 10 out of 18 studies involved traditional low or very low carbohydrate diets that were food-based and did not prescribe limits on energy intake. Two out of 18 studies used moderate energy reduction targets. Almost all of the studies in these groups aimed for sustained carbohydrate restriction throughout the study period. Only two were initiated by a very restrictive early phase followed by subsequent increases in carbohydrate allowance (36,37).

Six out of the 18 trials restricted energy intake to <1000kcal/day, with all except one incorporating meal-replacements as part of a stepped weight loss programme. Three studies used a 3 to 5 month proprietary total diet replacement (TDR) weight loss phase involving energy restriction of around 800kcal/day, followed by food reintroduction and weight loss maintenance phases (38–40). In the TDR phase, carbohydrates accounted for 50-59% of total energy (TE) which translated to 100-125g per day. The TDR phase was low carbohydrate in absolute terms but the macronutrient composition of subsequent phases was unclear from the published reports. These studies did not explicitly prescribe carbohydrate restriction but rather aimed to achieve weight loss via energy restriction. There were two exceptions to this; Morris (2020) (41) used a food-based diet that was explicitly low carbohydrate (<26% TE) as well as low energy (800-1000kcal/day) (39) and Goday (2016) (42) used a very low energy ketogenic diet. All of the LED trials were recently published, allowing only a limited period for follow up.

Study aims

The principle aim for the majority of energy-restricted studies was to achieve and maintain weight loss, which was accomplished using mixed interventions with a number of different strategies including meal replacements to achieve <1200kcal/day, individualised dietary advice, lifestyle changes and medication, if necessary (43). For these studies, the control group was a variant of usual care. By contrast, the principal aim of most of the low carbohydrate diet studies was to test the effect of manipulating carbohydrate intake on participants' weight and glycemic control, with a more conventional "low fat" diet as a comparator.

Outcome measures

Most studies' primary outcome measures related to weight and/or glycemic control with the exception of three studies that assessed cardiac function, safety parameters and full-trial feasibility

criteria. All studies reported HbA1c, with 11 out of 18 studies specifying HbA1c as a primary outcome. Four studies, all published in or after 2018, reported T2D “remission” or “reversal”, although definitions of this varied (38–40,44). One earlier study reported the proportion of participants with final HbA1c below the T2D diagnostic criteria (45).

Baseline participant characteristics

Mean population ages ranged from 42 to 69 years and there was a mix of ethnicities and gender ratios across studies. All studies except those conducted in Japan recruited participants who had BMI $>30 \text{ kg/m}^2$, with the majority having a mean BMI $>35 \text{ kg/m}^2$. There was a wide range of average diabetes duration (2 to 14 years) and medication usage (Table S2).

Intervention details

Interventions varied across studies in several ways including mode of delivery, dietary advice provided, intensity of support and utilisation of behavioural strategies to promote adherence (Table S3). Some studies included very low intensity interventions (involving only infrequent group sessions and dietary advice), whereas others involved more intensive input and employed a range of strategies to support dietary and lifestyle change including behaviour change techniques, intensive group support, biomarker feedback and health technologies, online support and remote care. More recent studies, published in or after 2017, involved higher intensity mixed interventions, typically employing a range of technological and behavioural support.

Control

Six out of 18 studies used usual care as a control. In five of these studies, usual care provided minimal input so the intervention and control arms differed in a number of aspects beyond dietary change. The remaining 12 studies all used a version of a low fat, energy-restricted diet. In all but one study, energy intake was not matched between intervention and control diets. The exception was Tay (2018) who used a planned isocaloric control, advising both arms to limit energy intake to achieve a 500-1000kcal deficit per day.

Dietary assessment and adherence

The majority of studies attempted to assess dietary adherence in some way, although the methods employed varied between studies. A total of 10 studies used food records (1, 3, 5 or 7-day food diaries) and two studies used self-report via questionnaires. Dietary adherence was not assessed in

249 any of the four studies that utilised total diet replacement (via meal replacements). Several studies
 250 used urinary or blood ketones as a marker of nutritional ketosis but the majority of these did not
 251 base adherence on these reported measures. Of note, in those that included participant reported
 252 carbohydrate intakes, 8 out of 9 studies (90%) had reported values that exceeded the prescribed
 253 carbohydrate intake by more than 10% (Table S4).

Table 3: Characteristics of included studies

Study	Location, setting	Sample size	Length (months)	Objectives	Primary outcome (s)	Intervention	Control	Prescribed carbohydrate (g/day)	Prescribed energy (kcal/day)
Unrestricted energy intake (<i>ad libitum</i>)									
Athinarayanan (2019) (44)	US, app-based with or without onsite-clinic support	262	24	To assess the effectiveness and safety of CCI at 2 years	Retention, HbA1c, HOMA-IR, fasting glucose, fasting insulin, c-peptide and weight	Metabolic and continuous care intervention (CCI) + nutritional ketosis	Usual diabetes care	<30	Unrestricted (instructed to achieve satiety without tracking energy intake)
Daly (2006) (36)	UK, Hospital outpatient	51	3	To examine effects of a 3 month programme of dietary advice to restrict carbohydrate intake compared with reduced-portion, low-fat advice in obese adults with poorly controlled T2D	Change in weight, HbA1c, TC:HDL, TAG	Low carbohydrate	Low fat	<70	Unrestricted (although energy-balance principles incorporated into education)
Davis (2009) (46)	US, Research centre	55	12	To compare effects of a 1 year intervention with a low carbohydrate and a low-fat diet on weight loss and glycemic control in adults with T2D	Weight, HbA1c	Low carbohydrate	Low fat	20-25 (increase by 5g/week)	Unrestricted
Dyson (2007) (47)	UK, Hospital outpatient	6	3	To assess impact of a low carbohydrate diet on body weight, HbA1c, ketone and lipid levels in diabetic and non-diabetic adults	Weight	Low carbohydrate	Diabetes UK nutritional recommendations	40	Unrestricted
Iqbal (2010) (48)	US, Hospital outpatient	70	24	To determine whether comparable results to those of short-term, intensive interventions comparing a low-carbohydrate versus low-fat diet in obese, diabetic adults could be achieved over 24 months using a low-intensity intervention that approximates what is feasible in outpatient practice	Weight, HbA1c, glucose and lipids	Low carbohydrate	Low fat	30	Unrestricted
Saslow (2017a) (49)	US, Research centre	16	12	To compare effects of two diets on HbA1c and other health-related outcomes in overweight/obese adults with T2D or prediabetes	HbA1c	Very low carbohydrate high fat, non-energy restricted	Medium carbohydrate, low fat, energy-restricted, carbohydrate counting diet	20-50	Unrestricted
Saslow (2017b) (45)	US, Online	12	7	To determine whether an online intervention based on an <i>ad libitum</i> very low-carbohydrate ketogenic diet with lifestyle factors or an online diet program based on the ADA "Create Your Plate" diet would improve glycemic control and other health outcomes among overweight individuals with T2D	HbA1c	Online ketogenic diet program	Online ADA diet program	20-50	Unrestricted
Sato (2017) (50)	Japan, Hospital outpatient	33	6	To compare effectiveness and safety of low carbohydrate diet with energy restricted diet	HbA1c	Low carbohydrate	Energy-restricted	130	Unrestricted

Westman (2008) (51)	US, Outpatient research centre	38	6	To test whether a diet lower in carbohydrate would lead to greater improvement in glycemic control over 24 weeks in obese adults with T2D	HbA1c	Low carbohydrate ketogenic	Low GI, reduced energy	<20	Unrestricted
Yama da (2014) (52)	Japan, Outpatient clinic	12	6	To examine effects of a non-energy-restricted, low-carbohydrate diet in Japanese patients unable to adhere to an energy-restricted diet	HbA1c	Low carbohydrate	Conventional energy-restricted	70-130	Unrestricted
Moderate energy restriction (1200 to 2000kcal/day)									
Guldbrand (2012) (53)	Sweden, Primary care	30	24	To compare effects of a 2 year intervention with a low-fat diet or a low carbohydrate diet based on four group-meetings to achieve compliance	Weight, HbA1c	Low carbohydrate	Low fat	85	1800 men/1600 women
Tay (2018) (37)	Australia, Research centre	58	24	To compare effects of a very-low-carbohydrate, high unsaturated fat, low saturated fat diet with a high carbohydrate, low-fat diet on glycaemic control and CVD risk factors in T2D	HbA1c	Low carbohydrate, high unsaturated fat, low saturated fat	High carbohydrate, low fat	<50	Individualised to achieve 500-1000kcal deficit per day
Severe energy restriction (<1200kcal/day)									
Brown (2020) (54)	UK, Secondary care outpatient	45	12	To examine the effect of a low-energy total diet replacement (TDR) intervention versus standardised dietetic care in patients with long-standing type 2 diabetes and obesity receiving insulin therapy	Weight	12 week low energy TDR by Cambridge Weight Plan, followed by structured food reintroduction and weight loss maintenance programme	Standardized dietetic care on weight loss (600kcal deficit diet)	115	800-820
Goday (2016) (42)	Spain, Hospital outpatient	45	4	To evaluate the short-term safety and tolerability of a VLCK diet (≤50 g of carbohydrate daily) in an interventional weight loss program including lifestyle and behavioural modification support (Diapokal Method) in subjects with T2DM	Safety parameters including renal function, liver function and plasma uric acid, NA and K	Very low energy-ketogenic diet involving three phases (Pronokal Method)	Low energy diet	<50	600-800
Gulsin (2020) (55)	UK, Research centre	29	3	To confirm the presence of subclinical cardiovascular dysfunction in working-age adults with T2D and determine whether this is improved by a low-energy meal replacement diet or exercise training	Measure of diastolic function: change in left ventricular peak early diastolic strain rate	12 week low energy TDR by Cambridge Weight Plan	Two other arms: routine care as per NICE guidelines and a supervised aerobic exercise program	101	810
Lean (2019) (39)	UK, Primary care	149	24	To assess whether intensive weight management within routine primary care would achieve remission of T2D	Weight loss of 15 kg or more and remission of diabetes	12 week low energy total TDR by Cambridge Weight Plan, followed by food reintroduction and weight loss maintenance programme	Usual diabetes care	124	825–853

Morris (2020) (56)	UK, Primary care	21	3	To examine the feasibility of a food-based, low-energy, low-carbohydrate diet with behavioural support delivered by practice nurses for patients with T2D	Prespecified feasibility criteria to progress to a full trial	Food-based, low-energy, low-carbohydrate diet	Usual diabetes care	<59	800-1000
Taheri (2020) (40)	Qatar, Primary care	70	12	To assess whether an intensive lifestyle intervention would lead to significant weight loss and improved glycaemia in young individuals with early diabetes	Weight loss	12 week low-energy total TDR by Cambridge Weight Plan, followed by food reintroduction and weight loss maintenance programme	Usual diabetes care	124	825–853

ADA, American Diabetes Association; CCI, continuous care intervention; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; HbA1c, glycated haemoglobin; HDL-C; HOMA-IR, Homeostatic Model Assessment of Insulin Resistance; NICE, The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; TAG, blood triacylglycerol; TC, total cholesterol; T2D, type 2 diabetes; TDR, total diet replacement; VLCK, very low calorie ketogenic

Risk of bias

Selection bias was high for the two studies in which participants self-selected into the intervention; it was low or unclear for the 16 trials that randomised participants between intervention arms. Six studies provided insufficient information on allocation concealment. Performance bias was judged to be high in the eight studies which involved mixed interventions that differed in several aspects to the control arm, due to the nature of these trials. Performance bias was unclear for the remainder of trials due to the possible influence of participant or personnel expectations on the results. Detection bias was considered low for all studies based on the objective nature of the outcomes of interest. Attrition bias was high in four studies in which dropout rates were high or imbalanced between groups and completers analysis was used. Reporting bias of the outcomes of interest was low in all studies since pre-specified outcomes of interest were reported. Only three studies were judged as unclear for 'other bias', due to potential baseline imbalances in confounders between the groups. The risk of bias assessment is summarised in Figure 4.

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias
Athinarayanan (2019)	-	-	-	+	?	+	?
Brown (2020)	+	+	-	+	?	+	+
Daly (2006)	+	+	?	+	+	+	+
Davis (2009)	+	?	?	+	+	+	+
Dyson (2007)	+	+	?	+	+	+	+
Goday (2016)	?	?	?	+	?	+	+
Guldbbrand (2012)	+	+	?	+	+	+	+
Gulsin (2020)	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Iqbal (2010)	?	?	?	+	-	+	+
Lean (2019)	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Morris (2020)	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Saslow (2017a)	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
Saslow (2017b)	+	+	-	+	?	+	?
Sato (2017)	+	?	?	+	+	+	+
Taheri (2020)	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Tay (2018)	+	+	?	+	-	+	+
Westman (2008)	+	?	?	+	-	+	?
Yamada (2014)	+	?	?	+	+	+	+




 = High risk of bias
 = Low risk of bias
 = Unclear risk of bias

Figure 4: Risk of bias assessment results

+, low risk of bias; ?, unclear risk of bias; -, high risk of bias.

Effectiveness of interventions

Between group differences

All but one study resulted in a reduction in HbA1c between baseline and study end-point (Table 4). A total of 10 studies demonstrated significant improvements in HbA1c in the intervention arm compared with the comparator arm. All studies reported weight loss from baseline to end-point, with 12 studies showing greater weight loss in the intervention arm compared with the control group. All studies using usual diabetes care as a control arm reported significant between-group differences in weight and HbA1c. Only two of the five studies reporting data at 24 months found a difference between intervention and control groups by the end of the study (39,44).

Table 4: Baseline and change values for HbA1c and weight for intervention and control arms

Author (date)	Duration	HbA1c (%)						Weight (kg)			
	(months)	Intervention		Control		Between group	Intervention		Control		Between group
		Baseline	Change	Baseline	Change		Baseline	Change	Baseline	Change	
Unrestricted energy intake (<i>ad libitum</i>)											
Athinarayanan (2019)	24	7.6 (1.5)*	-0.9	7.6 (1.8)*	0.4	Significant	114.6 (0.6)*	-11.94	112.35 (1.9)*	1.28	Significant
Daly (2006)	3	9.0 (0.2)	-0.55	9.1 (0.17)	-0.23	Non-significant	101.6 (1.84)	-3.55	102.3 (2.49)	0.92	Significant
Davis (2009)	12	7.5 (1.5)	-0.02	7.4 (1.5)	0.24	Non-significant	93.6 (18)	-3.1	101 (19)	-3.1	Non-significant
Dyson (2007)	3	7.2 (1.7)	-0.4	7.1 (1.0)	-0.2	Non-significant	99.7 (14.6)	-8	96.9 (12.9)	-0.8	Significant
Iqbal (2010)	24	7.9 (1.7)	-0.1	7.6 (1.3)	-0.2	Non-significant	118.3 (21.3)	-1.5	115.5 (16.7)	-0.2	Non-significant
Saslow (2017a)	12	6.6 [6.3, 6.9]	-0.5	6.9 [6.6, 7.2]	-0.2	Significant	99.9 [88.4, 111.5]	-7.9	97.5 [86.6, 108.3]	-1.7	Significant
Saslow (2017b)	7	7.1 (0.4)	-0.8	7.2 (0.3)	-0.3	Significant	109.7 (24.9)	-12.7	90.9 (16.4)	-3.0	Significant
Sato (2017)	6	8	-0.65	8.3	0	Significant	74	-1.6	73.6	-0.6	Significant
Westman (2008)	6	8.8 (1.8)	-1.5	8.3 (1.9)	-0.5	Significant	108.4 (20.5)	-11.1	105.2 (19.8)	-6.9	Significant
Yamada (2014)	6	7.6 (0.4)	-0.6	7.7 (0.6)	-0.2	Significant	67.0 (15.9)	-2.6	68.1 (7.7)	-1.4	Non-significant
Moderate energy restriction (1200 to 2000kcal/day)											
Guldbrand (2012)	24	7.5 (3.1)	0.0	7.2 (2.9)	0.0	Non-significant	88.0 (16)	-2.34	90.6 (19)	-2.97	Non-significant
Tay (2018)	24	NR	-0.6	NR	-0.9	Non-significant	101.7 [97.8, 105.7]	-6.8	101.6 [97.6, 105.6]	-6.6	Non-significant
Severe energy restriction (<1200kcal/day)											
Brown (2020)	12	8.75 (1.74)	-0.43	9.32 (1.71)	-0.09	Non-significant	104 (20.2)	-9.8	103.1 (18.9)	-5.6	Significant
Goday (2016)	4	6.9 (1.1)	-0.9	6.8 (1.0)	-0.4	Significant	91.5 (11.4)	-14.7	90.0 (11.3)	-5.05	Significant
Gulsin (2020)	3	7.2 (1.1)	-1.0	7.3 (0.9)	-0.1	NR	106.7 (16.2)	-13.44	102.6 (14.9)	-1.05	NR
Lean (2019)	24	7.7 (1.3)	-0.5	7.5 (1.1)	0.0	Significant	101.0 (16.7)	-7.6	98.8 (16.1)	-2.3	Significant
Morris (2020)	3	7.93 (1.35)	-1.49	7.37 (0.76)	-0.06	Significant	103.0 (16.7)	-9.5	97.6 (13.2)	-2.0	Significant
Taheri (2020)	12	6.95 (1.40)	-0.89	6.95 (1.22)	-0.35	Significant	100.64 (16.95)	-11.98	101.68 (19.26)	-3.98	Significant

Data taken for longest available time-point. All data are mean (standard deviation, SD) unless specified. Italics show median data where means not available. (*) shows standard error of the mean, SEM. NR, not reported. [] show 95% confidence interval, CI.

Weight loss and HbA1c change in intervention arms

There was a wide range of reported improvements in the intervention arms across studies in mean HbA1c change (ranging from 0.0% to 1.5%) and mean percentage weight loss (ranging from only 1% to over 15% of baseline weight). Figure 5 shows the data for all study endpoints.

Those trials that severely restricted energy all produced clinically significant weight loss of more than 5% whereas energy-unrestricted trials produced a wider range of weight and HbA1c outcomes. The non-energy restricted studies were more numerous, published over a longer time period and involved more diverse intervention types. Two of the most effective interventions explicitly combined low carbohydrate and low energy approaches (41,42).




Figure 5: Average improvement in HbA1c and average percentage weight loss at study end-points.

Each point represents the mean value for a single study with the exception of Sato (2017) which represents median values. Study end-points range from 3 to 24 months. Squares, no energy restriction (*ad libitum*


feeding); circles, moderate energy restriction (1200-2000kcal/day); triangles, severe energy restriction (<1200kcal/day).

Figure 6 shows the data at 12 months to facilitate comparisons between studies. Level of energy restriction did not clearly distinguish intervention efficacy. The three studies using LEDs led to consistent and considerable mean weight loss of around 10% (16,39,40). The two studies reporting the largest changes at both 12 and 24 months involved LCDs with unrestricted or moderate energy restriction (37,44). The most effective intervention at 12 and 24 months involved an *ad libitum* ketogenic diet (44).

Association between weight loss and HbA1c

An association was observed between average weight loss and change in HbA1c across studies at 6, 12 and 24 months. The association was strongest at longer study-lengths, as assessed by R-squared: at 6 months 58% of the variation in average HbA1c change between studies could be accounted for by the variation in average weight loss; at 12 months this increased to 81%; and at 24 months this increased to 91%. A scatterplot summarises the results at 12 months (Figure 6). Reductions in HbA1c were associated with increased percentage of weight lost.

308



309

310 **Figure 6: Average improvement in HbA1c and average percentage weight loss at 12 months.**

311 Each point represents the mean changes from baseline in HbA1c and weight for a single study, with the
312 exception of Sato (2017) which represents median values. Studies were only included if they reported data at
313 12 months. Squares, no energy restriction (*ad libitum* feeding); circles, moderate energy restriction (1200-
314 2000kcal/day); triangles, severe energy restriction (<1200kcal/day).

Discussion

This systematic took a novel approach to the clinical trial evidence regarding dietary approaches to treat T2D by recognising that carbohydrate restriction is a common feature of LCDs and LEDs. Previous systematic reviews with meta-analyses have assessed the impact of higher versus lower carbohydrate diets (20–29). These have shown either no effect (27–29) or a positive effect of carbohydrate restriction on weight loss and HbA1c (20–26) and have noted the role of spontaneous energy restriction in LCDs as a potential confounder.

Risk of bias

The heterogeneity of the study designs gave rise to different risk of bias when studies were evaluated with the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. Studies that aimed to assess the efficacy of mixed interventions (involving dietary, physical, and behavioural changes) were judged as high risk of performance bias as they may document larger effects than those only assessing dietary changes. Additionally, two studies involved patients self-selecting the treatments they underwent which, although a valid approach for assessing efficacy, may also bias them towards reporting larger effects (39,44). The heterogeneity of the (mostly design-inherent) sources of bias precludes head-to-head comparisons.

Intervention efficacy

This review found a range of intervention effectiveness that was not clearly distinguished by level of energy restriction: both energy-restricted and energy-unrestricted diets were effective at 12 months, and the most effective intervention at 12 and 24 months involved an *ad libitum* energy-unrestricted diet (44). This reinforces others' observations of spontaneous energy restriction in LCDs (57) and highlights the potential efficacy of both low carbohydrate and low energy intervention types in the treatment of T2D.

The strength of the association between average weight loss and HbA1c change at 12 and 24 months was notable. This finding is consistent with the 'Twin Cycle Hypothesis' of T2D which proposes that T2D can be put into remission following weight loss, which reverses the accumulation of fat in the pancreatic beta-cells, thereby restoring their function (10). The potential causal relationship between weight loss and diabetes remission remains a matter of investigation (58,59).

Regardless of causality, the strength of the association between weight loss and glycemic markers underscores the importance of interventions that can maintain weight loss in the longer term. Weight maintenance is the most challenging area of weight management. Low energy meal-replacement based diets are capable of producing dramatic weight loss (60) but they are necessarily short term and weight regain is common upon cessation, especially in the absence of continued support (54). DiRECT (39) was the only LED trial to report data beyond 12 months and it will be of interest to see if the results achieved can be sustained over the full five-year trial period. This review identified a greater number of clinical trials testing low or very low carbohydrate diets, and a correspondingly wider range of outcomes. As with DiRECT, it will be of interest to see if the results using an *ad libitum* ketogenic diet in the Virta Health Study (Athinarayanan 2019) (44) can be maintained over the full five-year trial period.

In line with this focus on weight loss maintenance, this review identified a trend toward interventions with greater levels of participant support through co-interventions (involving exercise, pharmacotherapy, sleep and stress-reduction), new technologies and behaviour change techniques. Previous research shows that, regardless of modality of weight loss, participant support is important (61), and this represents a promising trend in research.

Independent role of carbohydrate restriction

It is not clear from this review if carbohydrate restriction directly affects T2D status independent of weight loss. None of the included studies robustly measured energy intake or used an isoenergetic control, meaning the influence of spontaneous energy restriction was not controlled or accounted for. Tay (2018) (37) included a planned energy-matched high carbohydrate control but the diet was undertaken in a free-living environment and participants on the low carbohydrate arm reported lower energy intakes than those on the low fat diet. Several short-term studies do indicate a weight-independent effect of carbohydrate restriction on glycemic control (62–64) and there are other plausible underlying mechanisms that remain under investigation (65,66).

The field would greatly benefit from further research to explore the potential for an independent effect of carbohydrate-restriction on glycemic control. This could be tested using a parallel-arm clinical trial comparing low energy meal replacements with varying proportions of carbohydrates across a large enough range. Trials similar to this have been conducted using low energy formula diets with 100g (40%) versus 162.5g (65%) carbohydrates per day and 1000kcal for 4 weeks (67) and <40g versus 65-156g per day for 3 weeks each (in a crossover trial) (62). These trials have found that

manipulating carbohydrates leads to differences in various markers of metabolic health. Trials using a broader range of carbohydrate intakes at fixed energy levels are needed to further explore these findings.

Implications for clinical practice

The data in this review indicate that a major factor in T2D remission is weight loss maintenance. In clinical practice, patients would benefit from receiving information about the available options to enable them to make a fully informed individual choice, and to select for the diet and lifestyle changes that they can adhere to over the longer-term, which may or may not incorporate carbohydrate restriction.

Limitations in the literature to date

The present review identified some limitations in the research to date. Inconsistent reporting of medication adjustment across studies means that changes in HbA1c were not considered in the context of medication changes. This can lead to an underestimation of the intervention impact on glycemic control (21,23,24,26,28). Future studies would benefit from a more standardised approach to reporting medication changes to facilitate comparisons between studies.

All of the included studies were conducted in free-living individuals, which enhances the ecological validity of the findings but reduces the level of control over participants' diets. Diet studies in free-living individuals often suffer from poor adherence to the prescribed diet (68) and this review also found substantial deviations in reported versus prescribed carbohydrate levels among studies. For the majority of studies, participant intakes were assessed by self-report using food diaries or 24-hour recall. These methods have significant flaws which limit interpretation of achieved carbohydrate and energy intakes (69). Studies involving ketogenic diets may have an advantage since there is a measurable biomarker that can be used to assess adherence (44) but most trials did not report blood ketone levels.

During the selection and screening of studies for inclusion in this review, variation in definitions of 'low carbohydrate' were identified, something which is an ongoing challenge in this area of research. For consistency going forwards, the field would benefit from adhering to the definitions outlined by Feinman (18). The field would also benefit from standardisation of definitions of 'low carbohydrate' and 'short/medium/long-term' to ensure consistency in reporting.

Limitations of present review

There are several limitations to this review. Firstly, presenting average weight and HbA1c outcomes of studies did not account for the underlying individual variability in weight and HbA1c outcomes. Secondly, intervention efficacy was based solely on weight and HbA1c change. Some studies reported outcomes including sleep quality, anxiety, and quality of life, as well as other glycemic outcomes such as fasting blood glucose and glycemic variability. There is also growing use and application of continuous glucose monitoring which provides measures of short-term glycemic control such as time in target range (70,71). Future reviews could consider inclusion of these and other outcomes to provide a more holistic review of the effectiveness of LED and LCDs in treatment of T2D. Thirdly, it did not distinguish between ketogenic and non-ketogenic diets. Ketones have been shown to directly lower hyperglycemia by suppressing hepatic glucose output (72,73). However, the role of ketosis in long-term weight loss is contentious due in part to poor adherence rates to ketogenic diets in some clinical trials (48). This is reflected in a recent systematic review that found that low carbohydrate diets were more effective than very low carbohydrate ketogenic ones, an effect which diminished when adherence was accounted for (26).

Conclusions

This review took a novel approach to the dietary strategies for T2D remission by recognising the commonality of carbohydrate restriction between LED and LCDs. It found that trials that severely restricted energy intake were not superior to those that allowed *ad libitum* low carbohydrate feeding (no prescribed energy deficit) at longer study durations (12 and 24 months). However, the strong association between average weight loss and HbA1c change that strengthened with time indicates that successful interventions for T2D are those that enable sustained weight loss in the longer-term. Further studies that carefully match carbohydrate and/or energy intake between arms are needed to establish the independent roles of carbohydrate and energy restriction in T2D treatment.

Acknowledgments

None.

Financial Support

No funding provided.

Conflict of Interest

None.

Authorship

AN conceptualised the project, developed the search strategy, conducted the literature search, selected studies, extracted and interpreted the data, and wrote the manuscript. ASM contributed to the search strategy design, selected studies, reviewed extracted data and reviewed/edited the manuscript. HL and AC contributed to the project conceptualisation and search strategy design, provided final decisions on study selection and reviewed the manuscript.

References

1. World Health Organisation. Diabetes [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 14]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/diabetes>
2. Diabetes UK. Facts & Figures [Internet]. 2020. [cited 2020 Aug 14]. Available from: <https://www.diabetes.org.uk/professionals/position-statements-reports/statistics>
3. Holman N, Knighton P, Kar P, O’Keefe J, Curley M, Weaver A, et al. Risk factors for COVID-19-related mortality in people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes in England: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* [Internet]. 2020;8587(20):1–11.
4. Nagi D, Hambling C, Taylor R. Remission of type 2 diabetes: a position statement from the Association of British Clinical Diabetologists (ABCD) and the Primary Care Diabetes Society (PCDS). *Br J Diabetes*. 2019;19(1):73–6.
5. Taylor R, Al-Mrabeh A, Zhyzhneuskaya S, Peters C, Barnes AC, Aribisala BS, et al. Remission of Human Type 2 Diabetes Requires Decrease in Liver and Pancreas Fat Content but Is Dependent upon Capacity for β Cell Recovery. *Cell Metab*. 2018;28(4):547-556.e3.
6. Sjöström L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, Ahlin S, Andersson-Assarsson J, Anveden Å, et al. Association of bariatric surgery with long-term remission of type 2 diabetes and with microvascular and macrovascular complications. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc*. 2014;311(22):2297–304.
7. Lean ME, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, Brosnahan N, Thom G, McCombie L, et al. Primary care-led weight management for remission of type 2 diabetes (DIRECT): an open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2018;391(10120):541–51.
8. Hallberg SJ, McKenzie AL, Williams PT, Bhanpuri NH, Peters AL, Campbell WW, et al. Effectiveness and Safety of a Novel Care Model for the Management of Type 2 Diabetes at 1 Year: An Open-Label, Non-Randomized, Controlled Study. *Diabetes Ther*. 2018;9(2):583–612.
9. Williamson DF, Thompson TJ, Thun M, Flanders D, Pamuk E, Byers T. Intentional weight loss and mortality among overweight individuals with diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2000 Oct 1;23(10):1499–504.
10. Taylor R. Pathogenesis of type 2 diabetes: Tracing the reverse route from cure to cause. *Diabetologia*. 2008;51(10):1781–9.
11. Lips MA, De Groot GH, Van Klinken JB, Aarts E, Berends FJ, Janssen IM, et al. Calorie restriction is a major determinant of the short-term metabolic effects of gastric bypass surgery in obese type 2 diabetic patients. *Clin Endocrinol*. 2014;80(6):834–42.
12. Rizza RA. Pathogenesis of fasting and postprandial hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes: Implications for therapy. *Diabetes*. 2010;59(11):2697–707.
13. Ludwig DS, Ebbeling CB. The carbohydrate-insulin model of obesity: Beyond “energys in, energys out”. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2018;178:1098–103.
14. Hall KD, Guyenet SJ, Leibel RL. The carbohydrate-insulin model of obesity is difficult to reconcile with current evidence. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2018;178:1103–5.

- 495 15. Leslie WS, Taylor R, Harris L, Lean MEJ. Weight losses with low-energy formula diets in obese patients
496 with and without type 2 diabetes: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Obes*. 2017;41(1):96–101.
- 497 16. Brown A, Leeds AR. Very low-energy and low-energy formula diets: Effects on weight loss, obesity
498 co-morbidities and type 2 diabetes remission – an update on the evidence for their use in clinical
499 practice. *Nutr Bull*. 2019;44(1):7–24.
- 500 17. Lim EL, Hollingsworth KG, Aribisala BS, Chen MJ, Mathers JC, Taylor R. Reversal of type 2 diabetes:
501 Normalisation of beta cell function in association with decreased pancreas and liver triacylglycerol.
502 *Diabetologia*. 2011;54(10):2506–14.
- 503 18. Feinman RD, Pogozelski WK, Astrup A, Bernstein RK, Fine EJ, Westman EC, et al. Dietary carbohydrate
504 restriction as the first approach in diabetes management: Critical review and evidence base. *Nutrition*.
505 2015;31:1–13.
- 506 19. Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN). Lower carbohydrate diets for adults with type 2
507 diabetes. 2020.
- 508 20. Fan Y, Di H, Chen G, Mao X, Liu C. Effects of low carbohydrate diets in individuals with type 2 diabetes:
509 Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Exp Med*. 2016;9(6):11166–74.
- 510 21. Snorgaard O, Poulsen GM, Andersen HK, Astrup A. Systematic review and meta-analysis of dietary
511 carbohydrate restriction in patients with type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*.
512 2017;5(1):e000354.
- 513 22. Meng Y, Bai H, Wang S, Li Z, Wang Q, Chen L. Efficacy of low carbohydrate diet for type 2 diabetes
514 mellitus management: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes*
515 *Res Clin Pract*. 2017;131:124–31.
- 516 23. Sainsbury E, Kizirian N V., Partridge SR, Gill T, Colagiuri S, Gibson AA. Effect of dietary carbohydrate
517 restriction on glycemic control in adults with diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
518 *Diabetes Res Clin Pract*. 2018;139:239–52.
- 519 24. Huntriss R, Campbell M, Bedwell C. The interpretation and effect of a low-carbohydrate diet in the
520 management of type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled
521 trials. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2018;72(3):311–25.
- 522 25. Van Zuuren EJ, Fedorowicz Z, Kuijpers T, Pijl H. Effects of low-carbohydrate- compared with low-fat-
523 diet interventions on metabolic control in people with type 2 diabetes: A systematic review including
524 GRADE assessments. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2018;108(2):300–31.
- 525 26. Goldenberg JZ, Day A, Brinkworth GD, Sato J, Yamada S, Jönsson T, et al. Efficacy and safety of low and
526 very low carbohydrate diets for type 2 diabetes remission: systematic review and meta-analysis of
527 published and unpublished randomized trial data. *BMJ*. 2021;m4743.
- 528 27. Schwingshackl L, Chaimani A, Hoffmann G, Schvedhelm C, Boeing H. A network meta-analysis on the
529 comparative efficacy of different dietary approaches on glycaemic control in patients with type 2
530 diabetes mellitus. *European Journal of Epidemiology*. 2018;33:157–70.
- 531 28. Korsmo-Haugen HK, Brurberg KG, Mann J, Aas AM. Carbohydrate quantity in the dietary management
532 of type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*. 2019;21(1):15–27.

- 533 29. McArdle PD, Greenfield SM, Rilstone SK, Narendran P, Haque MS, Gill PS. Carbohydrate restriction for
534 glycaemic control in Type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabet Med*.
535 2019;36(3):335–48.
- 536 30. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook*
537 *for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.0 (updated July 2019). Cochrane, 2019. Available
538 from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
- 539 31. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Altman D, Antes G, et al. Preferred reporting items for
540 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(7).
- 541 32. National Institute for Health Research. PROSPERO: International prospective register of systematic
542 reviews [Internet]. [cited 2020 Jul 6]. Available from: <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>
- 543 33. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care*.
544 2010;33:S62.
- 545 34. Sterne J, Savović J, Page M, Elbers R, Blencowe N, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing
546 risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2019;366(4898).
- 547 35. Prism 8 for Mac OS X Version 8.4.3 (471). GraphPad Software LLC; 2020.
- 548 36. Daly ME, Paisey R, Paisey R, Millward BA, Eccles C, Williams K, et al. Short-term effects of severe
549 dietary carbohydrate-restriction advice in Type 2 diabetes - A randomized controlled trial. *Diabet Med*.
550 2006;23(1):15–20.
- 551 37. Tay J, Thompson CH, Luscombe-Marsh ND, Wycherley TP, Noakes M, Buckley JD, et al. Effects of an
552 energy-restricted low-carbohydrate, high unsaturated fat/low saturated fat diet versus a high-
553 carbohydrate, low-fat diet in type 2 diabetes: A 2-year randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*.
554 2018;20(4):858–71.
- 555 38. Brown A, Dornhorst A, McGowan B, Omar O, Leeds AR, Taheri S, et al. Low-energy total diet
556 replacement intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and obesity treated with insulin: A
557 randomized trial. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2020;8(1):1–17.
- 558 39. Lean MEJ, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, Brosnahan N, Thom G, McCombie L, et al. Durability of a primary care-
559 led weight-management intervention for remission of type 2 diabetes: 2-year results of the DiRECT
560 open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2019;7(5):344–55.
- 561 40. Taheri S, Zaghloul H, Chagoury O, Elhadad S, Ahmed SH, El Khatib N, et al. Effect of intensive lifestyle
562 intervention on bodyweight and glycaemia in early type 2 diabetes (DIADEM-I): an open-label, parallel-
563 group, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2020;8(6):477–89.
- 564 41. Morris E, Aveyard P, Dyson P, Noreik M, Bailey C, Fox R, et al. A food-based, low-energy, low-
565 carbohydrate diet for people with type 2 diabetes in primary care: A randomized controlled feasibility
566 trial. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*. 2020 Apr 25;22(4):512–20.
- 567 42. Goday A, Bellido D, Sajoux I, Crujeiras AB, Burguera B, García-Luna PP, et al. Short-Term safety,
568 tolerability and efficacy of a very low-calorie-ketogenic diet interventional weight loss program versus
569 hypocaloric diet in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Nutr Diabetes*. 2016;6(9):e230.
- 570 43. Leslie W, Ford I, Sattar N, Hollingsworth KG, Adamson A, Sniehotta FF, et al. Diabetes Remission

571 Clinical Trial (DiRECT): Protocol for a cluster randomised controlled trial in primary care. *Diabet Med*.
572 2016;33:192.

573 44. Athinarayanan SJ, Adams RN, Hallberg SJ, McKenzie AL, Bhanpuri NH, Campbell WW, et al. Long-term
574 effects of a novel continuous remote care intervention including nutritional ketosis for the
575 management of type 2 diabetes: A 2-year nonrandomized clinical trial. *Front Endocrinol*. 2019;10:348.

576 45. Saslow LR, Mason AE, Kim S, Goldman V, Ploutz-Snyder R, Bayandorian H, et al. An online intervention
577 comparing a very low-carbohydrate ketogenic diet and lifestyle recommendations versus a plate
578 method diet in overweight individuals with type 2 diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. *J Med*
579 *Internet Res*. 2017;19(2):e36.

580 46. Davis NJ, Tomuta N, Schechter C, Isasi CR, Segal-Isaacson CJ, Stein D, et al. Comparative study of the
581 effects of a 1-year dietary intervention of a low-carbohydrate diet versus a low-fat diet on weight and
582 glycemic control in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2009;32(7):1147–52.

583 47. Dyson PA, Beatty S, Matthews DR. A low-carbohydrate diet is more effective in reducing body weight
584 than healthy eating in both diabetic and non-diabetic subjects. *Diabet Med*. 2007;24(12):1430–5.

585 48. Iqbal N, Vetter ML, Moore RH, Chittams JL, Dalton-Bakes C V., Dowd M, et al. Effects of a low-intensity
586 intervention that prescribed a low-carbohydrate vs. a low-fat diet in obese, diabetic participants.
587 *Obesity*. 2010;18(9):1733–8.

588 49. Saslow LR, Daubenmier JJ, Moskowitz JT, Kim S, Murphy EJ, Phinney SD, et al. Twelve-month outcomes
589 of a randomized trial of a moderate-carbohydrate versus very low-carbohydrate diet in overweight
590 adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus or prediabetes. *Nutr Diabetes*. 2017;7(12).

591 50. Sato J, Kanazawa A, Makita S, Hatae C, Komiya K, Shimizu T, et al. A randomized controlled trial of 130
592 g/day low-carbohydrate diet in type 2 diabetes with poor glycemic control. *Clin Nutr*. 2017;36(4 CC-
593 Complementary Medicine):992-1000.

594 51. Westman EC, Yancy Jr. WS, Mavropoulos JC, Marquart M, McDuffie JR, Yancy WS, et al. The effect of a
595 low-carbohydrate, ketogenic diet versus a low-glycemic index diet on glycemic control in type 2
596 diabetes mellitus. *Nutr Metab*. 2008;5(1):1–9. A

597 52. Yamada Y, Uchida J, Izumi H, Tsukamoto Y, Inoue G, Watanabe Y, et al. A non-calorie-restricted low-
598 carbohydrate diet is effective as an alternative therapy for patients with type 2 diabetes. *Intern Med*.
599 2014;53(1):13–9.

600 53. Guldbrand H, Dizdar B, Bunjaku B, Lindström T, Bachrach-Lindström M, Fredrikson M, et al. In type 2
601 diabetes, randomisation to advice to follow a low-carbohydrate diet transiently improves glycaemic
602 control compared with advice to follow a low-fat diet producing a similar weight loss. *Diabetologia*.
603 2012;55(8):2118–27.

604 54. Brown A, Dornhorst A, McGowan B, Omar O, Leeds AR, Taheri S, et al. Low-energy total diet
605 replacement intervention in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and obesity treated with insulin: A
606 randomized trial. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*. 2020;8(1):1012.

607 55. Gulsin GS, Swarbrick DJ, Athithan L, Brady EM, Henson J, Baldry E, et al. Effects of Low-Energy Diet or
608 Exercise on Cardiovascular Function in Working-Age Adults With Type 2 Diabetes: A Prospective,

609 Randomized, Open-Label, Blinded End Point Trial. *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(6):1300–10.

610 56. Morris E, Aveyard P, Dyson P, Noreik M, Bailey C, Fox R, et al. A food-based, low-energy, low-
611 carbohydrate diet for people with type 2 diabetes in primary care: A randomized controlled feasibility
612 trial. *Diabetes, Obes Metab*. 2020;22(4):512–20.

613 57. Johnstone A, Horgan G, Murison S, Bremner D, Lobley G. Effects of a high-protein ketogenic diet on
614 hunger, appetite, and weight loss in obese men feeding ad libitum. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2008;87:44–55.

615 58. Taylor R, Holman RR. Normal weight individuals who develop Type 2 diabetes: The personal fat
616 threshold. *Clin Sci*. 2015;128(7):405–10.

617 59. Al-Mrabeh A. Pathogenesis and remission of type 2 diabetes. *Cardiovasc Endocrinol Metab*. 2020;
618 Ah:1–11.

619 60. Rehackova L, Arnott B, Araujo-Soares V, Adamson AA, Taylor R, Sniehotta FF. Efficacy and acceptability
620 of very low energy diets in overweight and obese people with Type 2 diabetes mellitus: A systematic
621 review with meta-analyses. *Diabet Med*. 2016;33(5):580–91.

622 61. Hall KD, Kahan S, Diseases K. Maintenance of lost weight and long-term management of obesity. *Med*
623 *Clin North Am*. 2018;102(1):183–97.

624 62. Gumbiner B, Wendel JA, McDermott MP. Effects of diet composition and ketosis on glycemia during
625 very-low-energy-diet therapy in obese patients with non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Am J*
626 *Clin Nutr*. 1996;63(1):110–5.

627 63. Miyashita Y, Koide N, Ohtsuka M, Ozaki H, Itoh Y, Oyama T, et al. Beneficial effect of low carbohydrate
628 in low calorie diets on visceral fat reduction in type 2 diabetic patients with obesity. *Diabetes Res Clin*
629 *Pract*. 2004 Sep;65(3):235–41.

630 64. Parker N. Hyde, Teryn N. Sapper, Christopher D. Crabtree, Richard A. LaFountain, Madison L. Bowling,
631 Alex Buga, Brandon Fell, Fionn T. McSwiney, Ryan M. Dickerson, Vincent J. Miller, Debbie Scandling,
632 Orlando P. Simonetti, Stephen D. Phinney, William J. K and JSV. Dietary carbohydrate restriction
633 improves metabolic syndrome independent of weight loss. *Clin Med (Northfield Il)*. 2019

634 65. Soto-Mota A. The mechanism whereby an exogenous ketone drink lowers blood glucose. *ISRCTN*.
635 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1186/ISRCTN16169021>

636 66. Soto-Mota A. Safety of twenty-eight-day consumption of ΔG° in healthy adults and type 2 diabetes
637 patients. *ISRCTN*. 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1186/ISRCTN12401551>

638 67. Miyashita Y, Koide N, Ohtsuka M, Ozaki H, Itoh Y, Oyama T, et al. Beneficial effect of low carbohydrate
639 in low calorie diets on visceral fat reduction in type 2 diabetic patients with obesity. *Diabetes Res Clin*
640 *Pract*. 2004 Sep;65(3):235–41.

641 68. Gibson AA, Sainsbury A. Strategies to improve adherence to dietary weight loss interventions in
642 research and real-world settings. *Behav Sci (Basel)*. 2017 Sep 1;7(3).

643 69. Thompson FE, Subar AF. Dietary assessment methodology. In: *Nutrition in the Prevention and*
644 *Treatment of Disease*. Elsevier; 2017. p. 5–48.

645 70. Chehregosha H, Khamseh ME, Malek M, Hosseinpanah F, Ismail-Beigi F. A View Beyond HbA1c: Role of
646 Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *Diabetes Therapy*. Springer Healthcare; 2019;10:853–63.

647 71. Krhač M, Lovrenčić MV. Update on biomarkers of glycemic control. World J Diabetes. 2019;10(1):1–15.
648 72. Ari C, Murdun C, Koutnik AP, Goldhagen CR, Rogers C, Park C, et al. Exogenous ketones lower blood
649 glucose level in rested and exercised rodent models. Nutrients. 2019;11(10).
650 73. Stubbs BJ, Cox PJ, Evans RD, Santer P, Miller JJ, Faull OK, et al. On the Metabolism of Exogenous
651 Ketones in Humans. Front Physiol. 2017;8:848.
652

Pattern identified by some species (dominant) that include both large birds (B&W) and small birds (B&W) in their diet

Both strategies involve searching for food resources within a foraging site or within a territory

Small Territory (Small TITs)

Large Territory (Large TITs)



1

Small territory owner (territoriality in relation to) food, all other "free for all" species (opportunistic) feeding on the same resource (territoriality) and all other birds

2


Large territory owner (territoriality in relation to) food, all other "free for all" species (opportunistic) feeding on the same resource (territoriality) and all other birds



Large territory, large intermediate size and all other "free for all" species (opportunistic) feeding on the same resource (territoriality) and all other birds



also reported for average weight loss and average change in B&W in response to dieting



It is likely that the flycatcher is the least weight loss with 10% or less weight loss in 10 days of study were made

average change in B&W correlated with average weight loss, it was the smallest decrease in average change in weight loss in 10 days

Weighted weight loss in the flycatcher is 10% reduction

It is likely that the flycatcher is the least weight loss in 10 days of study were made

Incident Energy I_{inc}

Current reflection

the $z=0$ plane

Incident Current density I_{inc}

Current density reflection

E

Impedance of the surface



Optimal: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 Efficient: $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$
 $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}} = \arg \max_{\theta} \ell(\theta)$

