Brain Dopamine Receptor System is Not Altered in Obesity: Bayesian and Frequentist Meta-Analyses

Kyoungjune Pak^{1,2}, Lauri Nummenmaa^{3,4,5}

¹Department of Nuclear Medicine and Biomedical Research Institute, Pusan National University

Hospital, Busan, Republic of Korea

²School of Medicine, Pusan National University, Busan, Republic of Korea

³Turku PET Centre, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

⁴Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland

⁵Department of Psychology, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

Kyoungjune Pak (Corresponding author)

Department of Nuclear Medicine and Biomedical Research Institute, Pusan National University

Hospital and School of Medicine, Pusan National University, 179 Gudeok-ro, Seo-gu, Busan 49241,

Republic of Korea

+82-51-240-7389

ilikechopin@me.com

Lauri Nummenmaa

Turku PET Centre, University of Turku and Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland latanu@utu.fi

ABSTRACT

Background: Feeding induces dopamine release in the striatum, and a dysfunction of the dopaminergic reward system can lead to overeating, and obesity. Studies have reported inconsistent findings of dopamine receptor (DR) positron emission tomography (PET) scans in obesity. Here we investigated the association between DR availability and overweight/obesity using Bayesian and frequentist meta-analysis.

Methods: We performed a systematic search of Embase, Medline, Scopus and Web of Science for studies which compared striatal DR availability between lean subjects and overweight/obese subjects. The standardized mean difference (Hedge's g) of DR availability was calculated after extraction of data from each study. Studies were divided into two groups according to the definition of overweight/obese subjects (BMI cutoff of 25 and 30kg/m²). Both Bayesian and conventional meta-analysis was done in R Statistical Software version 4.2.2 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

Results: Nine studies were eligible for inclusion in this study. Three studies with C11-raclopride, one with C11-PNHO, two with F18-fallypride, one with I123-IBZM, one with C11-NMB and one with both C11-raclopride and C11-PNHO were included. In Bayesian meta-analysis, the standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and overweight/obese subjects markedly overlapped with zero regardless of BMI cutoff for obesity. In frequentist meta-analysis the pooled standardized mean difference of DR availability did not show the significant difference between lean and overweight/obese subjects. There was an effect of the radiopharmaceutical on the standardized mean difference of DR availability in meta-analysis of BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m².

Conclusions: Brain DR availability is not different between lean and overweight/obese subjects. However, the effect is dependent on the radiopharmaceutical and the degree of obesity. Further studies with multi-radiopharmaceutical in the same individuals are need to understand the association between DR and obesity.

KEYWORDS

Dopamine Receptor; Obesity; Positron Emission Tomography

INTRODUCTION

Obesity has nearly tripled worldwide since 1975 and has become one of the major public health threats. Obesity is a risk factor for malignancies of the colon [1], pancreas [2], thyroid [3], liver [4], and uterus [5] as well as for cardiovascular disease and diabetes mellitus [6].

Obesity is caused by an imbalance between energy intake and expenditure over a long period of time [7]. The brain plays a critical role in controlling energy balance [7]. Feeding induces dopamine release in the striatum [8], and a dysfunction of the dopaminergic reward system can lead to overeating, and obesity [9]. However, there is no direct method to measure the synaptic dopamine concentration in the human brain. Therefore, positron emission tomography (PET) and single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) using dopamine receptor (DR) radiopharmaceuticals has been adopted to understand the role of dopaminergic system in obesity. A landmark study by Wang et al showed that DR availability was lower in severely obese subjects (the mean BMI of 51.2kg/m²) than in lean subjects [10]. After that, several studies reported inconsistent findings of DR PET scans in obesity; higher [11] or not different [12] DR availability in obese subjects compared to lean subjects. In addition, some researchers suggested non-linear relationship between DR availability and BMI [13, 14]. However, previous studies included the small sample size, the discrepancies in regionof-interest (ROI) and the variety of radiopharmaceuticals, leading to these inconsistent findings. Therefore, it is more timely than ever to meta-analyze the previous studies of association between DR availability measured from PET or SPECT and obesity. In this study, we divided the previous publications into two groups according to the definition of overweight/obese subjects (BMI cutoff of 25 and 30kg/m²) and we investigated the association between DR availability and overweight/obesity with conventional as well as Bayesian meta-analysis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data Search and Study Selection

We performed a systematic search of Embase, Medline, Scopus and Web of Science from inception to November 2022 for articles published in English using the keywords "dopamine

receptor", "obesity" and "positron emission tomography OR single-photon emission computed tomography". All searches were limited to human studies. The inclusion criteria were neuroimaging studies which 1) compared DR availability of lean subjects and that of overweight/obese subjects and 2) measured DR availability within the striatum (whole striatum, caudate nucleus, putamen, nucleus accumbens, ventral striatum) using PET or SPECT scans. Reviews, abstracts, and editorial materials were excluded. Further, duplicate articles were excluded. If there was more than one study using the same set of patients, the study reporting information most relevant (i.e. initial patient-control differences) to the present study was included. Two authors performed the literature search and screened the articles independently, and discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

Data Extraction and Statistical Analysis

Two reviewers independently extracted the following information from the reports: first author, year of publication, country, radiopharmaceuticals, the mean BMI of lean subjects and overweight/obese subjects and region-of-interest (ROI). First, we extracted the mean and the standard deviation of DR availability and the number of subjects in each group, directly from each study, if provided by the authors. If they were not provided by the authors, BMI and DR availability were extracted from the figures using WebPlotDigitizer version 4.6

(https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/): figure 1 from the study by Caravaggio et al [15] and supplementary figure 5 from the study by Dunn et al [16]. Original subject-wise data matrix was used for one study [17]. Subsequently, the standardized mean difference (Hedge's g) of DR availability was calculated for each study.

The standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and overweight/obese subjects were first investigated using Bayesian hierarchical modelling with brms [18-20] that applies the Markov-Chain Monte Carlo sampling tools of RStan [21]. We set up a model with the standardized mean difference of DR availability as a dependent variable and added study, radiopharmaceutical and ROI as random intercepts to allow the standardized mean difference of DR availability to vary between studies, radiopharmaceuticals and ROIs. Bayesian models were estimated using four Markov chains, each of which had 4,000 iterations including 1,000 warm-ups, thus totaling

12,000 post-warmup samples. The sampling parameters were slightly modified to facilitate convergence (max treedepth=30). Also, complementary frequentist meta-analysis was performed using metafor [22]. Heterogeneity among studies was assessed using Cochran's Q and I^2 statistics, as described previously [23]. The pooled effect size was estimated using random-effects model. Metaregression was performed to explore potential sources of heterogeneity due to radiopharmaceutical and the mean BMI of overweight/obese subjects. Statistical analysis was carried out in R Statistical Software version 4.2.2 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

RESULTS

Study Characteristics

The search identified 6,102 articles from Embase/Medline, 1,771 from Scopus, 917 from Web of Science. After excluding duplicate records (n=1,367), conference abstracts (n=1,795) and non-English publications (n=88), studies were assessed for eligibility after screening the title or abstract. After reviewing the full text of 103 articles, nine studies were eligible for inclusion in this study [10-12, 15-17, 24-26] (Figure 1). Three studies with C11-raclopride [10, 17, 25], one with C11-PNHO [11], two with F18-fallypride [16, 24], one with I123-IBZM [26], one with C11-NMB [12] and one with both C11-raclopride and C11-PNHO [15] were included. The definition of lean and overweight/obese subjects varied across the studies. In 4 studies, subjects were divided into 2 groups according to BMI cutoff of 30 kg/m² [10, 12, 17, 24]. Three studies that defined lean subjects as BMI less than 25 kg/m² and obese subjects as BMI more than 30 [11, 16] or 35 kg/m² [17] were included in both analyses of studies with BMI cutoff of 25 and 30 kg/m². In one study, lean subjects were defined as BMI less than 24 kg/m² and overweight subjects as BMI more than 27 kg/m² [25]. As the study by Caravaggio et al included subjects of BMI between 18.6 and 27.8 kg/m², we divided subjects into 2 groups with BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m²[15]. Due to the heterogeneity in the definition of obesity, we ran the meta-analyses separately with datasets where obesity was defined as $BMI > 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$ or BMI > 30 kg/m^2 .

A. Brain Dopamine Receptor and Overweight/Obesity: A Bayesian Meta-Analysis

The distribution of the standardized mean difference of DR availability and mean BMI of overweight/obese subjects are shown in Figure 2 (BMI cutoff for overweight/obesity 25 kg/m²) and Figure 3 (BMI cutoff for obesity 30 kg/m²). In the analysis of BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m², the standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and obese subjects overlapped with zero. There was a more support for the association with radiopharmaceutical that overweight/obese subjects in studies with F18-Fallypride and C11-PHNO has higher DR availability and those in studies with C11-Raclopride and I123-IBZM has lower DR availability than lean subjects (Figure 2). In the analysis of BMI cutoff of 30 kg/m², the standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and overweight/obese subjects markedly overlapped with zero (Figure 3).

B. Brain Dopamine Receptor and Overweight/Obesity: Frequentist Meta-Analysis

A single ROI from each study was included in conventional meta-analysis. If the study reported results for more than one ROI [11, 17, 24, 25], mean DR availability across striatal subregions was calculated. In the meta-analysis of studies with BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m², the pooled standardized mean difference of DR availability did not show the significant difference between lean and overweight/obese subjects (0.23, 95% confidence interval -0.46 ~ 0.92, I²=76.7%). Meta-regression analyses revealed a statistically significant effect of radiopharmaceutical on the pooled effect size (C11-Raclopride, -1.0504, -1.8265 ~ -0.2742, p=0.0080; I123-IBZM, -1.9141, -2.8656 ~ - 0.9626, p<0.0001). In a meta-analysis of studies with BMI cutoff of 30 kg/m², the pooled standardized mean difference of DR availability was not significantly different between lean and overweight/obese subjects (0, -0.69 ~ 0.69, I²=83.4%). Meta-regression analyses revealed that the mean BMI of overweight/obese subjects is negatively associated with the standardized mean difference of DR availability (-0.1214, -0.2397 ~ -0.0031, p=0.0442) (Figure 4).

DISCUSSION

Our main finding was that brain DR availability does not differ between lean and overweight/obese subjects. This result was confirmed in both Bayesian and conventional meta-

analyses and with two different criteria ($BMI > 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$ or $BMI > 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$) for overweight/obesity. However, the effect sized varied as the function of the used radiopharmaceuticals and the degree of obesity. Altogether these results suggest that striatal downregulation of D2R is not a common feature of obesity despite the centrality of dopaminergic system in feeding and reward [27].

Obesity is caused by an imbalance between the energy intake and expenditure [28]. Feeding is controlled by both homeostatic regulatory brain circuits and those involved in reward and motivation [29]. Dopamine is one of the neurotransmitters involved with eating behavior through modulation of the rewarding properties of food and the motivation and desire for food consumption [27]. There are two major hypotheses regarding the role of dopamine in obesity. The first hypothesis, dopamine hyperresponsiveness, proposes that there is a hypersensitivity to rewards and increased behavioral salience toward food, resulting in the excessive intake of palatable foods [30, 31]. The second hypothesis, reward deficit model, states that subjects who are insensitive to rewards overeat to increase their endogenous dopamine levels to a normal amount of pleasure [30, 31]. However, it is not possible to measure the synaptic dopamine levels directly in the human brain. Therefore, PET with DR radiopharmaceuticals has been used to understand the role of dopaminergic system in obesity. However, it is difficult to interpret the relationships between DR availability measured from PET scans and the synaptic dopamine level. Low DR binding potential could represent 1) low density of existing DR, 2) low affinity to bind DR or 3) greater amount of endogenous dopamine which competes with DR radiopharmaceutical to bind DR [14, 24].

Nine such studies were included in this meta-analysis. There was no significant difference of DR availability between lean and overweight/obese subjects in 4 studies in any striatal ROIs [12, 17, 24, 25], in 1 study no effect in caudate and putamen [11] and also in 1 study with C11-Raclopride, there was no significant correlation between BMI and DR availability [15]. In the study by Dunn et al, obese subjects had higher DR availability in caudate [16] and in the study by Caravaggio et al with C11-PHNO, there was a positive correlation between BMI and DR availability [15]. In 2 studies, obese subjects had lower DR availability than lean subjects [26, 29].

Because the studies had different definition of overweight/obese subjects, we conducted two separate meta-analyses with studies using two different cutoffs for obesity (BMI > 25 kg/m² and BMI > 30 kg/m²). Neither meta-analysis provided support for overall obesity-dependent modulation of striatal DR. In the meta-analysis of BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m², 5 studies were included. The study by Caravaggio et al. included overweight subjects of BMI between 25 and 27.8 kg/m² without obese subjects [15] and the study by Haltia et al. included both overweight and obese subjects from BMI 27 kg/m² [25]. The other 3 studies were included in both analysis of BMI cutoff of 25 and 30 kg/m² [11, 16, 26]. Although there was no difference between lean and overweight/obese subjects in DR availability, there was an effect of radiopharmaceutical on both Bayesian and conventional meta-analysis of BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m². One study with F18-Fallypride [16] and 2 studies with C11-PHNO showed the higher DR availability in overweight/obese subjects while 2 studies with C11-Raclopride [15, 25] and 1 study with I123-IBZM [26] did not show the difference of DR availability, which might elucidate this effect of radiopharmaceutical on the result.

In a meta-analysis with BMI cutoff of 30 kg/m², in addition to 3 studies that included in both analysis of BMI cutoff of 25 and 30 kg/m², 4 additional studies with obese subjects were included. Similar with the result of BMI cutoff of 25 kg/m², there was no difference between lean and overweight/obese subjects in DR availability. However, meta-regression showed that the mean BMI of overweight/obese subjects was negatively associated with the standardized mean difference of DR availability. The subjects in the studies with the two different BMI cutoffs also varied with respect to the degree of the severity of obesity: The mean BMI of overweight/obese subjects in a meta-analysis of BMI cutoff of 30 kg/m² was higher than that of 25 kg/m² (mean BMI of 40.1 kg/m² vs 34.9 kg/m²). Also, the study by Wang et al [10] with the highest mean BMI of obese subjects (mean BMI of 51.2 kg/m²) was included in a meta-analysis of BMI cutoff of 30 kg/m² thus also includes obese subjects with the wider range of BMI.

Against our expectation, there was no effect of ROI on the standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and overweight/obese subjects, although all ROIs could be included in Bayesian meta-analysis (unlike in the frequentist meta-analysis that included a single representative

ROI from each study). Five DR radiopharmaceuticals were included in this meta-analysis and each radiopharmaceutical has its own profile of DR affinity, competition with endogenous dopamine and agonist/antagonist. Both C11-Raclopride and F18-Fallypride, D2/D3 antagonists, have a similar affinity to D2 and D3 and compete with endogenous dopamine [16, 32]. I123-IBZM, a D2/D3 antagonist for SPECT, competes with endogenous dopamine, similar with C11-Raclopride [14]. C11-NMB, a D2-selective antagonist, is not replaceable by endogenous dopamine [12]. C11-PHNO, a D3-preferring agonist, is more sensitive to endogenous dopamine levels than radiopharmaceuticals of DR antagonists [11], therefore, considered superior to detect synaptic dopamine release [33]. Therefore, it is critical to consider the feature of each radiopharmaceutical while interpreting the results from PET and SPECT scans.

There are several limitations in this study. First, only a small number of studies could be included in this meta-analysis. After a systematic search for publication, several papers were assessed for eligibility. However, most of them were published from the same institution with overlapping subjects and we selected the most relevant publication among the pool of articles with same subjects. In addition, as two different BMI cutoffs were applied in these studies, 5 studies with BMI cutoff of 25kg/m² and 7 studies with that of 30 kg/m² could be included in meta-analysis. Finally, five DR radiopharmaceuticals were used in studies included in this meta-analysis and each radiopharmaceutical has a its own receptor-binding property. Therefore, we should be cautious when interpreting the findings from the studies included in this meta-analysis.

In conclusion, brain DR is not different between lean and overweight/obese subjects and these meta-analytic findings from patients also align with the recent large-scale study of non-obese healthy subjects [34]. There is an effect of the variety of radiopharmaceuticals and the degree of the severity of obesity on this result, therefore, we still cannot exclude the association of brain DR with obesity. For example, it is possible that obesity alters the threshold for endogenous dopamine release following feeding rather than the receptor densities [8], or that obesity alters the molecular coupling between dopamine and other neurotransmitter systems such as endogenous opioid systems that has

been consistently linked with obesity [35-37]. Further studies with multi-radiopharmaceutical in the same individuals are needed to elucidate the potential links between DR and obesity.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request

FUNDING

The study was supported by National Research Foundation of Korea (KP: 2020R1F1A1054201), Pusan National University Hospital (KP: Clinical research grant 2023), Sigrid Juselius Foundation (LN), and Academy of Finland (LN: 294897 and 332225).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No potential conflict of interest

REFERENCES

[1] Na SY, Myung SJ. [Obesity and colorectal cancer]. Korean J Gastroenterol. 2012;59:16-26.

[2] Gukovsky I, Li N, Todoric J, Gukovskaya A, Karin M. Inflammation, autophagy, and obesity: common features in the pathogenesis of pancreatitis and pancreatic cancer. Gastroenterology. 2013;144:1199-209 e4.

[3] Mijovic T, How J, Payne RJ. Obesity and thyroid cancer. Front Biosci (Schol Ed). 2011;3:555-64.

[4] Alzahrani B, Iseli TJ, Hebbard LW. Non-viral causes of liver cancer: does obesity led inflammation play a role? Cancer Lett. 2014;345:223-9.

[5] Gu W, Chen C, Zhao KN. Obesity-associated endometrial and cervical cancers. Front Biosci (Elite Ed). 2013;5:109-18.

[6] Burke GL, Bertoni AG, Shea S, Tracy R, Watson KE, Blumenthal RS, et al. The impact of obesity on cardiovascular disease risk factors and subclinical vascular disease: the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. Arch Intern Med. 2008;168:928-35.

[7] Morton GJ, Meek TH, Schwartz MW. Neurobiology of food intake in health and disease. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2014;15:367-78.

[8] Small DM, Jones-Gotman M, Dagher A. Feeding-induced dopamine release in dorsal striatum correlates with meal pleasantness ratings in healthy human volunteers. Neuroimage. 2003;19:1709-15.[9] Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Baler RD. Reward, dopamine and the control of food intake: implications

for obesity. Trends Cogn Sci. 2011;15:37-46.

[10] Wang GJ, Volkow ND, Logan J, Pappas NR, Wong CT, Zhu W, et al. Brain dopamine and obesity.Lancet. 2001;357:354-7.

[11] Gaiser EC, Gallezot JD, Worhunsky PD, Jastreboff AM, Pittman B, Kantrovitz L, et al. Elevated Dopamine D(2/3) Receptor Availability in Obese Individuals: A PET Imaging Study with [(11)C](+)PHNO. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2016;41:3042-50.

[12] Eisenstein SA, Antenor-Dorsey JA, Gredysa DM, Koller JM, Bihun EC, Ranck SA, et al. A comparison of D2 receptor specific binding in obese and normal-weight individuals using PET with (N-[(11)C]methyl)benperidol. Synapse. 2013;67:748-56.

[13] van Galen KA, Ter Horst KW, Booij J, la Fleur SE, Serlie MJ. The role of central dopamine and serotonin in human obesity: lessons learned from molecular neuroimaging studies. Metabolism. 2018;85:325-39.

[14] Janssen LK, Horstmann A. Molecular Imaging of Central Dopamine in Obesity: A Qualitative Review across Substrates and Radiotracers. Brain Sci. 2022;12.

[15] Caravaggio F, Raitsin S, Gerretsen P, Nakajima S, Wilson A, Graff-Guerrero A. Ventral striatum binding of a dopamine D2/3 receptor agonist but not antagonist predicts normal body mass index. Biol Psychiatry. 2015;77:196-202.

[16] Dunn JP, Kessler RM, Feurer ID, Volkow ND, Patterson BW, Ansari MS, et al. Relationship of dopamine type 2 receptor binding potential with fasting neuroendocrine hormones and insulin sensitivity in human obesity. Diabetes Care. 2012;35:1105-11.

[17] Tuominen L, Tuulari J, Karlsson H, Hirvonen J, Helin S, Salminen P, et al. Aberrant mesolimbic

dopamine-opiate interaction in obesity. Neuroimage. 2015;122:80-6.

[18] Bürkner P-C. Bayesian Item Response Modeling in R with brms and Stan. Journal of Statistical Software. 2021;100:1-54.

[19] Bürkner P-C. brms: an R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. Journal of Statistical Software. 2017;80:1-28.

[20] Bürkner P-C. Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. The R Journal. 2018;10:395-411.

[21] Stan Development Team. RStan: the R interface to Stan. 2022.

[22] Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. Journal of Statistical Software. 2010;36:1 - 48.

[23] Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. Bmj.2003;327:557-60.

[24] Guo J, Simmons WK, Herscovitch P, Martin A, Hall KD. Striatal dopamine D2-like receptor correlation patterns with human obesity and opportunistic eating behavior. Mol Psychiatry. 2014;19:1078-84.

[25] Haltia LT, Rinne JO, Helin S, Parkkola R, Nagren K, Kaasinen V. Effects of intravenous placebo with glucose expectation on human basal ganglia dopaminergic function. Synapse (New York, NY). 2008;62:682-8.

[26] van de Giessen E, Celik F, Schweitzer DH, van den Brink W, Booij J. Dopamine D2/3 receptor availability and amphetamine-induced dopamine release in obesity. J Psychopharmacol. 2014;28:866-73.

[27] Bello NT, Hajnal A. Dopamine and binge eating behaviors. Pharmacol Biochem Behav. 2010;97:25-33.

[28] Bellisle F, Drewnowski A, Anderson GH, Westerterp-Plantenga M, Martin CK. Sweetness, satiation, and satiety. J Nutr. 2012;142:1149S-54S.

[29] Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Tomasi D, Baler RD. The addictive dimensionality of obesity. Biol Psychiatry. 2013;73:811-8.

[30] Kessler RM, Zald DH, Ansari MS, Li R, Cowan RL. Changes in dopamine release and dopamine D2/3 receptor levels with the development of mild obesity. Synapse. 2014;68:317-20.

[31] Verbeken S, Braet C, Lammertyn J, Goossens L, Moens E. How is reward sensitivity related to bodyweight in children? Appetite. 2012;58:478-83.

[32] Volkow ND, Wang GJ, Fowler JS, Logan J, Schlyer D, Hitzemann R, et al. Imaging endogenous dopamine competition with [11C]raclopride in the human brain. Synapse. 1994;16:255-62.

[33] van Wieringen JP, Michel MC, Janssen HM, Janssen AG, Elsinga PH, Booij J. Agonist signalling properties of radiotracers used for imaging of dopamine D2/3 receptors. EJNMMI Res. 2014;4:53.

[34] Malén T, Karjalainen T, Isojärvi J, Vehtari A, Bürkner P-C, Putkinen V, et al. Age and sex dependent

variability of type 2 dopamine receptors in the human brain: A large-scale PET cohort. Neuroimage. 2022.

[35] Karlsson HK, Tuominen L, Tuulari JJ, Hirvonen J, Honka H, Parkkola R, et al. Weight loss after bariatric surgery normalizes brain opioid receptors in morbid obesity. Molecular psychiatry. 2016;21:1057-62.

[36] Tuominen L, Tuulari J, Karlsson H, Hirvonen J, Helina S, Salminen P, et al. Aberrant mesolimbic dopamine-opiate interaction in obesity. Neuroimage. 2015;122:80-6.

[37] Burghardt PR, Rothberg AE, Dykhuis KE, Burant CF, Zubieta JK. Endogenous Opioid Mechanisms Are Implicated in Obesity and Weight Loss in Humans. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2015;100:3193-201.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Flowchart for literature searches and data extraction



Figure 2. Studies of BMI cutoff of 25kg/m², Left; scatter plot of the standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and overweight/obese subjects and BMI, Right; Posterior probability distributions with their median (point), 80% (thick line) and 95% (thin line) posterior intervals, describing the standardized mean difference of DR availability. Posterior located on the positive side of the zero line suggests higher DR availability in overweight/obese subjects.



Figure 3. Studies of BMI cutoff of 30kg/m², Left; scatter plot of the standardized mean difference of DR availability between lean and obese subjects and BMI, Right; Posterior probability distributions with their median (point), 80% (thick line) and 95% (thin line) posterior intervals, describing the standardized mean difference of DR availability. Posterior located on the positive side of the zero line suggests higher DR availability in obese subjects.



Figure 4. Forest plots of studies of BMI cutoff of 25 and 30kg/m²





TABLES

			D : (BMI	Lean subjects		Overweight/Obese subjects			
Study		utical	Region-of- interest	cutoff (kg/m ²)	No.	BMI (kg/m ²)		No	BMI (kg/m ²)	
						mean	range	- NO.	mean	range
Caravaggio		C11-PHNO	VST	25	16	21.6	18.6 ~ 24.9	10	26.6	25 ~ 27.8
2015		C11-Raclopride	VST	25	24	21.7	$18.6 \sim 24.9$	11	26.6	$25 \sim 27.8$
Dunn JP 2012		F18-Fallypride	Caudate	25/30	8	23	~ 24.9	14	40	30 ~
Eisenstein SA 2013		C11-NMB	Caudate/Puta men/VST/Stri atum	30	15	22.6	18.9 ~ 27.7	15	40.3	33.2 ~ 47
Gaiser EC 2016		C11-PHNO	Caudate/Puta men/VST	25/30	14	22.3	18.5 ~ 24.9	14	35.3	30 ~
Guo J 2014		F18-Fallypride	Caudate/Puta men/VST	30	23	22.4	~ 30	20	36.1	30 ~
Haltia 2008	Female	C11-Raclopride	Putamen/VST	25	6	21.4	~ 24	6	34.4	27 ~
	Male	C11-Raclopride	Putamen/VST	25	6	21.9	~ 24	6	31.8	27 ~
Tuominen L 2015		C11-Raclopride	Caudate/Puta men/VST	30	20	22.3	~ 30	25	41.3	35 ~
van de Giessen E 2014		I123-IBZM	Striatum	25/30	15	21.8	18.5 ~ 24.9	15	42.9	36.3 ~ 56.5
Wang GJ 2001		C11-Raclopride	Striatum	30	10	24.7	21 ~ 28	10	51.2	42 ~ 60

Table 1. Studies of DR availability

DR, dopamine receptor; BMI, body mass index; VST, ventral striatum





Duplicate records removed = 1,367(11) Non-English study (n = 88) Conference abstract (n = 1,795)

Records excluded (n = 5, 108)

Records excluded (n = 329)

Reports excluded: Overlapped data (n = 4) Not relevant (n = 87) Data not extractable (n = 3)

Records removed before screening:



Study

- Caravaggio 2015
- Dunn JP 2012
- Gaiser EC 2016
- Haltia 2008 F
- Haltia 2008 M
- van de Giessen E 2014

ROI

- Caudate
 - Putamen
 - Striatum
- VST

50

Dunn JP 2012 Haltia 2008 F Haltia 2008 M Caravaggio 2015 Gaiser EC 2016 van de Giessen E 2014 Pooled Effect

σ σ ſ

S

F18–Fallypride C11–PHNO C11–Raclopride 1123–IBZM **Pooled Effect**

S **D**e **D**e

VST Putamen Caudate Striatum **Pooled Effect**





Study Dunn JP 2012 Eisenstein SA 2013 Gaiser EC 2016 Guo J 2014 Tuominen L 2015 van de Giessen E 2014 Wang GJ 2001

ROI

55

- Caudate
- Putamen
- Striatum
- VST

Dunn JP 2012 Gaiser EC 2016 Tuominen L 2015 Eisenstein SA 2013 Guo J 2014 Van de Giessen E 2014 Wang GJ 2001 Pooled Effect

adiopharmaceutical

S

F18–Fallypride C11–PHNO C11–NMB C11–Raclopride I123–IBZM Pooled Effect -2

-2

-2

Region-of-interest







Study	Radiopharmaceutical	ROI	BMI
van de Giessen E 2014	I123–IBZM	Striatum	42.9
Gaiser EC 2016	C11–PHNO	Average	35.3
Dunn JP 2012	F18–Fallypride	Caudate	40
Haltia 2008 M	C11–Raclopride	Average	31.8
Haltia 2008 F	C11–Raclopride	Average	34.4
Caravaggio 2015	C11–PHNO	VST	26.9
Caravaggio 2015	C11–Raclopride	VST	26.59

RE Model for All studies (Q = 26.42, df = 6, p < .01; I^2 = 76.7%, τ^2 = 0.65)

Study

Radiopharmace

Eisenstein SA 2013 C11–NMB C11–Racloprid Tuominen L 2015 Wang GJ 2001 C11–Racloprid van de Giessen E 2014 |123–IBZM Gaiser EC 2016 C11–PHNO Dunn JP 2012 F18–Fallyprid F18–Fallyprid medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.22.28291735 this tension post d June 25, 2023. The copyright holders this prevint (which was not certified by peet review) is the author under, who has granted and Rxiv a litense to apply the previous the previous of the author under, who has granted and Rxiv a litense to apply the previous of the previous of the author under, who has granted and Rxiv a litense to apply the previous of the previous of the author under, who has granted and Rxiv a litense to apply the previous of the previous of the author under, who has granted and Rxiv a litense to apply the previous of the pre

RE Model for All studies (Q = 28.39, df = 6, p < .01; l^2 = 83.4%, τ^2 = 0.71)

eutical	ROI	BMI
	Striatum	40.3
ide	Average	41.3
ide	Striatum	51.2
	Striatum	42.9
)	Average	35.3
de	Caudate	40
de	Average	36.1

-2

Standardized Mean Difference

Standardized Mean Difference

0.23 [-0.46, 0.92]

Hedge's g

	-0.05 [-0.77,	0.66
	0.17 [-0.41,	0.76
	-1.29 [-2.25, -	-0.33
	-1.09 [-1.86, -	-0.33
	0.68 [-0.08,	1.45
	1.62 [0.63,	2.61
	0.01 [-0.59,	0.61
	0.00 [-0.69,	0.69
2		