Evidence for a protein leverage effect on food intake but not on body mass index in a Norwegian population

Rikke Eriksen[1], Kamilla Rognmo[1], Laila A Hopstock[2], James E McCutcheon[1]

1 Dept. of Psychology, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

2 Dept. of Health and Care Sciences, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

Keywords: dietary protein, energy intake, food frequency questionnaire, ultra-processed food, obesity

Running title: Protein leverage effect on food intake but not BMI

Contact information: James E McCutcheon, Dept. of Psychology, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Huginbakken 32, 9019 Tromsø, Norway

Word count: 3960

Funding: Funding was provided by Tromsø Research Foundation to JEM (19-SG-JMcC).

Disclosure: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author contributions: **Rikke Eriksen:** Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Writing - Original Draft; **Kamilla Rognmo:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review and Editing; **Laila A Hopstock:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review and Editing, Investigation; **James E McCutcheon:** Conceptualization, Writing – Review and Editing, Visualization.

Study Importance Questions

What is already known about this subject?

- The protein leverage hypothesis proposes that a strong appetite for protein plays a crucial role in the obesity epidemic.
- Though dietary protein is strongly linked to energy intake, in the context of protein leverage, no studies have found the predicted relationship between protein intake and body mass index.

What are the new findings in your manuscript?

- In a population-based study, we find that dietary protein and energy intake are related - in line with an effect of protein leverage - but we find no relationship between protein and body mass index.
- In our sample of women and men 40-99 years, a higher intake of ultra-processed foods is associated with higher energy intake and lower proportion of dietary protein, highlighting this class of foods as a possible dilutant of protein in the food supply.

How might your results change the direction of research or the focus of clinical practice?

- Our results highlight the important association between dietary protein and energy intake and the potential contribution of ultra-processed foods to this relationship.

- We suggest that further research should be devoted to understanding how the hormone FGF21 – which is increased by low protein diets – might interact both with appetite and energy expenditure to affect body mass index.

Abstract

Objective

In this pre-registered study, we aimed to explore the protein leverage hypothesis in a general population, by studying the relationship between habitual dietary protein intake, total energy intake, and body mass index (BMI), and whether proportion of ultra-processed food (UPF) was associated with any of these variables.

Methods

We used regression-based analyses to investigate these phenomena in cross-sectional data from a Norwegian population-based study, the seventh survey of Tromsø Study 2015-2016, (n = 11,152; 40-99 years).

Results

Total energy intake was negatively associated with proportion of dietary protein (L = -0.36, p < .001) and positively associated with dietary fat (L = 0.33, p < .001). The relationship between BMI and dietary protein was positive but small (b = 0.01, p < .001). Proportion of UPFs was positively associated with total energy intake (b = 554, p < .001), negatively associated with proportion of dietary protein (b = -2.0, p < .001), and positively associated with BMI (b = 0.011, p = .026).

Conclusions

In summary, our study of middle-to-older aged Norwegians provides strong support for a protein leverage effect on energy intake but no evidence for an effect of protein leverage on BMI.

Introduction

The obesity epidemic is a global problem that is estimated to contribute to a huge number of deaths each year as well as posing a significant economic burden (1). Although its causes are multifactorial, reduced intake of dietary protein has been implicated via the protein leverage hypothesis. The protein leverage hypothesis is based on a nutritional geometric framework that was developed to explain how humans and other animals meet their nutritional needs (2). The hypothesis emphasizes that protein is the most essential macronutrient as many of the amino acids cannot be synthesized de novo and must be acquired from one's diet. This implies that humans need to consume a target level of protein on a regular basis (i.e., on the order of days) resulting in a strong appetite for protein (3). The protein leverage mechanism is proposed to regulate energy intake towards this protein target through appetite (4) and, as such, the proportion of protein in a given diet is suggested to influence food intake more strongly than total calories consumed. Accordingly, if a food environment is "protein diluted", (i.e., contains a lower proportion of dietary protein than a balanced diet), excess energy will be consumed in an effort to reach the protein target (4). Recent analyses find that the US food supply has indeed become protein diluted over recent decades, and though this dilution is small (~1% of available calories), modeling suggests a significant effect on development of obesity in the adult population (5).

Several studies, including randomized controlled trials (6, 7) and observational studies (8-11), find support for the energy regulating effects of the protein leverage mechanism in specific cohorts including preschool children prone to obesity, children and adolescents living with obesity, and older adults. To our knowledge, few observational

studies have examined protein leverage effects in adults and none of these have yet been conducted in European populations.

The dilution of protein in the human food supply (12) may be linked to the increase in availability and popularity of ultra-processed foods (UPFs) . The human obesity epidemic has developed concomitantly with the emergence of these foods, and now UPFs dominate the market in several high-income countries. For example, in the UK, US, and Canada more than half of the energy consumed comes from these foods (13). In the context of protein leverage, high UPF diets that tend to be low in dietary protein should lead to an increase in total calories consumed. Indeed, this has been found in national representative samples of the Australian (14) and US (14) populations, which show that high UPF diets are related to a lower proportion of dietary protein intake and a heightened energy intake. In addition, a carefully planned 14-day RCT (15)found overcompensation of energy intake on a 16.1% protein UPF diet when compared to an 18.7% protein non-UPF diet. This increased energy intake was also accompanied by an increase in bodyweight where participants gained 0.9 kg when on the UPF diet and lost 0.9 kg when on the non-UPF diet, implying that all weight gain observed in high UPF diets results from unbalanced protein levels (16), although in natural settings where UPFs are thought to dilute the protein content it is likely a part of the equation.

The biological processes that underpin protein leverage are still under study, but one potential mechanism is variation in levels of the hormone fibroblast growth factor 21 (FGF21). Studies in humans and rodents have found that FGF21 increases in response to protein restriction (17, 18). In mice, FGF21 has also been found to increase protein intake and protein preference without increasing total food intake (19). In humans,

plasma FGF21 levels have been found to vary negatively with the percentage protein in the diet (20, 21). FGF21 increases manyfold in response to a low-protein overfeeding diet (22), indicating that its release is not just dependent on the caloric content of the food. Additionally, FGF21 levels after exposure to a low-protein overfeeding diet are positively related to 24 hour energy expenditure (23). Similarly, energy requirements increased concomitantly with FGF21 levels in lean men on a protein restricted diet (20). As such, the relationship between FGF21, protein intake, and bodyweight is complex.

In our study, we aimed to replicate and extend findings on the protein leverage mechanism by testing the predicted relationships between dietary protein, energy intake, and body mass index (BMI) in middle-aged and older adults through two preregistered hypotheses (osf.io/4g62f). These were that (1) the proportion of dietary protein will be negatively associated with total energy intake, and (2) the proportion of dietary protein will be negatively associated with BMI. In addition, we assessed properties of diets high in UPFs. Finally, we investigated the relationship between habitual dietary protein intake and FGF21.

Methods

Data source and sample

The current study include data from the Tromsø Study, a large-scale population-based study conducted in the municipality of Tromsø, Norway. To date, seven surveys have been carried out and the eight survey is ongoing (Tromsø1–Tromsø8, 1974–2026). Data collection includes questionnaires and interviews, biological sampling and clinical measurements. This analysis include data from Tromsø7 (2015–2016), where all

inhabitants of Tromsø municipality aged 40 years and older (*N* = 32,591) were invited, and 21,083 (65%) attended. Details of the study design, sample, and data collection methods for Tromsø7 have been described elsewhere (24).

The current study was approved by the Regional Committee for Medical Research Ethics Northern Norway (ref. 789456), and the Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research (ref. 935030). All participants gave written consent at study attendance. Data from participants that later withdrew their consent were not used in the analysis. The current study analyzed data from 11,152 participants. The exclusion criteria are visualized in the flow chart depicted in Figure 1. Data exclusion plan and two hypotheses were preregistered on Open Science Framework (osf.io/4g62f).



Figure 1 | Flowchart of exclusions leading to final sample. Tromsø7 data was collected in 2015-2016. Food frequency questionnaire (FFQ). % indicates percent change since the last step. To increase the validity of the data we excluded (1) participants that completed less than 90% of the FFQ and (2) participants with extreme intakes of energy, i.e., the 1st (below 3,950 kJ/day) and 99th (above 21,249 kJ/day) percentile in total energy intake (TEI). Pregnancy may interfere with habitual eating patterns and body composition and we therefore excluded (3) participants that reported being pregnant at the time of the data collection. Finally, we excluded (4) participants with extreme BMI values, i.e., groups of BMI with less than 10 participants, ensured by binning the BMI data in bins of one BMI unit and excluding bins with fewer than 10 observations.

Food Frequency Questionnaire

All participants were invited to complete a food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) designed to collect data on habitual dietary patterns by assessing frequency and quantity of

intake of 261 of single foods, beverages, dishes and dietary supplements (25). Details of the FFQ used in Tromsø7 have been described elsewhere (26). The FFQ was developed and validated (25) at the University of Oslo. Food, energy and nutrient intakes were calculated using the food database KBS AE14 and KBS software system (KBS, version 7.3.), based on the Norwegian food composition tables from 2014 to 2015.

Demographics and Health Related Information

Height and weight were measured by trained personnel using a Jenix DS-102 scale (DongSahn Jenix, Seoul, Korea). BMI was calculated as kg/m^2 and categorized in the standard groups normal (<25 kg/m^2), overweight (25–<30 kg/m^2), and obese (≥30 kg/m^2). The group normal includes a low proportion of underweight participants (≤1 %) as reported in Løvsletten, Jacobsen (27).

Demographic and health information was collected by questionnaires. Level of leisure time physical activity was measured with the Saltin-Grimby Physical Activity Level Scale (28) including sedentary, light, moderate, and vigorous physical activity levels. Education level included primary/partly secondary education (≤10 years), upper secondary (10 + minimum 3 years), tertiary short (college/university less than 4 years), and tertiary long (college/university 4 years or more). Current or previous disease included the four main non-communicable diseases (NCD) from the NCD framework (29): cardiovascular diseases (myocardial infarction and/or stroke), cancer, chronic respiratory diseases (asthma and/or chronic bronchitis/emphysema/chronic obstructive lung disease) and/or diabetes, in addition to psychiatric problems the participant reported to have sought help for. Presence of chronic pain was defined by the question

”Do you have persistent or constantly recurring pain that has lasted for 3 months or more?” with answer options “yes” or “no”. Smoking status was defined by the question “Do you/did you smoke daily” with answer options “yes, now”, “yes, previously”, or “never”.

Fibroblast Growth Factor 21

Non-fasting blood samples were obtained with a light tourniquet released after venipuncture (24). In a randomly selected subsample (n = 1,144), FGF21 was analyzed as part of the OLINK Target Inflammation panel which uses Proximity Extension Assay (PEA) technology to measure relative protein levels.

NOVA Classification of Food Processing Level

The food items from the FFQ were categorized based on the NOVA classification system (30) and the procedure was adapted from Huybrechts et al. (2022) (31). The NOVA system classifies foods and dishes into four mutually exclusive groups (30). Based on the categorization of the FFQ, a binary variable was made for (0) non-ultra-processed foods (NOVA groups 1-3) and (1) ultra-processed foods (NOVA group 4). For further details, see Supporting Information section 1.

Statistical Analyses

Data pre-processing and statistical analyses were performed using RStudio version 4.2.2. Data visualizations were made in Python version 3.9.

The protein leverage mechanism was tested through a power function (equation 1.1) and indexed by the L-value,

$$TEI = P.p^L \quad (1.1)$$

where TEI = total energy intake per day, *P* = a constant obtained from the analysis, *p* = the proportion of protein in the diet, and *L* = the strength of leverage. An *L*-value of -1 indicates complete protein leverage, while an *L*-value of 0 indicates that protein has no control over total energy intake (32). A positive *L*-value indicates that protein increases energy intake, i.e., the opposite of the predicted pattern. An *L*-value between -1 and <0 indicates partial protein leverage. The variables TEI and *p* are taken from the data set, while *P* and *L* are derived from the model when Equation 1.1 is log-transformed to a linear regression equation (equation 1.2),

$$log(TEI) = log(P) + L.log(p) \quad (1.2)$$

To assess the individual contributions of each macronutrient to total energy intake, a mixture model was run with the R package, *Mixexp* (33). The package demands that the predictors (i.e., the three macronutrients) sum to one, which was accomplished by removing the contribution of alcohol and fiber to total energy intake. The mixture models were run based on the framework described by Lawson and Willden (33), starting with a linear model and increasing the polynomial complexity (for details see Supporting Information section 2). The output from the mixture model was used to make a mixture triangle plotting predicted total energy intake per participant based on macronutrient composition.

The proportion of UPFs in the diet was calculated as intake of UPFs in kJ/day divided by total intake of food in kJ/day (i.e., UPF proportion (%E) = UPF kJ /day/ total intake of food

kJ/day). Analyses were conducted on UPF intake classified into quintiles. For relevant analyses, significant effects were followed up with contrast analyses using the *emmeans* package in RStudio.

Multiple linear regression models with relevant covariates were run with BMI as the outcome. This includes the following binary variables, which were entered into the model in the given order: age (over vs. under 60 years), sex (female vs. male), physical activity level (sedentary vs. three active levels), health conditions (presence vs. absence of conditions), education level (lowest vs. three highest levels), and smoking status (not current vs. current smokers). BMI was positively skewed and was therefore log-transformed prior to analyses.

For mixture modeling and BMI analyses, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) (34) was used to choose between models, and if several models were within two AIC points of each other, the simplest model was favored.

Code and data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available upon application to the Tromsø Study. Restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for this study. All analysis code is available at https://github.com/jaimemcc/proteinleverage.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the full sample (n = 11,152, 53.3% women) are presented in Table 1. Information about BMI was missing for 27 participants, and all analyses on BMI are therefore based on n = 11,125. Participants with valid FGF21 data were n = 880 (51% women).

The Protein Leverage Mechanism

Analyses of the strength of leverage protein has over energy intake found support for a partial protein leverage effect with the analysis showing that L = -0.36 (p < .001). The negative L-value indicates that protein was negatively associated with energy intake (Figure 2A), in line with our hypothesis. The power function was fitted for carbohydrate and fat and the analysis revealed L-values of -0.0008 (p = .966) and 0.33 (p < .001), respectively. This indicates that the proportion of carbohydrates in the diet had no control over energy intake (Figure 2B), while the proportion of fat was positively associated with energy intake (Figure 2C).



Figure 2 I Power functions between total energy intake and proportional intake of each macronutrient. (A) shows protein, (B) shows carbohydrate, and (C) shows fat. Dashed lines show regression lines fitted with Equation 1.1. Data on individual participants are presented as a density heat map (darker colors indicate higher density of observations). L is the leverage strength of each macronutrient on energy intake where a positive number indicates that total energy intake increases as percentage of the macronutrient increases and a negative value indicates that total energy intake decreases as percentage of the macronutrient increases.

Mixture Models for Protein, Carbohydrate, and Fat

The AIC (Table S1) favored the second model (Table S2) which is visualized in the mixture triangle in Figure 3 which shows that the change in total energy intake mainly followed the protein axis, but fat also had an effect. As the proportion of protein increases from e.g., 10% to 30%, the predicted total energy intake decreases (as seen by the color change from yellow to purple). As the proportion of fat increases from e.g. 10% to 70%, the color changes from purple to orange-yellow.



Figure 3 | Equilateral mixture triangle for predicted total energy intake by macronutrient proportions. Predicted total energy intake based on the mixture model shown in Table S2 is shown as colored contours. Negatively sloped lines indicate percent protein, positively sloped lines indicate percent fat, and horizontal lines indicate percent carbohydrate. As percent protein increases, predicted energy intake decreases and as percent fat increases, predicted energy intake increases. Changes to percent carbohydrate have only a minor effect on predicted energy intake.

Properties of Diets High in Ultra-Processed Foods

Several linear regression models were run to assess how changes in proportion of UPFs in the diet were related to (1) proportion of dietary protein, (2) dietary protein in absolute terms, and (3) total energy intake. The output from the regression models and estimated marginal mean comparisons are reported in the Supporting Information (Tables S3-S8). Proportion of UPFs in the diet was negatively related to proportion of dietary protein (Supplementary table S3), and positively related to total energy intake (Supplementary

table S4), while the amount of protein in absolute terms stayed relatively stable between UPF quintiles (Supplementary table S5). Figure 4A summarizes these results.



Figure 4 | Relationship between ultra-processed foods (UPFs), dietary patterns, and BMI. (A) Descriptive bi-coordinate intake plot of protein versus non-protein energy intake (MJ) by quintiles (Qs) of UPF intake. Dots indicate mean intake of protein energy and non-protein energy (i.e., the combination of carbohydrate and fat) per quintile of UPF intake. The quintile dots most closely follow the protein prioritization line. Solid grey lines represent different predictions of intake for Q1 based on energy prioritization (negatively sloped line), protein prioritization (vertical line) or non-protein energy prioritization (horizontal line). Dashed grey lines show shift in total energy intake (negatively sloped) and protein intake (positively sloped) for Q5. *n* = 11,152. (B) Relationship between BMI and UPF intake plotted as quintiles. Data are estimated marginal means from regression model that control for sex, age, and physical activity. Error bars are 95%CI. *n* = 11,125.

Body Mass Index and Intake of Dietary Protein and ultra-processed foods

Several linear regression analyses were run to assess the relationship between dietary habits and BMI. In the analyses of the relationship between protein intake and BMI, the AIC (Table S9) favored the model presented in Table 2, which included age, sex, and physical activity (R^2 = .07, F(4, 10866) = 204, p < .001). The model indicated a positive relationship between protein intake and BMI, a finding contrary to our hypothesis. The covariates sex and physical activity level were also significant in the model. This shows that being male was associated with a higher BMI than being female and being physically active was associated with a lower BMI than being sedentary. Age was not

significant in the model, but to check for interaction effects, a follow-up analysis was run and reported in the Supporting Information (Table S10). The main effect of age was not significant, but the interaction between dietary protein and age was significant and positive. This interaction is visualized in Figure S1.

In the analysis of the relationship between proportion of UPFs and BMI, the AIC (Table S11) favored the model that included UPF quintiles as well as the covariates age, sex, and physical activity level (see table 3) (R^2 = .05, $F(7, 10863) = 74$, $p < .001$). The estimated marginal means were calculated for the quintiles of UPF intake while keeping the covariates in the model constant as the reference category (i.e., age = under 60 years, sex = female, physical activity level = sedentary) and while adjusting the *p*-value using the Dunnett method. This yielded a trend towards higher UPF quintiles being associated with a higher BMI as compared to the first UPF quintile (Table S12). The estimated marginal means per quintile of UPF are visualized in Figure 4B.

FGF21 and Dietary Protein

To assess the relationship between FGF21 and dietary protein, several multiple linear regression models were run, and the AIC-favored (Table S13) model is presented in Table 4 (R^2 = .04, $F(7, 757) = 5.9$, $p < .001$). The model reveals a negative, significant, relationship between dietary protein and FGF21, in line with our expectations. Several other covariates were also significantly associated with FGF21 including age, physical activity level, disease and smoking status.

Discussion

In this study of 11,152 women and men from a general population in Norway, we examined several predictions of the protein leverage hypothesis. We found strong support for the protein leverage mechanism (i.e., the energy intake regulating effects of dietary protein; *L* = -.36) in line with previous studies in the field (8-11). Interestingly, we did not find the predicted negative relationship between dietary protein and BMI, and our study is thus one of several that fail to establish this link. Our analyses of the relationship between dietary protein, total energy intake, and habitual UPF intake revealed relationships that are predicted to arise from the protein leverage hypothesis, namely, that a higher UPF intake was associated with greater energy intake but lower proportion of dietary protein. But again, our analysis failed to establish a concordant effect of UPF intake on BMI. Finally, in an exploratory analysis, we examined the relationship between FGF21 and dietary protein and this revealed the expected negative relationship.

Positive leveraging effect of fat on energy intake

Our power functions not only revealed a partial protein leverage mechanism, but also a positive L-value for fat, again in line with previous studies (9, 11). The effect of fat on energy intake may be due to several factors. For example, fat has a lower satiating effect than the other two macronutrients (35), which could lead to larger meals and thus an excess energy intake when consuming diets high in fat. The high palatability of fat-rich foods (36) may also play a role in driving energy intake. As such, people may eat more when consuming diets high in fat because they taste better, or being exposed to high fat diets may lead to changes in dietary patterns such as larger meals or more snacking.

The protein leverage hypothesis is based on a nutritional geometric framework and emphasizes that it is the balance of the macronutrients that are of importance for energy intake and potential weight gain and our results for fat and protein attest to this.

Relationship between FGF21, energy expenditure and BMI

Though our results strongly point to dietary protein as an important factor for energy intake regulation, our analysis did not find the expected negative relationship between protein and BMI. In fact, contrary to our hypothesis, analysis revealed a significant, though weak, positive relationship. One factor that may play a role in this is the liver-derived hormone, FGF21. We found that dietary protein was negatively associated with FGF21, an expected finding in line with results in prior studies (20, 21). Moreover, FGF21 is also suggested to upregulate energy expenditure (20). This has been shown most robustly in rodent models (18, 19) although one study has also established this association in humans (23). As such, low-protein diets seem to have two contradicting forces on BMI: the protein leverage mechanism drives energy intake up, while FGF21 increases energy expenditure. This could explain why ours and other studies fail to find that low protein diets are related to a higher BMI, a relationship predicted by the protein leverage mechanism (8-11).

Implications of sample age

The age of our sample may also contribute to the small, positive relationship we found between dietary protein and BMI. The Tromsø7 sample spanned middle-to-older age with a relatively large proportion of older adults (42.7% ≥60 years). The exploratory analysis of the interaction between age and dietary protein indicates that the

relationship between BMI and dietary protein is moderated by age, so that the positive effect of protein on BMI increases in the older age group (60+ years) (see Figure S1). This effect might be related to the heightened need for protein in older adults (37) and may suggest that an adequate intake of protein protects against age-related conditions like frailty and sarcopenia, conditions that are often accompanied by bodyweight changes (38, 39). Nevertheless, the main effect of protein in the model is positive, indicating that the lack of support for our hypothesis (H2) is not due to the moderation by age in our sample. However, whether this relationship would still be present in a sample containing younger adults remains to be tested.

Potential role of ultra-processed foods

A higher proportion of energy from UPFs was accompanied by a higher energy intake and a lower proportional protein intake. As detailed in the Results, a change in percent dietary protein was observed between the highest (16.4%) and lowest (18.5%) quintiles. This reduction by a mere 2% may seem modest, but this may have large effects on energy intake via leveraging. A previous RCT found that dilution by 1.6% of protein may have contributed to significant increases in energy intake and subsequent weight gain in participants (15). Assuming perfect protein leverage, this dilution may explain as much as 50% of the increase in energy intake (15). In the current study, the *L*-value for protein was -0.36, i.e., far from perfect, meaning that the protein leverage mechanism will explain less than 50% of changes in energy intake between the quintiles, however, this does not mean that it is insignificant as a potential mechanism.

This also implies that, unsurprisingly, properties other than their protein content drive energy intake in UPFs. Their formulations, including the combination of macronutrients, encourage consummatory patterns that lead to high energy intake (40). In particular, high fat content may increase energy intake, independent of carbohydrate, given the positive *L*-value for fat found in our earlier analysis. Another possibility is that the umami and salt flavors associated with many UPFs may drive energy intake up (41) due to the protein decoy effect. Foods rich in protein often have these savory flavors, and people in search of protein may use these cues to guide them towards a potentially nutritious food source. Finally, UPFs are designed to increase food intake due to their industrialized, cosmetic, ingredients (13). All these factors may play a role in increasing energy intake in diets high in UPF content, in addition to the diluted protein content.

Strengths and limitations

A major strength of the current study is the large sample size from a general population, high attendance, and data collection using standard methods and validated measurements. Another strength is that several of the findings replicate other studies, thus further strengthening the implications of the protein leverage hypothesis. Some limitations include the nature of the self-reported food intake, which is an issue that has been discussed elsewhere (e.g., 42, 43), though we are using a validated FFQ. Of importance, people living with a higher BMI have been found to underreport energy intake to a larger degree, on a group level, than people in the normal BMI range (44, 45). A large proportion of the participants in our study are either living with overweight or obesity, so this could have impacted our data.

Conclusion

We found strong support for the protein leverage mechanism through several analysis methods, i.e., fitted power functions and mixture modeling. An interesting and related finding was the positive effect of proportion of fat on energy intake. Though this has been reported before, it has not received attention in relation to the protein leverage mechanism. Our study revealed that a diet consisting of a high proportion of UPFs was related to heightened energy intake and a lowered proportion of dietary protein, while protein intake in absolute terms remained relatively stable between UPF diets. Finally, despite these expected effects of low protein diets on energy intake, we did not find the predicted consequence of greater BMI.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the staff involved in data collection and administration of the Tromsø Study and the participants that volunteered to take part. Funding was provided by Tromsø Research Foundation to JEM (19-SG-JMcC). The data that support the findings of this study are available upon application to the Tromsø Study. Restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for this study.

References

1. World Health Organization. Obesity and overweight 2021 [08.11.2023]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight.

2. Raubenheimer D, Senior AM, Mirth C, et al. An integrative approach to dietary balance across the life course. iScience. 2022;25(5):104315–.

3. Raubenheimer D, Machovsky-Capuska GE, Gosby AK, Simpson S. Nutritional ecology of obesity: From humans to companion animals. Br J Nutr. 2015;113(S1):S26–S39.

4. Simpson SJ, Raubenheimer D. Obesity: The protein leverage hypothesis. Obes Rev. 2005;6(2):133–42.

5. Hall KD. The potential role of protein leverage in the US obesity epidemic. Obesity (Silver Spring). 2019;27(8):1222–4.

6. Gosby AK, Conigrave AD, Lau NS, et al. Testing protein leverage in lean humans: A randomised controlled experimental study. PLoS One. 2011;6(10):e25929–e.

7. Martens EA, Lemmens SG, Westerterp-Plantenga MS. Protein leverage affects energy intake of high-protein diets in humans. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2013;97(1):86–93.

8. Zhang H, Senior AM, Saner C, et al. Evidence for the protein leverage hypothesis in preschool children prone to obesity. Clin Nutr. 2023;42(11):2249–57.

9. Saner C, Senior AM, Zhang H, et al. Evidence for protein leverage in a general population sample of children and adolescents. Eur J Clin Nutr. 2023;77(6):652–9.

10. Saner C, Tassoni D, Harcourt BE, et al. Evidence for protein leverage in children and adolescents with obesity. Obesity (Silver Spring). 2020;28(4):822–9.

11. Honfo SH, Senior AM, Legault V, et al. Evidence for protein leverage on total energy intake, but not body mass index, in a large cohort of older adults. Int J Obes. 2023.

12. Raubenheimer D, Simpson SJ. Protein appetite as an integrator in the obesity system: The protein leverage hypothesis. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2023;378(1888):20220212–.

13. Monteiro CA, Cannon G, Levy RB, et al. Ultra-processed foods: What they are and how to identify them. Public Health Nutr. 2019;22(5):936–41.

14. Martinez-Cordero C, Kuzawa CW, Sloboda DM, et al. Testing the protein leverage hypothesis in a free-living human population. Appetite. 2012;59(2):312–5.

15. Hall KD, Ayuketah A, Brychta R, et al. Ultra-processed diets cause excess calorie intake and weight gain: An inpatient randomized controlled trial of ad libitum food intake. Cell Metab. 2019;32(4):690–.

16. Preston JM, Iversen J, Hufnagel A, et al. Effect of ultra-processed food consumption on male reproductive and metabolic health. Cell Metab. 2025.

17. Volcko KL, McCutcheon JE. Protein preference and elevated plasma FGF21 induced by dietary protein restriction is similar in both male and female mice. [New York] :2022. p. 113994.

18. Laeger T, Henagan TM, Albarado DC, et al. FGF21 is an endocrine signal of protein restriction. J Clin Invest. 2014;124(9):3913–22.

19. Hill CM, Laeger T, Dehner M, et al. FGF21 signals protein status to the brain and adaptively regulates food choice and metabolism. Cell Rep. 2019;27(10):2934–47. e3.

20. Nicolaisen TS, Lyster AE, Sjøberg KA, et al. Dietary protein restriction elevates FGF21 levels and energy requirements to maintain body weight in lean men. Nat Metab. 2025:1–15.

21. Gosby AK, Lau NS, Tam CS, et al. Raised FGF-21 and Triglycerides Accompany Increased Energy Intake Driven by Protein Leverage in Lean, Healthy Individuals: A Randomised Trial. PLoS One. 2016;11(8):e0161003–e.

22. Hollstein T, Ando T, Basolo A, et al. Metabolic response to fasting predicts weight gain during low-protein overfeeding in lean men: further evidence for spendthrift and thrifty metabolic phenotypes. Am J Clin Nutr. 2019;110(3):593–604.

23. Vinales KL, Begaye B, Bogardus C, et al. FGF21 is a hormonal mediator of the human “thrifty” metabolic phenotype. Diabetes. 2019;68(2):318–23.

24. Hopstock LA, Grimsgaard S, Johansen H, et al. The seventh survey of the Tromsø Study (Tromsø7) 2015–2016: Study design, data collection, attendance, and prevalence of risk factors and disease in a multipurpose population-based health survey. Scand J Public Health. 2022;50(7):919–29.

25. Carlsen MH, Lillegaard ITL, Karlsen A, et al. Evaluation of energy and dietary intake estimates from a food frequency questionnaire using independent energy expenditure measurement and weighed food records. Nutr J. 2010;9(1):37–.

26. Lundblad MW, Andersen LF, Jacobsen BK, et al. Energy and nutrient intakes in relation to National Nutrition Recommendations in a Norwegian population-based sample: The Tromsø Study 2015-16. Food Nutr Res. 2019;63:1–10.

27. Løvsletten O, Jacobsen BK, Grimsgaard S, et al. Prevalence of general and abdominal obesity in 2015–2016 and 8-year longitudinal weight and waist circumference changes in adults and elderly: The Tromsø Study. BMJ Open. 2020;10(11):e038465–e.

28. Grimby G, Börjesson M, Jonsdottir IH, et al. The "Saltin-Grimby Physical Activity Level Scale" and its application to health research. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2015;25(S4):119–25.

29. World Health Organization. Global action plan for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases 2013-2020. Geneva, Switzerland; 2013.

30. Monteiro CA. Nutrition and health. The issue is not food, nor nutrients, so much as processing. Public Health Nutr. 2009;12(5):729–31.

31. Huybrechts I, Rauber F, Nicolas G, et al. Characterization of the degree of food processing in the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition:

Application of the Nova classification and validation using selected biomarkers of food processing. Front Nutr. 2022;9:1035580–.

32. Senior AM, Raubenheimer D, Simpson SJ. Testing the protein-leverage hypothesis using population surveillance data. R Soc Open Sci. 2022;9(9):220756.

33. Lawson J, Willden C. Mixture experiments in R using mixexp. J Stat Softw. 2016;72(Code Snippet 2):1–20.

34. Akaike H. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In: Parzen E, Tanabe K, Kitagawa G, editors. Selected Papers of Hirotugu Akaike Springer Series in Statistics. United States: United States: Springer; 1992. p. 610–24.

35. Blundell JE, Macdiarmid JI. Fat as a risk factor for overconsumption: Satiation, satiety, and patterns of eating. J Am Diet Assoc. 1997;97(7):S63–S9.

36. Mizushige T, Inoue K, Fushiki T. Why is fat so tasty? Chemical reception of fatty acid on the tongue. J Nutr Sci Vitaminol (Tokyo). 2007;53(1):1–4.

37. Deer RR, Volpi E. Protein intake and muscle function in older adults. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2015;18(3):248–53.

38. Konglevoll DM, Hjartåker A, Hopstock LA, et al. Protein intake and the risk of pre-frailty and frailty in Norwegian older adults: The Tromsø study 1994–2016. J Frailty Aging. 2022;11(3):256–66.

39. Baum JI, Kim I-Y, Wolfe RR. Protein consumption and the elderly: What is the optimal level of intake? Nutrients. 2016;8(6):359.

40. Fazzino TL, Rohde K, Sullivan DK. Hyper-palatable foods: Development of a quantitative definition and application to the US food system database. Obesity (Silver Spring). 2019;27(11):1761–8.

41. Grech A, Sui Z, Rangan A, et al. Macronutrient (im)balance drives energy intake in an obesogenic food environment: An ecological analysis. Obesity (Silver Spring). 2022b;30(11):2156–66.

42. Dhurandhar NV, Schoeller D, Brown AW, et al. Energy balance measurement: When something is not better than nothing. Int J Obes. 2015;39(7):1109–13.

43. Prentice RL, Aragaki AK, Zheng C, et al. Energy intake is associated with dietary macronutrient densities: inversely with protein and monounsaturated fat and positively with polyunsaturated fat and carbohydrate among postmenopausal females. Am J Clin Nutr. 2025:Advance online publication.

44. Poslusna K, Ruprich J, de Vries JHM, Jakubikova M, van't Veer P. Misreporting of energy and micronutrient intake estimated by food records and 24 hour recalls, control and adjustment methods in practice. Br J Nutr. 2009;101(S2):S73–S85.

45. Howes EM, Laskaridou E, Davy KP, Hedrick VE. Representation of adults with class III obesity in studies assessing validity of self-reported energy intake using doubly labeled water: A systematic review. Obes Rev. 2024;25(5):e13713–n/a.

Tables

Table 1 | Descriptive statistics for the full sample from the Tromsø Study 2015–2016

Variable	Group	Count
Age (groups of 10 years)	40–49	28.6%
	50–59	28.8%
	60–69	27.7%
	70–79	12.7%
	80+	2.3%
Body mass index (kg/m^2)	Normal (<25)	33.4%
	Overweight (25–<30)	44.0%
	Obese (≥30)	22.7%
Total energy intake(kJ/day)		9,722 (3,048)
Protein intake (%E)		17.6 (2.5)
Carbohydrate intake (%E)		42.2 (6.2)
Fat intake (%E)		34.5 (5.8)
UPF intake (%E)		54.8 (9.7)
Education	Primary/partly secondary education	20.4%
	Upper secondary	27.2%
	Tertiary short	20.6%

Variable	Group	Count
	Tertiary long	31.9%
Physical activity level	Sedentary	12.9%
	Low	58.7%
	Moderate	25.4%
	Vigorous	3.0%
Health status (% with conditions)	Non-communicable diseases	31.2%
	Chronic pain	21.8%
	Psychiatric problems	3.9%
Current smoker		12.5%

Note. *n* = 11,152. Numbers are means and standard deviations for continuous variables and percentages for categorical variables. The age group 80+ includes participants aged between 80–99. Health status does not sum to 100% because not all participants had health challenges. %E = percent of total energy intake.

Table 2 | Regression model for log-transformed body mass index by dietary protein

Variable	***b***	**SE**	***t***	***p***
Intercept	3.20	0.011	293.0	< .001
Protein, %E	0.01	0.001	17.0	< .001
Age	0.01	0.003	0.5	.638
Sex	0.04	0.003	14.8	< .001
Physical activity	-0.08	0.004	-18.9	< .001

Note. *n* = 11,125. Covariates were coded as follows: age = 0 (under 60 years), sex = 0 (female), physical activity level = 0 (sedentary). %E = percent of total energy intake from protein.

Table 3 | Regression model for log-transformed body mass index by ultra-processed food quintiles

Variable	***b***	**SE**	***t***	***p***
Intercept	3.328	0.005	624.6	< .001
Quintile 2	0.011	0.005	2.3	0.0192
Quintile 3	0.010	0.005	1.9	0.0531
Quintile 4	0.012	0.005	2.5	0.0118
Quintile 5	0.011	0.005	2.2	0.0256
Age	0.005	0.003	1.8	0.0744
Sex	0.037	0.003	12.2	< .001
Physical activity	-0.077	0.004	-17.9	< .001

Note. *n* = 11,125. Quintiles represent the proportion of ultra-processed foods (UPFs) as a percentage of total energy intake (%E) in the diet. The first quintile is handled in the intercept and used as the reference point for comparison in the regression model. Covariates were dichotomous and coded as follows: age = 0 (under 60 years), sex = 0 (female), physical activity level = 0 (sedentary).

Table 4 | Regression model for fibroblast growth factor 21 by dietary protein

Variable	***b***	**SE**	***t***	***p***
Intercept	5.30	0.35	15.2	< .001
Protein, %E	-0.05	0.02	-3.2	.001
Age	0.28	0.09	3.0	.002
Sex	-0.12	0.08	-1.4	.168
Physical activity	-0.28	0.13	-2.1	.035
Disease	0.20	0.08	2.4	.016
Education level	-0.02	0.098	-0.2	.848
Smoking status	0.34	0.13	2.7	.008

Note. *n* = 880. Covariates were dichotomous and coded as follows: age = 0 (under 60 years), sex = 0 (female), physical activity level = 0 (sedentary), disease = 0 (no disease), education level 0 (≤10 years).