



# "Low-calorie sweeteners – a place in a healthy diet?

### Anne Raben, Professor, PhD Unit for Obesity Research Department of Nutrition, Exercise and Sports

International Sweeteners Association - Conference 2014 Brussels, 02-April-2014

# Content

Low-calorie sweeteners – a place in a healthy diet?

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Appetite
- 3. Body weight and fat mass
- 4. Risk for diabetes and CV diseases
- 5. Conclusions



(This presentation is not a formal review, but includes relevant examples from the literature)



# 1. Introduction

- Prevalence of obesity still increasing.
- Type-2 diabetes increases exponentially with increased obesity -> <u>diabesity</u>
- 50% of individuals with type-2 diabetes are obese and nearly 90% are overweight
- Around 31 mio people in Europe need treatment for diabetes
- By 2020 prevalence of pre-diabetes and diabetes in the USA will be around 50% !
- Most serious consequence of diabetes: a 3-4 times increased risk of cardiovascular diseases
- Even a 5-10% weight loss can prevent or delay progression to type-2 diabetes



 1 in 5 children in the WHO European region is overweight.

*Garber, Diabetes, Obesity and Metabolism* 2012;14:399-408



# Percentage of U.S. Adults who were Obese or had diagnosed Diabetes





Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: National Diabetes Surveillance System. Available online at: http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/DDTSTRS/default.aspx. Accessed 10/3/2011.

# **Projecting the Future Diabetes Population:** The Imperative for Change





Boyle JP, et al. Popul Health Metr. 2010;8(29):1-12.

# Content

Low calorie sweeteners – a place in a healthy diet?

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Appetite
- 3. Body weight and fat mass
- 4. Risk for diabetes and CV diseases
- 5. Conclusions





### **Hunger and satiety**

### Satiety hierarchy: Protein > carbohydrate > fat (> alcohol?)



Hunger and satiety influenced by:

- Sensorical factors:
  - View, smell, taste
- Physiological signals from the intestine, blood, depots, brain:
  - Blood glucose
  - Glycogen stores/Fat stores
  - Oxidation of macronutrients
  - Hormones: Insulin, GLP-1, CCK, PPY, leptin, ghrelin, etc



#### Will low-calorie sweeteners make you fat?

Sucrose  $\downarrow$ Carbohydrate intake  $\downarrow$ Fat/carbohydrate ratio ↑ Sweenetes  $\uparrow$ , but no calories Hunger ↑ **Compensation?** Increased energy intake?



Sukkerindholdet i en Pepsi<sup>®</sup> svarer til 18 sukkerknalde, mens der ikke er tilsat sukker i Pepsi Light<sup>®</sup>.



## **Possible mechanisms for compensation after low-calorie sweeteners:**

- Over-stimulating taste receptors and increase cravings for sweetness?
- Provoking hunger and causing overeating?
- Not promoting satiety and therefore compensatory eating occurs at the next meal?
- These mechanisms considered, but rejected again (Mattes and Popkin 2009, Raben & Richelsen 2012).
- No studies the past > 25 y have confirmed the earlier suggestions



# <u>Decreased</u> ad libitum energy intake after intake of diet cola vs regular cola



<sup>(</sup>Maersk et al Eur J Clin Nutr 2012)

Short-term studies interesting from a mechanistic point of view. However, longer-term studies needed to look at effects on body weight, fat mass and risk factors for diabetes and cardiovascular disease





# Content

Low calorie sweeteners – a place in a healthy diet?

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Appetite
- 3. Body weight and fat mass:
- 4. Risk for diabetes and CV diseases
- 5. Conclusions





#### Low calorie-sweetened beverage use and long-term weight gain. Fueling the Obesity Epidemic?



OR for overweight and obesity by 7-8-year follow-up.



Slide 13

#### Evidence hierarchy for studies:





10 wks study with supplements and ad libitum intake

#### Supplements of drinks and food - average intake in week 10:

	SUCROSE	SWEETENER <sup>a</sup>
Carbohydrate (g/d)	176 ± 3 §	31 ± 3
Sucrose (g/d)	151 ± 3 §	$0 \pm 0$
Dietary fiber (g/d)	3 ± 1 §	5 ± 1
Fat (g/d)	8 ± 0	9 ± 0
Protein (g/d)	9 ± 0	9 ± 0
Total energy (kJ)	<b>3349 ± 66</b> §	963 ± 44
Amount (g/d)	1621 ± 43	1564 ± 48

N=43 overweight. Parallel design. Data are means ± SEM. Between groups: §: p<0.0001. a: 54% aspartame, 22% acesulfame K, 23% cyclamate, 1% saccharin.

Raben et al AJCN 2002



Raben et al AJCN 2002



Means ± SEM. \*: p<0.05. \$: p<0.01. £: p<0.001. §: p<0.0001.

Raben et al AJCN 2002





Means ± SEM. \*: p<0.05. \$: p<0.01. £: p<0.001. §: p<0.0001.

Raben et al AJCN 2002

#### The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

#### ORIGINAL ARTICLE

# 18-m study, children A Trial of Sugar-free or Sugar-Sweetened Beverages and Body Weight in Children

Janne C. de Ruyter, M.Sc., Margreet R. Olthof, Ph.D., Jacob C. Seidell, Ph.D., and Martijn B. Katan, Ph.D.

#### METHODS

We conducted an 18-month trial involving 641 primarily normal-weight children from 4 years 10 months to 11 years 11 months of age. Participants were randomly assigned to receive 250 ml (8 oz) per day of a sugar-free, artificially sweetened beverage (sugar-free group) or a similar sugar-containing beverage that provided 104 kcal (sugar group). Beverages were distributed through schools. At 18 months, 26% of the children had stopped consuming the beverages; the data from children who did not complete the study were imputed.

> This article was published on September 21, 2012, at NEJM.org.





#### CONCLUSIONS

Masked replacement of sugar-containing beverages with noncaloric beverages reduced weight gain and fat accumulation in normal-weight children.



(De Reyter et al NEJM 2012)

#### Evidence hierarchy for studies:



#### **Increasing sugar intake increases body weight - Adults**

Study	Mean difference	Standard e error	Mean dif (95%	ference CI)	Weight (%)	Mean difference (95% Cl)	
Studies (8 weeks			19.5				
Aeberil 2011 <sup>47</sup>	-0.17	0.13	-	15	14.1	-0.17 (-0.42 to 0.08)	
Brynes 2003 <sup>26</sup>	0.41	0.30	+	-	11.7	0.41 (-0.18 to 1.00)	
Marckmann 200032	0.90	0.43	-		9.6	0.90 (0.06 to 1.74)	
Reid 2007 <sup>38</sup>	0.30	0.70			6.1	0.30 (-1.07 to 1.67)	
Reid 2010 <sup>37</sup>	0.36	0.22	-	-	12.9	0.36 (-0.07 to 0.79)	
Szanto 1969 <sup>43</sup>	0.40	0.19	-	+	13.4	0.40 (0.03 to 0.77)	Declad offects for
Tordoff 1990 <sup>44</sup>	0.91	0.22			12.9	0.91 (0.47 to 1.35)	differences in
Werner 1984 <sup>45</sup>	1.40	0.40			10.1	1.40 (0.62 to 2.18)	
Subtotal (95% Cl)				▲	90.8	0.52 (0.14 to 0.89)	BW (kg) for studies
Test for heterogeneil	ty: τ <sup>2</sup> =0.2	0,					comparing increased
χ <sup>2</sup> =30.39, df=7, Po	0.001,  2=	77%					intake (higher sugars)
Test for overall effect	t: z=2.70,	P=0.007					with usual intake
Studies >8 weeks							(lower sugars).
Poppitt 200234	3.97	1.75			1.5	3.97 (0.55 to 7.39)	
Raben 2002 <sup>35</sup>	2.60	0.57			7.7	2.60 (1.49 to 3.71)	BW was increased in
Subtotal (95% Cl)				-	9.2	2.73 (1.68 to 3.78)	higher sugar groups
Test for heterogeneit	ty: τ <sup>2</sup> =0.0	о,					
χ <sup>2</sup> =0.56, df=1, P=0	0.46,   <sup>2</sup> =0 <sup>4</sup>	%					
Test for overall effec	t: z=5.07,	P<0.001					
Total (95% CI)				•	100.0	0.75 (0.30 to 1.19)	
Test for heterogeneit $\chi^2$ =50.93, df=9, Po	ty: τ <sup>2</sup> =0.3 0.001, l <sup>2</sup> =	5, -4	-2 0	2 4	Ŷ		B
Test for overall effect:	z=3.30, P	-0.001 L	ower sugars	Higher sugar:	5	(Te Morenga	a et al BMJ Jan 2013)

#### Increasing sugar-sweetened beverages increases BW in adults Weighted Mean Weight Difference, kg (95% CI) Study (D+L) Tordoff, 1990, Men (69) 0.99 (0.41, 1.57) 36.29 Tordoff, 1990, Women (69) 0.72 (0.14, 1.30) 36.04 Reid, 2007 (66) 1.37 (0.38, 2.36) 12.51 0.43 (-0.84, 1.70) Reid. 2010 (67) 7.62 0.30 (-1.12, 1.72) Aeberli, 2011 (70) 6.09 0.66 (-2.25, 3.57) Maersk, 2012 (68) 1.45 D+L Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.780) 0.85 (0.50, 1.20) 100.00 0.85 (0.50, 1.20) I-V Overall NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis 0.00 -3.57 3.57 Intervention reduces weight Intervention increases weight

Weighted mean differences (95% CI) in weight change (kg) between the intervention and control regimens from **randomized controlled trials** in adults. Interventions evaluated the effect of **adding** sugar-sweetened beverages



# Increasing intake of sugar-sweetened <u>beverages</u> increases overweight/obesity in <u>children</u>

Study (	Log (odds ratio)	Standard error	đ	(	Odds ra (95% C	tio I)	Weight (%)	Odds ratio (95% Cl)
Dubois 2007 (1)5	<sup>24</sup> 0.77	0.32					- 6.3	2.16 (1.15 to 4.07)
Lim 2009 (2)97	0.31	0.12			-	_	44.5	1.37 (1.08 to 1.74)
Ludwig 2001 (3) <sup>5</sup>	<sup>95</sup> 0.39	0.44		-			- 3.5	1.48 (0.63 to 3.47)
Weijs 2011 (4) <sup>80</sup>	0.61	0.24					- 11.8	1.84 (1.16 to 2.92)
Welsh 2005 (5)90	0.26	0.25		-	_	-	+ 10.7	1.30 (0.80 to 2.11)
Welsh 2005 (6)96	0.59	0.24			13		▶ 11.2	1.80 (1.12 to 2.89)
Welsh 2005 (7)90	0.59	0.23					12.1	1.80 (1.14 to 2.84)
Total (95% CI)						-	100.0	1.55 (1.32 to 1.82)
Test for heterogen	eity: τ <sup>2</sup> =0.0	00,	0.5	0.7	1	1.5	2	
χ <sup>2</sup> =3.93, df=6, P	=0.69,   <sup>2</sup> =0	1%	Lower	SSB		Higher	SSB	
Toot for overall off	art E 13	B-0.001						

Higher odds ratio of overweight or obesity at follow-up in children consuming one or more servings of sugar sweetened beverages at baseline compared with children consuming none or very little at baseline.



#### **Reducing** sugar-sweetened beverages reduces BMI in children



Weighted mean differences in BMI change (95% CI) between the intervention and control regimens from **randomized controlled trials** in children. Interventions evaluated the effect of **reducing** sugar-sweetened beverages.



Dias 25

# Intake of soft drinks and overweight reduced in children in California

# "Political measures may have changed the consumption of sugar-sweetened drinks in the population!"

	2003	2005	2007	
Coko - VA				
	16.4%	11.0%	5.0%	
Mobile er	15.7%	13.3%	11.2%	
	22.5%	16.0%	9.9%	
	13.5%	14.3%	11.1%	
	3			
	35.7%	30.6%	25.7%	
	12.4%	14.2%	13.3%	



Shi & Meijgaard, Int J Gen Med. 2010; 3: 221–224.

# Editorial, NEJM, 21-Sep-2012 (S Caprio):

Sugar intake from sugar-sweetened beverages approaches 15% of the daily caloric intake in several population groups in the US.

Sugar-sweetened beverages are marketed extensively to children and adolescents.

Large increases in consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages have occurred among **black and Mexican-American youth**, who are at higher risk for obesity and the development of **type 2 diabetes** than white counterparts.



# Editorial, NEJM, Sep-2012 (S. Caprio)

In relation to publication of several studies on sucrose-rich drinks in adults and children:

"These randomized, controlled studies — in particular, the study by de Ruyter et al. — provide a ....

strong impetus to develop recommendations and policy decisions to <u>limit consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages</u>,

especially those served at low cost and in excessive portions, to attempt to reverse the increase in <u>childhood obesity</u>..... "



Institut for Human Ernæring, Frederiksberg Campus Dias 28

# Content

Low calorie sweeteners – a place in a healthy diet?

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Appetite
- 3. Body weight and fat mass
- 4. Risk for diabetes and CV diseases
- 5. Conclusions



# Sugar vs low-calorie sweetened soft drinks, obesity and the metabolic syndrome Observational studies

- Positive associations between sugar-sweetened soft drinks obesity, type-2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease
- (Nurses Health Study, Am J Clin Nutr 2006;84:274 & JAMA 2004;292:927)
- Positive associations between low-calorie sweetened soft drinks, obesity, metabolic syndrome, and Type-2 diabetes
- (Nettleton et al Diabetes Care 2009, Fagherazzi et al Am J Clin Nutr 2013)
- Careful with findings from observational studies due to "Spurious associations" or "reverse causality"
- (Mackenzie, Ann Epidemiol 2006).

# Blood pressure decreased after 10 wks' on non-calorie sweeteners



#### Postprandial glucose, insulin and triglycerides increase after 10 wks' sucrose compared with low-calorie sweeteners



Time after breakfast (min)

Sugar-sweetened drink increases blood lipids and liver, muscle, and visceral fat compared with low-calorie sweetened drink, milk or water

#### 6-mo randomized intervention study:

Four different beverages were ingested daily for 6 months:

- 1. 1 liter sucrose sweetened soda (Coca Cola)
- 2. 1 liter skimmed milk (isocaloric with 1)
- 3. 1 liter aspartame sweetened (Diet Cola)
- 4. 1 liter water (control)

by overweight - obese individuals

Investigations:

Body composition (DXA), visceral fat (MR), liver- and muscle fat (MRI-spectroscopy) Metabolic factors: blood lipids, insulin/HOMA, inflammatory markers MR-scan to determine fat in the abdomen (visceral) and under the skin (subcutane)



#### Relative changes in ectopic fat accumulation

(from baseline to 6 mo)



(Maersk et al Am J Clin Nutr 2012)

# Effects of the beverages on blood lipids



(Maersk et al Am J Clin Nutr 2012)

## **Mechanisms**



Weight gain Insulin resistance B-cell dysfunction Inflammation Hypertension Visceral adiposity Atherogenic dyslipidemia

Metabolic syndrome Type-2 diabetes Cardiovascular Disease



Institut for Human Ernæring, Frederiksberg Campus Dias 37

# Content

Low calorie sweeteners – a place in a healthy diet?

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Appetite
- 3. Body weight and fat mass
- 4. Risk for diabetes and CV diseases
- 5. Conclusions





# Conclusions

- Relatively large intake of sugars, especially in the form of liquid sugar, can result in increased energy intake and body weight.
- Sucrose and fructose intake have been linked to development of lipid dysregulation, visceral adiposity, hypertension, inflammation, metabolic syndrome, type-2 diabetes, and coronary heart disease.
- Data from recent longer-term intervention studies point towards a beneficial effect of low calorie sweeteners on energy intake, body weight, liver fat, fasting and postprandial glycemia, insulinemia, and lipidemia compared with sugars.
- Low-calorie sweeteners, especially in beverages, can be a useful aid to maintain reduced energy intake and body weight and decrease risk of type-2 diabetes and CVD compared to sugars.
- Concerning beverages, low-calorie sweeteners is from a metabolically point of view a more healthy choice than sugar, but water is still a neutral and healthy choice.



# Thank you for your attention !







# Extra...



#### **Safety concerns – Aspartame**

EFSA - European Food Safety Authority - completed full risk assessment on <u>aspartame</u> and concluded that <u>it is safe</u> at current levels of exposure (Dec 2013)

- Aspartame: Sweetener authorised as food additive in the EU.
- Aspartame rapidly and completely hydrolysed in the gastrointestinal tract to phenylalanine, aspartic acid and methanol.
- Panel Conclusion: Aspartame not of safety concern at current exposure or at acceptable daily intake, ADI, 40 mg/kg bw/day.
- Therefore, no reason to revise ADI of aspartame.
- Current exposures to aspartame and its degradation product DKP (5-benzyl-3,6-dioxo-2-piperazine acetic acid) – are below their respective ADIs.
- The ADI is not applicable to PKU patients



# **Taste - Sweetness**

- Sugar tasted by sugar receptors in mouth and stomach. Possibly also taste receptors in the intestine!
- Sweetness of a carbohydrate measured relatively to sucrose (saccharose or table sugar) set at 100
- Fructose: Sweetness of 173
- High-Fructose Corn Syrop (HFCS): 120



- Aspartame: 200 times sweeter than sucrose
- Dried leaves from *Stevia rebaudiana* relative sweetness 200-300 that of sucrose
- Amount of non-caloric sweeteners needed to obtain sweet taste very small compared with sucrose





#### Carbohydrate metabolism and regulation in the liver



24-hour circulating triglyceride concentrations increased after fructose (B) compared with glucose (A) before and after 2, 8, and 10 weeks





J Clin Invest 2009;119:1322



Nordic Nutrition Recommendations Integrating nutrition and physical activity

Intake of added sugars should be kept below 10 E%.

- Limitation of the intake of added sugars from particularly sugar-sweetened beverages and sugar-rich foods is recommended in order to reduce the risk for type 2 diabetes, weight gain and dental caries.
- A limitation of the intake of added sugars is also necessary to ensure an adequate intake of essential nutrients and dietary fibre, especially in children and adults with a low energy intake.



#### Relative Risk of Type 2 Diabetes According to Frequencies of Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Consumption in 91 249 Women.

Table 3. Relative Risk of Type 2 Diabetes According to Frequencies of Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Consumption in 91 249 Women

	Sugar-Sweetened Soft Drink Intake					
	<1/mo	1-4/mo	2-6/wk	≥1/d	P Value for Trend	
All sugar-sweetened soft drinks Cases	368	163	95	115		
Person-years	381 275	188 501	80 086	66 438		
Age-adjusted RR (95% CI)	1.00	0.93 (0.78-1.12)	1.32 (1.06-1.66)	1.98 (1.60-2.44)	<.001	
Multivariate-adjusted RR (95% CI)*	1.00	1.06 (0.87-1.28)	1.49 (1.16-1.91)	1.83 (1.42-2.36)	<.001	
Sugar-sweetened cola Cases SSSD	403	142	96	100		
Person-years	420 598	166 656	75778	53 267		
Age-adjusted RR (95% Cl)	1.00	0.92 (0.76-1.12)	1.44 (1.16-1.81)	2.14 (1.72-2.67)	<.001	
Multivariate-adjusted RR (95% CI)*	1.00	0.99 (0.80-1.23)	1.56 (1.21-2.02)	1.87 (1.43-2.45)	<.001	
Fruit punch Cases	589	85	38	29		
Person-years	525 780	124 932	45958	19 630		
Age-adjusted RR (95% Cl)	1.00	0.95 (0.73-1.24)	1.24 (0.86-1.77)	2.31 (1.55-3.45)	<.001	
Multivariate-adjusted RR (95% CI)*	1.00	0.90 (0.68-1.18)	1.15 (0.79-1.66)	2.00 (1.33-3.03)	.001	

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; RR, relative risk.

\*Relative risks are adjusted for age; alcohol intake (0, 0.1-4.9, 5.0-9.9, or ≥10 g/d); physical activity (quintiles); family history of diabetes; smoking (never, past, or current); pos menopausal hormone use (never or ever); oral contraceptive use (never, past, or current); intake (quintiles) of cereal fiber, magnesium, trans-fat, and ratio of polyunsaturated is saturated fat; and consumption of sugar-sweetened soft drinks, diet soft drinks, fruit juice, and fruit punch (other than the main exposure, depending on model).

Copyright restrictions may apply.

Dias 48

Schulze, M. B. et al. JAMA 2004;292:927-934



Mean body weight in 1991, 1995, and 1999 according to trends in <u>Sugar-Sweetened Soft Drink</u> Consumption in 1969, Women Who Changed Consumption From 1991 to 1995 and either changed or maintained Level of Consumption Until 1999.

Low and high intakes were defined as 1 drink or less per wk and 1 drink or more per d, resp.

