Supplementary materials

Article: Food liking but not wanting decreases after controlled intermittent or continuous energy restriction to \geq 5% weight loss in women with overweight/obesity

Table S1: List of food used in the LFPQ in this study, **Table S2**: Baseline characteristics of the 30 women with overweight and obesity who reached ≥5%WL, **Table S3**: Changes in food reward during weight loss and follow-up, **Table S4**: Mixed model for liking during weight management, **Table S5**: Mixed model for implicit wanting during weight management

Table S1: List of food used in the LFPQ in this study

Food Categories	High-fat	Low-fat		
	Cheese	Boiled potatoes		
Carronser	Peanuts	Pasta in sauce		
Savoury	Crisps	Rice		
	Fries	Bread loaf		
	Jam bun	Jelly beans		
Sweet	Milk chocolate	Popcorn		
Sweet	Blueberry muffins	Marshmallow		
	Donuts	Fruits salad		

Table S2: Baseline characteristics of the 30 women with overweight and obesity who reached ≥5%WL

	CER	IER	p-value
Per protocol (≥5%WL)	N = 18	N = 12	
Age (years)	35 ± 9	34 ± 10	0.80
Body mass (kg)	79.2 ± 10.4	81.1 ± 12.2	0.64
Height (cm)	1.65 ± 0.8	1.67 ± 0.9	0.58
BMI (kg/m2)	29.1 ± 2.4	29.1 ± 2.5	0.95
Fat mass (kg)	32.5 ± 8.3	34.0 ± 7.2	0.60
Fat-free mass (kg)	46.7 ± 5.5	47.1 ± 6.6	0.85
Body fat (%)	40.6 ± 6.2	41.7 ± 4.1	0.60
RMR (kcal/day)	1456 ± 214	1441 ± 201	0.85

 $Means \pm SD; BMI: body \ mass \ index; CER: continuous \ energy \ restriction; IER: intermittent \ energy \ restriction; RMR: resting \ metabolic \ rate; WL: weight loss. P-values \ are results of independent sample \ t-test$

Table S3: Changes in food reward during weight loss and follow-up

		Baseline (N = 29)	Post-WL (N = 29)	Follow-up (N = 13)	Changes WL (N = 29)	Change Follow-up (N = 13)
	HFSA	63.1 ± 17.6	55.9 ± 21.2	64.4 ± 12.1	-7.1 ± 15.4	7.1 ± 21.7
Liking	LFSA	53.2 ± 20.4	46.0 ± 20.9	52.7 ± 19.5	-7.2 ± 15.1	0.3 ± 13.4
(mm)	HFSW	55.8 ± 25.7	48.3 ± 21.8	53.1 ± 23.0	-7.5 ± 17.6	8.1 ± 13.3
	LFSW	57.0 ± 19.1	50.9 ± 13.9	54.9 ± 17.1	-6.1 ± 16.8	6.4 ± 17.2
	HFSA	18.9 ± 22.1	18.4 ± 22.0	26.9 ± 19.8	-0.5 ± 20.6	4.3 ± 6.8

TA7	LFSA	-2.6 ± 27.5	-3.7 ± 23.0	3.8 ± 20.0	-1.1 ± 21.1	-3.9 ± 11.3
Wanting (no unit)	HFSW	-7.1 ± 29.1	-9.6 ± 25.5	-13.5 ± 2	-2.5 ± 20.0	2.0 ± 12.5
(110 unit)	LFSW	-9.2 ± 27.2	-5.0 ± 25.9	-17.2 ± 6.1	4.1 ± 18.4	-2.4 ± 5.9

 $\label{lem:mean} Mean \pm SD; HFSW: high-fat-sweet, HFSA: high-fat-savoury, LFSW: low-fat-sweet, LFSA: low-fat-savoury; \\ "Changes-WL" represents changes during WL (post-WL – baseline); "Changes Follow-up" represents changes during follow-up (Follow-up – Post-WL). N = 13 for follow-up as LFPQ data were missing from one participant.$

Table S4: Mixed model for liking during weight management

	Model for HFSA:	HFSA_PreLunch	~ SV + C	onditior	_5perce	ent + (1	PPID)	
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df	p- value	CI_lower	CI_higher
	(Intercept)	59.49	3.95	15.06	44.21	.001	51.58	67.41
	Post-WL	-7.12	3.25	-2.19	42.78	0.034	-13.64	-0.60
	Follow-up	1.64	4.39	0.37	46.98	0.711	-7.11	10.5
	IER	8.65	5.52	1.56	30.46	0.128	-2.56	19.82
Random		Variance	SD					
effect	PPID	147.5	12.15					
	Residuals	153.2	12.38					
	Number of obs	Groups: 71; PPID:	29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.537; N							
	Model for LFSA	LFSA_PreLi	unch ~ S	SV + Co	nditior	_5perc	ent + (1 1	PPID)
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df	p- value	CI_lower	CI_higher
	(Intercept)	50.87	4.60	11.07	35.49	.001	41.62	60.14
	Post-WL	-7.20	2.62	-2.75	42.26	0.009	-12.47	-1.95
	Follow-up	-4.19	3.60	-1.16	44.08	0.251	-11.35	3.12
	IER	5.62	6.81	0.82	29.59	0.416	-8.19	19.41
Random		Variance	SD					
effect	PPID	282.29	16.80					
	Residuals	99.81	9.99					
	Number of obs	Groups: 71; PPID:	29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.751; N	Marginal R²: 0.046; AI	C: 599.9;	BIC: 61	3.5			
	Model for HFSW	HFSW_Pre	eLunch ~	SV + C	onditior	_5perce	ent + (1 PP	ID)
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df	p- value	CI_lower	CI_higher
	(Intercept)	53.20	5.37	9.91	35.47	< .001	42.40	64.04
	Post-WL	-7.48	3.15	-2.37	41.85	0.022	-13.81	-1.16
	Follow-up	-2.07	4.32	-0.48	43.80	0.635	-10.72	6.60
	IER	6.21	7.94	0.78	29.19	0.440	-9.94	22.23
Random		Variance	SD					
effect	PPID	379.3	19.47					

SV: Study Visits with 3 levels "Baseline" [ref], "Post-WL" and "Follow-up"; Condition_5percent stands for the diets conditions either IER or CER [ref]; (SE): standard error (SD): standard deviation; (df): degree of freedom

Groups: 71; PPID: 29

Number of obs

Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.735; Marginal R ² : 0.038; AIC: 624.2; BIC: 637.8								
	Model for LFSW	Model for LFSW LFSW_PreLunch ~ SV + Condition_5percent + (1 PPID)							
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate		SE	t- value	df	p- value	CI_lower	CI_higher
	(Intercept)	55.30	1	3.73	14.82	41.93	< .001	47.83	62.81
	Post-WL	-6.12		2.99	-2.05	41.41	0.047	-12.11	-0.13
	Follow-up	-0.60		4.04	-0.15	45.40	0.883	-8.7	7.48
	IER	4.14		5.25	0.79	29.04	0.437	-6.56	14.74
Random		Varian		SD					
effect	PPID	137.2		11.71					
	Residuals	129.3		11.37					
	Number of obs	Groups: 71	; PPID: 2	29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.536; M								
Table	S5: Mixed model for in	nplicit wanti	ng duri	ng wei	ght ma	nagem	ent		
	Model for HFSA	HF	SA_Pre	Lunch ~	SV + C	onditio	n_5perc	ent + (1 P	PID)
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df		p- alue	CI_lower	CI_higher
	(Intercept)	18.99	4.95	3.84	37.2	20 <	.001	9.01	28.93
	Post-WL	-0.50	3.19	-0.16	42.0	0.	876	-6.90	5.90
	Follow-up	5.40	4.36	1.24	44.4	1 2 0.	222	-3.29	14.20
	IER	-0.22	7.23	-0.03			973	-14.82	14.49
Random		Variance	SD						
effect	PPID	302.7	17.40						
	Residuals	147.5	12.15						
	Number of obs	Groups: 7	1; PPID	: 29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.676; M	์ไarginal R²: 0.เ	011; AIC	C: 619.7;	BIC: 63	3.3			
	Model for LFSA	LF	SA_Pre	Lunch ~	SV + C	onditio	n_5perc	ent + (1 P	PID)
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df		p- ılue	CI_lower	CI_higher
	(Intercept)	-1.13	5.68	-0.20	36.0	02 0.	843	-12.58	10.32
	Post-WL	-1.11	3.52	-0.31	41.5	59 0.	755	-8.16	5.95
	Follow-up	-1.88	4.82	-0.39	43.7	78 O.	699	-11.44	7.99
	IER	-3.58	8.35	-0.43	28.9	97 0.	671	-20.51	13.34
Random effect		Variance	SD						
CHECK	PPID	411.1	20.27						
	Residuals	179.4	13.40						
	Number of obs	Groups: 7	1; PPID	: 29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.698; N	3; Marginal R ² : 0.006; AIC: 636.3; BIC: 649.9							
	Model for HFSW HFSW_PreLunch ~ SV + Condition_5percent + (1 PPID)								

Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df	p- value	CI_lower	CI_higher	
	(Intercept)	-8.31	6.30	-1.32	33.61	0.196	-21.02	4.42	
	Post-WL	-2.52	3.35	-0.75	41.31	0.456	-9.25	4.20	
	Follow-up	-0.51	4.61	-0.11	42.9	0.913	-9.83	8.67	
	IER	2.92	9.40	0.31	28.6	0.759	-16.20	21.94	
Random		Variance	SD						
effect	PPID	549.9	23.45						
	Residuals	163.0	12.77						
	Number of obs	Groups: 7	71; PPID:	29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.772; M	Conditional R ² : 0.772; Marginal R ² : 0.005; AIC: 639.2; BIC: 652.8							
	Model for LFSW	LF	SW_PreI	Lunch ~ S	SV + Cond	lition_5pe	ercent + (1 1	PPID)	
Fixed effect	Variables	Estimate	SE	t- value	df	p- value	CI_lower	CI_higher	
	(Intercept)	-9.49	6.00	-1.58	33.90	0.123	-21.61	2.61	
	Post-WL	4.13	2.97	1.39	42.35	0.171	-1.82	10.08	
	Follow-up	-2.22	4.08	-0.54	43.68	0.589	-10.49	5.91	
	IER	0.76	9.01	0.08	29.60	0.933	-17.48	19.02	
Random		Variance	SD						
effect	PPID	514.6	22.68						
	Residuals	127.8	11.30						
	Number of obs	Groups: 7	71; PPID:	29					
Goodness of fit measures	Conditional R ² : 0.803; M	arginal R²: 0.0	010; AIC	: 626.5; B	IC: 640.1				

SV: Study Visits with 3 levels "Baseline" [ref], "Post-WL" and "Follow-up"; Condition_5percent stands for the diets conditions either IER or CER [ref]; (SE): standard error (SD): standard deviation; (df): degree of freedom