Evolution not Revolution: what can we learn about human health from nutritional ecology?



THE UNIVERSITY OF

David Raubenheimer

Leonard P Ullman Chair of Nutritional Ecology Faculty of Vet Science | School of Biological Science | Charles Perkins Centre

Nutritional Ecology is

- Ecological / evolutionary approach to nutrition
 - focus on how nutrition mediates the relationship between animal & environment



- to determine health and wellbeing

Aims for the talk

- Introduce Nutritional Geometry: approach for studying these interactions
- Show how it has been used to understand:



 \rightarrow 1) Obesity: a not so obvious question 2) Nutritional geometry 3) Stepping back in time: wild apes 4) Humans 5) Closer look at our environment 6) A closer look at human biology

1. Way back



• Luxuries

- honey



- tubers



- fruit



- Staples
- lean meat



- low GI vegetables



- Diet
 - high protein (25–30%)

(picture credits: Wikipedia)

2. Agriculture



• Grains

- high starch



- Domesticated fruit
 - increased sugar



- Livestock
 - higher fat than game



- Diet
 - reduced % protein

3. Industrial revolution



- Bulk extraction
 - carbs







• Processed foods



• Diet

- further reduction in % P

Overview

- Problem
 - fats + carbs limiting



- evolved strong appetite for F+C
- New problem

Solution

- culture lifts limitation



- satisfies appetite



- stone age physiology - modern environment

MALADAPTED



The not-so-obvious question



1) Obesity: a not so obvious question 2) Nutritional geometry 3) Stepping back in time: wild apes 4) Humans 5) Closer look at our environment 6) A closer look at human biology

What is nutritional geometry?

- models nutrition in terms of: (i) two or more NUTRIENTS

(ii) their *interactive* effects on animals/humans

- by constructing a multi-dimensional nutrient space



Can then plot in this space:



- and model the relationships among these

1. Nutrient requirements



2. Foods

i. amount of nutrients ii. balance of nutrients



3. Feeding

- the animal gains nutrients in same balance as the food – as it eats, it "moves" along rail

i. balanced



- what are the options?

- there are main 3 options:



- how to measure the rule of compromise?

- prioritise carbohydrate
- prioritise protein
- some balance of excesses & deficits





- response surface



- or contour plot



1) Obesity: a not so obvious question 2) Nutritional geometry 3) Stepping back in time: wild apes 4) Humans 5) Closer look at our environment 6) A closer look at human biology

How do they prioritise macronutrient intake?



Mountain gorillas

Orangutans

1. Mountain gorillas

Method

- Direct observations
- Record:
 - i. what is eatenii. how muchiii. nutrient content



• Analyse data using nutritional geometry



- mainly fruits: 4 months



- mainly leaves: 8 months



- low % protein

- high % protein

Results

- Fruit diet: 19% P
- Leaf diet: 31% P
- Rule of compromise

 regulated to target Carb + Fat intake
 to do so, over-ate P
 - i.e. prioritise non-P energy





Biology Letters 2011 7:847-849.

Closer look at what it means

- Similar carb + fat intake on all diets
- AND higher P intake on high-P diets
- i.e. Mountain gorillas eat MORE energy on high P diets
- Unlikely to get fat in modern human environments





2. Orangutans





Method

- Observations over a 7 year period
- 49 orangs
- 2,233 full day observations
- 49000 hours
- also physiology

Diet

- Preference
 - fruits: high carbs + fat



- but availability unpredictable
- So also eat
 - leaves + cambium



- high protein



Result

- Wide variation in carb + fat intake
- Tight regulation of protein
 - i.e. prioritise non-P energy





Implications

- Will over-eat fats + carbs on low-P diets
- Or under-eat fats + carbs on high-P diets
- Could the same pattern explain why humans get fat in modern environments?



Protein



High protein





High fats + carbs

WHY DO WE OVER-EAT ENERGY ON DIETS HIGH IN FATS + CARBS?

And

- Physiology tells us
 - lay down fat when energy (fruit) is abundant
 - draw on it when energy is scarce
- i.e. Adapted to "boom and bust" ecology
- As are humans!





1) Obesity: a not so obvious question 2) Nutritional geometry 3) Stepping back in time: wild apes ---> 4) Humans 5) Closer look at our environment 6) A closer look at human biology

Two Questions:



i. How do we compare with other primates?



ii. What are the implications for obesity?



Human macronutrient regulation

- 3 experimental studies: Oxford, Sydney, Jamaica
- Meta analysis: 26 published trials





Protein intake (Kcal)

fat

Carbohydrate and

- Prioritise P, like orangs

Protein

Gosby et al., Obesity Reviews 2014

Implications of protein prioritisation for obesity

- A small change in <u>% P</u> in foods will result in a disproportionately large change in the <u>amount</u> Carbs + Fat eaten
- For example, a 1.5% decrease in % P



- could this explain the obesity epidemic?



And weight loss ...

- a small increase in % protein will result in a large decrease in carbohydrate and fat eaten

(1.5%)14% P 15.5% P fat + Carbohydrate 11% decrease in C+F eaten Protein

- could this explain why high protein weight loss diets work?



-> Called the "Protein Leverage Hypothesis" (PLH)

Two predictions of PLH

1) Energy intake increases with decreasing %P



Prediction 2). Dietary % P has decreased with the rise in obesity

- e.g. USA



- yes!

Data: FAOSTAT 2010

1) Obesity: a not so obvious question 2) Nutritional geometry 3) Stepping back in time: wild apes 4) Humans 5) Closer look at our environment 6) A closer look at human biology

The general question

 PLH suggests that because humans prioritise P, energy intake will be higher on low-P diets



• What changes in the environment cause the shift to low-P diets?



- A clue that economics is involved:
 - obesity is more common among low SES groups



Adults 15 years and above who are obese, by socioeconomic status, 2007–08

Source: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

• Is this related to variation in dietary % protein?



Three predictions

1) Protein is more expensive than fats and carbs

• Test

- 106 supermarket foods
- compared the separate contributions of each g of Pro, Fat and Car to the cost food

• Result

- price increases with P
- not with fats & carbs

Conclude

- suggests an economic incentive to eat low P foods
- = high energy intake



Brooks et al. (2009) Obesity reviews.

Prediction 2). Low SES groups eat low-protein diets

- Aboriginal study
 - 14 diet surveys of low SES indigenous Australian communities
- Low relative to:
 - 1. Australian recommendations (AMDR)
 - most have low % P relative to recommended range
 - 2. Higher SES groups



[With Aboriginal Nutrition Project Node]

Prediction 3). Low protein diets are associated with high energy intake



A role for global change





Coovright 1999 NCAR/Louise Emmons

Rapid increase in atmospheric CO2



Raubenheimer et al. (2013), in review

Alters plant composition

- Robinson et al. 2012*
 - CO₂ enrichment results in an average 54% increase in the carbohydrate:protein ratio



Raubenheimer et al. (2014), in review

Likely to impact not only on plant foods







1) Obesity: a not so obvious question 2) Nutritional geometry 3) Stepping back in time: wild apes 4) Humans 5) Closer look at our environment 6) A closer look at human biology

A Role for Protein Requirements



- protein leverage is expected to be proportional to protein requirements

- can variation in P requirements help explain variation in obesity?

1. Obesity as a cause of increased P requirements



- Physiological effect of obesity: Protein efficiency is reduced
- So more protein needs to be eaten to meet needs
 - and P leverage is enhanced
- Suggests a positive feedback: obesity drives further excess energy intake and obesity



2. Dietary history (evolutionary or developmental?)

- Populations with high protein traditional diets are particularly susceptible to obesity when transferring to westernised diets
- For example, Alaskan Inuit
 - among the highest rates of obesity globally
 - traditional diet = 30-35% P
 - have developed low
 P efficiency
 - so higher P intake need
- Could this explain their susceptibility to obesity?







Data from Kang-Jey et al. (1972), AJCN 25:737-745.

3. Effects of early nutrition ("developmental programming")

- Formula-fed infants are more susceptible to obesity later in life than if breast-fed
- Milk formula is much higher in protein than human breast milk
- Could high-P early in development lead to reduced P efficiency hence increased P target and energy intake?



Data from Koletzko et al. (2009), AJCN 89:1836-49.





CONCLUSIONS

 Nutritional geometry can help to measure interactions among appetites for different nutrients



• Helps to understand the mismatch between humans and modern food environments







- And identify new areas for research and intervention
 - factors that reduce % protein in the human diet
 - factors that decrease human protein efficiency

Thank you for your attention!

