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The doubly labeled water (DLW) technique is used to assess metabolic rate (MR) in free-living conditions. We investigated whether differences in the nutritional and body adiposity status affect validity of the assessment of CO₂ production (rCO₂) by the DLW technique. To serve this purpose, we compared calculated rCO₂ by the DLW method to actual CO₂ production concomitantly measured in an indirect calorimetry setup over a 3-day period in mice fed with a low-fat (LF) diet or an obesogenic high-fat/high-sucrose (HF) diet. To uncover a potential effect of body composition on DLW accuracy, the HF-fed group was further subdivided in a diet-induced obesity-prone (DIO) and diet-induced obesity-resistant (DR) group. Furthermore, we assessed the influence of different sampling protocols, duration, and methodology of calculation. An excellent match was found between rCO₂ assessed by the two methods in the LF-fed mice (least discrepancy 0.5 ± 1.1%). In contrast, there was a consistent overestimation of rCO₂ by the DLW technique in the HF-fed animals compared with actual CO₂ production independent from body mass gain (least discrepancy DR +15.9 ± 2.2%, DF +18.5 ± 3.2%). The least discrepancies were found when two-pool model equations and the intercept method were used to calculate the body water pool. Furthermore, the HF group presented different equilibrium kinetics of 2H and 18O and a lower dilution space ratio between the two. We recommend particular caution when using the DLW method for MR assessment in HF-fed animals and potentially humans because of the overestimation of rCO₂.

body composition; diet-induced obesity; doubly labeled water; metabolic rate; validation

The current epidemic of obesity has spurred the need for understanding how energy balance and body weight are regulated and how derangements in these can develop. The doubly labeled water (DLW) technique has served this demand because it is an isotopic tracer method ideally suited for measuring metabolic rate (MR) and body composition in free-living conditions. As such, the DLW method has been used in laboratory as well as field studies to assess MR in a variety of species, including humans, migratory birds, and rodents (19, 27, 39).

DLW is a water mixture in which the natural abundant forms of hydrogen (∗H) and oxygen (∗O) have been partially or totally replaced with the low abundant stable isotopic forms (∗H and ∗O, respectively). The method is based on the straightforward principle that hydrogen leaves the body primarily via water turnover, whereas oxygen leaves the body both via water turnover and via CO₂ production. The difference between the two elimination rates allows the estimation of the rate of CO₂ production (rCO₂) over time. By introducing a known mass of the DLW mixture in the body by injection or drinking, enrichments of body fluids by ∗H and ∗O are determined at an initial and final time point from which elimination rates can be determined. rCO₂ can be converted to MR by using an estimated or measured respiratory quotient (RQ) on the basis of the equation of Weir (38). This allows assessment of MR and body composition in conditions where confinement in an indirect calorimetry setup (i.e., where the actual rates of rCO₂ and O₂ consumption, rO₂, are assessed) is impossible to perform, since it would conflict with the study design. Examples of these are assessment of MR in animals living in a social context (3), in flight energy expenditure during bird migration (39), in lactation energetics (Guidotti S, Jónás I, Schubert K, Garland T Jr, Meijer H, Scheurink A, and van Dijk G, unpublished observations), or during sleep deprivation (1, 2).

Despite the fact that the principle of DLW technique for calculation of MR is rather straightforward, it is based on several assumptions, as reported originally by Lifson and colleagues (20, 21), that may not always be met in experimental settings. Violation of these assumptions can have a negative impact on the validity of the assessment of rCO₂ and hence, MR (24, 31). One of the assumptions, particularly relevant in light of the use of the DLW technique for studying derangements in energy balance and obesity, is that hydrogen and oxygen do not compartmentalize beyond the water and CO₂ pool. However, hydrogen and oxygen probably violate this assumption since they could be incorporated into nonaqueous molecules via ionic exchange or anabolic metabolism, resulting in larger pool sizes and isotopic fractional washout rates. In fact, ∗H incorporation into C-H bonds has been used in biomedical sciences to measure in vivo lipogenesis (36) or synthesis of macromolecules such as DNA (12).

To our knowledge, studies in mammals that compared rCO₂ assessed by indirect calorimetry to the level obtained by the DLW technique generally find overestimation by the latter (20, 23), which might be due to nutritional and/or energy balance parameters. Therefore, the main aim of this study was to investigate whether differences in the nutritional status and energy balance affect the validity of rCO₂ assessed by the DLW technique. To serve this purpose, we compared rCO₂ calculated by the DLW method with actual CO₂ production concomitantly measured using a calibrated CO₂ sensor in an indirect calorimetry setup over a 3-day period in mice fed a
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low-fat (LF) diet and an obesogenic high-fat/high-sucrose (HF) diet. To uncover a potential effect of body composition on DLW validity, the HF-fed group was further subdivided in a diet-induced obesity-prone (DIO) and diet-induced obesity-resistant (DR) group. Furthermore, we assessed the influence of different sampling protocols, duration, and method of calculation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals and housing. Thirty-two male outbred HSD:icr mice of 14 wk were initially used for this study. The mice were housed individually on a 12:12-h light-dark cycle (lights on 9 AM, lights off 9 PM) under temperature-controlled conditions (21 ± 1°C), with food and water ad libitum, in plexiglas cages (Macrolon Type II; UNO Roes-tvaststaal, Zevenaar, The Netherlands) with Envirolod wood shavings and a gnawing stick. After initial inclusion, eight of the mice were maintained on regular control (LF) laboratory chow (energy content: 15.9 kJ/g; 13% fat, 63% starch, and 24% protein, RMH-B 2181; HopeFarms, Woerden, The Netherlands), whereas the other 24 were switched to a 45% HF diet (energy content: 19.7 kJ/g; 45% fat, 18% starch, 13% sucrose, and 24% protein) 6 wk prior the experiment. On the basis of body mass gain over the course of HF feeding, the mice were assigned to a DR or DIO group.

Experimental design. Under nonrestrictive conditions, LF- and HF-fed mice received an intraperitoneal injection of DLW (−0.15 g weighed to the nearest 0.001 g of enriched water consisting of 33.3% 2H and 66.6% 18O). Exactly 1, 2, and 3 h after dosing of the DLW mixture, blood was sampled from the mice by tail snip and flame-sealed into glass capillaries until determination of isotopic enrichment. Directly after sampling of the last initial sample, mice were transferred to indirect calorimetry cages with housing conditions similar to their home cage for 3 consecutive days. To reduce stress of novelty, wood shaving from their home cage was transferred as well. Exactly 24, 48, and 72 h after the third initial, blood was again sampled by tail snip and again flame-sealed into glass capillaries. For the 24- and 48-h blood sample, indirect calorimetry was interrupted shortly for ~10 min. After the 72-h blood sample, HF-fed mice were euthanized for carcass analysis. These and all other experimental procedures were approved and guided by the local Animal Experiment Committee of the University of Groningen.

Indirect calorimetry. The open-circuit indirect calorimeter system allowed determination of O2 (l/h) and CO2 (l/h) (37). In brief, O2 and CO2 concentrations of dried inlet and outlet air from each chamber were measured with paramagnetic O2 analyzer (Servomex Xenta 4100, Crowborough, UK) and CO2 by an infrared gas analyzer (Servomex 1440). The system recorded the differential in O2 and CO2 concentrations of inlet air, a subsample was passed at a rate of 6 l/h through the drying chamber were measured with paramagnetic O2 analyzer (Sevomex 1440). The system recorded the differential in O2 and CO2 concentrations of dried inlet and outlet air from each metabolic chambers. O2 and CO2 analyzers were calibrated with two gas mixtures with known composition, inlet and outlet air, a subsample was passed at a rate of 6 l/h through the drying system (3 Å molecular sieve drying beads; Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) and subsequently through the gas analyzers. Data were collected every 10 min for each animal and automatically stored on a computer. The RQ was defined as rCO2 divided by rO2. MR was calculated according to Weir (38):

\[
MR (kJ) = rCO2 \left( \frac{15.457}{RQ} + 5.573 \right)
\]

Body composition. Body composition was determined by both the isotope dilution method (plateau/intercept) and direct carcass analysis. Carcasses were dried till constant weight at 103°C [ISO 6496–1983(E)], which was usually the case after 4 h, and this was followed by fat extraction with petroleum ether (Boom, Meppel, The Netherlands) in a soxhlet apparatus.

Analysis of the DLW samples. Determinations of 2H/H and 18O/16O ratios in blood samples were performed at the University of Groningen Center for Isotope Research. A detailed description of the analytical procedures followed in our laboratory is described elsewhere (9). Shortly, samples were prepared by microdistillation (cryo-distillation) in a vacuum line, first heating the broken capillaries and then cryogenically trapping the emerging water vapor with liquid nitrogen. Water samples were stored in glass vials and then automatically injected into a Hekatech high-temperature pyrolysis (Hekatech, Wegberg, Germany) unit (8), in which the injected water reacted with glassy carbon at a temperature of 1,420°C. The resultant H2 and CO gases, emerging into a continuous helium flow through the system, were then led through a gas chromatography column to separate the two gases in time and finally fed into an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (GV Instruments IsoPrime, Manchester, UK) for the analysis of 18O and 13C measurements were corrected for memory effects using an algorithm described previously (9).

For each analytical series, at least three internal water standards were chosen to cover the entire enrichment range of the samples. Those standards samples were prepared and analyzed, with the same methods followed (distilled and undistilled).

Samples were measured in duplicates, unless a flaw was detected in the flame-sealing step. Maximum allowed duplicate differences were 5 and 2% of the value for 2H values and 0.8 and 1.5% of the value for 18O values (9). If the differences exceeded the above-mentioned limits, we examined the data critically and omitted the aberrant value, performing further calculations on a single replicate, and/or analyzed a third sample if available. More detailed information on how the analytical error propagating into rCO2 was estimated is described elsewhere (9).

Isotope dilution spaces. Estimation of the body water pools for 2H (N2) and 18O dilution space (N3), using the plateau method, was performed according to the following equation:

\[
N \text{ (mol)} = \text{mol} \frac{E_{\text{ini}} - E_{\text{30}}} {E_{\text{bkg}} - E_{\text{30}}}
\]

where N represents the dilution space or body water pool for 2H or 18O expressed in moles. Eini and E30 are the enrichments at equilibrium and at background in the body, respectively. E30 is the enrichment of the injected water. E is expressed in parts per million.

Estimation of the body water pools for 2H (N2) and 18O (N3) by the intercept method was performed by extrapolating the E30 back to the time of injection according to the following equation, with modifications (18):

\[
E_{\text{ini}} - \text{ic} = \left( E_{\text{ini}} - E_{\text{bkg}} \right) e^{\ln(1 + k)} + E_{\text{bkg}}
\]

where Eini - ic is now the initial value to be used for the body water pools calculation, tini = t30 is the time between injection and the initial sampling (in h), and k is the 2H or 18O turnover rate in h⁻¹. Isotope turnover rates were calculated as follows:

\[
k \text{ (mol/h)} = \left[ \log( E_{\text{ini}} - E_{\text{bkg}} ) - \log( E_{\text{ini}} - E_{\text{bkg}} ) / t \right] / t
\]

where Eini represents the enrichment level at final sample and t the time (in h) between final and initial sample. The initial body water pool TBW was calculated by the isotope dilution method. TBW, as percentage of initial body mass was applied to the final body mass to estimate the final pool sizes.

For the multisample methodology the k values were calculated from the curves fitted along the values of samples collected during the 3-day measurement by using the 2-h time point as initial. Enrichment values above background were log transformed and curve-fitted; k values were derived from the slope of the regression line (least-squares fit).
Calculation of $r_{CO_2}$. Several equations, presented in Supplemental Table S1 (supplemental data for this article can be found on the AJP-Endocrinology and Metabolism website), were employed for the calculation of $r_{CO_2}$. N used in the equations was an average between initial and final body water pool. The first equation, applied in 1966 by Lifson and McClintock (21), used only the $^{18}O$ dilution space (“one-pool model”) and considered only equilibrium fractionation factors at 24°C (see Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 1). Speakman further updated this equation by using a combination of in vivo kinetics and equilibrium fractionation factors at 37°C and assuming that they contribute in a ratio of 3:1 to the fractionated losses (see Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 2 (31)). In two-pool model equations, both observed isotope pool sizes, $N_D$ and $N_O$, are used in the estimation of $r_{CO_2}$. The first equation used individual isotope spaces and the fractionation factors in Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 2 (see Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 5) (4). In 1986 and then in 1988, Schoeller and colleagues (27–29) updated the latter equation by using individual dilution space with fixed average pool size for oxygen and hydrogen pools relative to the body water pool (i.e., $N_O$ 1.01 and $N_D$ 1.04 times greater than actual dilution space and with a dilution space ratio of 1:0.3). The fractionation factors were estimated by equilibrium processes at 37°C, with fractionated water loss being equivalent to 2.3 times $r_{CO_2}$ (see Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 4).

Racette et al. (26) further updated Schoeller’s equation in 1994 proposing that the population pool ratio was 1.034 (Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 8). Speakman et al. (32) also proposed a two-pool equation in 1993, but using a group dilution ratio, and they adopted the same fractionation factors as the ones used in Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 4. The equation was later update by Speakman (31) in 1997, using still a group dilution ratio but with the fractionation factors used in Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 2 (see Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 6) (31).

Finally, in 1980, Nagy (24) proposed an equation that does not use turnover rates (i.e., $K_O$ and $K_D$) but does use the log ratios of the initial and final isotope concentrations and directly incorporates initial and final pool sizes (N) as well as initial and final body mass of the animal under study (Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 7).

Apart from Supplemental Table S1, Eqs. 1 and 7, all equations are in fact only minor variations of each other. Yet, especially the choices for the level of fractionated water loss have a significant influence on the result. However, quantifying this fractionation experimentally is cumbersome (11, 14).

Statistical analysis. The data are expressed as means ± SE. Analysis was performed in Statistica (Statsoft). Multiple hour (initials) and day (finals) differences were tested with repeated-measures ANOVA (RM-ANOVA), with time as within factor and group as between factor. To test differences between groups, a general linear model ANOVA was used, followed by Tukey’s honestly significant difference post hoc testing.

RESULTS

Body mass. After being on the HF diet for 6 wk, eight of the mice that had the lowest weight gain were assigned to the DR group ($n = 8$; $\Delta$mass $= -0.05 ± 0.50$ g), whereas another eight with the highest weight gain were assigned to the DIO group ($n = 8$; $\Delta$mass $6.12 ± 0.60$ g). Using body masses on the day just before indirect calorimetry was started (day 0; Fig. 1, top left), ANOVA revealed group effects [$F(2,21) = 13.69, P < 0.001$], and post hoc analysis showed that mice in the HF-DIO group weighed significantly more than those in the HF-DR and LF groups. No differences were found between the HF-DR group and the LF group. In retrospect, the HF-DIO mice also weighed more than the HF-DR mice at the start of HF feeding [$F(1,14) = 16.61, P < 0.01$]. Percent body fat (see Fig. 1, top right) determined by isotopic dilution (see below) was affected by group [$F(2,21) = 12.63, P < 0.001$], and post hoc analysis showed that the HF-DIO mice had more fat relative to the LF mice (150 ± 8%) and HF-DR mice (113 ± 7%). No significant differences in percent body fat were found between HF-DR mice and LF mice (17 ± 16%).

Over the course of metabolic assessment by DLW/indirect calorimetry, HF-DIO mice reduced body mass slightly, whereas other groups remained stable [$F(4,42) = 5.52, P < 0.05$; see Fig. 1, top left].

Indirect calorimetry. During the placement of mice in the indirect calorimetry cages, the actual $r_{CO_2}$, $r_{O_2}$, and RQ were assessed over 3 consecutive days. A summary of the indirect calorimetry data and the calculated MR is presented in Table 1.

There was a different time course between groups [$F(4,42) = 8.59, P < 0.001$], $r_{O_2}$ [$F(4,42) = 4.45, P < 0.01$], and RQ.
Between-subject analysis revealed a lower MR in the HF-DR than the LF-fed group. 

Table 1. Indirect calorimetry measurements during the 3-day validation study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LF (n=6)</th>
<th>LF-DR (n=6)</th>
<th>LF-DIO (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rCO2, ml/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>112.6±3.1</td>
<td>110.3±6.1</td>
<td>108.4±2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>116.0±3.1</td>
<td>95.7±5.2</td>
<td>105.0±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>118.9±2.9</td>
<td>96.1±5.0</td>
<td>104.8±1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rO2, ml/h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>112.9±4.9</td>
<td>109.3±7.1</td>
<td>121.6±3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>116.6±4.4</td>
<td>104.4±6.2</td>
<td>118.3±2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>117.3±3.5</td>
<td>104.3±5.9</td>
<td>117.9±2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ, CO2/O2</td>
<td>1.00±0.01</td>
<td>0.92±0.01</td>
<td>0.89±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>1.00±0.01</td>
<td>0.92±0.01</td>
<td>0.89±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>1.02±0.01</td>
<td>0.92±0.01</td>
<td>0.89±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR, kJ/day</td>
<td>56.9±2.3</td>
<td>54.0±3.4</td>
<td>59.6±1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>58.8±2.0</td>
<td>51.5±3.0</td>
<td>57.9±1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>59.4±1.7</td>
<td>51.6±2.9</td>
<td>57.8±1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are expressed as means ± SE. LF, low-fat diet; HF, high-fat/high-sucrose diet; DR, diet-induced obesity-resistant group; DIO, diet-induced obesity-prone group; CO2, rate of CO2 production; rO2, rate of oxygen production; RQ, respiratory quotient; MR, metabolic rate.

Fig. 2. 18O dilution space (ND/NO) for LF and HF-fed mice calculated by plateau method. *LF vs. HF-DR or HF-DIO. #HF-DR vs HF-DIO.
The body water pool assessed by carcass analysis in HF-DIO and HF-DR mice (following desiccation and soxhlet fat extraction), expressed as percentual deviation from the body water pool estimated by 18O dilution, is shown in Fig. 2. Deviations are shown with initials taken at 1, 2, and 3 h and using the “plateau” (Fig. 2, bottom left) and “intercept” method, using the final on day 3 (Fig. 2, bottom right). $E_{\text{init}}$ 18O at 1 h resulted in an ~20% overestimation of body water pool relative to the level obtained by the desiccation method. This difference was smaller at 2 and 3 h, particularly when the intercept method was used. None of these levels were different between HF-DIO and HF-DR mice.

Isotope turnovers. Turnover rates of 18O ($k_\text{O}$) and 2H ($k_\text{D}$) calculated from logarithmic decline using initials and finals were used for calculation of rCO2 (from $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$) and for assessment of the body water flux linked to oxygen turnover (by $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$) in the different experimental groups, and these are shown in Fig. 3.

First, the relevance of the initial time points (i.e., at 1, 2, and 3 h) for $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ and $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$ in the different diet groups was investigated by using the enrichment levels of 18O and 2H at the same final point (we chose day 2). As shown in Fig. 3, top left, there was no significant time effect or time $\times$ group interaction effect on $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ values, but a tendency ($P = 0.066$) was observed for a group effect, meaning that $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ levels tended to be higher in LF-fed mice than in the HF-fed mice.

Analysis of $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$ values revealed a significant group $\times$ time interaction [$F_{(4,40)} = 5.88, P < 0.001$; Fig. 3, top right]. This effect was caused mainly by the difference at the 1st hour, during which the ratio for the HF-fed mice was ~27% lower than at 2 and 3 h. This difference was much smaller in the LF group (at the 1st hour, ~4% lower than at 2 h). There was no significant interaction anymore if 1-h ratio was excluded from the model, indicating no significant difference between 2- and 3-h ratios. Between-group differences persisted over the 3-h period, showing consistently that HF-fed mice overall had a lower $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$ ratio than LF-fed ones, irrespective of weight gain.

Next, we evaluated the effect of the duration of the time interval between initial and final (i.e., taken at 1, 2, and 3 days) on $k_\text{O}$ and $k_\text{D}$, and thus the resultant $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ and $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$, using one initial time (2 h). In the analysis of $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ from aforementioned time points, a significant time $\times$ group interaction [$F_{(4,40)} = 11.81, P < 0.001$] was observed (see Fig. 3, bottom left). In both HF-fed groups, $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ decreased over the course of the 3-day measurement, whereas in LF-fed mice $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ increased.

Analysis of $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$ showed a group effect [$F_{(2,20)} = 9.34, P < 0.01$] and no difference over the 3 days, with LF-fed mice having overall a significantly higher $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$ than the HF-fed DR and DIO mice (Tukey-HSD, $P < 0.01$; see Fig. 3, bottom right).

Different methods of calculation. Several equations shown in Table 1 were used to calculate rCO2, using the 2-h initials. The results, by using the 2-h initials and 2-day finals, are shown in Fig. 4 together with the results of indirect calorimetry. Although the DLW method performed well in the LF group, we observed a significant deviation from the actual rCO2 based on indirect calorimetry, with DLW systematically overestimating rCO2 by ~18% (depending on the type of equation and model) in the HF-fed mice irrespectively of body composition. In general, one-pool model equations performed worse than two-pool model ones. Within the DLW results, neither using any of the models nor using intercept or plateau made a significant difference (that is, significant compared with the SE; see Fig. 4). This shows that the DLW method in itself is robust. Nevertheless, it can apparently deliver results that are systematically deviating.

Finally, the multisample approach did not perform better than a two-sample approach when using the initial at 2 h. Differences over 3 days between the two approaches for calculating decay rates were small (<1%).

Duration of the measurement. To evaluate the effect of time between sampling of initial and final enrichments and how this influenced the validity of rCO2 by DLW analysis (i.e., compared with rCO2 production assessed by indirect calorimetry), we examined deviations from the latter by using Supplemental Table S1, Eq. 5, and the 2-h initial on each day of the DLW...

Fig. 3. Comparison of $k_\text{O} - k_\text{D}$ (left) or $k_\text{D}/k_\text{O}$ (right) between different initials (top) and different duration between measurements (bottom) in HF-fed DIO (black bar) and DR mice (gray bar) and in LF-fed (open bar) mice. Data are expressed as means ± SE; Tukey’s post hoc test. *LF vs. HF-DR or HF-DIO.
The most important finding here is that an excellent match existed between rCO₂ assessed by the two methods in the LF-feeding mice, whereas there was a consistent overestimation of rCO₂ by the DLW technique in the HF-fed animals compared with actual CO₂ production. This was already anticipated because several other studies in mammals validating the DLW technique reported such overestimation, as reviewed by Speakman and Racey (34) in 1988 and later by others (10, 33). The importance of our study is that feeding a HF diet may be a relevant factor in explaining this inconsistency rather than the increased amount of body fat (or any other compartment associated with this) induced by HF feeding in the DIO-prone mice. DLW studies performed thus far have ignored nutritional or body composition effects on the validity of the rCO₂ assessed by DLW method.

A number of factors may have contributed to this error. When we analyzed the equilibration period during the 3 h after administration of the labels, we observed an incomplete mixing of them, particularly in the HF-fed group, with 1 h being significantly lower in the HF group than in the LF group. It may be possible that the incomplete mixing persisted at 2 and 3 h, which caused overestimation of the body water pool and thus overestimation of rCO₂. In the validation study performed by Schoeller et al. (30), similar incompleteness in the equilibration of the labels was observed in obese human subjects. In that study, in lean subjects a stable equilibration was reached between 2 and 6 h after isotope administration, whereas in obese subjects the estimates were more variable, and the same degree of stability was not obtained before 5 h postdosing.

Verification by carcass analysis through desiccation showed an overestimation of body water by DLW, particularly when the initial at 1 h was used for the calculation of total body water. This difference occurred at 2 and 3 h as well, but to a minor extent. This comparison also showed that the intercept method performed better at longer initial final intervals in determination of body water (from 10 to 5% deviation at 2 and 3 h) than the plateau method.

One possible cause of the overestimation of the body water pool is that hydrogen and/or oxygen can be incorporated into nonaqueous molecules and/or excreted from the body independent of CO₂ and water fluxes. In addition to the increase in body water pool, the dilution space ratio of deuterium and oxygen (D/O) was lower in the HF-fed mice than in the LF-fed mice. Because D/O tended to be lower only in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plateau</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>−0.5 ± 1.1</td>
<td>3.9 ± 1.5</td>
<td>−5.7 ± 2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF-DR</td>
<td>19.5 ± 2.9</td>
<td>25.8 ± 2.8</td>
<td>39.6 ± 6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF-DIO</td>
<td>21.3 ± 3.3</td>
<td>23 ± 2.1</td>
<td>33.0 ± 4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>−3.3 ± 1.0</td>
<td>0.8 ± 1.5</td>
<td>−1.4 ± 1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF-DR</td>
<td>16.7 ± 2.7</td>
<td>23.0 ± 2.7</td>
<td>18.9 ± 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF-DIO</td>
<td>18.7 ± 3.2</td>
<td>20.2 ± 2.1</td>
<td>17.0 ± 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are expressed as means ± SE. DLW, doubly labeled water.
HF-DIO vs. the HF-DR mice, this points toward primary dietary effects on N2/N20, but body composition effects may be not ruled out. Thus, the estimated turnover of hydrogen was too low, the estimated turnover of oxygen was too high, or both processes occurred simultaneously. One potential mechanism is that the HF-fed mice have a lower level of hydrogen and methane production by gut microbiota as a result of lower dietary fiber density than the LF-fed mice, which is analogous to what has been found in humans and pigs (13, 22). In turn, this then would lead to a relatively lower 2H turnover in the HF-fed mice than in the LF-fed mice. Another potential mechanism contributing to fluxes independent from water and CO2 is an elevated level of ketone body production by HF feeding. Normally, ketone bodies are produced during fasting as a side effect of β-oxidation, which can be used as an alternative substrate in the brain. Several studies have shown that the feeding of a HF diet will also lead to an upregulation of the production of ketone bodies (5, 6, 15, 25), and when not sufficiently metabolized they will accumulate in the urine or breath because these fuels are water soluble (6). The net loss of ketone bodies will constitute an increased 18O flux from the body independent of CO2 and water turnover. Of course 2H is dragged along in this process, but in a smaller proportion to 18O in ketones compared with water. 18O and 2H fluxes could also be increased due to incorporation of these molecules in urea via the ornithine-arginine synthesis cycle. This effect may be substantial if the HF-fed mice have an increased extent of protein degradation and urea synthesis (7, 35). At present, it is extremely difficult to make summated numerical estimates to the extent by which all of these pathways contribute to 18O and 2H turnovers beyond those mediated by CO2 and water turnover. A final, even more exotic explanation of which very little is known is that isotopic levels of H and O atoms in intracellular water could differ from the extracellular compartment by physiological processes that discriminate between isotopes (16, 17). The latter processes could potentially explain differential intra/ extracellular isotopic composition and could be underlying to the differences in the N2/N20 ratio in the HF-fed mice relative to the LF-fed mice.

In summary, our data showed that, compared with actual rCO2, the DLW method performed extremely well when rCO2 in the LF-fed mice was assessed with a precision of −0.5 ± 1.1 (considering an analytical error of ∼1.5%). Furthermore, the intercept method appears to perform superiorly over the plateau method in estimating isotopic pool sizes, in particular for longer measurement duration (i.e., 3 days). We did not observe a significant improvement in the multisample approach over the two-sample one. We recommend particular caution with the use of the DLW technique in HF-fed humans and animals because it may overestimate MR calculated by DLW. These findings can have major consequences for the interpretation of results obtained by the DLW technique, particularly in obesity research. Future research should be dedicated to the mechanisms (of which potentially some are mentioned above) underlying this discrepancy and how to correct for it.
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