

measure of cardiorespiratory fitness in overweight and obese participants with T2D.

Trial registration: Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry ACTRN12615000475549.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.226>

226

How do very low energy diet brands available in Australia compare in terms of nutritional content and cost?



Alice A. Gibson^{1,*}, Janet Franklin²,
Andrea L. Pattinson¹, Zilvia G. Y.
Cheng¹, Samir Samman³, Tania
Markovic², Amanda Salis¹

¹ *The Boden Institute of Obesity, Nutrition, Exercise and Eating Disorders, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia*

² *Metabolism and Obesity Services, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney, NSW, Australia*

³ *Department of Human Nutrition, University of Otago, Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand*

Very low energy diets (VLEDs) effectively induce rapid weight loss but may not contain adequate macronutrients or micronutrients for individuals with varying nutritional requirements. Adequate protein intake during weight loss appears particularly important to help preserve fat free mass and control appetite, and low energy and carbohydrate content also contribute to appetite control with VLEDs. As obesity disproportionately affects those of lower socioeconomic status, cost is also an important consideration. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to compare the cost and nutritional content (with a focus on protein) of all available VLED brands in Australia. Cost was determined by averaging the price (in Australian Dollars) of all flavours for each brand, and then calculating the cost proportionally to expected consumption (e.g. higher ratio of shake to bar or soup intake). Nutritional content was extracted and compared between brands and to the Recommended Dietary Intake (RDI) or adequate intake (AI) of macronutrients and micronutrients for men and women aged 19–70 years or >70 years. Eight brands of VLED products were identified (KicStartTM, Optislim[®], Optifast[®], Proslim, Tony Fergusson[®], Dr MacLeod's[®], Cambridge[®], Vita Diet). The average cost per product varied widely, from \$2.33 for KicStartTM to \$4.43 for Cambridge[®],

which would result in a weekly difference of \$44.10 if three products are consumed per day. All brands contained less protein than the requirements for males, larger individuals (BMI > 35 kg/m²) and adults >70 years. Even brands with the highest daily protein content, based on consuming three products/day (KicStartTM and Optislim[®], ~60g/day), only met protein requirements of the smallest and youngest women for whom a VLED would be indicated. Considering multiple options to optimise protein content, we propose that adding pure powdered protein is the most suitable option because it minimizes additional energy, carbohydrate and cost of VLEDs.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2016.10.227>

228

Parental body shape at midlife and its association with adult offspring weight measures



Janet F. Grant^{*}, Catherine R.
Chittleborough, Anne W. Taylor

*The University of Adelaide,
Adelaide, SA, Australia*

Parental weight has been shown to be a strong determinant of offspring weight status. This study used cross-sectional self-reported and measured data from Stage 3 (2008–10) of the North West Adelaide Health Study (baseline 1999–2003, $n = 4056$), a longitudinal cohort of Australian adults, to investigate the association between midlife parental body shape and four indicators of obesity and fat distribution. The analysis used pictograms for recall of parental body shape, and measured body mass index (BMI), waist circumference (WC), waist hip ratio (WHR) and waist height ratio (WHtR) of adult offspring ($n = 2128$). Compared to both parents being a healthy weight, offspring were more likely to be overweight or obese if both parents were an unhealthy weight at age 40 (OR 2.14, 95% CI 1.67–2.76). Furthermore, those participants whose mother was an unhealthy weight were more likely to be overweight or obese themselves (OR 1.50, 95% CI 1.14–1.98). There were similar but lower results for those with an overweight/obese father (OR 1.44, 95% CI 1.08–1.93). The effect of one or both parents being overweight or obese tended to be stronger for daughters than for sons across BMI, WC and WHtR. BMI showed the strongest association with parental body shape (OR 2.14), followed by WC (OR 1.78), WHtR (OR 1.71) and WHR (OR 1.45). WHtR (42–45%) and BMI (35–36%) provided the highest positive predictive values for