

Naltrexone Suppresses Hyperphagia Induced in the Rat by a Highly Palatable Diet

M. APFELBAUM AND A. MANDENOFF

*Laboratoire de Nutrition Humaine, Faculté Xavier Bichat
16 rue Huchard, 75018 Paris, France*

Received 26 September 1980

APFELBAUM, M. AND A. MANDENOFF. *Naltrexone suppresses hyperphagia induced in the rat by a highly palatable diet.* PHARMAC. BIOCHEM. BEHAV. 15(1) 89-91, 1981.—A highly palatable diet (ordinary chow supplemented with 4 highly palatable items changed every day) (HPD) provokes hyperphagia and overweight in the rat. After 17 weeks of such a diet, naltrexone (0.5 or 2.5 mg/kg IP) an opiate antagonist, was injected at the beginning of the dark period, and a food intake test was performed during the 3 following hours. Naltrexone does not modify the energy intake in control rats receiving ordinary chow but suppresses HPD induced hyperphagia. The involvement of the β -endorphin system in this type of hyperphagia is discussed.

Naltrexone Hyperphagia Energy intake Endorphin-antagonist Dietary obesity Highly palatable diet

A large choice of highly palatable items, varied everyday, provokes in the rat hyperphagia, overweight, and an enlargement of adipose tissue [13, 14, 16, 18]. In other models of hyperphagia β -endorphin is involved: in genetically obese rodents naloxone, an opiate antagonist suppresses hyperphagia and the amount of β -endorphin in the pituitary gland is very high [11]. Naloxone also suppresses hyperphagia induced by 2-deoxyglucose [19], by diazepam [20] and by lesions of the ventromedial nucleus of the hypothalamus [9].

On the other hand, β -endorphin injected into the ventromedial nucleus of the hypothalamus provokes a complementary food intake in satiated rats and this effect is suppressed by naltrexone, another opiate antagonist [5]. The present experiment was designed to check whether naltrexone can also suppress dietary hyperphagia.

METHOD

Animals

40 male Wistar rats (commentry), weighing between 100 and 120 g, were housed in groups of 3 during 10 weeks and in individual cages thereafter. They were maintained at 24°C with a 12 hour light/dark cycle. They were divided into two experimental groups. The first group, "control," received ordinary chow (extralabo M25) ad lib; the second group "high palatability" (HP) was given 4 palatable foods in addition to the chow. The 4 supplementary items were changed each day on a week rotation. The list of palatable items was previously tested and includes such delicacies as ham, salami, smoked fish, tuna, potato chips, lard, marshmallows,

cheeses, cookies, breakfast cereals, bread, pop corn, noodles and a large choice of penny candies and chocolate bars.

Animals were weighed regularly. By week 17, the mean weight of the HP group was 546.8 ± 11.6 g (SEM) versus 453 ± 10.6 for the control group. On Wednesday of week 17 at 20.00 hr, the end of the light period, both groups were divided into two randomized subgroups of 10 rats each:

(1) Ten control and ten HP animals received an intraperitoneal injection of 1 ml/kg of body weight of 9% solution of NaCl;

(2) The other ten control and ten HP animals received an intraperitoneal injection of 0.5 mg/kg of body weight of naltrexone.

Food Intake

Food intake tests were then conducted over a period of 3 hours. At the start of the test session, rats were placed in individual cages, where a fresh choice of preweighed foods (lard, noodles, cakes, chocolate, and chow) was presented to the HP rats, and preweighed chow was given to the control rats. At the end of the test period, all rats were returned to their home cages. Unconsumed palatable food and chow were collected and the food intake was calculated as the difference between the weight of the food prior the testing and the amount of food recovered subsequent to the test session. The energy content of each item consumed was calculated according to tables [21].

During the following week, the animals continued to have free access to their respective diets. At week 18 the same experiment following the same schedule was performed again, but this time using 2.5 mg/kg of naltrexone.

TABLE 1
EFFECTS OF NALTREXONE ON FOOD INTAKE OF HP AND CONTROL RATS

		NaCl N=20*	Naltrexone 0.5† N=10	Naltrexone 2.5† N=10
Control	kJ/Rat‡	51.0 ± 6.3	54.0 ± 5.8	38.6 ± 6.3
	kJ/kg B.W.‡	111.7 ± 12.9	123.2 ± 16.0	86.8 ± 15.5
Cafeteria	kJ/Rat‡	140.8 ± 13.4	67.9 ± 11.1	36.0 ± 8.8
	kJ/kg B.W.‡	251.3 ± 23.1	125.5 ± 21.5	67.4 ± 16.2

*Food intakes after NaCl injection in 0.5 mg and 2.5 mg experiments are the same for chow group and for HP group, therefore these control values were pooled.

†Doses of naltrexone are expressed in mg/kg of body weight.

‡Food intakes are expressed in kJoules/rat/3 hours of darkness and in kJoules/kg of body weight/3 hours of darkness (mean ± SEM).

Statistical Analysis

The parameter studied was the energy intake after administration of naltrexone compared to intake after administration of NaCl, expressed in kJoules/animal/first 3 hours of darkness and in kJoules/kg/of body weight/first 3 hours of darkness. The data were analyzed using the variance analysis; F values reported in the text correspond to energy intake per animals.

RESULTS

The food intake of HP rats injected with NaCl is significantly higher than that of control NaCl, $F=84.6$; $p<0.05$. Naltrexone does not modify the caloric intake of control rats either at 0.5 mg or at 2.5 mg. However, in the HP rats, naltrexone results in a highly significant decrease in food intake: the decrease with 0.5 mg is from 140.8 to 67.9 kJoule/animal, $F=55.85$; $p<0.05$, and with 2.5 mg is from 140.8 to 36.0, $F=115.48$; $p<0.05$. The intake with 2.5 mg is significantly lower than that obtained with 0.5 mg, $F=10.71$; $p<0.05$. With both doses the food intake decreases so dramatically that it is no longer significantly different from that of controls. Thus naltrexone suppresses dietary induced hyperphagia.

DISCUSSION

Control Rats

In this experiment the tested drug was naltrexone rather than the usual opiate antagonist naloxone, because the duration of its effect is twice as long [6]. We did not find any reports in the literature about the effects of naltrexone on eating behavior; however there are several studies on those of naloxone. At a 0.25 mg/kg of body weight naloxone does not modify food intake in normal rats [11]; at a 1 mg/kg dose it does not suppress the operant behavior learned in order to obtain food in chronically food restricted rats [4]. Results of a high dose of 10 mg are controversial—Brands [1] found a decrease in food intake and Stapleton [20] did not find any effect—but such a dose provokes sickness [12], thus making difficult to discriminate a possible specific effect from the others. As a whole, it appears that endogenous opiates have

little or no involvement in the control of food intake in normal rats fed with laboratory chow.

HP Rats

Hyperphagia is not due to an inability of the rat to recognize the amount of energy contained in the various items, since it is classically demonstrated that the rat adapts its food intake accurately whether the animal is given concentrated or diluted food as well as when it is fed with a choice of elemental nutrients. On the other hand, effects of naltrexone are not that of an anorectic agent since only hyperphagia has been suppressed. Thus, it can be hypothesized that the β -endorphin system may constitute a trigger of HP hyperphagia independent from the hunger-satiation loop. This hypothesis is consistent with β -endorphin's role in two other experimental situations which also result in hyperphagia: stress and fast.

A stress like tail-pinching induces a range of inappropriate responses such as motor hyperactivity, sexual hyperactivity or hyperphagia [17]; the level of β -endorphin is increased in plasma [15] and in brain [10].

A 24 hour fast increases the algesic threshold and is followed by a compensatory overeating. Naloxone tends to normalize the threshold [9] and to reduce the overeating [2,7].

Thus in the rat the endogenous opiate system is not indispensable for an adequate control of food intake in a stress-shielded environment including the availability of monotonous food; however, it is involved in hyperphagia provoked by either stressors or overabundance of palatable foods, when these events are unavoidable, whatever the behavior of the rat.

Both these situations are prevalent in modern societies. Thus it could be of interest to test whether human hyperphagia can also be suppressed by antagonists of endogenous opiates.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This investigation was supported in part by DGRST grant no. 1080. We thank Mr. T. Lenoir for his technical assistance.

REFERENCES

1. Brands, B., J. A. Thornhill, M. Hirst and C. W. Gowdey. Suppression of food intake and body weight gain by naloxone in rats. *Life Sci.* **24**: 1773-1778, 1979.
2. Brown, D. R. and S. G. Holtzman. Suppression of deprivation-induced food and water intake in rats and mice by naloxone. *Pharmac. Biochem. Behav.* **11**: 567-573, 1979.
3. Cabanac, M. and E. F. Rabe. Influence of a monotonous food on body weight regulation in humans. *Physiol. Behav.* **17**: 675-678, 1976.
4. Gellert, V. F. and S. B. Sparber. A comparison of effects of naloxone upon body weight loss and suppression of fixed ratio operant behavior in morphine dependent rats. *J. Pharmac. exp. Ther.* **201**: 1, 44-54, 1977.
5. Grandison, N. L. and A. Guidotti. Stimulation of food intake by muscimol and beta endorphin. *Neuropharmacology* **16**: 533-536, 1977.
6. Gray, A. P. and D. S. Robinson. Naltrexone zinc tannate: a prolonged-action narcotic antagonist complex. *J. Pharm. Sci.* **63**: 1, 159-161, 1974.
7. Holtzman, S. G. Behavioral effects of separate and combined administration of naloxone and d-amphetamine. *J. Pharmac. exp. Ther.* **198**: 1, 51-60, 1974.
8. King, B. M., F. X. Castellanos, A. J. Kastin, M. Berzas, M. D. Mauk, G. A. Olson and R. D. Olson. Naloxone induced suppression of food intake in normal and hypothalamic obese rats. *Pharmac. Biochem. Behav.* **11**: 729-732, 1979.
9. McGivern, R., C. Berka, G. G. Berntson, J. M. Walker and C. A. Sandman. Effect of naloxone on analgesia induced by food deprivation. *Life Sci.* **25**: 885-888, 1979.
10. Madden, J., H. Akil, R. L. Patrick and J. D. Barchas. Stress-induced parallel changes in central opioid levels and pain responsiveness in the rat. *Nature* **265**: 358-360, 1977.
11. Margules, D. L., B. Moisset, M. J. Lewis, H. Shibuya and C. B. Pert. β Endorphin is associated with overeating in genetically obese mice (ob/ob) and rats (fa/fa). *Science* **202**: 988-991, 1978.
12. Rogers, G. H., H. Frenk, A. N. Taylor and J. C. Liebeskind. Naloxone suppression of food and water intake in deprived rats. *Proc. west. Pharmac. Soc.* **21**: 457-460, 1978.
13. Rolls, B. J. How variety and palatability can stimulate appetite. *Nutr. Bull.* **5**: 78-86, 1979.
14. Rolls, B. J., E. A. Rowe and R. C. Turner. Persistent obesity in rats following a period of consumption of mixed, high energy diet. *J. Physiol.* **298**: 415-427, 1980.
15. Rossier, J., E. D. French, C. Rivier, N. Ling, R. Guillemin and F. E. Bloom. Foot shock induced stress increases β endorphin levels in blood but not brain. *Nature* **270**: 5638, 618-620, 1977.
16. Rothwell, N. J. and M. J. Stock. A role for brown adipose tissue in diet-induced thermogenesis. *Nature* **281**: 5726, 31-35, 1979.
17. Rowland, N. E. and S. M. Antelman. Stress induced hyperphagia and obesity in rats: a possible model for understanding human obesity. *Science* **191**: 310-312, 1976.
18. Scalfani, A. and D. Spinger. Dietary obesity in adult rats: similarities to hypothalamic and human obesity syndromes. *Physiol. Behav.* **17**: 461-471, 1976.
19. Sewell, R. D. E. and K. Jawaharlal. Antagonism of 2-deoxy-D-glucose induced hyperphagia by naloxone: possible involvement of endorphins. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* **32**: 148-149, 1980.
20. Stapleton, J. M., M. D. Lind, V. J. Merriman and L. D. Reid. Naloxone inhibits diazepam-induced feeding in rats. *Life Sci.* **24**: 2421-2426, 1979.
21. Watt, B. K. and A. L. Merrill, editors. *Agriculture Handbook No. 8. Composition of Foods: Raw, Processed, Prepared.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. Rev. ed. 1976.