

1 **A novel tool to predict food intake: The Visual Meal Creator**

2

3 Adrian Holliday^a, Chris Batey^a, Dr Frank F. Eves, Dr Andrew K Blannin^a

4 ^aSchool of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences,

5 University of Birmingham,

6 Edgbaston,

7 Birmingham.

8 B15 2TT

9

10 Corresponding Author:

11 Dr Andrew Blannin

12 School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences,

13 University of Birmingham,

14 Edgbaston,

15 Birmingham.

16 B15 2TT

17 a.k.blannin@bham.ac.uk

18

19 Requests for reprints should be addressed to:

20 Dr Andrew Blannin, School of Sport & Exercise Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston,

21 Birmingham. B15 2TT

22 a.k.blannin@bham.ac.uk

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 **ABSTRACT**

30 **Background:** Subjective appetite is commonly measured using an abstract visual analogue scale (VAS)
31 technique, that provides no direct information about desired portion size or food choice, which are both
32 key components of eating behaviour. The purpose of the current investigation was to develop and
33 validate a user-friendly tool – the Visual Meal Creator (VIMEC) - that would allow for independent,
34 repeated measures of subjective appetite and provide a prediction of food intake.

35 **Method:** Participants experienced dietary control over a 5-hour period to manipulate hunger state on
36 three occasions (small breakfast (SB) vs. large breakfast (LB) vs. large breakfast + snacks (LB+S)).
37 Appetite measures were obtained every 60 minutes using the VIMEC and VAS. At 4.5 hours,
38 participants were presented with an *ad libitum* test meal, from which energy intake (EI) was measured.
39 The efficacy of the VIMEC was assessed by its ability to detect expected patterns of appetite and its
40 strength as a predictor of energy intake. Day-to-day and test-retest reproducibility were assessed.

41 **Results:** Between- and within-condition differences in VAS and VIMEC scores were significantly
42 correlated with one another throughout. Between- and within-condition changes in appetite scores
43 obtained with the VIMEC exhibited a stronger correlation with EI at the test meal than those obtained
44 with VAS. Pearson correlation coefficients for within-condition comparisons were 0.951, 0.914 and
45 0.875 (all $p < 0.001$) for SB, LB and LB+S respectively. Correlation coefficients for between-condition
46 differences in VIMEC and EI were 0.273, 0.904 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.575 ($p < 0.05$) for SB – LB+S, SB –
47 LB and LB – LB+S respectively. The VIMEC exhibited a similar degree of reproducibility to VAS.

48 **Conclusion:** The VIMEC appears to be a stronger predictor of energy intake and may prove to be a
49 more preferable measure of subjective appetite than VAS.

50

51 **KEYWORDS:** Appetite, eating behaviour, food photography, energy intake

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81 **BACKGROUND**

82 Methodological issues associated with measures of appetite persist. Self-report questionnaires
83 and scales are commonly used for the measure of subjective appetite, with the visual analogue scale
84 method (VAS) being the most prevalent within appetite research [1]. Such measures are inexpensive
85 and both quick and simple to administer. While validity is not easily assessed, it is generally considered
86 that the VAS is a valid measure of subjective appetite [1-3], demonstrating sensitivity to manipulation,
87 especially when used to address within-subject comparisons [4]. The VAS's ability to predict eating
88 behaviour is less clear. While some studies have demonstrated a significant correlation between VAS
89 scores and subsequent aspects of eating behaviour [4, 5], others have shown a lack of a relationship [5,
90 6]. Test-retest reproducibility has been shown to be good [3, 4], but day-to-day reproducibility is
91 considerably weaker [4, 6]. There are limitations associated with the use of the VAS method; notably
92 the abstract nature of the question and line format and the difficulty in conceptualising the constructs of
93 "hunger" and "fullness," and the lack of any indication of desired portion size, food choice or food-
94 specific desires. Hence, important aspects of eating behaviour are neither assessed nor predicted when
95 using this method of measurement.

96 Subjective appetite measures are usually used in conjunction with more objective measures,
97 typically in the form of food intake measures. Commonly, *ad libitum* energy intake is measured from
98 buffet-style or constant composition test meals. The *ad libitum* food intake method has been shown to
99 exhibit a high degree of day-to-day reproducibility, both when presented as a buffet [7] and when the
100 meal is of a constant composition [8]. While allowing for a valid quantitative measure of objective
101 appetite, food intake in test meals can be influenced by a number of external factors, such as the amount
102 of food presented [9, 10], the variety of foods available [11] and the perceived palatability of the food
103 [12]. In addition, buffet-style presentation and a laboratory setting are not habitual eating environments
104 for the majority of people and may influence intake [1, 11, 13]. Such external cues are potent stimuli for
105 appetite regulation and can override physiological determinants of hunger. A key limitation of the *ad*
106 *libitum* intake method is that it does not allow for independent, repeated measures within a short space
107 of time, in contrast to VAS, which can be repeated frequently to track acute changes in appetite. Any
108 intake measure will have a large impact upon subsequent measures and, while total or mean intake

109 values can be calculated over a study period, each separate intake or eating episode will not be
110 independent from previous measures. From a practical viewpoint, the *ad libitum* intake method can be
111 expensive, time-consuming and labour-intensive to administer and can result in large amounts of food
112 wastage.

113 The aim of the current study was two-fold. Firstly, to develop a novel tool for the measure of
114 subjective appetite that could potentially rectify the short-comings of the VAS and *ad libitum* intake
115 methods of assessment. We aimed to provide a less abstract subjective measure than VAS, using a
116 portion selection method, while also allowing for indicative measures of food choice and enabling
117 independent, repeated measures in a cost-effective and time-efficient manner. Secondly, we aimed to
118 address the validity and reproducibility of the tool – the Visual Meal Creator (VIMEC) – relative to
119 both the VAS and *ad libitum* intake methods.

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135 MATERIALS AND METHODS


136 **Participants:** Twelve recreationally active participants (8 female, 4 male; mean age 23 ± 2
137 years; mean body mass 70.4 ± 17.3 kg; mean BMI 22.8 ± 3.6 kg•m⁻²) were recruited from the School of
138 Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham. Those suffering from illness
139 such as cold or flu, those taking medication that was likely to affect appetite or that needed to be taken
140 with food more frequently than once a day, those with food allergies and those suffering from diabetes
141 were excluded from taking part. Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the
142 University of Birmingham.

143 **Study design:** The validity of any form of rating scale is not easily addressed. To attempt this,
144 we used the three assessments as highlighted by Stubbs *et al* [2]. These are a) the apparent validity of
145 the measure in terms of its ability to predict the behaviour which is being assessed, which was assessed
146 by comparing the VIMEC score with an *ad libitum* test meal energy intake; b) the change in rating
147 score under conditions where it should change if sensitive, with changes compared with those seen with
148 a valid, commonly-used technique for the measure of subjective appetite – the visual analogue scale
149 (VAS) test and c) the reproducibility of the measures, which was assessed by comparing day-to-day
150 measures and short-term test-retest measures.

151 A within-subject, randomised crossover study design was utilised. Participants were randomly
152 assigned to each of the three experimental conditions; small breakfast (SB), large breakfast (LB) and
153 large breakfast with snacks (LB+S). These feeding conditions were used to manipulate hunger state.

154 **Procedure & protocol:** Participants arrived at the Exercise Metabolism Laboratory within the
155 School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham between 07.00 and
156 09.00, after a ten-hour overnight fast. Upon arrival at the laboratory for the first time, participants were
157 provided with further verbal information regarding the nature of the study and given the opportunity to
158 ask any questions regarding their participation. A written consent form was then signed. Health
159 questionnaires were completed and breakfast food selections were made. Participants were then
160 randomly allocated to one of the three trial conditions. The study protocol for each condition is shown
161 in diagrammatical form in **figure 1**. Participants remained sedentary throughout the trial period.

162 Prior to the first trial, participants were provided with a food diary and instructed on how to
 163 complete it. They were asked to complete the diary on the day before their first trial and instructed to
 164 replicate this diet on the day prior to the following two trials.



166
 167 **Figure 1.** Study protocol. Arrow = appetite measure (VAS and VIMEC). Small clear rectangle = small
 168 breakfast. Large clear rectangle = large breakfast. Striped rectangle = snack. Black square = *ad libitum*
 169 lunch meal
 170

171 **Breakfast meals and snack:** The small breakfast meal consisted of a 25g cereal bar (oat and
 172 raisin, Sainsbury's) with 200ml of pure orange or apple juice (Sainsbury's), exhibiting the following
 173 characteristics: ~140 kcal, 27g carbohydrate, 2.3g fat, 1.8g protein, 1.1g fibre. The large breakfast
 174 consisted of cereal (80g of Original Swiss-style Alpen, or 55g of Kellogg's Bran Flakes); 125-150ml of
 175 semi-skimmed milk (Sainsbury's); 2 slices of toast (Kingsmill 50/50 thick slice, ~88g); 16 g of
 176 margarine (Flora light) and 30g of jam (strawberry, Sainsbury's) with 200ml of pure orange or apple
 177 juice (Sainsbury's). A choice of two cereals, with similar energy density and macronutrient content was
 178 provided to allow for individual preferences and dislikes. However, when Bran Flakes were selected, a
 179 banana was added to the meal in order for energy content to be similar between the two options,
 180 accounting for the smaller portion of Bran Flakes. The same cereal was consumed for both large

181 breakfast conditions. The large breakfast meal (Alpen cereal chosen) typically exhibited the following
182 characteristics: ~763 kcal, 133.4g carbohydrate, 15.2g fat, 22.5g protein, 10.6g fibre. The meals were
183 consumed within 15 minutes.

184 Three snack items were administered at 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5 hours in the LB+S condition. These
185 were, in order, a 50g flapjack bar (Sainsbury's, 223 kcal); a 25g cereal bar (oat and raisin, Sainsbury's,
186 98 kcal) and a ~152g, medium sized banana (Sainsbury's, ~98 kcal). This provided an additional 419
187 kcal, 67.1g carbohydrate, 13.9g fat, 5.4g protein, 6.6g fibre, resulting in a total intake in the LB+S of
188 approximately 1182 kcal, 200.6g carbohydrate, 29.2g fat, 27.9g protein, 17.2g fibre. This compared
189 with a total energy intake of ~763 kcal in the LB condition and ~140 kcal in the SB condition.

190 **Measures:** Subjective appetite was measured using the VIMEC and the widely used visual analogue
191 scale technique (VAS). The VIMEC is a computer programme test, designed and developed in the
192 School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, in which the
193 participant is asked to construct a computerised visual meal from an extensive menu, represented by a
194 library of food images. The participant is asked to select the foods that they would opt to consume,
195 should they eat a meal or snack at this moment in time. Selecting no food is an option available. The
196 participant is presented with a screen exhibiting the food items available (see **figure 2a**). The
197 participant is free to select up to a maximum of four "main meal" items (from a selection of 17), which
198 can be displayed on the meal plate, along with any number of "snack or dessert" items, which are
199 selected individually and displayed separately. Once selections are made, the participant is then
200 presented with a screen consisting of a meal plate on which their selected food items appear. The
201 portion size of each item can then be manipulated individually using sliding bar scales (see **figure 2b**).
202 The number of images for each food item varies, depending on the nature of the item, typical portion
203 sizes and the number of food items selected. Typically, however, this number ranges from 10-40 images
204 per food item, allowing for a high resolution. This process is then repeated separately for any "snack or
205 dessert" items selected. Typically, this task took between 30 seconds and 2 minutes to complete.

206 Once the computerised meal was fully constructed, the meal was saved. The results were
207 analysed and the investigator was able to see which portion size was selected and what number
208 photograph this selection corresponded to. All food images were of a known weight and the food

209 characteristics of each food item were recorded (energy density, macronutrient content). Hence, it was
210 then possible to calculate the nutritional content of the meal.
211 Subjective appetite was also assessed using the 4-question, 150mm-line VAS test for subjective
212 appetite, addressing “hunger”, “fullness”, “desire to eat” and “expected food intake” [14]. A composite
213 VAS test score was calculated (hunger score + desire score + expected intake score + (150-fullness
214 score)). This single score was used for the ease of data analysis and presentation. With the original 6
215 question VAS technique of Hill & Blundell [14], the scores for each question co-vary to a large extent
216 [2] and the first principle component of the questions is the mean value of the scores [15]. The two
217 appetite measures, VIMEC and VAS, were completed in a counterbalanced order to partition out effects
218 of order.

219 Energy intake was measured with the use of an *ad libitum* test meal. The content of this test
220 meal was dependant on the food choices made by the participant when using the VIMEC. The food
221 items selected during the measure obtained 60 minutes before the test meal (t=180) were presented for
222 the test meal. At the appetite measure obtained immediately prior to the test meal, the participant was
223 asked not to select any new, additional food items. Participants were accompanied to the Research
224 Kitchen within the School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, where they were provided
225 with a dinner plate and a bowl at a table. The food items of the test meal were presented buffet-style on
226 a separate work surface, and of portion-size similar to that of the largest portion available on the
227 VIMEC tool. Participants were instructed to serve the food that they desired to eat from the buffet on to
228 the plate or into the bowl and return to the table to eat. They were informed that they could return for
229 further servings and that more of each food item was available. They were instructed to eat until they
230 felt satisfyingly full. Covertly, each food item presented was weighed prior to the meal commencing
231 and again at the cessation of eating, with the difference between the two indicating the amount
232 consumed. Subtracted from this was food left remaining on the plate or in the bowl, which was also
233 weighed after the meal. Energy density of all food was known, allowing for the calculation of energy
234 intake.

235 The reproducibility of VIMEC and VAS was assessed by comparing day-to-day and test-retest
236 reproducibility. Day-to-day comparisons were made between the first measure obtained, prior to the

237 breakfast meal, for each condition. A second comparison was made between the second, post-breakfast
238 measures obtained in the LB and LB+S conditions, as the same breakfast was consumed in each
239 condition. One appetite measure was randomly selected for each participant for a retest measure. In this
240 instance, participants were asked to repeat the measure within 2-3 minutes of the initial measure. These
241 comparisons were made for both the VAS and VIMEC techniques, hence allowing for between-
242 measure comparisons, as well as within-measure comparisons.

243 *Statistical analysis:* The mean energy intake values of the test meal for each condition were
244 compared using a one-way, repeated measures ANOVA. To test for sensitivity to change in appetite,
245 appetite scores from the VIMEC and the VAS were both assessed using a 3 (condition: SB, LB, LB+S)
246 x 7 (time: -30, 0, 60, 120, 180, 240, 300) factorial, repeated-measures ANOVA. Significant main effects
247 and interactions from ANOVA were further assessed by pairwise comparisons using Bonferroni post-
248 hoc analysis. VIMEC appetite scores were also compared with VAS test scores, using Pearson product
249 moment correlation analysis, for all measures obtained within each condition, separately. This was also
250 conducted for between-condition, within-subject comparison, by assessing percentage difference
251 between the conditions (SB – LB+S, SB – LB and LB – LB+S). This approach allows for comparisons
252 of the ability to detect inter-subject changes in appetite.

253 To assess the ability of the VIMEC to predict between-subject differences in energy intake,
254 appetite scores obtained immediately prior to the test meal were compared with energy intake at the test
255 meal. To assess the ability of the VIMEC to predict within-subject differences in energy intake,
256 between-condition percentage difference (SB – LB+S, SB – LB and LB – LB+S) for energy intake,
257 VAS score and VIMEC score was calculated and these differences were compared using correlation
258 analysis. Differences in correlation coefficients were assessed using t-tests for non-independent
259 correlation coefficients.

260 Day-to-day measures were compared using a one-way, repeated measures ANOVA (pre-
261 breakfast measures, SB vs. LB vs. LB+S) and a paired samples t-test (post-breakfast measures, LB vs.
262 LB+S). Test-retest measures were compared using a paired samples t-test. The coefficient of variation
263 was calculated for all reproducibility measures, with these coefficient of variation values for the
264 VIMEC and VAS methods compared using paired samples t-tests. A statistical significance level of $p <$

265 0.05 was used throughout. All statistical analysis was carried out using the SPSS software programme
266 (SPSS inc. Chicago, Illinois, USA).

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288


289

290

291


292

293 (a)



294

295 (b)




296

297 **Figure 2.** The Visual Meal Creator. The menu screen (a) and an example meal (b). Portion size of each
298 item in the meal can be manipulated using the sliding bar scales.
299

300 **RESULTS**

301 *Energy intake at the test meal:* Mean energy intake values at the test meal, for each of the three
302 trial conditions are shown in **figure 3**. A significant condition effect was observed for mean energy
303 intake ($F(2,22) = 8.253, p = 0.002$). Pairwise comparisons demonstrated that the mean intake in the
304 LB+S (404 ± 255 kcal) was significantly lower than both mean LB intake (675 ± 313 kcal, $p = 0.003$)
305 and SB intake (786 ± 519 kcal, $p = 0.02$), which did not differ.

306



307 **Figure 3.** Mean energy intake values (\pm SEM) for the SB, LB and LB+S conditions.
308 * = significantly different to LB and SB.

310

311 *Subjective appetite scores*


312 *VAS:* Changes in appetite scores, obtained with the VAS measure, over the trial periods, for
313 each of the three trial conditions are shown in **figure 4a**. A factorial, repeated measures ANOVA
314 demonstrated a significant condition x time interaction effect ($F(12,132) = 21.039, p < 0.001$). Post-hoc
315 pairwise comparisons showed significant within- and between-subject differences, as illustrated in
316 **figure 4a**.

317 *VIMEC:* Changes in appetite scores, obtained with the VIMEC, over the trial periods, for each
318 of the three trial conditions are shown in **figure 4b**. A factorial, repeated measures ANOVA
319 demonstrated a significant condition x time interaction effect ($F(12,132) = 6.973, p < 0.001$). Pairwise

320 comparisons highlighted significant within- and between condition differences. These are shown in
 321 **figure 4b.**


322

323 (a)



324

325 (b)



326

327 **Figure 4.** Appetite profiles for the SB, LB and LB+S conditions for (a) VAS and (b) VIMEC methods.
 328 Values are means \pm SEM. SB (●), LB (◇) and LB+S (■) conditions. Solid line indicates SB, dashed
 329 line indicates LB, dotted line indicates LB+S. Hollow rectangle = breakfast meal. Vertical lined
 330 rectangles = snacks. Solid black rectangle = *ad libitum* lunch meal. a = within-condition effect,
 331 significantly different to t=0. b = between-condition effect, significantly different to SB. c = between-
 332 condition effect, significantly different to LB.

333

334

335 ***Correlation between subjective appetite scores obtained with VAS and VIMEC***

336 Between-subject, within-condition correlations for VAS scores and VIMEC scores were of
337 moderate-strength to strong and statistically significant in each condition (SB, $r = 0.656$, $p < 0.001$; LB,
338 $r = 0.813$, $p < 0.001$; LB+S, $r = 0.673$, $p < 0.001$).

339 Within-subject, between-condition correlations for percentage difference in VAS and VIMEC
340 scores were also statistically significant, demonstrating moderate-strength correlation
341 (SB – LB+S, $r = 0.570$; SB – LB, $r = 0.526$; LB – LB+S, $r = 0.503$, all $p < 0.001$).

342
343 ***Ability to predict between-subject differences in energy intake***

344 **VAS:** Correlation between VAS scores immediately prior to the lunch test meal and EI at the
345 test meal for each of the three trial conditions are shown in **table 1**. Pearson correlation coefficients
346 were significant for LB but not for SB or LB+S.

347 **VIMEC:** Correlation between VIMEC scores immediately prior to the lunch test meal and EI at
348 the test meal for each of the three trial conditions revealed significant correlation coefficients for all
349 conditions (**table 3.1**).

350 T-tests for non-independent correlation coefficients revealed that, for each condition, the
351 correlation coefficient for VIMEC vs. EI was significantly greater than for VAS vs. EI (all p values $<$
352 0.01).

353

	VAS vs. EI	VIMEC vs. EI
SB	0.548 ($p=0.065$)	0.951 ($p<0.001$) *
LB	0.632 ($p=0.027$)	0.914 ($p<0.001$) *
LB+S	0.401 ($p=0.196$)	0.875 ($p<0.001$) *

354
355 **Table 1.** Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for VAS scores vs. EI and VIMEC scores vs.
356 EI. * = significantly greater than VAS vs. EI, $p < 0.01$. ** = significantly greater than VAS vs. EI, $p <$
357 0.001 .
358

359

360

361

362 ***Ability to predict within-subject differences in energy intake***

363 **VAS:** Percentage differences between each of the three conditions, for both EI and VAS were
364 calculated. The correlation between percentage difference in EI and percentage difference in VAS
365 scores proved to be weak (**table 2**).

366 **VIMEC:** Correlation between percentage differences in EI and percentage differences in
367 VIMEC score immediately prior to the test meal across the three conditions proved strong (**table 2**).
368 The correlation coefficients for two of the three comparisons (SB – LB and LB – LB+S) were
369 statistically significant, exhibiting moderate-strength positive correlation ($r = 0.525$, $p = 0.04$) and very
370 strong positive correlation ($r = 0.940$, $p < 0.001$) respectively.

371 Comparisons of EI vs. VAS correlation with EI vs. VIMEC correlations showed that the
372 correlation between EI and VIMEC was significantly stronger for the SB – LB difference.

373
374

	SB - LB+S	SB - LB	LB - LB+S
EI vs. VAS	0.063 ($p = 0.423$)	-0.016 ($p = 0.480$)	0.011 ($p = 0.193$)
EI vs. VIMEC	0.273 ($p = 0.195$)	0.940 ($p < 0.001$)**	0.525 ($p = 0.04$)

375
376 **Table 2.** Product moment correlation coefficients for comparison of differences in EI with differences
377 in VAS score and differences in VIMEC score between the three trial conditions. * = EI vs. VIMEC
378 correlation significantly greater than EI vs. VAS correlation, $p < 0.05$, ** = EI vs. VIMEC correlation
379 significantly greater than EI vs. VAS correlation, $p < 0.01$
380

381 ***Reliability and reproducibility of subjective appetite measures***

382 **Day-to-day measures:** Comparisons of measures at $t=-30$ (baseline) showed that there were no
383 significant differences between measures for VAS. There was a significant condition effect for VIMEC
384 scores at baseline ($F(1) = 11.63$, $p = 0.006$), with post hoc analysis demonstrating that VIMEC scores
385 were lower in the LB+S condition (369 ± 214 kcal), compared with both the SB (500 ± 251 kcal, $p =$
386 0.017) and LB (531 ± 351 kcal, $p = 0.047$) conditions. There were no differences between measures
387 obtained at $t=0$ for the LB and LB+S conditions for either subjective appetite method. Between-
388 measure comparisons of the coefficient of variation (CV) for $t=-30$ measures (SB vs. LB vs. LB+S) and
389 CV for mean appetite scores for measures obtained at $t=-30$, $t=0$ and $t=60$ (LB vs. LB+S) were
390 conducted. The mean CV value for VAS measures at $t=-30$ was significantly lower than that for

391 VIMEC measures ($19.1 \pm 11.7\%$ vs. $32.2 \pm 15.4\%$, $p = 0.033$). There was no significant difference in
392 mean CV values for meaned VAS and VIMEC measures obtained at $t=-30$, $t=0$ and $t=60$ ($23.3 \pm 12.1\%$
393 for VAS and $25.6 \pm 21.4\%$ for VIMEC, $p = 0.754$).

394 ***Test-retest measures:*** Paired sample T-tests comparing the test-retest scores showed that retest
395 measures were similar to initial measures for both VAS and VIMEC methods. Mean CV values were
396 small and did not differ between the two methods ($6.0 \pm 6.1\%$ vs. $5.7 \pm 6.2\%$ for VAS and VIMEC
397 respectively).

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418 **DISCUSSION**

419 The aim of the current study was to assess the validity and reliability of the Visual Meal Creator
420 (VIMEC) as a method for measuring subjective appetite. The VIMEC demonstrated the ability to detect
421 expected changes in subjective appetite, as shown by the appetite profiles. By time point t=240,
422 immediately prior to the lunch test meal, the appetite scores were significantly different between each
423 trial condition. This was reflected by a significant trial condition effect for energy intake at the lunch
424 test meal, although it should be noted that intakes in the SB and LB conditions, while differing by 14%,
425 were not significantly different. The appetite profile for VIMEC measures was almost identical to the
426 profile obtained from using the VAS method – a valid, reliable and highly-used method for the measure
427 of subjective appetite. Between-subject, within-condition comparisons of VIMEC and VAS scores
428 demonstrated significant, moderate-strength to strong correlation. Further, between-condition
429 percentage difference for VIMEC and VAS scores demonstrated a moderate-strength relationship.
430 While proving validity for such measures is difficult, this comparison suggests that the VIMEC was
431 performing as intended: providing a quantitative measure of subjective appetite and detecting changes
432 in subjective appetite after dietary manipulation.

433 The VIMEC showed potential as a predictor of eating behaviour, of which the lunch test meal
434 energy intake acted as a proxy. Correlations between VIMEC scores immediately prior to the test meal
435 and the energy intake values were very strong for each of the three conditions and compared favourably
436 with those for VAS and energy intake, indicating that the VIMEC is a stronger predictor of between-
437 subject differences in energy intake. The correlation for within-subject, between-condition differences
438 in EI and differences in VIMEC scores immediately prior to the test meal was significant and of
439 moderate-strength to strong in two of the three comparisons. This relationship was stronger than that of
440 differences in VAS score and differences in EI for all three comparisons, proving significantly so in one
441 of these cases.

442 Within appetite research, when the effect of an intervention upon appetite is under
443 investigation, VAS is commonly used in conjunction with objective appetite measures, such as
444 circulating levels of appetite-associated hormones or a measure of eating behaviour, such as *ad libitum*
445 energy intake. In these instances, the correlation between VAS scores and these objective or

446 behavioural measures are rarely assessed, so direct evidence of VAS's strength as a predictor of eating
447 behaviour in such circumstances is not abundant. Nevertheless, it is generally considered that VAS
448 exhibits good predictive strength when more severe interventions are implemented (pharmacological),
449 but when more subtle interventions are in place, such as exercise, the reliability of VAS to predict
450 eating behaviour is poor [5, 16, 17]. The intervention in the current study was achieved by controlling
451 food intake at breakfast and for the following four hours until lunch in an attempt to manipulate
452 appetite. Under these circumstances, the VIMEC proved a strong predictor of eating behaviour. It
453 remains to be seen whether the VIMEC will prove a strong predictor of eating behaviour within
454 exercise intervention studies.

455 The correlation coefficients for between-subject, within-condition comparisons of VIMEC
456 score and EI in the present study were extremely high. It is possible that the study design contributed.
457 The food items selected at time point t=180 were the items that were presented at the buffet meal. This
458 measure was obtained 60 minutes prior to the lunch test meal, allowing sufficient time for food to be
459 prepared. At t=240, immediately prior to the meal, food item selection for the VIMEC was restricted to
460 those items selected at t=180. This ensured that the items selected here were those that the participant
461 would be presented with at the lunch test meal, allowing a strong comparison of the amount of each
462 item selected. It was possible that the number of food items selected (and hence made available at the
463 lunch test meal) could have constrained the subsequent energy intake. As a result, the magnitude of
464 correlation could have been artificially inflated, as food variety has been shown to influence energy
465 intake at a meal [11]. Therefore, partial correlations were calculated to remove the influence of the
466 number of food items on the energy intake of the test meal. These partial correlations differed
467 minimally from the original correlation coefficients (SB: 0.930 vs. 0.951; LB: 0.934 vs. 0.914; LB+S:
468 0.870 vs. 0.875). Hence, it would appear that the number of food items selected was not a strong
469 predictor of energy intake in this study and did not contribute to the very strong correlation observed
470 between VIMEC score and energy intake.

471 Stubbs (2000) highlighted the large between-subject variability in subjective appetite measures
472 when using VAS and recommended that the method was therefore more appropriate for within-subject
473 comparisons. Large between-subject variability is not uncommon with appetite measures, including *ad*

474 *libitum* test meal intakes [18] due to large biological variation in appetite, food preference and eating
475 behaviour. The between-subject variability of the VIMEC scores immediately prior to the lunch test
476 meal, was large (coefficient of variation (CV) values for 69%, 60% and 76% for SB, LB and LB+S
477 respectively), although not vastly larger than the variability in the energy intake measures (CV values of
478 66%, 46% and 60% for SB, LB and LB+S respectively). Therefore, as with a number of other
479 subjective appetite and eating behaviour measures, the VIMEC is likely to be best suited to within-
480 subject comparisons and repeated-measure study designs

481 The VAS has previously been shown to exhibit good test-retest reproducibility [3, 4], but
482 considerably poorer day-to-day reproducibility [3, 4, 6]. The results of the current study would suggest
483 that the VIMEC exhibits a similar degree of test-retest reproducibility, with CV values very comparable
484 to those observed with VAS. While the CV for day-to-day repeated measures at $t=-30$ was significantly
485 higher than VAS, suggesting poorer day-to-day reproducibility when using the VIMEC, the mean
486 VIMEC scores for measure $t=-30$, $t=0$ and $t=60$ for the LB and LB+S conditions were similar,
487 suggesting a similar degree of reproducibility. One would perhaps have expected a greater degree of
488 variation with the VIMEC, due to the option of choosing different food items of different energy
489 densities. This large degree of choice, allowing for the selection of vastly different meal creations
490 would lend itself to large variations in the measure. It should also be noted that, with any variation in
491 day-to-day measure, it is difficult to disentangle the contribution of biological and methodological
492 variation, especially when obtaining subjective measures, prone to variation [4].

493 There were, however, significant differences in baseline values for VIMEC, between the LB+S
494 condition and LB condition and between LB+S and SB. This questions the day-to-day reproducibility.
495 Inspection of the data would suggest that this was not driven by a single or small number of outliers.
496 Other than the previously mentioned large degree of choice and consequent increased likelihood of
497 variability, and the biological variation in appetite sensations from day-to-day, it is difficult to explain
498 this observation. Food intake during the 24 hours prior to each trial was controlled by asking
499 participants to record their dietary intake on the day prior to their first trial, then asking them to repeat
500 this intake on the day before subsequent trials. It is possible that this was not well adhered to and that
501 differences in dietary intake on the day prior to trials may have influenced baseline appetite measures.

502 When obtaining a subjective appetite measure using the VIMEC, there is an upper limit to the
503 portion size available. This maximum portion is dependent on the food item and, for the main meal
504 items, the number of food items selected. To alleviate this limitation, participants were informed that,
505 should they desire more than the upper limit, they could save the current measure, clear the screen and
506 complete a second measure for any additional food desired. While this option is not ideal, with the
507 participant unable to visualise their entire meal creation, it does allow for unlimited portion size
508 selection. In the present study, no participant chose to complete a second test for any measure. In
509 addition, the 252 measures obtained in total resulted in 564 different food item selections. Only 31
510 times (5.5%) were maximum portions selected (15 x salad). In addition, 26 of these 31 maximum
511 portion selections occurred during instances where the participant selected 4 or more food items in the
512 measure, when space on the plate for individual food item portions was limited. We are therefore
513 confident that the VIMEC does not substantially restrict the upper limit of a subjective appetite
514 measure.

515 While the use of photographic images of food is not a new concept within the area of appetite
516 research, the VIMEC is, to our knowledge, the first subjective appetite tool that allows the user to create
517 a whole meal. Similar tools have asked users to select a desired portion size of a range of individual
518 food items [19] or a mixture of individual items and ready-made meals [20], showing potential as useful
519 appetite measures. However, in neither of these studies did the technique demonstrate a relationship
520 between desired portion size and *ad libitum* food intake. The progressive step evident with the VIMEC,
521 allowing for the creation of a meal from an extensive menu of food items allows a stronger measure of
522 food choice and preference that is limited with the aforementioned format of other tools. It is also
523 possible that the more sophisticated nature of the VIMEC allows for a stronger prediction of feeding
524 behaviour, as is supported by the findings of the current study.

525

526

527

528

529

530 **CONCLUSION**

531 In conclusion, the Visual Meal Creator would appear to be a strong predictor of between- and
532 within- subject differences in energy intake. Test-retest reproducibility was good. Day-to-day
533 reproducibility was quite large, but this may be due to the large degree of food choice allowable with
534 the VIMEC. In comparison with the VAS technique, the VIMEC proved equally as proficient at
535 detecting expected changes in subjective appetite, while exhibiting a similar degree of reproducibility.
536 The VIMEC was shown to be a significantly stronger predictor of energy intake – a fundamental aspect
537 of eating behaviour. Therefore, the VIMEC may prove a preferable tool for the measurement of
538 subjective appetite, due to its strength as a predictor of eating behaviour.

539

540

541 **REFERENCES**

- 542 1. Blundell, J., De Graaf, C., Hulshof, T., Jebb, S., Livingstone, B., Luch, A., et al., *Appetite*
543 *control: methodological aspects of the evaluation of foods*. *Obesity Reviews*, 2010. **11**(3): p.
544 251-270.
545
- 546 2. Stubbs, R.J., Hughes, D.A., Johnstone, A.M., Rowley, E., Reid, C., Elia, M., et al., *The use of*
547 *visual analogue scales to assess motivation to eat in human subjects: a review of their*
548 *reliability and validity with an evaluation of new hand-held computerized systems for*
549 *temporal tracking of appetite ratings*. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 2000. **84**(4): p. 405-15.
550
- 551 3. Stratton, R.J., Stubbs, R.J., Hughes, D., King, N., Blundell, J.E., Elia, M. *Comparison of the*
552 *traditional paper visual analogue scale questionnaire with an Apple Newton electronic*
553 *appetite rating system (EARS) in free living subjects feeding ad libitum*. *European Journal of*
554 *Clinical Nutrition*, 1998. **52**(10): p. 737-41.
555
- 556 4. Flint, A., Raben, A., Blundell, J.E., and Astrup, A. *Reproducibility, power and validity of*
557 *visual analogue scales in assessment of appetite sensations in single test meal studies*.
558 *International journal of obesity and related metabolic disorders : Journal of the International*
559 *Association for the Study of Obesity*, 2000. **24**(1): p. 38-48.
560
- 561 5. Parker, B.A., Sturm, K., MacIntosh, C.G., Feinle, C., Horowitz., and Chapman, I.M. *Relation*
562 *between food intake and visual analogue scale ratings of appetite and other sensations in*
563 *healthy older and young subjects*. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 2004. **58**(2): p. 212-
564 218.
565
- 566 6. Raben, A., Tagliabue, A., and Astrup, A. *The reproducibility of subjective appetite scores*.
567 *The British Journal of Nutrition*, 1995. **73**(4): p. 517-30.
568
- 569 7. Arvaniti, K., Richard, D., and Tremblay, A. *Reproducibility of energy and macronutrient*
570 *intake and related substrate oxidation rates in a buffet-type meal*. *The British Journal of*
571 *Nutrition*, 2000. **83**(5): p. 489-95.
572
- 573 8. Gregersen, N.T., Flint, A., Bitz, C., Blundell, J.E., Raben, A., and Astrup, A. *Reproducibility*
574 *and power of ad libitum energy intake assessed by repeated single meals*. *The American*
575 *Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 2008. **87**(5): p. 1277-1281.
576
- 577 9. Wansink, B., Painter, J.E., and North, J. *Bottomless Bowls: Why Visual Cues of Portion Size*
578 *May Influence Intake*[ast][ast]. *Obesity*, 2005. **13**(1): p. 93-100.
579
- 580 10. Rolls, B.J., Morris, E.L., and Roe, L.S. *Portion size of food affects energy intake in normal-*
581 *weight and overweight men and women*. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 2002. **76**(6):
582 p. 1207-1213.
583
- 584 11. Hetherington, M.M., Foster, R., Newman, T., Anderson, A.S., and Norton, G. *Understanding*
585 *variety: Tasting different foods delays satiation*. *Physiology & Behavior*, 2006. **87**(2): p. 263-
586 271.
587
- 588 12. Yeomans, M.R., Lee, M.D., Gray, R.W., and French, S.J. *Effects of test-meal palatability on*
589 *compensatory eating following disguised fat and carbohydrate preloads*. *International Journal*
590 *of Obesity*, 2001. **25**(8): p. 1215-1224.
591
- 592 13. George, V.A. and Morganstein, A. *Effect of moderate intensity exercise on acute energy*
593 *intake in normal and overweight females*. *Appetite*, 2003. **40**(1): p. 43-46.

- 594
595 14. Hill, A.J. and Blundell, J.E. *Nutrients and behaviour: Research strategies for the*
596 *investigation of taste characteristics, food preferences, hunger sensations and eating patterns*
597 *in man*. Journal of Psychiatric Research, 1982. **17**(2): p. 203-212.
598
- 599 15. Reid, C.H., Blundell, J.E., and Stubbs, R.J. *What are psychometric assessments of appetite*
600 *asking: a preliminary multivariate analysis*. International Journal of Obesity, 1998.
601 **22**(Suppliment 3): p. 151.
602
- 603 16. Martins, C., Morgan, L.M., Bloom, S.R., and Robertson, M.D. *Effects of exercise on gut*
604 *peptides, energy intake and appetite*. Journal of Endocrinology, 2007. **193**(2): p. 251-258.
605
- 606 17. Thompson, D.A., Wolfe, L.A., and Eikelboom, R. *Acute effects of exercise intensity on*
607 *appetite in young men*. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 1988. **20**(3): p. 222-227.
608
- 609 18. Stubbs, R.J., Johnstone, A.M., O'Reilly, L.M., and Poppitt. *Methodological issues relating to*
610 *the measurement of food, energy and nutrient intake in human laboratory-based studies*.
611 Proceedings of the Nutrition Society, 1998. **57**(3): p. 357-72.
612
- 613 19. Sadoul, B.C., Schuring, E.A.H., Symersky, T., Mela, D.J., Masclee, A.A.M., and Peters,
614 H.P.F. *Measuring satiety with pictures compared to visual analogue scales. An exploratory*
615 *study*. Appetite, 2012. **58**(1): p. 414-417.
616
- 617 20. Farah, N.M.F., Brunstrom, J.M., and Gill, J.M.R. *Using a novel computer-based approach to*
618 *assess the acute effects of exercise on appetite-related measures*. Appetite, 2012. **58**(1): p.
619 196-204.