| 1 | Downsizing food: A systematic review and meta-analysis examining |
|----|--|
| 2 | the effect of reducing served food portion sizes on daily energy intake |
| 3 | and body weight |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | Eric Robinson ¹ , India McFarland-Lesser ¹ , Zina Patel ¹ , Andrew Jones ¹ |
| 9 | |
| 10 | ¹ Department of Psychology, Eleanor Rathbone Building, University of Liverpool |
| 11 | Liverpool, L69 7ZA, UK |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | Corresponding Author: Dr Eric Robinson, above address, email - eric.robinson@liv.ac.uk |
| 21 | Running Head: Portion size, daily energy intake and body weight |
| 22 | Registration. Registered on PROSPERO (CRD42020223973). |
| 23 | Data Sharing. Data described in the manuscript, code book, and analytic code is publicly |
| 24 | and freely available without restriction at <u>https://osf.io/dj4yf/</u> |

| - |
|------------|
| / h |
| |
| |
| |
| _ |

| 25 | Abstract |
|----|--|
| 26 | Background. Portion sizes of many foods have increased over time and reducing food |
| 27 | portion sizes has been proposed as a public health strategy to reduce obesity. However, the |
| 28 | extent to which reducing food portion sizes affects daily energy intake and body weight is |
| 29 | unclear. Objective. To systematically review and meta-analyse experimental studies that |
| 30 | have examined the effect that serving smaller vs. larger portion sizes has on total daily energy |
| 31 | intake. Design. We used systematic review methodology to search identify eligible articles |
| 32 | that used an experimental design to manipulate portion size served to human participants and |
| 33 | measured energy intake for a minimum of one day. Multi-level meta-analysis was used to |
| 34 | used to pool effects of portion size on daily energy intake. Results. Fourteen eligible studies |
| 35 | were included and 85 effects were included in the primary meta-analysis. There was a |
| 36 | moderate-to-large reduction in daily energy intake when comparing smaller vs. larger |
| 37 | portions (SMD =709 [95% CI:956 to461], p < .001, I2 = 80.6%) and evidence of a |
| 38 | dose dependent response. Larger reductions to portion size and reducing portion sizes of |
| 39 | multiple meals per day both resulted in larger decreases in daily energy intake. There was |
| 40 | also evidence of a curvilinear relationship between portion size and daily energy intake, |
| 41 | whereby reductions to daily energy intake were markedly smaller when reducing portion size |
| 42 | from very large portions. In a subset of studies that measured body weight (n=5), being |
| 43 | served smaller portions was associated with less weight gain than larger portions (SMD = |
| 44 | .536 ([95% CI: .268 to .803], $p < .001$, $I^2 = 47.0\%$). Conclusions. Smaller food portion sizes |
| 45 | substantially decrease daily energy intake and there is evidence that over time this results in |
| 46 | lower body weight. Reducing food portion sizes may be an effective population level strategy |
| 47 | to reduce obesity. |
| | |

48

49 Key Words: portion size; energy intake; obesity; food reformulation; weight loss

| 50 | Introduction |
|----|--|
| 51 | Large portion sizes of commercially available food products have been identified as a likely |
| 52 | contributor to the rise in overweight and obesity observed across most of the developed world |
| 53 | (1-3). In particular, there is evidence that food portion sizes have increased over time, with |
| 54 | the current food environment characterised by a wide availability of energy dense food |
| 55 | products sold in portion sizes that promote excessive energy intake (2, 4-6). There is also |
| 56 | now a consistent body of evidence indicating that manipulating the portion size of a meal |
| 57 | served affects acute energy intake during that meal in children and adults (7-9). A recent |
| 58 | meta-analysis of short-term studies estimated that doubling the served portion size at a meal |
| 59 | increases meal energy intake by 35%, on average (10). Based on these findings, public health |
| 60 | measures to reduce portion sizes of food and drink products have been proposed as a |
| 61 | potentially effective intervention to reduce obesity (11). |
| 62 | Yet, the long-term effects of reducing food portion sizes are less clear. Recent |
| 63 | findings indicate that smaller portion sizes may 'normalize' overtime and be accepted by |
| 64 | consumers (12-14). However, less research has examined whether consumers 'compensate' |
| 65 | for reduced portion sizes by eating more at later meals, or whether reductions in portion size |
| 66 | instead lead to a meaningful decrease in daily energy intake and in doing result in longer- |
| 67 | term reductions to body weight (5, 15). One study that examined compensatory eating found |
| 68 | decreasing the portion size of a main course served at lunch resulted in decreased energy |
| 69 | intake from the main course, but resulted in an increase in amount of energy consumed at |
| 70 | dessert (16). Lewis et al., examined the effect of reducing breakfast portion size relative to a |
| 71 | larger portion size but found no difference in total daily energy intake between portion size |
| 72 | conditions (17). Conversely, other studies have found that serving smaller relative to larger |
| 73 | served portion sizes resulted in lower daily energy intake over multiple days (18, 19). If |
| 74 | smaller portion sizes do decrease daily energy intake it is also unclear what the approximate |

| 75 | size of this relationship is likely to be (i.e. reducing portion size by 100kcals results in x kcals |
|----|--|
| 76 | reduction in daily energy intake). Research examining the impact that portion size |
| 77 | manipulations have on body weight have produced mixed findings to date, which may be due |
| 78 | to studies having relatively short follow-up durations or lacking sufficient statistical power to |
| 79 | detect relatively modest changes in body weight attributable to portion size manipulations |
| 80 | (20-22). Therefore, the aims of the present research were to systematically review and meta- |
| 81 | analyse the impact that experimentally manipulating portion size has on total daily energy |
| 82 | intake and changes in body weight. |
| 83 | |
| 84 | Method |
| 85 | Eligibility criteria and study selection. We included studies that used an experimental design |
| 86 | to directly manipulate the portion size of food served to participants and measured energy |
| 87 | intake across the course of at least one day. |
| 88 | |
| 89 | Participants. Studies of human participants were eligible. Studies that sampled participants |
| 90 | with a diagnosed medical/chronic health condition or currently undergoing treatment which |
| 91 | may influence appetite (e.g. diabetes, bariatric surgery patients) were not eligible. There were |
| 92 | no other exclusion criteria based on participant characteristics. |
| 93 | Intervention. Studies were required to have manipulated portion sizes (i.e. amount of food |
| 94 | served to participants, also known as 'serving size') provided to participants. Studies that |
| 95 | manipulated portion size of a single food/meal were eligible, as were studies that manipulated |
| 96 | all foods/meals served across the day. Studies that only reduced portion size of drink(s) were |
| 97 | not eligible, as our focus was on food. However, if a study manipulated food and drinks it |
| 98 | was deemed eligible. Studies were required to serve or provide all participants with the same |

5

99 food type and to have achieved different portion size conditions by only altering the

100 weight/volume of food served.

| 101 | Intervention (smaller portion sizes) vs. comparator (larger portion sizes) conditions. In |
|-----|---|
| 102 | studies with two portion size conditions the 'comparator' condition was the larger portion |
| 103 | size condition and the 'intervention' condition was the smaller portion size condition. Some |
| 104 | studies described their manipulation as examining effect of 'larger' portion sizes vs. |
| 105 | 'standard' portion sizes on energy intake, and so to ensure consistency with the above |
| 106 | conceptualisation, we treated the larger condition as the comparator condition. Studies with |
| 107 | multiple portion size conditions (e.g. 100% vs. 75% vs. 50%) were eligible and contributed |
| 108 | multiple effects to the present review (e.g. 100% vs. 75%, 75% vs. 50%, 100% vs. 50%). |
| 109 | Outcomes. Eligible studies were required to have measured energy intake across the course of |
| 110 | a minimum of one day. Studies that measured energy intake through objective researcher |
| 111 | measurement (e.g. weighing of food pre/post eating), participant self-reported (e.g. dietary |
| 112 | recall data), or a combination of the two were eligible. |
| 113 | Study Design. Studies that adopted a within-subjects/repeated measures design (i.e. |
| 114 | participants receive both smaller and larger portions) were eligible, as were between-subjects |
| 115 | designs (i.e. participants were randomized to receive either the smaller vs. larger portions). |
| 116 | Studies that measured energy intake in controlled laboratory and in real-world settings were |
| 117 | eligible. Studies that required participants to consume a meal or food in full (e.g. compulsory |
| 118 | consumption of a set amount of breakfast) were eligible. Studies that 'crossed' a portion size |
| 119 | manipulation with another study manipulation (e.g. manipulation of both portion size and |
| 120 | energy density of food served in the same study) were eligible, although only contrasts |
| 121 | between portion size conditions were included in analyses. For studies that did not |
| 122 | manipulate all meals/foods (e.g. only manipulating portion size of lunch), eligible studies |
| 123 | were required to measure and report energy intake at that meal(s) that energy portion size was |

6

manipulated, in order to quantify the effect of the portion size manipulation independent ofnon-manipulated foods/meals.

126

127 Article identification strategy. In September 2020, we searched PsycINFO, PubMed and 128 SCOPUS (from date of inception onwards) using combinations of search terms relating to 129 portion size and energy intake (see online supplementary materials for an example). To 130 identify further published literature, we used a snowballing approach by searching the 131 reference lists of eligible papers and by contacting authors to ask whether they had authored 132 any other potentially eligible studies. To identify grey literature, we conducted additional 133 searches of the OSF preprint archive (a database covers 30 other preprint archives, including 134 PsychArxiv and Nutrixiv). Two authors independently screened and judged eligibility of 135 articles identified through electronic searches. A single author identified potentially eligible 136 articles using the snowballing and grey literature approaches, and all potentially eligible 137 articles were verified by a second independent author. Discrepancies for eligibility were 138 resolved by discussion or were adjudicated by a third author.

139

140 Data extraction. Two authors extracted the following information and any extraction 141 discrepancies were resolved through discussion or a third author adjudicated; study sample 142 information (e.g. country of study, participant group sampled, summary information on 143 participant demographic characteristics, exclusion criteria for participant eligibility), portion 144 size manipulation information (e.g. foods/meals manipulated, number of kcals served in 145 portion size conditions, total number of kcals served per day in portion size conditions), study 146 design information (e.g. within-subjects vs. between-subjects design), measurement of 147 energy intake (self-reported vs. researcher measured), use ad-libitum intake vs. compulsory 148 intake (i.e. whether any meals were required to be eaten in full as part of the method), number

7

of days energy intake was measured for, energy intake information (e.g. energy intake from
portion size manipulated meals, non-manipulated meals and total daily energy intake, and
correlation between comparator vs. intervention energy intake), results of any participant
characteristic moderation analyses reported (e.g. does effect of portion size on energy intake
differ in normal weight vs. participant with obesity?), whether body weight was measured
before and after each comparator vs. intervention condition, and risk of bias indices (see
below).

156

157 *Risk of bias indicators*. Informed by guidelines for best practice when conducting 158 randomized control trials and experimental studies of eating behaviour (23-26), studies were 159 coded for nine risk of bias indicators. Studies that relied on self-reported energy intake (as 160 opposed to researcher measured), did not use key participant exclusion eligibility criteria (e.g. 161 use of medication affecting appetite, currently pregnant), were missing key methodological 162 details (e.g. no information provided about foods used), did not report use of random 163 allocation to conditions, required participants to consume some meals/food in full (e.g. 164 compulsory consumption of smaller vs. larger portion sizes), did not address demand 165 characteristics (e.g. no attempt to blind participants to study aims or check if participants 166 were aware of study aims), had a small sample size (N < 12 for within-subject studies and N < 12167 20 per condition for between-subjects studies), did not pre-register the study or failed to 168 report information on conflicts of interest statement (or reported a relevant conflict) were 169 considered higher in risk of bias. 170

Analyses. Pre-registered analyses and study data are available online: <u>https://osf.io/dj4yf/</u>.
Authors were contacted and asked to provide details if statistical information required for
analyses examining energy intake or body weight outcomes was missing. No within-

8

| 174 | subject/repeated measures studies reported the correlation between daily energy intake in the |
|-----|---|
| 175 | larger vs. smaller portion size conditions. As this information was required to calculate |
| 176 | measures of effect size in within subject designs, we contacted all study authors to request |
| 177 | this information and calculated the average ($r = 0.8$). As only a minority of authors provided |
| 178 | this information, in sensitivity analyses we examined if results of meta-analyses differed |
| 179 | based on the magnitude of the correlation (including $r = 0.4$ and $r = 0.6$). Any deviations from |
| 180 | planned analyses are reported in the online supplemental material. |
| 181 | |

182 *Primary analyses*

183 Effect of portion size condition on daily energy intake. In a primary model we examined the 184 effect of portion size condition (smaller vs. larger) on daily energy intake for all included 185 studies. Because individual studies contributed multiple portion size comparisons, we used 186 multi-level meta-analysis to account for the dependency of these effects (27). We defined 187 outliers as any effect sizes for which the upper bound of the 95% confidence interval was 188 lower than the lower bound of the pooled effect confidence interval (i.e., extremely small 189 effects) or for which the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval was higher than the 190 upper bound of the pooled effect confidence interval (extremely large effects), using 191 standardised effects. We identified influential cases as any effects with DFBETA values > 1192 (indicative of a > 1 change in the standard deviation of the estimated co-efficient after 193 removal) (28). We conducted Egger's test (29) and a trim and fill procedure (30) to examine 194 potential publication bias. See online supplementary materials for detailed information on 195 outlier, influential case and publication bias analyses. If we identified any outliers they were 196 removed in all subsequent analyses on daily energy intake. For all meta-analyses we 197 calculated the standardised mean difference as a measure of effect size and SMDs of 0.2, 0.5 198 and 0.8 are typically considered small, moderate, and large sized effects (31). To aid

9

interpretation, where appropriate we also meta-analysed and present mean difference inenergy intake (kcals) between portion size conditions.

201

202 Participant and study features: effects on daily energy intake. We conducted sub-group 203 analyses to examine if results differed between effects drawn from female vs. male samples 204 and between studies that manipulated portion size at a majority of meals during the day (>2 205 meals) vs. fewer meals (≤ 2 meals). We planned to examine other participant characteristics 206 (e.g. normal weight vs. overweight) in sub-group analyses but were unable to because too 207 few studies reported sufficient data. Studies were variable in the number of days that they 208 measured energy intake, and some studies reported effects on daily energy intake for each 209 day of the study duration (effect of portion size on energy intake for day 1, 2, 3 etc.), so meta-210 regression was used to examine whether the impact of portion size on daily energy intake 211 differed based on number of days energy intake was assessed for. One study examined 212 energy intake at a 6-month follow-up; as this was a much longer follow-up period compared 213 to the other studies, we excluded this data point from the meta-regression (although results 214 were consistent with its inclusion). We also used meta-regression to examine if the effect of 215 portion size on daily energy intake was related to the % magnitude of portion size reduction 216 (i.e. smaller portion being 50% reduced compared to the larger portion) and difference in kcal 217 served between the two portion size conditions.

218

Risk of bias indicators: effects on daily energy intake. We conducted sub-group analyses to examine if results from the primary analyses differed based on measurement of energy intake (researcher measured only vs. use of self-report), whether studies required participants to consume any meals in full (yes vs. no), use of random allocation to portion size conditions (yes vs. no) and whether demand characteristics were addressed in the study (yes vs. no).

10

224 Secondary analyses

| 225 | Compensation effects. A sub-set of studies did not manipulate portion size at every meal and |
|-----|---|
| 226 | reported energy intake during the manipulated and/or energy intake post-manipulated meal. |
| 227 | In a series of analyses limited to these studies we meta-analysed the effect of portion size on |
| 228 | daily energy intake, manipulated meal energy intake and post-manipulated meal energy |
| 229 | intake, to quantify the extent to which acute changes in energy intake caused by reducing |
| 230 | portion size (i.e. difference in energy intake between portion size conditions at manipulated |
| 231 | meals) were later compensated for. In 3 studies, the manipulated meal was 'fixed' (i.e. eaten |
| 232 | in full by all participants) resulting in a standard deviation of 0. In sensitivity analyses we |
| 233 | imputed the SDs for these fixed meal as the average SD (as a proportion of the mean) |
| 234 | calculated from the non-fixed meals (~29%). |
| 235 | |
| 236 | Curvilinear relationship. Previous research has suggested that there may be a curvilinear |
| 237 | relationship between increases in portion size and energy intake (10, 32), whereby the effect |
| 238 | that manipulating portion size has on energy intake is reduced at larger more extreme portion |
| 239 | sizes (e.g. medium vs. large) compared to smaller portion sizes (e.g. small vs. medium). A |
| 240 | sub-set of studies (n=5) included three portion size conditions (e.g. large, medium, small) |
| 241 | with similar sized increments in served portion size (e.g. 250 vs. 500 vs. 750kcals). We meta- |
| 242 | analysed these studies and examined whether the reduction from the largest portion size (e.g. |
| 243 | large vs. medium contrast) produced a similar effect on daily energy intake as the same sized |
| 244 | from reduction from the intermediate portion size (e.g. medium vs. small) using sub-group |
| 245 | analysis. |

246

Effect of portion size condition on body weight. For studies that also measured body weight
change, we conducted generic variance inverse meta-analysis with change in body weight

11

| 249 | (difference in change in body weight between the large and small portion size condition) as |
|-----|---|
| 250 | the outcome variable. If studies had more than two portion size conditions, because relatively |
| 251 | subtle changes in energy intake would be unlikely to have a detectable effect on body weight |
| 252 | over the short duration of studies included, to maximise statistical power a-priori we included |
| 253 | the smallest and largest portion size condition from each study in the meta-analysis. |
| 254 | |
| 255 | Results |
| 256 | Study characteristics. A total of 14 studies were included in the review, see Figure 1 for |
| 257 | study selection flowchart. Nine studies were from the US, 4 were from the UK, and 1 study |
| 258 | was from Singapore. The majority of studies sampled from university staff/students and the |
| 259 | local community (12/14). Nine studies sampled males and females, 4 sampled females only |
| 260 | and 1 sampled males only. Twelve studies were in adults and 2 were in children. Of the 13 |
| 261 | studies that reported mean BMI, for 9 studies mean BMI was within the normal BMI range |
| 262 | (18.5-24.9) and 4 studies had a mean BMI above this range (BMI≥25). Thirteen studies used |
| 263 | within-subjects designs (portion size manipulated within participants) and one used a |
| 264 | between-subjects design (portion size manipulated between participants). The total number of |
| 265 | participants in each study ranged from N=19 to N=172. Portion size was manipulated and |
| 266 | energy intake measured for 1 day in 6 studies, between 2-11 days in 6 studies, in one study |
| 267 | for 4 weeks and in another study for 6 months. Six studies manipulated portion size at a |
| 268 | single meal and the remaining 8 studies manipulated portion size at multiple meals. See Table |
| 269 | 1 for individual study information. |
| 270 | From the 14 studies, there were a total of 85 smaller vs. larger portion size daily |
| 271 | energy intake comparisons, 35 of which were from female only samples, 23 male only and 27 |
| 272 | were mixed sex. The size of portion size reduction examined (energy served in a larger |
| | |

portion condition vs. smaller portion condition) ranged from 20% to 74%, with a median of

12

| 274 | 33%. For the 65 portion size comparisons that the difference in kcals served between larger |
|-----|---|
| 275 | and smaller portion conditions was reported or calculatable, the range of difference was 140 |
| 276 | kcals (portion size of a single meal manipulated) to 1865 kcals (all meals manipulated), with |
| 277 | a median of 823 kcals. |

278

279 *Risk of bias*. Only a minority of studies measured daily energy intake from participant self-280 reports as opposed to objective researcher measured energy intake (5/14). In a limited 281 number of studies participants were required to consume one or more meals in full (4/14) and 282 few studies failed to address demand characteristics (4/14). Most studies reported no relevant 283 conflicts of interest (9/14) and most studies were not pre-registered (1/14). It was rare for 284 studies to not report on key methodological information (2/14) or fail to report or use random 285 allocation to conditions (5/14). No studies had small sample sizes and no studies failed to use 286 key participant eligibility criteria (e.g. currently taking appetite affecting medication). See 287 online supplementary material table S1 for individual study risk of bias information.

288

289 *Effect of portion size condition on daily energy intake.*

290 Eighty-five effects from fourteen studies were included in the primary meta-analysis. The

291 multi-level meta-analysis was a better fit of the data than a standard analysis (Loglikelihood

ratio = 58.75, p < .001). There was a moderate-to-large reduction in daily energy intake, for

smaller vs larger portions (SMD = -.709 [95% CI: -.956 to -.461], Z = 5.62, p < .001, $I^2 =$

294 80.6%). Sensitivity analysis did not substantially influence the effect magnitude (SMDs >

.624) or statistical significance of the models. Trim and fill imputed 25 effect sizes in a single

level model, which did not substantially influence the effect size (SMD = -.667), and Egger's

test was significant indicative of bias (z = -14.08, p < .001), see online supplementary

298 materials for funnel plot. When removing 13 outlying effect sizes in which the confidence

13

| 299 | intervals did not overlap with the pooled estimates (upper bound CIs < -1.03; SMDS ranged |
|-----|--|
| 300 | from -2.17 to -4.39), the effect size remained moderate-to-large with a small reduction in |
| 301 | heterogeneity (SMD =660 [95% CI:860 to459], $z = 6.43$, $p < .001$, $I^2 = 74.9\%$). For |
| 302 | meta-analysed mean difference in daily energy intake expressed as kcals, smaller portions |
| 303 | were associated with a reduction of -235.75 [-303.02 to -168.48] calories consumed per day |
| 304 | compared to larger portions (see Figure 2). Removal of the outlying effects did not |
| 305 | substantially reduce this (-221.86 [95% CI: -275.69 to168.02]). |
| 306 | |
| 307 | Participant and study features: effects on daily energy intake |
| 308 | Impact of portion size on energy intake over time. We meta-regressed the day of assessment |
| 309 | (range day: $1 - 28$, mean = 3.98, median = 2) against the effect of portion size on energy |
| 310 | intake and there was no significant association (coefficient =011 [95% CI:038 to .016], Z |
| 311 | = $0.81 \text{ p} = .415$), indicating that the influence portion size had on energy intake was not |
| 312 | dependent on how long studies measured daily energy intake for. |
| 313 | |
| 314 | The effect of manipulating most meals during the day vs. fewer meals. There was a significant |
| 315 | moderation effect ($X^2(1) = 10.24$, p = .001). For studies in which two or fewer meals were |
| 316 | served as smaller vs. larger portions (30 effect sizes across 7 studies) the effect size was |
| 317 | small-to-moderate (SMD =429 [95% CI:622 to228], $Z = 4.23$, $p < .001$) and the raw |
| | |

- change in kcals was -168.23 [-233.86 to -103.61]. For studies in which more than two meals
- 319 were served as smaller vs. larger portion sizes (42 effect sizes across 7 studies) there was a

320 moderate-to-large effect size (SMD = -.900 [95% CI: -1.132 to -.669], Z = 7.63, p < .001)

and the raw change in kcals was -268.53 [-335.62 to -201.44].

14

| 324 | Reduction of portion size (percentage). In meta-regression, the standardised effect size was |
|-----|--|
| 325 | negatively associated with the magnitude portion size reduction as a percentage (coefficient = |
| 326 | 016 [95% CI:022 to009], $Z = 4.62$, $p < .001$), whereby based on the included studies a |
| 327 | reduction of portion sizes served by 10% was associated with a 1.6% reduction in daily |
| 328 | energy intake. |
| 329 | |
| 330 | Reduction of portion size (raw kcals). In meta-regression, the magnitude of portion size |
| 331 | reduction expressed as a raw kcal difference between portion size conditions was negatively |
| 332 | associated with total daily energy intake, coefficient = -0.135 ([95% CI: -0.214 to -0.056], Z |
| 333 | = 3.56, p < .001), whereby a 100kcal total reduction in food portion size served was |
| 334 | associated with a 14kcal reduction in daily energy intake. See Figure 3. |
| 335 | |
| 336 | Risk of bias indicators: effects on daily energy intake. |
| 337 | Whether energy intake was objectively measured (by the researcher) vs. self-report methods |
| 338 | moderated the effect of portion size on daily energy intake ($X^2(1) = 4.97$, p = .026). The |
| 339 | effect of portion size on daily energy intake for studies using researcher measured energy |
| 340 | intake (60 effect sizes from 9 studies) was SMD =804 ([95% CI: -1.033 to -0.575], Z = |
| 341 | 6.87, p < .001), and for self-reported energy intake (12 effect sizes from 5 studies) was SMD |
| 342 | =374 ([95% CI:640 to108], $Z = 2.76$, $p = .00$). Whether or not studies reported use of |
| 343 | random allocation to portion size conditions did not significantly affect results ($X^2(1) = 0.02$, |
| 344 | $p = .884$). Whether or not a study addressed demand characteristics ($X^2(1) = 0.03$, $p = .867$) |
| 345 | or required participants to consume any meals in full vs. ad libitum ($X^2(1) = 0.71$, p = .845) |
| | |

347

348 Evidence for post-portion size manipulation compensatory effects.

15

| 349 | For 15 effect sizes across 7 studies that did not manipulate portion size for all meals, the |
|-----|--|
| 350 | impact of portion size on meal energy intake (at manipulated portion size meals) and later |
| 351 | energy intake (at non-manipulated meals) were measured and reported separately. During the |
| 352 | manipulated meal there was a large sized reduction for these 15 effects (SMD = -1.60 [95% |
| 353 | CI: -2.362 to -0.841], $Z = 4.13$, $p < .001$), and the raw kcal effect on manipulated meal energy |
| 354 | intake was -232.92 [95% CI: -357.64 to -108.21], Z = 3.66, p < .001). For non-manipulated |
| 355 | meals following the portion size manipulated meals there was a small-to-moderate sized |
| 356 | increase in kcals consumed after the meal in the smaller portion vs larger portion (SMD = |
| 357 | .369 [95% CI: .024 to .714], Z = 2.10, p = .036, $I^2 = 70.5\%$) and the raw kcal effect was 97.72 |
| 358 | ([95% CI 12.60 to 182.83]). Note, the standardised effect was slightly smaller in sensitivity |
| 359 | analyses (SMD = .226 [95% CI: .010 to .442], Z = 2.05, p = .040). This analysis of a limited |
| 360 | sub-set of studies suggests that changes to energy intake at meals caused by serving smaller |
| 361 | vs. larger portion sizes are in part compensated by individuals eating more later in the day; |
| 362 | approximately 42% of the reduction in energy intake observed at manipulated portion size |
| 363 | meals was 'compensated for' through additional energy intake at other meals. |
| | |

364

365 Curvilinear relationship.

366 Examining the difference in the portion size effect between large vs normal (intermediate) portions and small vs normal (intermediate) portions demonstrated a significant moderation 367 effect ($X^{2}(1) = 7.57$, p = .006). In large vs normal portion comparison (12 effect sizes across 368 369 the 5 studies) the effect of portion size on daily energy intake was small-to-moderate in 370 statistical size (SMD = -.389 [95% CI: -.554 to -.224], Z = 4.61, p < .001), with a raw daily 371 kcal difference of -132.12 [95% CI: -191.92 to -72.31]. In small vs normal size portion 372 comparisons, the effect was larger (SMD = -.578 [95% CI: -1.047 to -.109], Z = 2.43, p = 373 .016), with raw kcal difference of -198.15 [95% CI: -331.55 to -64.75]. See Figure 4.

| 374 | Therefore, the impact that manipulating portion size has on daily energy intake is dependent |
|-----|---|
| 375 | on the size of portion that is decreased; decreasing portion size from the largest portions had a |
| 376 | 33% smaller impact on daily energy intake than decreasing portion size of medium |
| 377 | (intermediate) portions. |
| 378 | |
| 379 | Effect of portion size condition on body weight. |
| 380 | Five studies examined change in body weight in smaller vs. larger portion size conditions. |
| 381 | The standardised effect of portion size on change in body weight was SMD = .536 ([95% CI: |
| 382 | .268 to .803], Z = 3.92, p < .001, I^2 = 47.0%). The raw difference in change in kilograms was |
| 383 | .579 [95% CI: .384 to .776], indicating that after allocation to being served smaller portions, |
| 384 | participants gained 0.6 kilograms less weight than when served larger portions. See Figure 5. |
| 385 | |
| 386 | Discussion |
| 387 | We systematically reviewed and meta-analysed studies that examined the effect of |
| 388 | experimentally manipulating food portion sizes on daily energy intake. Across fourteen |
| 389 | eligible studies, smaller food portions resulted in lower daily energy intake and this effect |
| 390 | was consistent across males and females. Studies varied in duration from one day to six |
| 391 | months and there was no evidence that the effect of portion size on energy intake differed |
| 392 | between studies that were shorter in duration or examined energy intake for longer. |
| 393 | Reductions to daily energy intake were larger in studies that manipulated the portion size of |
| 394 | foods at most meals as opposed to studies that only manipulated portion size at one or two |
| 395 | meals. Larger reductions to served food portion sizes (expressed as either a % decrease in |
| 396 | portion size from the largest portion or difference in kcals served) resulted in larger changes |
| 397 | to daily energy intake. There was some evidence of compensation (e.g. participants eating |
| 398 | more later in the day) when served smaller vs. larger portions, but this compensation was |

| 399 | only partial. Studies tended to be relatively low in risk of bias and there was minimal |
|-----|---|
| 400 | evidence that studies higher in risk of bias (e.g. did not report use of random allocation to |
| 401 | portion size conditions) produced different results to studies not exhibiting risk of bias. |
| 402 | However, studies that relied in part on participant self-reports of food consumed to calculate |
| 403 | energy intake reported smaller effects of portion size on daily energy intake than studies |
| 404 | relying on researcher measured energy intake. Given that participant self-reported energy |
| 405 | intake is prone to recall bias and inaccuracy (33), participant reporting biases may |
| 406 | underestimate the effect of portion size on energy intake in some studies. |
| 407 | Meta-analyses of the effect of portion size on energy intake have been limited |
| 408 | predominantly to studies measuring energy intake at a single acute meal, to date. In a meta- |
| 409 | analysis of studies sampling children, larger (vs. smaller) portion sizes were estimated to |
| 410 | have a moderate-sized statistical effect on energy intake (SMD = 0.47) (7). In a meta-analysis |
| 411 | consisting of adults and children (10), increasing portion size by 100% resulted in on average |
| 412 | a 35% increase in meal energy intake (or in reverse a 50% portion size reduction being |
| 413 | associated with a 19% decrease in meal energy intake). After accounting for potential |
| 414 | publication bias, the effect of decreasing portion size on daily energy intake in the present |
| 415 | meta-analysis was a statistically moderate sized effect and based on the results of analyses of |
| 416 | all included studies, a 50% reduction in portion sizes would be associated with an 8% |
| 417 | decrease in daily energy intake, or expressed as energy; a 100kcal total reduction in portion |
| 418 | sizes served would be estimated to result in approximately 14kcal decrease to daily energy |
| 419 | intake. However, consistent with short-term studies of the effect of portion size on acute |
| 420 | energy intake (10, 32), we found evidence from a small sub-set of studies (N=5) that the |
| 421 | effect of portion size on daily energy intake was curvilinear; reductions to daily energy intake |
| 422 | were markedly smaller (~33%) when reducing portion size from a large portions to a |
| 423 | 'normal'/intermediate portion, compared to reducing portion size from a 'normal'/ |

18

424 intermediate portion to a smaller portion. In other words, the extent to which daily energy 425 intake appears to 'compensate' for energy served is far greater when portion size is very 426 large. This is important because most studies included in the present review served 427 participants very large amounts of food in the 'large' portion size condition and these 428 portions are unlikely to be representative of portion sizes served in everyday life. For 429 example, results from a laboratory study (19) examining the effect of very large portions (i.e. 430 serving participants in excess of 6000kcals per day) found that a 2050kcal difference in 431 energy served per day between the larger and smaller portion conditions of the study resulted 432 only in a 419 difference in average daily energy intake (80% 'compensation' in energy 433 consumed compared to energy served). Conversely in a different laboratory study that 434 compared meals that were chosen to be perceived as being 'normal' in size (i.e. typical of 435 everyday portion sizes) vs. smaller portioned meals (18), a 408kcal difference in energy 436 served across the day resulted in far less 'compensation'; a 210kcal decrease in average daily 437 energy intake (only 49% compensation). Therefore, caution should be taken and curvilinear 438 relations accounted for when extrapolating the results of our main analyses to estimate how 439 much reducing portion sizes in everyday life would be expected to decrease daily energy 440 intake.

441 The present results provide convincing evidence that food portion size has a causal 442 impact on daily energy intake. We assume that portion size impacts on daily energy intake 443 because there appears to be a lack of tight short-term control of energy intake in humans (34) 444 and food intake behaviour is context dependent, whereby individuals can easily eat more or 445 less food dependent on the absence vs. presence of environmental cues or factors, such as 446 portion size. Consistent with other studies (16), we found evidence that there is some energy 447 intake compensation in response to manipulations of portion size (e.g. eating more/less after 448 having been served a smaller/larger portion size), but this compensation was only partial

19

449 (approximately 42%). Furthermore, analyses suggested that this compensation does not 450 become larger over time (i.e. increased compensation after several days of being served small 451 portions as opposed to one day). The compensation in response to smaller vs. larger portions 452 that occurs each day but does not become larger over time may be explained by the short-453 term physiological regulation of food intake being largely determined by emptiness of the gut 454 (34) (i.e. why smaller portions may promote some short-term increase in energy intake on the 455 same day) and that cognitive regulation of food intake is episodic memory specific and 456 therefore influenced only by recent eating episodes (35, 36) (i.e. during the same day). 457 Because portion sizes of some commercially provided foods are known to have 458 increased in recent times (2), the present findings suggest that this is likely to have 459 contributed to increases in population level energy intake and the prevalence of overweight 460 and obesity. There have been some questions raised over the lack of causal evidence on the 461 effect of portion size on body weight and therefore the public health benefit of reducing 462 portion sizes (5). We meta-analysed a small number of studies that measured participant body 463 weight and found that larger portions were associated with greater weight gain than smaller 464 portions. Collectively the present findings indicate that reductions to food portion sizes may 465 reduce population level prevalence of overweight and obesity. 466 We were limited to examining only gender as a moderating participant characteristic 467 of the effect of portion size on daily energy intake and found no evidence of moderation. 468 However, this sub-group analysis consisted of a small number of effects and therefore should 469 be interpreted with caution. We were unable to examine whether participant BMI moderated 470 the effect of portion size on daily energy intake, or the potential moderating effect of 471 individual differences in trait eating behaviours, such as satiety responsiveness (37). Studies 472 to date have not found convincing evidence for participant characteristics that consistently 473 moderate the effect of portion size on energy intake (38). However, it will be important for

20

474 future research to address this and examine if the impact that reducing portion size has on 475 daily energy intake is beneficial to the majority of the population or if there are individual 476 level factors determine responsiveness to portion size. A further limitation is due to the 477 studies available we were unable to examine whether properties or presentation of food 478 determine the effect of portion size on daily energy intake. There was suggestive evidence of 479 publication bias and some of the included studies scored high for markers of risk of bias. 480 Analyses accounting for publication bias still resulted in a significant (but slightly smaller) 481 effect of portion size on energy intake and results were consistent in analyses that accounted 482 for risk of bias. Effect sizes were largely from adult studies and therefore may not be 483 generalisable to children, although similar findings have been demonstrated in children. As 484 noted, the number of eligible studies was relatively small and therefore caution should be 485 taken in the interpretation of some of the reported sub-group analyses. Most studies were 486 short in duration and measured energy intake for 1-2 days, therefore further studies 487 examining the effect portion size on daily energy intake and body weight over longer time 488 periods would be valuable. A further limitation is that the majority of studies were laboratory 489 based and therefore may not be reflective of real-world eating due to social desirability 490 concerns (39, 40). A recent study found that the effect of portion size on short-term energy 491 intake was larger when tested in the real-world vs. laboratory (41), therefore we presume that 492 the reliance on laboratory based studies in the present meta-analysis would be more likely to 493 under rather than overestimate the effect of portion size on daily energy intake. 494 495 *Conclusions.* Smaller food portion sizes substantially decrease daily energy intake and there

496 is evidence that over time this results in lower body weight. Reducing food portion sizes may497 be an effective population level strategy to reduce obesity.

| 499 | Acknowledgements |
|-----|------------------|
| 455 | Acknowledgements |

- 500 **Funding:** No external funding.
- 501 Conflicts of Interest: All authors report no conflicts of interest. ER has previously received
- 502 funding from the American Beverage Association and Unilever for projects unrelated to the
- 503 present research.
- 504 Author Contributions: ER designed the research, conducted the research, had primary
- responsible for the final content and wrote the paper. AJ designed the research, conducted the
- research, analysed data and wrote the paper. IML and ZP conducted the research.
- 507
- 508 Figures Titles
- 509 Figure 1. Study selection flowchart
- 510 Figure 2. Meta-analysis of mean difference in daily energy intake between small and
- 511 large portion size conditions.
- 512 Figure 2 footnote: L, M and S refers to the large, medium and small portion size
- 513 conditions in a study
- 514 Figure 3. Association between difference in kcals served by portion size conditions (x
- 515 axis) and daily energy intake (y axis) raw change in kcals based on portion size
- 516 reduction in kcals
- 517 Fig. 4. Effect of portion size on daily energy intake in studies allowing for examination
- 518 of a curvilinear relationship
- 519 Figure 4 footnote: L, M and S refers to the large, medium and small portion size
- 520 conditions in a study
- 521 Figure 5. Effect of portion size condition on change in body weight
- 522
- 523

| 524 | References |
|--------------|---|
| 525 | 1. Livingstone MBE, Pourshahidi LK. Portion size and obesity. Advances in nutrition. |
| 526 | 2014;5(6):829-34. |
| 527 528 | 2. Young LR, Nestle M. The contribution of expanding portion sizes to the US obesity epidemic. American journal of public health. 2002;92(2):246-9. |
| 529 | 3. Ledikwe JH, Ello-Martin JA, Rolls BJ. Portion sizes and the obesity epidemic. The |
| 530 | Journal of nutrition. 2005;135(4):905-9. |
| 531 | 4. Robinson E, Jones A, Whitelock V, Mead BR, Haynes A. (Over) eating out at major |
| 532 | UK restaurant chains: observational study of energy content of main meals. bmj. 2018;363. |
| 533 534 | 5. Benton D. Portion size: what we know and what we need to know. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr 2015:55(7):988-1004 |
| 535 | 6 Muc M Jones A Roberts C Sheen F Havnes A Robinson E A bit or a lot on the |
| 536 | side? Observational study of the energy content of starters, sides and desserts in major UK |
| 53/ | restaurant chains. BMJ open. $2019;9(10):e029679$. |
| 538 | 7. Reale S, Hamilton J, Akparibo R, Hetherington M, Cecil J, Caton S. The effect of |
| 539 | food type on the portion size effect in children aged 2–12 years: A systematic review and |
| 540 | meta-analysis. Appetite. 2019;137:47-01. |
| 541 542 | 8. Sheen F, Hardman CA, Robinson E. Plate-clearing tendencies and portion size are |
| 54Z | Appendentity associated with main meal food intake in women: A laboratory study. |
| 545 F 4 4 | Appende. 2016,127.225-9. Delle DL Dee LS. Meanes IS. Well DE Increasing the portion size of a conducish |
| 544 E4E | 9. Kons DJ, Koe LS, Meengs JS, wan DE. Increasing the polyton size of a sandwich increases anarow intake. Journal of the American Distatic Association 2004:104(3):367-72 |
| 545 E16 | 10 Zlatavska N. Dubalaar C. Holdon SS. Sizing up the affact of portion size on |
| 540 547 | consumption: a meta-analytic review. Journal of Marketing. 2014;78(3):140-54 |
| 547 | 11 Marteau TM Hollands GL Shemilt L Jebb SA Downsizing: policy options to reduce |
| 540 549 | nortion sizes to help tackle obesity BML 2015:351 |
| 550 | 12. Robinson E. Henderson J. Keenan GS. Kersbergen I. When a portion becomes a |
| 551 | norm: Exposure to a smaller vs. larger portion of food affects later food intake. Food quality |
| 552 | and preference. 2019;75:113-7. |
| 553 | 13. Robinson E, Kersbergen I. Portion size and later food intake: evidence on the |
| 554 | "normalizing" effect of reducing food portion sizes. The American journal of clinical |
| 555 | nutrition. 2018;107(4):640-6. |
| 556 | 14. Raghoebar S, Haynes A, Robinson E, Van Kleef E, De Vet E. Served portion sizes |
| 557 | affect later food intake through social consumption norms. Nutrients. 2019;11(12):2845. |
| 558 | 15. Haynes A, Hardman CA, Makin AD, Halford JC, Jebb SA, Robinson E. Visual |
| 559 | perceptions of portion size normality and intended food consumption: A norm range model. |
| 560 | Food quality and preference. 2019;72:77. |
| 561 | 16. Haynes A, Hardman CA, Halford JC, Jebb SA, Robinson E. Portion size normality |
| 562 | and additional within-meal food intake: two crossover laboratory experiments. British Journal |
| 563 | of Nutrition. 2020;123(4):462-71. |
| 564 | 17. Lewis HB, Ahern AL, Solis Trapala I, Walker CG, Reimann F, Gribble FM, et al. |
| 565 | Effect of reducing portion size at a compulsory meal on later energy intake, gut hormones, |
| 566 | and appetite in overweight adults. Obesity. 2015;23(7):1362-70. |
| 567 | 18. Haynes A, Hardman CA, Halford JC, Jebb SA, Mead BR, Robinson E. Reductions to |
| 568 | main meal portion sizes reduce daily energy intake regardless of perceived normality of |
| 569 | portion size: a 5 day cross-over laboratory experiment. International Journal of Behavioral |
| 570 | Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2020;17(1):21. |
| 571 | 19. Rolls BJ, Roe LS, Meengs JS. The effect of large portion sizes on energy intake is |
| 572 | sustained for 11 days. Obesity. 2007;15(6):1535-43. |

573 20. French SA, Mitchell NR, Wolfson J, Harnack LJ, Jeffery RW, Gerlach AF, et al. 574 Portion size effects on weight gain in a free living setting. Obesity. 2014;22(6):1400-5. 575 21. Kelly MT, Wallace JM, Robson PJ, Rennie KL, Welch RW, Hannon-Fletcher MP, et 576 al. Increased portion size leads to a sustained increase in energy intake over 4 d in normal-577 weight and overweight men and women. British journal of nutrition. 2009;102(3):470-7. 578 Jeffery RW, Rydell S, Dunn CL, Harnack LJ, Levine AS, Pentel PR, et al. Effects of 579 portion size on chronic energy intake. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and 580 Physical Activity. 2007;4(1):27. 581 Blundell J, De Graaf C, Hulshof T, Jebb S, Livingstone B, Lluch A, et al. Appetite 23. 582 control: methodological aspects of the evaluation of foods. Obesity Reviews. 2010;11(3):251-70. 583 584 24. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The 585 Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. Bmj. 2011;343. 586 25. Robinson E, Bevelander K, Field M, Jones A. Methodological and reporting quality in 587 laboratory studies of human eating behavior. Appetite. 2018;125:486-91. 588 26. Kersbergen I, Whitelock V, Haynes A, Schroor M, Robinson E. Hypothesis 589 awareness as a demand characteristic in laboratory-based eating behaviour research: An 590 experimental study. Appetite. 2019;141:104318. 591 Pastor DA, Lazowski RA. On the Multilevel Nature of Meta-Analysis: A Tutorial, 27. 592 Comparison of Software Programs, and Discussion of Analytic Choices. Multivariate 593 Behavioral Research. 2018;53(1):74-89. 594 28. Viechtbauer W, Cheung MWL. Outlier and influence diagnostics for meta analysis. 595 Research synthesis methods. 2010;1(2):112-25. 596 Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a 29. 597 simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315(7109):629-34. Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel plot–based method of testing and 598 30. 599 adjusting for publication bias in meta analysis. Biometrics. 2000;56(2):455-63. 600 31. Alcohol Health Alliance UK (2020). Drinking in the dark: How alcohol labelling fails 601 consumers. https://ahauk.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/DRINKING-IN-THE-DARK.pdf. 602 32. Roe LS, Kling SMR, Rolls BJ. What is eaten when all of the foods at a meal are 603 served in large portions? Appetite. 2016;99:1-9. 604 33. Ravelli MN, Schoeller DA. Traditional Self-Reported Dietary Instruments Are Prone 605 to Inaccuracies and New Approaches Are Needed. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2020;7(90). 606 34. Rogers PJ, Brunstrom JM. Appetite and energy balancing. Physiol Behav. 2016;164(Pt B):465-71. 607 608 35. Higgs S, Robinson E, Lee M. Learning and memory processes and their role in eating: 609 implications for limiting food intake in overeaters. Current obesity reports. 2012;1(2):91-8. 610 36. Robinson E, Aveyard P, Daley A, Jolly K, Lewis A, Lycett D, et al. Eating 611 attentively: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of food intake memory and 612 awareness on eating. The American journal of clinical nutrition. 2013;97(4):728-42. 613 37. Zuraikat FM, Smethers AD, Rolls BJ. Potential moderators of the portion size effect. 614 Physiology & Behavior. 2019;204:191-8. 615 38. Robinson E, Haynes A. Individual differences and moderating participant 616 characteristics in the effect of reducing portion size on meal energy intake: Pooled analysis of 617 three randomized controlled trials. Appetite. 2021;159:105047. 618 39. Robinson E, Kersbergen I, Brunstrom JM, Field M. I'm watching you. Awareness that 619 food consumption is being monitored is a demand characteristic in eating-behaviour 620 experiments. Appetite. 2014;83:19-25.

| 621 | 40. Robinson E, Proctor M, Oldham M, Masic U. The effect of heightened awareness of |
|-----|--|
| 622 | observation on consumption of a multi-item laboratory test meal in females. Physiology & |
| 623 | behavior. 2016;163:129-35. |
| 624 | 41. Gough T, Haynes A, Clarke K, Hansell A, Kaimkhani M, Price B, et al. Out of the lab |
| 625 | and into the wild: The influence of portion size on food intake in laboratory vs. real-world |
| 626 | settings. Appetite. 2021;162:105160. |
| 627 | 42. Blatt AD, Williams RA, Roe LS, Rolls BJ. Effects of Energy Content and Energy |
| 628 | Density of Pre-Portioned Entrées on Energy Intake. Obesity. 2012;20(10):2010-8. |
| 629 | 43. Fisher JO, Arreola A, Birch LL, Rolls BJ. Portion size effects on daily energy intake |
| 630 | in low-income Hispanic and African American children and their mothers. Am J Clin Nutr. |
| 631 | 2007;86(6):1709-16. |
| 632 | 44. Gray RW, French SJ, Robinson TM, Yeomans MR. Dissociation of the effects of |
| 633 | preload volume and energy content on subjective appetite and food intake. Physiology & |
| 634 | Behavior. 2002;76(1):57-64. |
| 635 | 45. Kral TV, Roe L, Rolls BJ. Combined effects of energy density and portion size on |
| 636 | energy intake in women. Am J Clin Nutr. 2004. |
| 637 | 46. McCrickerd K, Lim CM, Leong C, Chia-Ming E, Forde C. Texture-Based Differences |
| 638 | in Eating Rate Reduce the Impact of Increased Energy Density and Large Portions on Meal |
| 639 | Size in Adults. journal of nutrition Ingestive Behavior and Neurosciences. 2017. |
| 640 | 47. Rolls BJ, Roe LS, Meengs JS. Larger portion sizes lead to a sustained increase in |
| 641 | energy intake over 2 days. J Am Diet Assoc. 2006;106(4):543-9. |
| 642 | 48. Rolls BJ, Roe LS, Meengs JS. Reductions in portion size and energy density of foods |
| 643 | are additive and lead to sustained decreases in energy intake. Am J Clin Nutr. 2006;83(1):11- |
| 644 | 7. |
| 645 | 49. Smethers AD, Roe LS, Sanchez CE, Zuraikat FM, Keller KL, Kling SMR, et al. |
| 646 | Portion size has sustained effects over 5 days in preschool children: a randomized trial. Am J |
| 647 | Clin Nata 2010/100/5/12/172 |

647 Clin Nutr. 2019;109(5):1361-72.

653 Table 1. Summary information on included studies

654

| Study | Country and sample | Sample characteristics | Study design information | Number of participants in analysis | Foods served | Portion size manipulation | Body weight measurement pre- post comparator and intervention conditions |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Blatt 2012 (42) | USA Local community & university | Men (N=28) Age: M = 26.8 years BMI: M = 24.9 Women (N=40) Age: M = 27.6 years BMI: M = 23.3 | Within- subjects Researcher measured EI EI measured for 1 day | N = 68 28M, 40F | PS of main entrée of all meals (breakfast, lunch dinner) manipulated Sides and beverages not manipulated and consumed ad libitum Compulsory eating of manipulated entrees | MenSmaller PS condition1000 kcals served per day for manipulatedmeals5337 kcals served per daykcals eaten per day: M =2455, SE = 97Larger PS condition1570 kcals served per day for manipulatedmeals5904 kcals served per daykcals eaten per day: M = 2751, SE = 92WomenSmaller PS condition700 kcals served per day for manipulated meals4146 kcals served per daykcals eaten per day: M = 1805, SE = 57Larger PS condition1100 kcals served per day for manipulatedmeals4549 kcals served per daykcals eaten per day: M = 1988, SE = 58 | All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission. |
| Fisher, 2007 (43) | USA | Children Age: | Within- subjects | N = 116 | PS of main entrée of all meals | Children Smaller PS condition | Not measured |

| | Local | M = 5 years | | | (breakfast, lunch | 2727 kcals served per day | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|---|--|
| | community | | Researcher | | dinner) | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1500$, $SD = 359$ | |
| | (Low-income | BMI: | measured EI | | manipulated and | | |
| | family | M = 60 percentile | | | afternoon snack | Larger PS condition | |
| | children) | | EI measured | | | 4006 kcals served per day | |
| | | Gender: | for 1 day | | Sides and | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1639$, $SD = 378$ | |
| | | 24M, 35F | | | beverages not | | |
| | | | | | manipulated | Mothers | |
| | | Mothers (N=58) | | | 1 | Smaller PS condition | |
| | | Age: | | | No compulsory | 4109 kcals served per day | ⊳ |
| | | M = 30 years | | | eating, all foods | kcals eaten per day: M = 2819 , SD = 502 | ll rig |
| | | J | | | consumed ad | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I | ghts |
| | | BMI: | | | libitum | Larger PS condition | Ē |
| | | M = 34 | | | | 5974 kcals served per day | sen |
| | | | | | | kcals eaten per day: $M = 2965$, $SD = 616$ | /ed |
| | | | | | | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I | Z |
| French, 2014 | USA | Age: | Between- | N = 172 | PS of lunch | Small Lunch Box (~400kcal): | Small lunch box of |
| (20) | | M = 42.6 years | subjects | | manipulated | 413 kcals served per manipulated meal (lunch) | M kg = -0.1, |
| | Large | 5 | 5 | | 1 | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1718$, $SE = 70$ | SE = 0.43 a |
| | metropolitan | BMI: | Self-report | | All other meals | | 0We |
| | medical | M = 29.8 | measured EI | | and snacks not | Medium Lunch Box (~800kcal): | Medium lunch |
| | complex | | | | manipulated (free- | 821 kcals served per manipulated meal (lunch) | box |
| | employees | Gender: | EI measured | | living) | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1792$, $SE = 68$ | $\overline{M kg} = -0.1$. |
| | r r y r y | 60M. 112F | 3 times per | | No compulsory | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I | SE = 0.42 |
| | | | week at | | eating | Large Lunch Box (~1600kcal): | mis mis |
| | | | months 1.3 | | 6 | 1604 kcals served per manipulated meal (lunch) | Larger lunch box $\underline{\underline{\circ}}$ |
| | | | and 6 | | | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1996$, $SE = 71$ | M kg = 1.1. |
| | | | | | | | SE = 0.44 |
| Grav. 2002 | UK | Age: | Within- | N = 20 | PS of soup | Smaller PS condition | Not measured |
| (44) | | M = 24.3 years | subjects | | preload prior to | 100 kcals served per manipulated meal (soup) | |
| | Students and | | sucjeeus | | lunch manipulated | kcals eaten per day: $M = 2756.00$, $SE = 158.9$ | |
| | staff at a | BMI∙ | Researcher | | runen manpalatea | | |
| | University | M = 22.6 | and self- | | Ad libitum | Larger PS condition | |
| | | | report | | consumption of | 301 kcals served per manipulated meal (soup) | |
| | | Gender: 20M | measured FI | | nasta test meal | kcals eaten per dav: $M = 2798.40$ SE = 155 | |
| l | | Genuer. 20101 | measureu EI | 1 | Pasta test mean | 100 - 100 | |

| | r | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------|--|---|--|
| | | | EI measured for 1 day | | (lunch). All other meals and snacks not manipulated (free-living) | | |
| | | | | | Compulsory | | , the second sec |
| | | | | | preload | | |
| Haynes, 2020 | UK | Age: | Within- | N = 30 | PS of lunch and | Smaller than normal PS condition: | Smaller than |
| (18) | | M = 31.6 years | subjects | | dinner entrée | 678 kcals served per day for manipulated meals | <u>normal PS</u> ≥ |
| | Local | | | | manipulated | (lunch and dinner entrees) | condition |
| | community | BMI: | Researcher | | | 5074 kcals served per day | $M kg = -0.03$, \vec{s} |
| | and | M = 26.0 | measured EI | | Ad-libitum eating | kcals eaten per day: $M = 2238$, $SD = 490$ | SD = 1.55 g |
| | university | 37 % normal weight | EI management | | of all other | Small normal DC condition. | |
| | | obesity | for 5 days | | means/sides/snacks | <u>Sman-normal PS condition:</u> 1086 keels served per day for manipulated | small-normal PSP |
| | | obesity | 101 5 days | | No compulsory | meals (lunch and dinner entrees) | $\frac{\text{condition}}{M \text{ kg} - 0.03} = \overline{0}$ |
| | | Gender: | | | eating | 5485 kcals served per day | SD = 1.34 |
| | | 15M, 15F | | | 8 | kcals eaten per day: $M = 2448$, $SD = 584$ | allo |
| | | | | | | | Large-normal PS |
| | | | | | | Large-normal PS condition: | condition <u>s</u> |
| | | | | | | 1494 kcals served per day for manipulated | M kg = 0.33, |
| | | | | | | meals (lunch and dinner entrees) | SD = 0.74 |
| | | | | | | 5897 kcals served per day | ermi |
| | | | | | | Kcals eaten per day: $M = 2543$, $SD = 592$ | SSIO |
| Jeffery, 2007 | USA | Age: | Within- | N = 19 | PS of lunch | Smaller PS condition | Smaller PS |
| (22) | | M = 33.0 years | subjects | | manipulated | 767 kcals served per meal | condition a |
| | Local | | | | | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1875$, $SD = missing$ | M kg = 0.06 , |
| | community | BMI: | Self-report | | Ad-libitum eating | | SD = 1.03 |
| | and | M =28.9 | measured EI | | of lunch. All other | Larger PS condition | Lawara |
| | university | Condor | EI moogurad | | meals and snacks | 1528 Kcals served per meal keels extended $M = 2152$ SD = missing | Larger PS |
| | | 19F | 2 times per | | (free-living) | Kears earen per day: $M = 2155$, $SD = MISSINg$ | $\frac{\text{condition}}{M \log - 0.64}$ |
| | | 1/1 | week for 4 | | (ince-inving) | | SD = 1.16 |
| | 1 | | | L | | | <u> </u> |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.22.21263961; this version posted September 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

| | | | weeks | | No compulsory | | |
|-------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | eating | | |
| Kelly, 2009 | UK | Men (N=21) | Within- | N = 43 | PS of all meals, | Men | MEN: |
| (21) | | Age: | subjects | | snacks and drinks | Smaller PS condition | Smaller PS |
| | Local | M = 29.7 years | | | manipulated | kcals served per day/meal - not reported | condition |
| | community | | Researcher | | | kcals eaten per day: $M = 3490$, $SE = 220$ | M kg = 0.1, |
| | and | BMI: | measured EI | | | | SD = missing |
| | university | M = 25.3 | | | Ad-libitum eating | Larger PS condition | (imputed as 1.2) |
| | | 43% normal weight | EI measured | | of all food and | kcals served per day/meal - not reported | |
| | | 57% | for 4 days | | drink | kcals eaten per day: $M = 4056$, $SE = 239$ | Larger PS ≥ |
| | | overweight/obesity | 5 | | | 1 2 7 | condition = |
| | | | | | No compulsory | Women | $\overline{M \text{ kg}} = 0.9$, \overline{a} |
| | | Women (N=22) | | | eating | Smaller PS condition | $SD = missing \overline{g}$ |
| | | Age: | | | 8 | kcals served per day/meal - not reported | (imputed as 1.2) |
| | | M = 31.7 years | | | | kcals eaten per day: $M = 2721$, $SE = 137$ | (ed |
| | | | | | | | WOMEN: Z |
| | | BMI | | | | Larger PS condition | Smaller PS 7 |
| | | M = 23.7 | | | | kcals served per day/meal - not reported | condition 6 |
| | | 68% normal weight | | | | kcals eaten per day: $M = 2995$ SE = 137 | $\frac{V + M + K = 0}{M + K = 0} 2$ |
| | | 32% | | | | | SD = missing |
| | | overweight/obesity | | | | | $(imputed as 1.2) \leq 3$ |
| | | over weight obesity | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Larger PS |
| | | | | | | | condition 0 |
| | | | | | | | $\frac{\text{condition}}{M k a = 0.6}$ |
| | | | | | | | $M Kg = 0.0, \qquad SD = missing \qquad \overline{O}$ |
| | | | | | | | SD = IIIIssing = 5 |
| K1 2004 | | A = = : | W 7:41.1 | NL 20 | DC of outploot | 500 | (Iniputed as 1.2) |
| Krai, 2004 | USA | Age: | within- | N = 39 | PS of entree at | <u>500g condition:</u> | Not measured |
| (43) | T 1 | M = 23.4 years | subjects | | funch manipulated | 750 kcals served per manipulated meal (lunch | |
| | Local | DM | D 1 | | A 11 C 1 1 | entree) | |
| | community | BMI: | Researcher | | All foods and | Kcals eaten per day: $M = 1/45$, $SE = 5/$ | |
| | and | M = 23.1 | measured EI | | beverages were | 700 | |
| | university | | | | consumed ad | /UUg condition: | |
| | | Gender: | El measured | | libitum except for | 1050 kcals served per manipulated meal (lunch | |
| | | 39F | tor I day | | compulsory tood | entrée) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.22.21263961; this version posted September 26, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

| | | | | | items with lunch | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1782$, SE=51 | |
|------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|---------------|
| | | | | | Compulsory eating of side dishes at lunch | <u>900g condition:</u> 1350 kcals served per manipulated meal (lunch entrée) kcals eaten per day: $M = 1855$, $SE = 54$ | |
| Lewis, 2015 (17) | UK Local community & university | Age: M = 42.5 years BMI: | Within- subjects Researcher | N = 33 | PS of breakfast meal manipulated Ad-libitum eating | $\frac{40\% \text{ reduction condition:}}{420 \text{ kcals served per manipulated meal}}$ (breakfast) kcals eaten per day: M = 2190, SE = 104 | Not measured |
| | | M = 29.0 Adults with overweight and obesity only | and participant measured EI | | of lunch and afternoon snack. All other meals | 20% reduction condition: 559 kcals served per manipulated meal (breakfast) | rights reserv |
| | | Gender: 15M/18F | EI measured for 1 day | | and snacks not manipulated (free- living) | <pre>kcals eaten per day: M = 2365, SEM= 117 <u>'Control' no reduction condition:</u> 600 kools served per menipulated meal</pre> | /ed. No reus |
| | | | | | Compulsory eating of breakfast | (breakfast) kcals eaten per day: $M = 2459$, $SE = 94$ | |
| McCrickerd, 2017 (46) | Singapore Local community | Age: $M = 25.4$ years | Within- subjects | N = 51 | PS of breakfast meal manipulated | <u>Smaller PS condition</u> 399 kcals served per manipulated meal (breakfast) | Not measured |
| | & university | BMI: M = 21.1 | Researcher and self- | | Ad-libitum eating of all meals | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1668$ kcals, $SD = 521$ | |
| | | Gender: 53F | measured EI | | All other meals and snacks not manipulated (free- | 599 kcals served per manipulated meal (breakfast) kcals eaten per day: $M = 1689$ kcals SD = 489 | 2 |
| | | | for 1 day | | living) | $\frac{1000}{100}$ | |
| | | | | | No compulsory eating of meals | | |
| Rolls 2006a 'Larger' (47) | USA | Men (N=16) Age: | Within- subjects | N = 32 (16M, 16F) | PS of for all meals and snacks | Men kcals served per day - not reported / calculatable | Not measured |

| | Local community & university | M = 24.4 years BMI: M = 24.7 Women (N=16) Age: M = 21.2 years BMI: M = 22.2 | Researcher measured EI EI measured for 2 days | | manipulated Ad-libitum eating of all meals and beverages Beverages were not manipulated No compulsory eating of meals | kcals eaten per day: <u>100% condition</u> : M = 2964 kcal, SE = 133 <u>150% condition</u> : M = 3461kcal, SE = 137 <u>200% condition</u> : M =3774kcal, SE = 198 <u>Women</u> kcals served per day - not reported / calculatable kcals eaten per day: <u>100% condition</u> : M = 2188kcal, SE = 99 <u>150% condition</u> : M = 2523kcal, SE = 99 <u>200% condition</u> : M = 2717kcal, SE = 131 | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|--------|--|--|--------------|
| Rolls 2006b 'Reductions' (48) | USA Local community & university | Age: M = 21.9 years BMI: M = 22.6 Gender: 24F | Within- subjects Researcher measured EI EI measured for 2 days | N = 24 | PS of all food manipulated Ad-libitum eating of all meals and beverages Beverages were not manipulated No compulsory eating of meals | Smaller PS condition 2846kcals served per day kcals eaten per day: M =1951, SE = 65 <u>Larger PS condition</u> 3794kcals served per day kcals eaten per day: M = 2207, SE = 67 | Not measured |
| Rolls, 2007 (19) | USA Local community and university | Men (N=13): Age: M = 24.7 years BMI: M = 24.6 Women (N=10) Age: M = 25.8 years | Within- subjects Researcher measured EI EI measured for 11 days | N = 23 | PS of all meals (breakfast, lunch, dinner) and snacks manipulated Ad libitum consumption of all meals (breakfast, lunch, dinner) and snacks) | MEN: <u>Smaller PS condition</u> 4100 kcals served per day kcals eaten per day: $M = 2909$, $SE = 106$ <u>Larger PS condition</u> 6150 kcals served per day kcals eaten per day: $M = 3328$, $SE = 114$ WOMEN: | Not measured |

| | | BMI: M = 22.9 | | | No compulsory eating | <u>Smaller PS condition</u> 3400 kcals served per day kcals eaten per day: M = 2073, SE = 97 | |
|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | Larger PS condition 5100 kcals served per day kcals eaten per day: M = 2530, SE = 79 | |
| Smethers, | USA | Age: | Within- | N = 46 | PS of all food and | Smaller PS condition | Not measured |
| 2019 (49) | | M = 4.4 years | subjects | | beverages | 1627 kcals served per day | |
| | Children | | | | manipulated | kcals eaten per day: $M = 914$, $SE = 44$ | 2 |
| | from | BMI: | Researcher | | | | |
| | childcare | BMI-for-age percentile | measured EI | | Ad-libitum eating | Larger PS condition | |
| | centers | = 52.8 | | | of all meals and | 2450 kcals served per day | |
| | | 89% normal weight 11% overweight/ | EI measured for 5 days | | beverages | kcals eaten per day: $M = 1081$, $SE = 44$ | |
| | | obesity | | | No compulsory | | |
| | | - | | | eating of meals | | |
| | | Gender: | | | | | la l |
| | | 30M, 16F | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Č |

BMI = Body mass index, EI = energy intake, SE = standard error





Kcal difference(raw)



Portion size reduction Kcal

Rolls 2006 "L", female, L vs M (Day2) Rolls 2006 "L", female, L vs M (Day1) Rolls 2006 "L", male, L vs M (Day2) Rolls 2006 "L", male, L vs M (Day1) Lewis 2015, L vs M (Day1) Kral 2004, L vs M (Day1) Haynes 2020, L vs M (Day5) Haynes 2020, L vs M (Day4) Haynes 2020, L vs M (Day3) Haynes 2020, L vs M (Day2) Haynes 2020, L vs M (Day1) French 2014, L vs M (Day6months)

Large vs Normal

Rolls 2006 "L", female M vs S (Day1) Rolls 2006 "L", male M vs S (Day2) Rolls 2006 "L", male M vs S (Day1) Lewis 2015, M vs S (Day1) Kral 2004, M vs S (Day1) Haynes 2020, M vs S (Day5) Haynes 2020, M vs S (Day4) Haynes 2020, M vs S (Day3) Haynes 2020, M vs S (Day2) Haynes 2020, M vs S (Day1) French 2014, M vs S (Day6months)



Kcal difference

