# Article

# Efficacy and Safety of Habitual Consumption of a Food Supplement Containing Miraculin in Malnourished Cancer Patients: the CLINMIR Pilot Study

Bricia López-Plaza<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ana Isabel Álvarez-Mercado<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Lucía Arcos-Castellanos<sup>1</sup>, Julio Plaza-Diaz<sup>4,6,7</sup>, Francisco Javier Ruiz-Ojeda<sup>4,5,6,8</sup>, Marco Brandimonte-Hernández<sup>5,6</sup>, Jaime Feliú-Batlle<sup>9,10,11</sup>, Thomas Hummel<sup>12</sup>, Ángel Gil<sup>4,5,6,8,†</sup> and Samara Palma Milla<sup>1,11,13,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Food, Nutrition and Health Platform, Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research (IdiPAZ), 28046 Madrid, Spain; <u>bricia.plaza@idipaz.es</u>; <u>lucia.arcos.castellanos@idipaz.es</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30 31

32

33 34 35

- <sup>2</sup> Medicine Department, Faculty of Medicine, Complutense University of Madrid, Plaza de Ramón y Cajal, s/n, 28040 Madrid, Spain
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Pharmacology, University of Granada, 18071 Granada, Spain; <u>alvarezmercado@ugr.es</u>
- <sup>4</sup> Instituto de Investigación Biosanitaria ibs.GRANADA, Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Granada, 18014 Granada, Spain
- <sup>5</sup> Institute of Nutrition and Food Technology "José Mataix", Centre of Biomedical Research, University of Granada, Avda. del Conocimiento s/n, Armilla, 18016 Granada, Spain
- <sup>6</sup> Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology II, University of Granada, 18071 Granada, Spain; <u>jrplaza@ugr.es</u>; <u>agil@ugr.es</u>
- <sup>7</sup> Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute, Ottawa, ON K1H 8L1, Canada
- CIBEROBN (CIBER Physiopathology of Obesity and Nutrition), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, 28029 Madrid, Spain
- <sup>9</sup> Oncology Department, Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research IdiPAZ, Hospital Universitario La Paz, 28029 Madrid, Spain; jaime.feliu@salud.madrid.org
- <sup>10</sup> CIBERONC (CIBER Cancer), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, 28029 Madrid, Spain
- <sup>11</sup> Medicine Department, Faculty of Medicine, Autonomous University of Madrid, Arzobispo Morcillo 4, 28029 Madrid, Spain
- <sup>12</sup> Smell & Taste Clinic, Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Technische Universität Dresden, Fetscherstraße 74, 01307 Dresden, Germany; <u>thomas.hummel@tu-dresden.de</u>
- <sup>13</sup> Nutrition Department, Hospital University La Paz, 28046 Madrid, Spain; <u>samara.palma@salud.madrid.org</u>
- \* Correspondence: briciaplaza@idipaz.es; Tel.: +34 917277000 Ext 449507 (B.L.-P).

+ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract: Taste disorders (TDs) are common among systemically treated cancer patients 36 and negatively impact their nutritional status and quality of life. A food supplement con-37 taining the natural taste-modifying protein miraculin (DMB<sup>®</sup>) has emerged as a possible 38 alternative treatment for TDs. The present study aimed to evaluate the efficacy and safety 39 of habitual DMB consumption in malnourished cancer patients undergoing active treat-40 ment. An exploratory clinical trial was carried out in which 31 cancer patients were ran-41 domized into three arms [standard dose of DMB (150 mg DMB/tablet), high dose of DMB 42 (300 mg DMB/tablet) or placebo (300 mg freeze-dried strawberry)] for three months. Pa-43 tients consumed an intervention DMB tablet or placebo before each main meal. Through-44 out the five main visits, electrochemical taste perception, nutritional status, dietary intake, 45 quality of life and the fatty acid profile of erythrocytes were evaluated. Patients consuming 46 a standard dose of DMB exhibited improved taste acuity over time (% change right/left 47 side:  $-52.8 \pm 38.5 / -58.7 \pm 69.2\%$ ) and salty taste perception (2.29 ± 1.25 vs. high dose: 2.17 48  $\pm$  1.84 vs. placebo: 1.57  $\pm$  1.51 points, p < 0.05). They also had higher energy intake (p = 49

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by preview and should not be used to guidet clinical practice luated by 50 symptom scales improved in patients receiving the standard dose of DMB (constipation, 51

> p = 0.048). The levels of arachidonic (13.1 ± 1.8; 14.0 ± 2.8, 12.0 ± 2.0%; p = 0.004) and do-52 cosahexaenoic ( $4.4 \pm 1.7$ ;  $4.1 \pm 1.0$ ;  $3.9 \pm 1.6\%$ ; p = 0.014) acids in erythrocytes increased over 53 time after DMB intake. The standard dose of DMB increased fat-free mass vs. placebo (47.4 54  $\pm$  9.3 vs. 44.1  $\pm$  4.7 kg, p = 0.007). Importantly, habitual patients with DMB did not experi-55 ence any adverse events, and metabolic parameters remained stable and within normal 56 ranges. In conclusion, habitual consumption of a standard 150 mg dose of DMB improves 57 electrochemical food perception, nutritional status (energy intake, fat quantity and quality, 58 fat-free mass) and quality of life in malnourished cancer patients receiving antineoplastic 59 treatment. Additionally, DMB consumption appears to be safe, with no changes in major 60 biochemical parameters associated with health status. The clinical trial was registered at 61 http://clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05486260). 62

> Keywords: Taste disorders; ageusia; dysgeusia; neoplasm; chemotherapy; radiotherapy; Synsepalum63dulcificum; miraculin protein; miracle berry; malnutrition; fatty acids.64

#### 1. Introduction

Taste disorders (TDs) are frequent adverse events during antineoplastic treatments 67 in cancer patients [1–4]. However, limited attention has been given to these disorders. The 68 effects of TDs are related to the cytotoxic effects of chemotherapy on the differentiation 69 and proliferation of cells in the taste bud [5] or to chemosensory dysfunction that can cause 70 neurological damage by acting directly on taste receptors or synaptic uncoupling during 71 radiotherapy [6]. Stem cell therapy [7] and anticancer-targeted drugs [8,9] have also been 72 shown to induce taste alterations. However, chemotherapy-related TDs are more fre-73 quent. Chemotherapy-induced TDs are highly variable and range between 17% and 86% 74 [10]. The presence of TDs can occur as acute side effects after chemotherapy [11] increasing 75 according to the number of cycles received. Although these symptoms generally improve 76 once treatment is completed [12], they may also persist for a long period after treatment 77 is completed [13]. One of the most prevalent TDs is dysgeusia, which occurs between 56% 78 and 76% of patients receiving antineoplastic treatment [14]. Dysgeusia is a qualitative gus-79 tatory disturbance defined as impaired or altered sense taste perception or persistent taste 80 sensation without stimulation [15]. Generally, patients described unpleasant tastes or dis-81 tortions of taste sensation [16]. 82

Patients commonly present anorexia due to antineoplastic treatment but also due to dysgeusia. Indeed, patients attribute difficulties maintaining adequate food intake to altered taste during treatment [17]. TDs reduce appetite and energy intake, which produce changes in food preferences [18] that determine weight loss and changes in body composition [19] and increase malnutrition risk in cancer patients [20].

The prevalence of malnutrition in cancer patients varies between 40% and 80% [21]. 88 This condition determines the outcome in cancer patients [22] since its presence is associ-89 ated with treatment-induced toxicity, an increase in the postoperative risk of complica-90 tions [23], poor prognosis, overall survival reduction [24] and increased mortality. In this 91 sense, TDs can increase malnutrition risk by a factor of 3.36 [19]. TDs can also have a sig-92 nificant impact on cancer patients' quality of life by reducing food enjoyment [25,26] and 93 developing food aversions that reduce food intake [27] and increase the risk of malnutri-94 tion [28,29]. 95

Therefore, it is not surprising that different strategies have been developed to prevent 96 or ameliorate TDs [30–34]. Commonly known as the miracle berry, the *Synsepalum dulcificum* (Daniell) fruit has attracted increased attention due to its ability to transform sour 98 taste perception into sweet taste [35]. This quality is due to the presence of miraculin, a 99

66

> glycoprotein that acts as a selective agonist at acidic pH or antagonist at neutral pH, of 100 sweet taste receptors [36]. This characteristic allows miraculin to change the food flavor 101 depending on the pH of the food consumed making meals more palatable. Miraculin pro-102 vides a high sweetness intensity that persists for approximately 30 minutes after con-103 sumption [37]; thus, its consumption could improve the overall taste perception in cancer 104 patients undergoing antineoplastic treatment and those with TDs [38], improving food 105 intake and, consequently, their nutritional and health status. 106

> Two studies have evaluated the consumption of miracle fruit in cancer patients un-107 dergoing active chemotherapy treatment, and both have shown positive changes in TDs 108 [39,40]. However, despite pointing out the direction of the effect of consuming the miracle 109 berry on these patients, both studies used subjective methods for the assessment of TDs 110 and used the fruits of S. dulcificum. 111

> In December 2021, the European Commission authorized dried miracle berry (DMB) 112 as a novel food [41]. DMB, is a freeze-dried extract of miracle berry pulp juice rich in mirac-113 ulin. It was officially cataloged as the dried fruit of S. dulcificum, safe for use in the Euro-114 pean Union. DMB<sup>®</sup> has become available as a food supplement. 115

> In this sense, the present study hypothesizes that DMB consumption enhances the 116 electrochemical taste perception and improves both the nutritional status and quality of 117 life of cancer patients positively impacting their health. Therefore, the main aim of the 118 present clinical trial was to evaluate the efficacy and safety of habitual DMB consumption 119 in malnourished cancer patients undergoing active treatment. 120

# 2. Materials and Methods

A detailed description of the CLINMIR study protocol has recently been published 122 elsewhere [42]. Below is a summary of the clinical trial. 123

# 2.1 Trial design

The clinical trial protocol was approved by the Scientific Research and Ethics Com-125 mittee of the Hospital University La Paz (HULP), Madrid (Spain) in version 1 in June 2022 126 and protocolled by the HULP Code 6164. The present protocol clinical trial has also been 127 registered at http://clinicaltrials.gov with the number NCT05486260. 128

The CLINMIR study is a pilot randomized, parallel, triple-blind, and placebo-con-129 trolled clinical trial allocated in three arms according to treatment with a food supplement 130 enriched in the protein miraculin (DMB) in malnourished cancer patients exhibiting TDs 131 because of active chemotherapy and radiotherapy and adjusted by type of cancer. All pa-132 tients were recruited from medical consultations in the Clinical and Dietary Nutrition Unit 133 (UNC&D) and by referral from the Oncology Service of the HULP to UNC&D. 134

# 2.2 Participants

The main inclusion criteria were patients 18 years of age and older with cancer, active 136 chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy, and/or immunotherapy treatment who had a weight 137  $loss \ge 5$  % in the last six months, malnutrition diagnosis assessed by Global Leadership 138 Initiative on Malnutrition (GLIM Criteria) [43], and TDs measured by electrogustometry. 139 Additionally, patients had to have a life expectancy greater than 3 months and be able to 140 feed by oral intake. Patients also had an understanding of the clinical study guidelines. 141

The exclusion criteria included patients participating in another clinical trial, enteral 142 or parenteral nutrition, poorly controlled diabetes mellitus (HbA1c >8%), uncontrolled 143 hypertension or hyper/hypothyroidism, severe digestive toxicity due to treatment with 144 chemo-radiotherapy, severe kidney or liver disease (chronic renal failure, nephrotic syn-145

135

121

drome, cirrhosis, etc.), severe dementia, brain metastases, eating disorders, history of severe neurological or psychiatric pathology that may interfere with treatment, alcoholism or substance abuse, severe gastrointestinal diseases, and unwillingness to consume the miraculin-based food supplement.

Intolerance to miraculin was a withdrawal criterion. Any medication that did not 150 interfere with the study formulation was allowed and registered in the Clinical Research 151 Data.

# 2.3 Interventions

Patients who met the selection criteria were randomized to one of three arms of the clinical trial. The first arm had 150 mg of DMB equivalent to 2.8 mg of miraculin + 150 mg of freeze-dried strawberries per orodispersible tablet; the second arm had 300 mg of DMB equivalent to 5.6 mg of miraculin; and the third arm contained 300 mg of freeze-dried strawberries per orodispersible tablet as a placebo. All treatments were isocaloric (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Nutritional composition of the food supplement enriched in miraculin (DMB) and placebo

		Standard dose of DMB (150 mg DMB® + 150 mg strawberry freeze-dried)	High dose of DMB (300 mg DMB®)	Placebo (300 mg strawberry freeze-dried)
Energy	kcal	0.99	1	0.97
Carbohydrates	mg	194	234	154
Sugars	mg	156	162	150
Fiber	mg	26	6	46
Proteins	mg	20	15	24
Lipids	mg	9	5	12
Saturated fatty acids	mg	2	2	1
Sodium chloride	mg	0.1	0.1	0.03
Humidity	mg	4	4	5
Ash	mg	12	14	15
Miraculin	mg	2,8	5,6	0

Nutritional composition provided by Medicinal Gardens, S.L.

Those patients who voluntarily agreed to participate signed the informed consent160form. Over 3 months, each patient consumed an orodispersible tablet containing DMB or161placebo five minutes before each main meal (breakfast, lunch, and dinner).162

The clinical trial had six face-to-face visits in two phases, one selection visit (vS) in the Selection Phase and five visits in the Experimental Phase (**Figure 1**).



vS: Baseline visit; v1, v2, v3, v4 and v5 are successive visits of patients

Figure 1. CLINMIR clinical trial outline

165

153

166 167

On the selection visit, nutritional status was assessed according to the GLIM criteria 168 as well as electrical (electrogustometry) and chemical taste perception (taste strips). The 169 included patient received the questionnaires to complete and hand in at visit 1 (food daily 170 record of 3 days, one holiday, quality of life questionnaire -EORTC QLQ-C30- and International Physical Activity Questionnaire -IPAQ- as well as the blood sample extraction appointment (analysis of biochemical parameters and fatty acids from erythrocytes). Experimental phase visits were 4-7 days after their chemotherapy infusion, except visit 1 before it.

At visit 1 (v1) patients were randomized and provided with the necessary product 176 (DMB or placebo) until their next visit (v2). Anthropometric measurements, electrical bi-177 oimpedance and the Sniffin' Sticks Smell Test were carried out. Healthy eating and physi-178 cal exercise guidelines for cancer patients were explained. As part of the next visit, the 179 following forms were delivered: a product efficacy satisfaction questionnaire, a product 180 consumption control daily sheet, a product consumption tolerance record sheet, and a rec-181 ord sheet of adverse effects. Additionally, individualized nutritional treatment was imple-182 mented. If an oral nutritional supplement was needed, a polymeric, hypercaloric, and hy-183 perproteic formula enriched in omega-3 fatty acids was prescribed depending on their en-184 ergy requirements. 185

Visits 2 (v2, 4–7 days after the chemotherapy session), 3 (v3, ±1 month after visit 1) 186 and 4 (v4,  $\pm 2$  months after visit 1) were similar and they were carried out 4–7 days after 187 the chemotherapy session. During these visits, nutritional status was monitored, and an-188 thropometric measurements and smell and taste tests (electrogustometry, taste strips tests 189 and Sniffin' sticks smell test) were carried out. In these visits, biochemical parameters were 190 also measured. Completed questionnaires were collected (food daily record, quality of life 191 questionnaire, product efficacy, product consumption control, tolerance record and ad-192 verse effects record) and behavioral reinforcement (nutritional treatment and physical ac-193 tivity, consumption and registration of the assigned treatment, and tolerance and adverse 194 effects registry). Patients received the questionnaires to complete and hand in at the next 195 visit. 196

Finally, during visit 5 (v5,  $\pm 3$  months after v1 and 3-4 days after the patient's chemo-197 therapy) nutritional status was assessed and anthropometric measurements and taste and 198 smell tests were carried out (electrogustometry, taste strips tests and Sniffin' sticks smell 199 test). A blood sample was extracted (biochemical parameters and fatty acids from erythro-200 cytes) for analysis. Food daily records and quality of life questionnaire completed were 201 collected as well as a product efficacy questionnaire, product consumption control, toler-202 ance record and adverse effects record. Behavioral reinforcement of nutritional treatment 203 and physical activity were carried out. 204

#### 2.4 Outcomes

Malnourished cancer patients with TDs and consuming DMB were expected to im-206 prove their taste perception by reducing the electrical-chemical taste perception threshold 207 from baseline (v0) and throughout the intervention. Moreover, it is expected that DMB 208 consumption improves the chemical and olfactory perception of food. Improvements in 209 dietary intake and nutritional and safety biochemical parameters, as well as improve-210 ments in the essential and polyunsaturated fatty acid status assessed through the fatty 211 acid composition of erythrocytes, were expected because of a better perception of food. 212 Tolerance and possible adverse effects were also outcomes studied since several doses 213 were evaluated. All parameters were evaluated from baseline to the end of the interven-214 tion and evolution was measured through the different visits carried out (v1, v2, v3, v4, 215 v5). 216

> 217 218

205

#### 2.5 Sample size

Because the CLINMIR study was exploratory and there was a lack of previous studies 221 using miraculin-based nutrition supplements in cancer patients, the sample size was es-222 tablished by the researchers. The number established was 10 patients per arm given a sam-223 ple size of 30 patients. The results obtained will be able to serve to establish the sample 224 size needed to evaluate the efficacy of the intervention product in multicenter studies.

#### 2.6 Randomization and Blinding

Randomization was carried out using computer-generated random numbers in 227 blocks of six taking into account treatment and cancer type. This sequence was generated 228 by the Biostatistics Unit (HULP). The allocation sequence was provided in a separate doc-229 ument. To implement the allocation, the sequences were sequentially numbered and 230 sealed in envelopes that were mailed to the nutritionist who enrolled and assigned partic-231 ipants to interventions. When the patient signed the informed consent (v1) patient's ran-232 domization envelope was opened. 233

Researchers, trial patients, care providers (nutritionists, nurses, physicians), assessing 234 outcomes, data analysts, and the promoter were blinded after assignment to interventions. 235 Both miraculin-based food supplements and placebo had similar appearances (pink tab-236 lets). They were packaged in white opaque bottles with 30 orodispersible tablets identified 237 by a lot number (L01, L02, L03) and a barcode for tracking. The test product in its powder 238 form (DMB®) and the placebo were provided by Baïa Food (Medicinal Gardens SL) to Rioja 239 Nature Pharma. The packaging, in the form of bottles equipped with protective technology 240 for moisture and oxygen-sensitive products (Activ Vial<sup>®</sup>), was supplied by CSP Aptar 241 Technologies. Rioja Nature Pharma was responsible for the manufacturing, labeling, iden-242 tification, and supply of the final product, and maintained the blind throughout the study 243 until the statistical analysis was completed. 244

#### Specific methodology 2.7

## 2.7.1 Malnutrition criteria

Nutritional diagnosis of malnutrition was established through the GLIM criteria 247 based on phenotypic and etiological criteria. It requires at least one phenotypic criterion 248 and one etiologic criterion to diagnose malnutrition. Body composition by bioelectrical im-249 pedance analysis (BIA) was used to evaluate reduced muscle mass. Gastrointestinal symp-250 toms as supportive indicators were considered to assess to evaluate reduced food assimi-251 lation and major infection. Finally, trauma or acute conditions were associated with 252 inflammation. Malnutrition was classified as moderate or severe malnutrition [43]. Nutri-253 tional status was evaluated at all study visits. 254

### 2.7.2 Anthropometric parameters

They were taken using standard techniques, following the international norms estab-256 lished by the WHO. Body weight was measured using a clinical digital scale (capacity 0-257 150 kg). The percentage of weight loss was assessed as follows: [(current weight – weight 258 6 months ago)/weight 6 months ago] \* 100. Height was measured with a height meter with 259 an accuracy of 1 mm (range, 80-200 cm). Body mass index (BMI) was determined using 260 weight (kg)/height (m)<sup>2</sup>. Anthropometric parameters were measured at the main visits (v1, 261 v3, v4 & v5). 262

#### 2.7.3 Daily food record

Diet was collected in three different days' daily food records, one of which had to be 264 a holiday. Patients were instructed to record the weight of the food consumed or, if this 265 was not possible, to record household measurements (spoonfuls, cups, etc.). All records 266

220

225

226

- 245
- 246

were thoroughly reviewed by a nutritionist in the presence of the patient to ensure that
the information collected was complete. Foods, drinks, dietary supplements, and preparations consumed were transformed into energy and nutrients using DIAL software (Alce
Ingeniería, Madrid, Spain). Results were compared with the recommended intakes of the
Spanish population.

## 2.7.4 Electrogustometry

The threshold for an electric-induced taste stimulus (taste acuity) was measured using 274 an electrogustometer (SI-03 Model, Sensonics International, New Jersey, USA). Patients 275 were instructed not to eat or drink for an hour before electrogustometry. Monopolar elec-276 trode applied electric stimulus. The electrogustometer produces low-amplitude stimuli of 277 a predetermined duration (0.5 seconds). The methodology used was that recommended 278 by the manufacturer. The electric threshold scores were measured in the area of the fun-279 giform papillae on both sides of the tongue. To detect thresholds, a two-down and one-280 up forced-choice single staircase procedure and a stimulus-response staircase were used. 281 Threshold differences between the left and right sides greater than 7 dB were considered 282 abnormal [44]. 283

#### 2.7.5 Taste strips test

A validated method to measure chemical taste perception [30,134] this tool is based 286 on the chemical perception of taste through taste-impregnated filter paper strips 287 (Burghart Messtechnik GmbH, Germany). Four different taste strips (sweet, sour, salty, 288 and bitter) were measured at four different concentrations each. For the assessment of 289 whole-mouth gustatory function, strips were placed on the tongue and savored with the 290 closed mouth for 10 seconds. Once the strip was removed, the participants had to identify 291 the taste within a forced choice procedure. A maximum score of 16 points (4 concentra-292 tions of each of the 4 basic taste qualities) was obtained. Hypogeusia was considered when 293 a score below nine was obtained regardless of age. 294

#### 2.7.6 Sniffin' Sticks Smell test

Smell perception was measured based on odor-containing felt-tip pens ("Sniffin' 297 sticks" Burghart Messtechnik GmbH, Germany). Consuming food, drinks, or cigarettes 15 298 minutes before testing was not allowed. A total of 16 odor pens were presented to be 299 identified. For each pen, a flash card with 4 choices was provided (e.g., pineapple, orange, 300 blackberry, strawberry). Each uncovered odor pen was held 2 cm in front of the nostrils 301 for 3-4 seconds. Based on the multiple forced choice paradigm patients had to choose the 302 best match with their olfactory perception. The score sums all correct answers and was 303 used to differentiate between normosmia and hyposmia depending on the age of the pa-304 tient. 305

#### 2.8 Quality of life

This was evaluated using the EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire for cancer patients validated in Spanish [45]. The questionnaire is formed by 5 functional scales (daily activities 308 and physical, emotional, cognitive, and social functioning), 3 symptomatic scales (fatigue, 309 pain and nausea, and vomiting), 1 overall health scale, and 6 questions about dyspnea, 310 insomnia, anorexia, constipation, diarrhea, and economic impact. All questions are about 311 the previous week and are scored with 1 to 4 points. The last two questions have a score 312 from 1 to 7, with 1 being terrible and 7 being excellent. 313

284 285

272

273

295

296

> Scores obtained are standardized from 0 to 100 points to determine the disease impact 314 on each scale. High scores on the global health status and functional scales indicate a better 315 quality of life, while low scores on the symptoms scale indicate a decrease in quality of life. 316

# 2.9 Tolerance and adverse events

Gastrointestinal disorders such as abdominal distension, abdominal pain, nausea, regurgitation or gastroesophageal reflux, vomiting, constipation, diarrhea, and flatulence were defined and recorded based on the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) from the National Cancer Institute [46]. These adverse events were classified as Grade 0 (not described), Grade 1 (mild), Grade 2 (moderate), Grade 3 (severe), Grade 4 (mortality risk), and Grade 5 (death associated with an event). Additionally, the patients were asked if they could be related to product consumption. 324

#### 2.10 Fatty acid profile of erythrocytes

The separation and quantification of fatty acids from erythrocyte lipids have been 326 reported in previous works [47]. Briefly, erythrocyte lipid extraction and fatty acid meth-327 ylation were performed as described by Lepage & Roy (1988) [48]. Fatty acid methyl esters 328 (FAME) were identified and quantified by comparing their retention times by gas chro-329 matography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS). This analysis was performed by injecting 1µl 330 into a Bruker (Bremen, Germany) model 456-GC high-resolution gas chromatograph cou-331 pled to a Bruker model EVOQ TQ triple quadrupole mass spectrometer as follows: 332 GC conditions 333

Se contantono	000
a) ZB-FAME capillary column (30m x 0.25mm ID x 0.20um film).	334
b) Split mode injector (100:1)	335
c) Injector temperature: 250ºC	336
d) Transfer line temperature: 240ºC	337
e) Carrier gas: He (1 ml/min)	338
f) Temperature ramp: 100°C (2 min) up to 210°C (5 min) at 4°/min.	339
MS conditions:	340
a) Temperature of the source: 240°C	341
b) Full scan from 45 Da to 450 Da	342
c) Electron impact ionization (EI+) at 70eVFood daily record	343

# 2.11 Biochemical parameters

Biochemical analyses were carried out in the Biochemistry Laboratory of the Hospital345La Paz, an ISO-certified laboratory, at each visit (v1, v3, v4, v5) using an Olympus AU5400346Automated Chemistry Analyzer (Olympus Corporation, Izasa, CA, USA).347

### 2.12 Miraculin-based food supplement taste perception

A visual analog scale (VAS) was designed by the researchers to obtain information 349 about the miraculin-based food supplement's taste perception efficacy. The questionnaire 350 included 5 questions using 10 cm scales, where 0 means not at all or very bad and 10 351 means very good or very effective. The questions included were as follows: Do you notice 352 a food taste change after consuming the product? Does food taste better to you? Does it 353 allow you to eat more food? What is your opinion of the product? Are you satisfied with 354 the effectiveness of the product? Does the administration of the product seem adequate to 355 you? 356

357

344

348

317

325

358

#### 2.13 Statistical methods

Data analysis was carried out by the intention to treat. Quantitative data are pre-361 sented as the means  $\pm$  standard deviations (SD), and percentages. Data type distribution 362 was determined using Shapiro-Wilks tests. Levene's test was used to evaluate the homo-363 geneity of variances. Parametric or nonparametric tests were performed depending on the 364 data distribution. General linear mixed models (GLM) of covariance (ANCOVA) were 365 used to evaluate differences between means for treatment, time, and treatment x time us-366 ing as covariates the baseline data. The analysis of the qualitative variables and percent-367 ages was carried out through  $\chi^2$  or Fisher's F analysis. 368

Double-sided tests were applied when needed, and a p-value < 0.05 was considered 369 statistically significant. Data were analyzed using R Project for Statistical Computing 370 (https://www.r-project.org/). 371

#### 3. Results

The recruitment period was extended from November 2022 to May 2023. A total of 373 62 patients were evaluated for eligibility. Of them, 31 oncologic patients met the selection 374 criteria and were randomized into the three intervention groups, adjusted by the type of 375 cancer (Figure 2). During follow-up, extended from November 2022 to August 2023, there 376 were 10 dropouts, most of them due to the taste distortion of non-sweet acidic foods (n = 377 6) and because the prescription derived from the intervention added difficulty to their, 378 already complex, antineoplastic treatment (n = 2). Additionally, there were 2 *exitus letalis* in the placebo group. There was a 32 % dropout and only 21 cancer patients completed 380 the clinical trial; however, all variables were evaluated by intention to treat.



Figure 2. CONSORT flow diagram.

387

360

372

379



#### 3.1 General characteristics of the population

The sample was made up of 58.1 % women and 41.9 % men with a mean age of 60.0 389  $\pm$  10.9 years old, all of them undergoing active treatment with at least chemotherapy, and 390 TDs were measured by electrogustometry (Table 2). 391

The average body mass index (BMI) was  $22.1 \pm 3.3$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>, indicating that the patients were within the normal weight range. However, the weight loss in the last six months was  $-7.8 \pm 6.9$  %, with no significant differences between treatment groups (p = 0.891). The 394 most prevalent cancer type was colorectal cancer followed by breast, lung, pancreas and 395 liver cancers with no significant differences between treatments. Treatment adherence 396 was adequate (85.6 %) with no significant difference between treatments (p = 0.337). 397

Table 2. Baseline characteristics of the population

		Standard dose of DMB	High dose of DMB	Placebo	p-value
Sex	Female (%)	70	45.5	60	0.517
	Male (%)	30	54.5	40	0.517
Age	years	$59.9 \pm 15.1$	$58.9 \pm 4.9$	$61.3 \pm 11.2$	0.891
Weight	kg	$61.4 \pm 11.1$	$62.0 \pm 14.1$	$62.6\pm10.7$	0.941
Weight lost in last 6 mo.	%	$7.5 \pm 6.0$	$8.7 \pm 7.1$	$7.2 \pm 8.0$	0.868
BMI	kg/m <sup>2</sup>	$21.9 \pm 3.6$	$22.0 \pm 3.3$	$22.9\pm3.4$	0.737
Type of cancer					
Head and neck	%	0	9.1	0	
Colorectal	%	30	27.3	20	
Esophagus	%	10	0	10	
Stomach	%	0	9.1	10	
Liver	%	0	9.1	10	
Breast	%	10	18.2	10	0.895
Neuroendocrine	%	10	0	0	
Ovary	%	10	18.2	0	
Pancreas	%	10	9.1	10	
Lung	%	10	0	10	
Others	%	10	0	20	
Chemotherapy	%	100	100	100	1
Radiotherapy	%	20	12.5	0	0.594

BMI, body mass index. Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation

### 3.2 Miraculin-Based Food Supplement Efficacy

3.2.1 The effect on electrical and chemical taste perception

Overall, the electrical taste perception did not show significant changes depending on treatment, time, and their interaction with treatment per time (Table 3, Figure 3). However, patients consuming the standard dose of DMB had the lowest detection levels at the end of the intervention and considerably reduced the taste threshold for an electric-induced taste stimulus (taste acuity) over time (% change right/left side:  $-52.8 \pm 38.5$  /  $58.7 \pm 69.2$  %). None of the cancer patients reached normal thresholds once the intervention was completed (< 7 dB).

406 407

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

408

409

- 410 411
- 412
- 413
- 414
- 415

416

388

392 393

							p-value	
			Standard dose of DMB	High dose of DMB	Placebo	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t
Right side	(dB)	Baseline	$17.7 \pm 13.2$	$19.3 \pm 14.0$	$17.9 \pm 13.4$			
		1 week	$18.5 \pm 10.4$	$14.5\pm15.5$	$15.2\pm13.5$			
		1 month	$17.9 \pm 16.3$	$20.0\pm15.4$	$16.5\pm17.3$	0.200	0.393	0.499
		2 months	$6.9 \pm 10.8$	$20.8 \pm 14.1$	$10.8\pm11.9$			
		3 months	$10.9 \pm 11.1$	$18.0\pm18.8$	$16.7\pm17.1$			
Left side	(dB)	Baseline	$20.0 \pm 12.5$	$19.7 \pm 14.0$	$22.6 \pm 13.8$			
		1 week	$15.9 \pm 12.9$	$19.1 \pm 16.0$	$17.1\pm15.8$			
		1 month	$12.1 \pm 15.3$	$17.7 \pm 15.1$	$14.7\pm15.4$	0.444	0.544	0.946
		2 months	$9.6 \pm 13.5$	$18.4 \pm 16.2$	$18.4 \pm 13.1$			
		3 months	$9.8 \pm 13.5$	$18.3 \pm 18.4$	$9.9 \pm 12.5$			

#### Table 3. Electrical taste perception depending on treatment.

Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.



Figure 3. Left and right electrical taste perception (mean ± standard error).

However, at the end of the study, the chemical taste perception reached normal levels ( $\geq$  9) in all patients (**Table 4**). When different tastes were evaluated, salty taste perception changed over time and depending on the treatment assigned (p < 0.001). In this regard, patients consuming DMB significantly improved the perception of salty taste versus placebo (p < 0.05) (**Figure 4**).

Particularly, those taking both DMB standard and high doses experienced a notable 427 percentage of change from baseline (108.3  $\pm$  134.4 and 158.3  $\pm$  116.7 %) contrasting with 428 placebo ( $-22.2 \pm 72.0$  %). Although no significant changes were observed depending on 429 time or treatment, bitter taste, frequently affected by chemotherapy treatment, had a lower 430 percentage change in those patients receiving the standard dose of DMB (% change = 14.3 431  $\pm$  65.6 %) contrasting with the high dose of DMB (25.0  $\pm$  16.7 %) or placebo (33.3  $\pm$  94.3 %). 432 Smell perception did not change throughout the clinical trial (Table 4). 433

# 3.2.2 The effect on dietary intake

Since the beginning of the study, the diet of the cancer patients was high-protein and high-fat, and this condition persisted during the study. Patients consuming the standard 437 dose of DMB declared not having consumed a smaller amount of food (p = 0.032) consid-438 ering 22% perceived eating less at the beginning of the study (Table S1). 439

Related to the above, changes in energy intake (p = 0.075) were observed in patients 440 depending on treatment (Table 5). Indeed, at the end of the intervention, the group re-441 ceiving the standard dose of DMB exhibited the highest energy intake compared with the 442 other two groups. Moreover, patients consuming the standard dose of DMB were those 443 who best covered energy expenditure ( $107 \pm 19$  %). 444

417



420 421 422

423

424

425

- 434
- 435
- 436

		Stand	dard dose of	DMB	Hi	gh dose of E	OMB		Placebo		p-value		
		Baseline	1 week	3 months	Baseline	1 week	3 months	Baseline	1 week	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t
Chemical Taste Perception	points	8.00 ± 3.53	$9.38 \pm 4.24$	$9.63 \pm 3.93$	$8.00 \pm 3.9$	$8.56 \pm 4.83$	$10.17 \pm 4.67$	$9.6 \pm 4.35$	$11.13 \pm 3.23$	$10.71 \pm 3.09$	0.444	0.133	0.663
Sweet	right	$2.8 \pm 1.48$	$3.13 \pm 1.64$	$2.86 \pm 1.46$	$2.64 \pm 1.5$	$2.56 \pm 1.74$	$3.17 \pm 1.6$	$3.4 \pm 0.84$	$3.57\pm0.79$	$3.57 \pm 0.79$	0.405	0.534	0.821
Sour	right	$2.0 \pm 0.82$	$2.00\pm0.93$	$1.86 \pm 0.9$	$1.91 \pm 1.14$	$1.56 \pm 1.24$	$2.17\pm0.98$	$2.3 \pm 1.06$	$3.00 \pm 0.82$	$2.57\pm0.98$	0.194	0.688	0.591
Salt	right	$0.9 \pm 0.99$	$1.63 \pm 1.41$	$2.29 \pm 1.25$	$1.36 \pm 1.21$	$1.89 \pm 1.45$	$2.17 \pm 1.84$	$2.00 \pm 1.41$	$2.00 \pm 1.00$	$1.57 \pm 1.51$	0.714	0.001	0.001
Bitter	right	$2.3\pm0.95$	$2.63 \pm 1.30$	$2.57 \pm 1.4$	$2.09 \pm 1.22$	$2.44 \pm 1.42$	$2.67 \pm 1.51$	$1.9 \pm 1.85$	$3.14 \pm 1.22$	$3.14 \pm 0.69$	0.782	0.964	0.278
Smell Perception	points	$13.2 \pm 1.9$	$12.1 \pm 2.2$	$12.3 \pm 2.7$	$13.6 \pm 2.4$	$13.8 \pm 1.6$	$13.3 \pm 2.4$	$12.5 \pm 2.2$	$12.1 \pm 2.4$	$13.0 \pm 2.1$	0.166	0.930	0.142

Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.



**Figure 4**. Chemical taste perception (mean ± standard error).

|--|

			Standard d	lose of DM	В		High dos	se of DMB			Pla	cebo		p-value		
		Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t
Intake	kcal/d	2512± 569	$2641 \pm 384$	$2364\pm594$	$2679\pm625$	$2254\pm 663$	$2030\pm577$	$1809 \pm 291$	$1850 \pm 778$	$2338 \pm 724$	2294 ± 751	$2035\pm301$	$2443\pm581$	0.290	0.075	0.907
Contribution	%	$100 \pm 22$	$101 \pm 26$	$90 \pm 25$	$107 \pm 19$	$83 \pm 20$	$69 \pm 22$	$62 \pm 12$	$61 \pm 29$	$89 \pm 29$	$90 \pm 30$	79 ± 13	$93 \pm 26$	0.513	0.324	0.982
Calorie profile																
Proteins	%	$15.8\pm2.2$	$16 \pm 3.2$	$16.7 \pm 2.0$	$16.1 \pm 1.5$	$16.5 \pm 1.72$	$19.4 \pm 5.3$	$18.3 \pm 2.2$	$18.1 \pm 3.4$	$18.6\pm3.5$	$17.4 \pm 2.2$	$18.2\pm2.0$	$15.6\pm2.6$	0.113	0.332	0.164
Carbohydrates	%	$37.2 \pm 4.8$	$34.6 \pm 2.9$	$34.2 \pm 7.1$	$30.4 \pm 4.5$	$37.7\pm7.88$	$36.0 \pm 11.1$	$40.4\pm9.0$	$39.3\pm4.8$	$36.0 \pm 5.4$	$40.2\pm3.4$	$36.2 \pm 6.1$	$37.5 \pm 6.3$	0.208	0.806	0.060
Lipids	%	$41.7\pm4.5$	$44.0\pm5.3$	$45.3\pm4.1$	$48.37\pm5.0$	$42.8\pm6.81$	$42.0 \pm 8.$	$37.8 \pm 10.2$	$39.5 \pm 5.3$	$43.3\pm6.0$	$39.4 \pm 4.4$	$43.1\pm6.7$	$43.4\pm3.4$	0.163	0.431	0.017
Lipidic profile																
SFA	%	$13.8\pm2.0$	$12.7 \pm 2.4$	$13.4 \pm 2.5$	$14.9\pm3.3$	$12.8\pm2.7$	$14.3\pm4.7$	$11.8\pm3.9$	$12.3\pm4.0$	$13.5 \pm 2.2$	$11.8\pm3.5$	$13.7 \pm 3.7$	$12.0\pm3.1$	0.483	0.799	0.042
MUFA	%	$18.2 \pm 4.3$	$20.9\pm3.5$	$20.4\pm4.2$	$23.1\pm4.4$	$18.9\pm4.3$	$17.5\pm4.9$	$17.2 \pm 6.8$	$16.3 \pm 4.3$	$19.4 \pm 5.2$	$18.5\pm3.8$	$19.6\pm3.8$	$21.0\pm3.7$	0.308	0.401	0.092
PUFA	%	$7.8 \pm 9.6$	$41.8 \pm 109.1$	$31.1 \pm 60.1$	$22.9 \pm 46.3$	$29.9 \pm 68.9$	$46.8 \pm 111.8$	53.7 ± 120.9	29.9 ± 59.1	$18.8 \pm 38.7$	$13.4 \pm 24.8$	$14.1 \pm 23.7$	$29.0\pm57.5$	0.849	0.587	0.590

SFA, Saturated fatty acids; MUFA, Monounsaturated fatty acids; PUFA, Polyunsaturated fatty acids. Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

# Table 6. Fatty acid profile of erythrocytes depending on treatment

		Standard do	se of DMB	High dos	se of DMB	Pla	cebo	p-value			
		Baseline	Baseline 3 months		3 months	Baseline	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t	
Palmitic acid (16:0)	%	$26.4 \pm 1.8$	$22.4\pm11.3$	$29.7\pm8.3$	$26.5\pm2.6$	$26.3\pm2.7$	$26.1 \pm 7.5$	0.342	0.483	0.814	
Stearic acid (18:0)	%	$20.4\pm1.4$	$18.2 \pm 2.7$	$21.8\pm4.6$	$18.6\pm2.5$	$21.1 \pm 3.0$	$19.8\pm4.3$	0.068	0.676	0.817	
Oleic acid (18:1 n–9)	%	$19.7 \pm 3.1$	$20.0 \pm 2.1$	$18.7 \pm 3.2$	$17.8\pm2.8$	$18.2 \pm 1.4$	$17.1 \pm 1.2$	0.497	0.122	0.787	
Total PUFA	%	$41.2 \pm 1.4$	$47.1 \pm 5.2$	$40.7\pm4.6$	$45.2\pm5.9$	$41.3\pm2.8$	$41.9\pm3.1$	0.009	0.759	0.784	
Linoleic acid (18:2 n–6)	%	$8.0 \pm 0.8$	$9.0 \pm 0.8$	$8.2 \pm 0.6$	$8.6\pm1.7$	$8.8\pm0.9$	$8.4\pm2.0$	0.327	0.949	0.296	
Arachidonic acid (20:4 n–6)	%	$10.0 \pm 2.8$	$13.1 \pm 1.8$	$10.3 \pm 2.1$	$14.0\pm2.8$	$11.1 \pm 2.0$	$12.0 \pm 2.0$	0.004	0.810	0.396	
Eicosapentaenoic acid (20:5 n–3)	%	$0.4 \pm 0.2$	$0.6 \pm 0.4$	$0.5 \pm 0.1$	$0.7 \pm 0.4$	$0.3 \pm 0.2$	$0.5 \pm 0.3$	0.093	0.536	0.963	
Docosahexaenoic acid (22:6 n–3)	%	$3.0 \pm 1.3$	$4.4 \pm 1.7$	$3.0 \pm 1.1$	$4.1 \pm 1.0$	$2.9\pm0.7$	$3.9 \pm 1.6$	0.014	0.923	0.836	
Omega–3 Index	%	$3.4 \pm 1.3$	$5.0 \pm 2.1$	$3.5 \pm 1.2$	$4.8 \pm 1.2$	$3.2 \pm 0.9$	$4.4 \pm 1.4$	0.010	0.936	0.947	

Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

# 456

479

480

481 482

The energy contribution of lipids (p = 0.017) and carbohydrates (p = 0.060) changed 457 over time and depending on the treatment assigned. Only patients consuming the stand-458 ard dose of DMB reduced the energy contribution of carbohydrates (% change =  $-17.6 \pm$ 459 13.1). Also, these patients had a greater lipid contribution compared to those consuming 460 the high dose of DMB (p = 0.003) or placebo (p = 0.020). In addition, patients taking the 461 standard dose of DMB also had a greater lipid percentage of change from the beginning 462 to the end of the intervention ( $22.0 \pm 15.7$  %). Moreover, there was a significant change 463 over time and depending on treatment in the dietary percentage provided by saturated 464 fatty acids (SFA, p = 0.042) and monounsaturated fatty acids (MUFA, p = 0.092). In this 465 regard, patients consuming a standard dose of DMB tended to intake more SFA versus 466 placebo (p = 0.071). Additionally, patients consuming the standard dose of DMB increased 467 all major dietary fatty acids from the beginning to the end of the intervention, including 468 SFA (% change =  $11.2 \pm 20.2$  %), MUFA (40.6 ± 33.2) and polyunsaturated fatty acids 469 (PUFA,  $41.1 \pm 123.9$  %) different from those consuming high dose of DMB (-8.6  $\pm$  32.7; -6.4 470 ± 15.4; 3.2 ± 45.6 %) or placebo (-12.0 ± 16.5; 4.1 ± 20.6; 1.9 ± 29.9 %). 471

Taking the latter into account, after three months of intervention, all patients showed472a trend to decrease in levels of palmitic and stearic acid from the fatty acid profile of eryth-473rocytes (p = 0.068), particularly in DMB patients (% change standard dose:  $-13.2 \pm 44.0/$  -4747.9 ± 17.5; high dose:  $-7.9 \pm 29.1/$ -11.9 ± 19.7; placebo:  $3.6 \pm 35.9/$ -1.0 ± 42.3) (**Table 6, Figure**4755). In patients consuming standard and high doses of DMB, the increase in linoleic acid476percentage change was  $15.3 \pm 15.0$  and  $4.7 \pm 17.3$  % respectively, while it was reduced in477placebo (-6.0 ± 20.7 %).478



**Figure 5.** Percentage of change in membrane fatty acids at the end of the intervention (%).

Moreover, there was a change in total PUFA (p = 0.009), total PUFA n-6 (p = 0.010), 483 arachidonic acid (20:4 n-6, p = 0.004), EPA (20:5 n-3, p = 0.093), DHA (22:6 n-3, p = 0.014) 484 and Omega–3 index (p = 0.010) over time. In the groups consuming standard and high 485 doses of DMB, AA increased the percentage change by  $49.9 \pm 57.9$  and  $42.1 \pm 49.8$  %, respectively, while in placebo 8.4  $\pm$  31.5 %. The percentage of change of n-6 PUFA was 487 higher in patients consuming the standard dose of DMB ( $30.2 \pm 26.0$  %) and high dose of 488 DMB ( $23.5 \pm 28.5$  %) in contrast to placebo ( $1.5 \pm 26.6$  %). It was also the standard dose of 489

DMB consumed by cancer patients who observed a greater percentage of change in DHA  $(81.2 \pm 94.7 \%)$  and omega-3 index (52.7 ± 81.0 %) from the beginning to the end of the intervention. 490

493

494

516

517

## 3.2.3 The effect on anthropometry and body composition

After three months of intervention with the miraculin-based food supplement, onco-495 logic patients tended to change body weight (p = 0.073), BMI (p = 0.073), and waist cir-496 cumference (p = 0.053) and significantly changed fat-free mass (p = 0.006) and total water 497 (p = 0.029) over time and depending on treatment (**Table 7**). Patients consuming the stand-498 ard dose of DMB were those who had a higher percentage of change in body weight 499  $(-1.9 \pm 4.4 \%)$ , BMI  $(-1.4 \pm 4.6 \%)$  and waist circumference  $(-2.4 \pm 6.7 \%)$  compared to the 500 beginning of the intervention. Compared to placebo, patients consuming the standard 501 dose of DMB increased fat-free mass (p = 0.007) and those with the high dose of DMB had 502 greater total water (p = 0.020). Only patients consuming DMB reduced fat mass, mainly 503 those with a standard dose [ $(-2.5 \pm 1.3 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 3.2 \text{ vs.} 0.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ kg}$ ); (% change =  $-11.4 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 3.2 \text{ vs.} 0.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ kg}$ ); (% change =  $-11.4 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 3.2 \text{ vs.} 0.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ kg}$ ); (% change =  $-11.4 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 3.2 \text{ vs.} 0.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ kg}$ ); (% change =  $-11.4 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 3.2 \text{ vs.} 0.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ kg}$ ); (% change =  $-11.4 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 3.2 \text{ vs.} 0.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ kg}$ ); (% change =  $-11.4 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.3 \pm 1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.4 \text{ vs.} -1.4$ 504 35.0 vs. -6.1 ± 19.5 vs. 2.1 ± 14.8 %)] (Table 7). 505

When the bioimpedance phase angle was evaluated, all patients showed a loss of 506 cellular integrity throughout the study (< 5°). However, when the angle phase was standardized by age and sex, patients treated with DMB tended to present an improvement 508 depending on treatment (p = 0.072). Also, the percentage of change was greater in patients 509 consuming the standard dose of DMB (61.8 ± 19.1 %) than in those with a high dose of 510 DMB (53.7 ± 99.6 %) or placebo, where it worsened (-20.6 ± 95.6 %) (**Table 7**). 511

After three months of intervention, all patients regained part of the weight lost during the last 6 months before the start of the study and improved their nutritional status without significant differences between treatments (**Table S2**). Two patients consuming a standard dose of DMB continued with severe malnutrition after the study ended. 512

# 3.2.4 The effect on quality of life

Although the global health status perception was not modified by the consumption of 518 the miraculin-based food supplement, changes were observed on social (p = 0.018), fatigue 519 (p = 0.044) and constipation (p = 0.048) scales depending on treatment (Table 8). At the 520 end of the intervention patients consuming a high dose of DMB significantly reduced their 521 social scale (p < 0.05) and felt more fatigue (p < 0.05) compared to a standard dose of DMB 522 and placebo. Patients consuming a standard dose of DMB significantly improved the pres-523 ence of constipation compared to the other two groups (p < 0.05). In this regard, cancer 524 patients consuming the standard dose of DMB showed a higher percentage change in the 525 social functional scale (19.6  $\pm$  40.3 %) and constipation (-66.7  $\pm$  57.7 %) from the beginning 526 to the end of the intervention. 527

Over time, a trend of change was also observed on the physical (p = 0.083), emotional 528 (p = 0.074) and loss of appetite (p = 0.070) scales (**Table 8**). Consistent with food consumed 529 perception, those patients consuming the standard dose of DMB showed a higher fall in 10ss of appetite (% change =  $-100.0 \pm 0.0$ ) contrasting with those consuming the high dose 531 ( $-33.3 \pm 57.7$ ) or placebo ( $-33.3 \pm 57.7$ %) that increased their inappetence. These patients 532 also were the only ones who improved their emotional scale during the intervention (% 533 change =  $1.2 \pm 9.9$ %). 534

Additionally, to a better quality of life, the perception perceived by cancer patients 535 about product effectiveness tended to improve depending on treatment (p = 0.074) (**Table** 536 **S3**). Patients consuming the standard dose of DMB showed a better perception of its effectiveness from the start to end of intervention (% chance = 44.2 ± 73.5 vs. 14.6 ± 75.3 or placebo -21.4 ± 44.4 %). 539

Table 7. Anthropo	ometric and bod	v composition	parameters de	pending on f	he assigned	treatment
		, composition	paralitectoro ac	perioning on t	and aloughtee	er contracter to

	Standard dose of DMB						High dose of DMB			Placebo					p-value		
		Baseline 1 month 2 months 3 months Baseline				1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t		
Peso	kg kg/m	$61.4 \pm 11.1$	$60.9 \pm 11.6$	59.8 ± 12.5	59.6 ± 12.6	$62.0 \pm 14.1$	$65.4 \pm 14.3$	67.5 ± 13.3	$65.5 \pm 14.2$	$62.6\pm10.7$	$60.1 \pm 11.8$	60.8 ± 11.6	61.5 ± 11.2	0.450	0.516	0.073	
BMI	2	$21.9\pm3.6$	$21.4 \pm 3.1$	$21.0\pm3.4$	$20.9\pm3.6$	$22.0\pm3.3$	$22.7\pm3.3$	$23.0\pm3.2$	$22.7\pm3.4$	$22.9\pm3.4$	$23.3\pm3.4$	$23.6\pm3.2$	$23.9\pm3.0$	0.56	0.266	0.073	
WC	cm	$80.5\pm9.7$	$81.6 \pm 11.6$	$78.8 \pm 12.6$	$77.8 \pm 11.9$	$84.3 \pm 12.8$	$87.9 \pm 12.6$	$90.2 \pm 13.6$	$89.4 \pm 11.4$	$79.4 \pm 10.5$	$83.1\pm10.4$	$83.7\pm10.2$	$86.0 \pm 11.6$	0.857	0.209	0.053	
FFM	kg	$46.8\pm8.3$	$48.7\pm8.7$	$48.4\pm9.4$	$47.4 \pm 9.3$	$47.6\pm9.9$	$48.4\pm7.4$	$50.9 \pm 8.5$	$47.3\pm7.1$	$45.7\pm5.9$	$43.4\pm5.0$	$43.3\pm5.2$	$44.1\pm4.7$	0.017	0.346	0.006	
FM	kg	$14.6\pm5.5$	$12.1 \pm 3.9$	$11.4\pm4.5$	$12.1 \pm 4.2$	$14.2 \pm 7.3$	$17.0\pm9.0$	$16.5 \pm 9.8$	$12.9\pm4.1$	$17.0\pm8.4$	$16.9 \pm 9.9$	$17.5 \pm 9.8$	$17.5 \pm 9.2$	0.498	0.262	0.446	
TW	L	$34.8\pm6.0$	$36.1 \pm 6.2$	$35.7\pm6.9$	$35.1 \pm 6.6$	$36.0 \pm 9.0$	$36.9 \pm 7.2$	$38.0\pm7.2$	$35.0\pm5.4$	$34.8 \pm 5.6$	$32.0\pm3.9$	$32.0 \pm 4.3$	$32.8 \pm 3.1$	0.240	0.326	0.029	
BCM	kg	$22.7 \pm 5.5$	$23.6\pm5.9$	$23.2\pm5.9$	$22.0\pm6.1$	$22.3 \pm 5.7$	$21.7\pm5.3$	$25.4\pm8.7$	$22.7\pm4.7$	$20.4 \pm 3.2$	$20.6\pm2.9$	$20.7\pm2.7$	$20.9\pm3.7$	0.067	0.603	0.213	
PhA	0	$4.9 \pm 1.0$	$4.9\pm0.8$	$4.8\pm0.6$	$4.6\pm0.8$	$4.7\pm0.8$	$4.4\pm1.0$	$5.3 \pm 2.2$	$4.8\pm0.7$	$4.4\pm1.0$	$4.7\pm0.9$	$4.9\pm0.8$	$4.8\pm0.9$	0.194	0.837	0.632	
S. PhA	0	$-0.9 \pm 1.0$	$-0.9 \pm 0.7$	$-1.0 \pm 0.5$	$-1.0 \pm 0.8$	-1.3 ± 1.1	-1.5 ± 1.1	$-1.7 \pm 0.9$	$-1.4 \pm 0.8$	-1.1 ± 1.7	$-1.0 \pm 0.4$	$-1.0 \pm 0.4$	$-0.7 \pm 0.5$	0.378	0.072	0.662	

BMI, body weight index; WC, waist circumference; PhA, phase angle; FFM, fat free mass; FM, Fat mass; TW, total water; BCM, body cell. mass; S. PhA, standardized phase angle. Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

# Table 8. Quality of life depending on the assigned treatment

		9	Standard d	ose of DMI	3		High dos	e of DMB		Placebo				p-value		
		Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t
Global health status	Points	$66.67 \pm 12.42$	$66.67 \pm 21.65$	$68.75 \pm 13.91$	$69.79 \pm 16.02$	$46.21 \pm 15.97$	$41.67 \pm 22.27$	$44.05 \pm 19.07$	$40.28 \pm 8.19$	$57.41 \pm 23.36$	$73.81 \pm 23.78$	$73.81 \pm 16.27$	$78.57 \pm 9.45$	0,000	0.473	0.181
Functional Scales																
Physical	Points	$94.67 \pm 6.89$	$95.56 \pm 6.67$	$95.83 \pm 7.07$	$94.17 \pm 7.51$	$90.3 \pm 8.62$	$85.83 \pm 12.57$	$89.52 \pm 13.25$	$92.22 \pm 6.55$	$97.04 \pm 4.84$	$96.19 \pm 7.56$	$99.05 \pm 2.52$	$98.1 \pm 5.04$	0.083	0.117	0.228
Daily activities	Points	$96.67 \pm 7.03$	$98.15 \pm 5.56$	$97.92 \pm 5.89$	$97.92 \pm 5.89$	$90.91 \pm 11.46$	$89.58 \pm 15.27$	$95.24 \pm 8.13$	$91.67 \pm 13.94$	$96.3 \pm 7.35$	$92.86 \pm 8.91$	$95.24 \pm 8.13$	$100.00\pm0.0$	0.159	0.125	0.408
Emotional	Points	$89.17 \pm 14.19$	$89.81 \pm 14.3$	$91.67 \pm 11.79$	$89.58 \pm 11.57$	$75.76 \pm 19.88$	$70.83 \pm 17.82$	$70.24 \pm 20.33$	$61.11 \pm 20.18$	$85.19 \pm 15.47$	$91.67 \pm 12.73$	$89.29 \pm 16.47$	$82.14\pm26.1$	0.074	0.273	0.947
Cognitive	Points	$93.33 \pm 11.65$	$94.44 \pm 11.79$	$97.92 \pm 5.89$	$97.92 \pm 5.89$	$80.3 \pm 14.56$	$70.83 \pm 21.36$	$73.81 \pm 16.27$	$69.44 \pm 12.55$	$85.19 \pm 22.74$	$90.48 \pm 13.11$	$90.48 \pm 18.9$	$92.86 \pm 13.11$	0.010	0.586	0.427
Social	Points	$75 \pm 22.57$	$88.89 \pm 16.67$	$87.5 \pm 14.77$	$87.5 \pm 17.25$	$60.61 \pm 30.98$	$68.75 \pm 41.25$	$71.43 \pm 34.31$	$58.33 \pm 31.18$	$81.48 \pm 19.44$	$85.71 \pm 15$	$92.86 \pm 13.11$	$85.71\pm20.25$	0.108	0.018	0.936
Symptomatic Scales																
Fatigue	Points	$24.44\pm23.89$	$20.99 \pm 23.2$	$12.5\pm12.51$	$13.89 \pm 21.21$	$42.42 \pm 18.47$	$40.28 \pm 18.72$	$44.44\pm26.45$	$50\pm26.06$	$38.27 \pm 26.12$	$25.4 \pm 19.99$	$23.81 \pm 23.51$	$20.63 \pm 28.28$	0.092	0.044	0.307
Nausea and vomiting	Points	$3.33 \pm 7.03$	$3.7 \pm 11.11$	$2.08 \pm 5.89$	$4.17 \pm 11.79$	$12.12 \pm 18.4$	$10.42 \pm 17.68$	$9.52 \pm 13.11$	$5.56 \pm 13.61$	$7.41 \pm 12.11$	$2.38\pm6.3$	$4.76\pm8.13$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	0.457	0.232	0.517
Pain	Points	$16.67 \pm 19.25$	$11.11 \pm 18.63$	$8.33 \pm 12.6$	$10.42 \pm 12.4$	$24.24\pm31.06$	$35.42 \pm 43.13$	$38.1 \pm 39.34$	$50 \pm 39.44$	$14.81 \pm 21.15$	$4.76 \pm 12.6$	$7.14 \pm 13.11$	$4.76 \pm 12.6$	0.176	0.678	0.304
Dyspnoea	Points	$3.33 \pm 10.54$	$3.7 \pm 11.11$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$15.15 \pm 17.41$	$12.5\pm24.8$	$4.76 \pm 12.6$	$16.67 \pm 18.26$	$3.7 \pm 11.11$	$4.76 \pm 12.6$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$9.52\pm25.2$	0.615	0.306	0.244
Insomnia	Points	$26.66\pm30.63$	$11.11 \pm 16.67$	$16.67 \pm 17.82$	$16.67\pm25.2$	$24.24\pm26.21$	$29.16\pm33.03$	$14.28\pm26.22$	$22.22\pm27.21$	$25.92\pm27.78$	$23.81 \pm 25.2$	$28.57 \pm 29.99$	$23.81 \pm 31.7$	0.757	0.787	0.731
Lost of appetite	Points	$6.67 \pm 14.05$	$7.41 \pm 14.7$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$15.15\pm22.92$	$12.5\pm17.25$	$14.28\pm26.22$	$22.22\pm27.21$	$14.81 \pm 24.21$	$38.09 \pm 29.99$	33.33 ± 33.33	$23.81 \pm 31.7$	0.070	0.688	0.227
Constipation	Points	$16.67\pm23.57$	$3.7 \pm 11.11$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$15.15\pm27.34$	$0.0 \pm 0.0$	$19.05\pm26.22$	$16.67 \pm 18.26$	$18.52\pm29.39$	$9.52\pm25.2$	$14.28 \pm 17.82$	$9.52 \pm 16.26$	0.608	0.048	0.716
Diarrhea	Points	$10.00 \pm 16.10$	$7.41 \pm 14.7$	$8.33 \pm 15.43$	$8.33 \pm 23.57$	$21.21 \pm 26.97$	$29.16 \pm 33.03$	$23.81 \pm 31.7$	$16.67 \pm 18.26$	$14.81 \pm 24.21$	$23.81 \pm 31.7$	$19.05\pm26.22$	$23.81 \pm 31.7$	0.174	0.723	0.879
Financial difficulties	Points	$6.67 \pm 14.05$	$3.7 \pm 11.11$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$15.15\pm22.92$	$4.17 \pm 11.78$	$19.05\pm26.22$	11.11 ± 27.21	$3.7 \pm 11.11$	$4.76 \pm 12.60$	$4.76 \pm 12.60$	$9.52 \pm 16.26$	0.821	0.195	0.192

Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

# 3.3 Miraculin-Based Food Supplement Safety

# 3.3.1 Adverse events

During the study, some adverse events occurred in the patients evaluated (Table S4). 560 However, when patients were asked about the possible association with DMB consump-561 tion all declared no none of them were associated with these adverse events. Indeed, the 562 intensity of adverse events reported by cancer patients consuming DMB improved once 563 the intervention was completed. In this sense, patients who initially reported a moderate 564 intensity changed from having a moderate intensity to mild or not described. Symptoms 565 such as abdominal distention improved only in those patients consuming the standard 566 dose of DMB. When an adverse event occurred, oncologic patients consumed the medica-567 tion indicated by the physician. Thus, after three months of treatment, patients consuming 568 DMB did not present more adverse events than those consuming placebo. 569

# 3.3.2 Biochemical parameters

Glucose metabolism parameters remained within normal ranges in all considered 572 groups (Table 9). It is worth mentioning that, in patients consuming the standard dose of 573 DMB, the percentage of change since the beginning of the intervention in insulin concen-574 tration was  $-20.8 \pm 39.7$  %, while in high dose was  $-1.6 \pm 50.2$  % and in placebo  $-7.5 \pm 23.4$ 575 %. 576

Even though the diet of patients consuming the standard dose of DMB was fat-high 577 (Table 5), the blood lipid profile was not altered and parameters related to lipid metabo-578 lism remained within normal ranges for the age and sex of the population (Table 9). 579

Proteins usually related to nutritional status such as retinol-binding protein (RBP) 580 showed changes over time and depending on treatment (p = 0.027). Patients consuming 581 the high dose of DMB had higher RBP values than placebo (p < 0.05); however, the mean 582 of this increase remained within normal ranges. 583

Vitamin and mineral biomarkers, except for magnesium, were not affected by habit-584 ual consumption of the miraculin-based food supplement and remained stable through-585 out the clinical trial and within the normal ranges of the population throughout the clini-586 cal trial (Table S5). Magnesium showed a change throughout the study depending on the 587 time and treatment assigned (p = 0.028). Only those patients consuming DMB improved 588 magnesium concentration at the end of the study (% change standard dose 4.2 ± 5.7; high 589 dose: 11.7 ± 13.6; placebo -3.0 ± 12.7). 590

At the end of the study kidney function biomarkers such as creatinine (p = 0.054), 591 glomerular filtration rate (p = 0.051) and uric acid (p = 0.066) tended to change over time 592 and depending on treatment (Table 10). Nevertheless, all patients had values within nor-593 mal ranges. 594

Finally, safety biomarkers of liver function did not show significant changes after 595 completing the clinical trial (Table 10), except for ALT levels (p = 0.057). Only patients 596 consuming the standard dose of DMB reduced ALT levels from the beginning to the end 597 of the intervention (% change =  $-7.5 \pm 23.4$  %, high dose:  $16.7 \pm 32.9$  % and placebo:  $5.6 \pm$ 598 23.2 %) within the normal range while this was not so in patients consuming the placebo 599 who had final ALT blood concentrations higher than normal (< 35 UI/L). From the begin-600 ning of the intervention to the end, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), an enzyme used to de-601 tect tissue or liver damage, had higher levels than those recommended (100–190 UI/L) in 602 all patients. 603

> 604 605

558 559

570

Table 9. Parameters of carbohydrate and lipid metabolism and nutritional status depending on the treatment																
		Standard dose of DMB			High dose of DMB				Placebo				p-value			
		Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t
Glucose	mg/dL	$106.1 \pm 15.37$	$104.89 \pm 12.72$	$100 \pm 15.22$	$102.5\pm13.9$	$108.82\pm30.68$	$102.13\pm15.81$	$95 \pm 7.98$	$104.83\pm26.01$	109.3 ± 22.99	$104.57\pm27.96$	$106.86\pm25.37$	$102.05\pm23.21$	0.809	0.678	0.789
Insulin	μU/mL	$11.3\pm10.71$	$10.56\pm8.35$	$6.25 \pm 3.33$	$6.21 \pm 3.28$	$12.18\pm7.67$	$9.14 \pm 8.11$	$9.29 \pm 6.65$	$16 \pm 14.46$	$11.3\pm9.02$	$9 \pm 7.44$	$11.29 \pm 8.98$	$10.1 \pm 6.19$	0.845	0.323	0.435
Total Cholesterol	mg/dL	$187.4\pm33.28$	$174.44 \pm 38.76$	170.63 ± 33.39	$178.5\pm27.15$	$174.45\pm27.19$	$177.13\pm27.22$	$186.24\pm23.43$	$188.67\pm36.46$	$185.2\pm29.08$	$169.57\pm26.51$	$183.29\pm23.62$	$187.1\pm21.69$	0.751	0.932	0.768
HDL Cholesterol	mg/dL	60.7 ± 23.99	$53.33 \pm 23.08$	$50.88 \pm 22.08$	$52.25 \pm 25.42$	$53.45 \pm 17.95$	$51.63 \pm 17.72$	$50.19 \pm 19.02$	56.33 ± 21.71	$57 \pm 24.82$	$55.43 \pm 24.58$	$64.14 \pm 27.01$	$65.48 \pm 28.25$	0.909	0.546	0.192
No HDL	mg/dL	$97 \pm 0$	$121.11\pm34.09$	$119.75\pm31.67$	131.83 ± 50.7	$132.5\pm0$	$125.5\pm29.77$	$124.14\pm41.33$	$132.5 \pm 0$	$130.75\pm27.93$	$114.14\pm15.85$	$118.86\pm27.27$	$126 \pm 21.4$	0.801	0.991	0.989
LDL Cholesterol	mg/dL	$105.9 \pm 24.12$	$99.67 \pm 27.58$	$100.5\pm26.44$	$106.13\pm25.93$	$95.91 \pm 30.45$	99.38 ± 30.39	$107.19\pm22.49$	$111\pm27.62$	$100.2\pm25.19$	$91.29 \pm 18.87$	91.86 ± 19.18	$97.86 \pm 14.68$	0.244	0.721	0.694
Triglycerides	mg/dL	$113.8\pm60.35$	$107.44\pm49.51$	96.38 ± 28.87	$102.42\pm43.73$	$145.45\pm67.59$	134.88 ± 66.2	$145.38\pm45.12$	$107.5\pm26.36$	$140.2\pm44.86$	$114.29\pm30.51$	$135.57 \pm 60.35$	$120.33\pm50.46$	0.203	0.58	0.506
Total proteins	g/dL	$6.77\pm0.45$	$6.68\pm0.33$	$6.78\pm0.31$	$6.53 \pm 0.38$	$6.96\pm0.7$	$6.79\pm0.76$	$6.86 \pm 0.57$	$6.95\pm0.62$	$6.2 \pm 1.47$	$6.66\pm0.5$	$6.71\pm0.34$	$6.79\pm0.43$	0.268	0.502	0.415
Albumin	g/dL	$4.35\pm0.17$	$4.22 \pm 0.2$	$4.31\pm0.2$	$4.06\pm0.5$	$4.24\pm0.31$	$4.1 \pm 0.23$	$4.2 \pm 0.21$	$4.32\pm0.23$	$4.33 \pm 0.36$	$4.17\pm0.28$	$4.21\pm0.23$	$4.27\pm0.21$	0.595	0.062	0.114
Prealbumin	mg/dL	$23.8 \pm 7.11$	$22.22 \pm 5.47$	$20.47\pm5.29$	$20.29\pm5.76$	$22.07\pm7.96$	$21.49 \pm 8.34$	$23.73 \pm 8.94$	$24.94 \pm 11.42$	$19.94\pm5.68$	$17.61 \pm 3.76$	$19.74 \pm 3.34$	$20.58 \pm 4.55$	0.337	0.297	0.152
RBP	mg/dL	$4.36 \pm 1.68$	$3.93 \pm 1.47$	$3.79 \pm 1.32$	$3.76 \pm 1.64$	$4.22 \pm 1.34$	$3.99 \pm 1.54$	$4.29 \pm 1.42$	$4.69 \pm 2$	$3.88 \pm 1.28$	$3.07 \pm 0.6$	$3.33 \pm 0.78$	$4.16 \pm 1.32$	0.47	0.218	0.027

RBP, Retinol binding protein. Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

607 608

# Table 10. Security parameters depending on the assigned treatment

		Standard dose of DMB					High dose of DMB			Placebo				p-value		
		Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Baseline	1 month	2 months	3 months	Time (t)	Treatment (T)	T x t
Creatinine	mg/dL	$0.76 \pm 0.27$	$0.79\pm0.27$	$0.85\pm0.26$	$0.77 \pm 0.28$	$0.71 \pm 0.2$	$0.7 \pm 0.18$	$0.68\pm0.15$	$0.71\pm0.25$	$1 \pm 1.03$	$0.65\pm0.11$	$0.68 \pm 0.12$	$0.75\pm0.18$	0.329	0.033	0.054
GFR	mL/min/1.73 m <sup>2</sup>	82 ± 13.22	$79.44 \pm 13.74$	$78.38 \pm 15.83$	$81.17 \pm 14.03$	$87.55 \pm 8.68$	89.63 ± 3.89	$90.14 \pm 2.27$	87.17 ± 9.39	81.1 ± 23.74	$88.14 \pm 7.56$	$86.57 \pm 8.42$	81.71 ± 14.19	0.832	0.202	0.051
Uric acid	mg/dL	$4.25 \pm 1.27$	$4.56 \pm 1.77$	$4.86\pm2.08$	$4.12 \pm 1.52$	$4.38 \pm 1.2$	$4.59\pm0.82$	$4.64 \pm 1$	$4.55 \pm 1.22$	$5.1 \pm 2$	$4.34 \pm 1.13$	$4.77\pm0.98$	$5.01 \pm 1.28$	0.16	0.057	0.066
AST	UI/L	$31.64 \pm 12.61$	29.5 ± 18.73	27.1 ± 18.42	26.39 ± 12.27	29.37 ± 17.57	30.96 ± 22.07	35.86 ± 30.03	$31.67 \pm 21.56$	26.75 ± 15.23	$26\pm10.77$	28.29 ± 20.31	$28.05 \pm 14.15$	0.778	0.985	0.903
ALT	UI/L	34.2 ± 18.02	24.33 ± 12.86	$27.88 \pm 15.01$	23.88 ± 12.8	$26.64 \pm 13.31$	$25.13 \pm 18.91$	31.19 ± 24.55	29.5 ± 13.77	32.11 ± 11.6	$32.71 \pm 14.51$	$36.43 \pm 16.52$	37.71 ± 17.98	0.221	0.051	0.057
LDH	UI/L	225.6 ± 25.68	$230.75\pm43.44$	238.75 ± 27.86	229.25 ± 23.75	291.8 ± 154.17	236.08 ± 77.87	272.07 ± 109.24	240.08 ± 117.92	520.74 ± 841.91	$258 \pm 65.68$	262 ± 53.59	$248.11\pm60.64$	0.267	0.865	0.996
AP	UI/L	82.57 ± 27.28	$79.17 \pm 20.15$	$69.8 \pm 9.65$	72.07 ± 10.39	149.6 ± 138.72	145.56 ± 172.63	167.79 ± 199.69	89 ± 31.03	$146.78 \pm 75.96$	$128.14\pm43.13$	$131.14\pm46.46$	$126.48\pm40.81$	0.264	0.934	0.982
GGT	UI/L	$39.14\pm20.31$	35.33 ± 19.19	$31 \pm 17.07$	$34.07 \pm 18.74$	168.3 ± 389.02	$235\pm523.74$	$250\pm544.6$	43.17 ± 29.39	142.63 ± 157.81	92.33 ± 92.83	117.67 ± 129.16	116.06 ± 122.14	0.537	0.727	0.748
Bilirubin	mg/dL	$0.74\pm0.45$	$0.66 \pm 0.37$	$0.6 \pm 0.24$	$0.65\pm0.36$	$0.53 \pm 0.13$	$0.52 \pm 0.3$	$0.47 \pm 0.24$	$0.46 \pm 0.15$	$0.56 \pm 0.31$	$0.43 \pm 0.2$	$0.52 \pm 0.19$	$0.5 \pm 0.22$	0.239	0.730	0.867

GFR, glomerular filtration rate; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ALT, alanine transaminase; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; AP, alkaline phosphatase; GGT, gamma-glutamyl transferase. Values are expressed as mean ± standard deviation.

> It is worth mentioning that, although there were no differences depending on time or treatment, at the end of the intervention the gamma-glutamyl transferase (GGT), a bi-621 omarker of possible damage to the bile ducts, was normal just in those patients consuming 622 the standard dose of DMB while the rest were above normal ranges (< 38 IU/L).

## 4. Discussion

The main findings of the present study were that the habitual intake of a standard 625 dose of DMB improved the electrochemical perception of taste in cancer patients allowing 626 a greater food intake and a better quantity and quality of dietary lipid intake, which in 627 turn was reflected in an ameliorated fatty acids status. Additionally, improvements in 628 body composition, nutritional status and quality of life were observed. Furthermore, the 629 main safety parameters remained stable and within normal ranges throughout the entire 630 study. These results suggest that habitual consumption of a standard dose of 150 mg of 631 miraculin-food supplement (DMB) is effective and safe for malnourished cancer patients 632 in active treatment who present an objective TDs. 633

Two clinical trials have been carried out on patients receiving chemotherapy using 634 the miracle berry. In the first study, a crossover clinical trial was carried out on 23 chem-635 otherapy patients whose taste alterations were measured by the Wickham questionnaire 636 [39]. In two weeks, patients consumed either the miracle fruit or supportive measures 637 alone. At the end of the study, 30% of patients showed an improvement in taste. The sec-638 ond study included eight participants who received three or more cycles of chemotherapy 639 and expressed positive taste changes to the nurse [40]. These patients were assigned to the 640 experimental (n = 4) or control group (n = 4) in a nonrandomized manner. Patients con-641 sumed six fruits per day of miracle fruit or dried cranberries as a placebo for two weeks. 642 At the end of the study, all patients reported positive taste changes with miracle fruit con-643 sumption through qualitative data. 644

In the present study, a reduction in the electrical threshold (taste acuity) was ob-645 served in all patients evaluated, including those consuming the miraculin-based food sup-646 plement. This finding is relevant because a gradual deterioration in taste perception is 647 expected to occur because of antineoplastic treatment [3,4,49,50] and this deterioration has 648 remained stable throughout the study. Although the overall change in electrical taste per-649 ception change was not conclusive, the chemical perception of salty taste significantly im-650 proved in cancer patients habitually consuming the standard dose of DMB. Analysis of 651 subjective taste changes reported that salt and umami tastes are more sensitive to chemo-652 therapy than other taste descriptors [51]. Salty taste distortion is the most frequently re-653 ported taste alteration during neo/adjuvant chemotherapy [52]. Umami taste was not eval-654 uated as a descriptor in the present clinical trial because foods providing umami flavor 655 are not commonly used in the Spanish population. Since one taste perception is associated 656 with changes in other tastes during chemotherapy [53] an improvement in an affected 657 descriptor can contribute to a better perception of global food taste. 658

Up to 87% of cancer patients with TDs experience a loss of appetite [54] which is 659 widely known to be associated with poor prognosis [55]. However, patients who con-660 sumed the standard dose of DMB did not exhibit a loss of appetite at the end of the study. 661 Therefore, habitual consumption of a standard dose of DMB may protect against loss of 662 appetite in cancer patients; in fact, these patients had greater food intake and better met 663 their energy needs. This finding is of relevance since cancer patients have shown a lower 664 intake of total energy, protein and fat during chemotherapy related to TDs [56]. 665

In addition to better covering the total energy expenditure, habitual consumption of 666 a standard dose of DMB was associated with increased quantity and quality of fat intake 667 in cancer patients. Various studies have shown that high-fat diets, especially those rich in 668

619 620

623

trans and saturated fat, promote tumorigenesis by modulating the gut microbiota [57–59], 669 systemic low-grade inflammation [60], and changes in the adipocytokine profile [61,62]. 670 On the other hand, although epidemiological data do not support the theory that a de-671 crease in total fat intake is effective in preventing cancer [63-66] or decreasing cancer-spe-672 cific mortality [67], dietary lipid composition can have an impact on cancer pathogenesis 673 [68]. Thus, cancer patients who consumed a standard dose of DMB exhibited notably im-674 proved MUFA and PUFA intake. MUFA intake has been inversely associated with de-675 creased cancer risk [63,69]. Indeed, a higher intake of MUFA from plant sources was as-676 sociated with lower mortality rates associated with all causes [70]. Olive oil is the largest 677 contributor to MUFA since it provides up to 78 % of oleic acid, the most abundant MUFA 678 in the Spanish diet [71]. Thus, olive oil was the most commonly used culinary fat by cancer 679 patients in the present study. A meta-analysis of case-control studies showed that olive 680 oil consumption was associated with lower odds of developing any type of cancer [72], 681 which highlights the importance of its consumption. 682

On the other hand, a majority of studies examining the relationship between PUFAs 683 and cancer risk have focused on n–6 and n–3, two of their most biologically active representatives. However, a meta-analysis of observational studies revealed a mild inverse association between diets high in total PUFA and specific-cancer risk [73], while others have 686 not found an association with increased risk [66,74]. Therefore, an adequate quantity and 687 quality of dietary fats, promoted by the habitual consumption of a standard dose of DMB 688 could improve the prognosis of these patients. 689

As shown in the present study, erythrocyte percentages of oleic acid and selected 690 PUFA, including linoleic acid, AA, and DHA, increased following habitual intake of a 691 standard dose of DMB. Additionally, cancer patients who consumed DMB had the highest 692 omega-3 index, an indicator of omega-3 status and coronary heart disease risk [75]. A 693 higher omega-3 index has also been found to be inversely associated with lower cancer-694 specific risk in a meta-analysis of case-control studies [76]. PUFA play important roles as 695 precursors of lipid mediators that regulate metabolic pathways and inflammatory re-696 sponses, oxidative stress, and modifications of membrane composition that could impact 697 cell signaling pathways and cancer progression [77]. In addition, cancer cells with more 698 membranes are less susceptible to oxidative stress induced by chemotherapeutic agents 699 [78]. 700

On the other hand, cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy often suffer from nu-701 tritional alterations, particularly in terms of essential fatty acid and long-chain PUFA sta-702 tus [79]. Additionally, nutritional status is associated with poor prognosis, lower treat-703 ment completion and greater healthcare consumption [80]. Accordingly, it has been re-704 ported that supplementation with EPA and DHA in cancer patients has a positive impact 705 during treatment, which is associated with cellular membrane modulation [81]. Moreover, 706 the discovery of pro-resolution mediators of inflammation derived from arachidonic acid, 707 called lipoxins, and from EPA and DHA, called resolvins, protectins and maresins [82-708 84], supports the idea that a PUFA-enriched membrane could be favorable for the man-709 agement of this disease [85,86]. In this scenario, it is possible to assume that consuming 710 more and better quality food would involve the intake of more essential fatty acids and 711 lead to an improvement in the levels of PUFA with a concomitant improvement in nutri-712 tional status [87]. Changes in the fatty acid profile of the erythrocyte membrane would be 713 indicative of improved nutritional status in cancer patients. This improvement can be at-714 tributed to supplementation with the miraculin food supplement given that it was ex-715 tended for 12 weeks, sufficient time for the complete renovation of the total pool of eryth-716 rocytes [88]. 717

In a randomized clinical trial carried out on malnourished cancer patients a high–fat 718 diet provided for eight weeks improved weight control, fat–free mass and body mass from 719

the first to the third chemotherapy cycle [89]. In this regard, in the present clinical trial, 720 habitual consumption of a standard dose of DMB maintained body weight and increased 721 fat-free mass, as measured by BIA, a reliable tool in nutritional intervention studies [90]. 722 This is probably because a high-fat diet, favored by the consumption of DMB, would com-723 pensate at least in part for the rise in resting energy expenditure observed in cancer pa-724 tients [66], which is also a major determinant of the development of malnutrition [91]. 725 Calorie intake is also a significant factor in preventing fat-free mass weight loss in cancer 726 patients [92], and those consuming a standard dose of DMB adequately meet their energy 727 requirements. 728

Malnutrition predicts the risk of physical impairment, chemotherapy toxicity and 729 mortality in cancer patients [93,94]. In this sense, all cancer patients improved their nutri-730 tional status once the intervention was completed. Loss of body weight (skeletal muscle 731 and body fat) is associated with a reduction in quality of life [95]. The latter is also affected 732 by the disease itself and the antineoplastic treatment used [96]. Therefore, it is not surpris-733 ing that poor quality of life in cancer patients is associated with poor nutritional status 734 [97] and conversely, that malnutrition reduces their quality of life [98]. Additionally, gual-735 ity of life can significantly impact long-term cancer survivorship [99]. In this regard, in the 736 present clinical trial, it was found that habitual consumption of a standard dose of DMB 737 improved quality of life, in particular constipation, as measured by symptom scales, Di-738 verse catabolic factors are activated by the presence of constipation, fatigue, nausea, vom-739 iting and other relevant symptoms usually present in cancer patients [100]. Fatigue or loss 740 of appetite are among the most common symptoms exhibited by cancer patients that affect 741 their quality of life [101]. In the present study, only patients who consumed a standard 742 dose of DMB improved their loss of appetite and improved their scores on the emotional 743 scale from the beginning to the end of the intervention. They also showed improvements 744 in fatigue. Since TDs caused by cancer therapies negatively affect patient quality of life 745 [14,28,54], the improvement observed in the perception of salty taste in patients consum-746 ing a standard dose of DMB could have contributed to the improvement of these quality 747 of life scales. 748

Synsepalum dulcificum fruits have been consumed since the 18th century by natives of 749 Western and Central Africa [102] without describing adverse events beyond wanted taste 750 changes. In 2021, DMB obtained from dried fruits of S. dulcificum was approved as a novel 751 food in the European Union after a positive scientific opinion by the European Food Safety 752 Authority (EFSA). The panel concluded that an intake of 10 mg/kg body weight (bw) per 753 day is safe for human consumption [41]. The maximum dose used in the present clinical 754 trial was 0.9 g/day, slightly above this recommendation. However, the EFSA also indi-755 cated that a 90-day oral dose of 2000 mg/kg bw per day was not associated with adverse 756 effects. In this vein, different studies assessed the taste-modifying properties of different 757 products from S. dulcificum and although this has not been its main objective, the authors 758 of these studies did not report adverse events during its consumption [40,103–107]. The 759 potential allergenicity and toxicity of miraculin have also been evaluated and it has not 760 been associated with any safety concerns [108]. 761

In this regard, cancer patients who habitually consumed DMB did not experience 762 any adverse events related to their consumption. A negative effect, but not an adverse 763 event, was the dropout of six patients due to the taste distortion caused by habitually non-764 sweet acidic foods such as tomatoes and salads. The majority of dropouts (67 %) occurred 765 at a high dose of DMB, indicating that patients are more likely to accept a standard dose 766 of DMB. Indeed, the effectiveness perceived by patients of the food supplement contain-767 ing miraculin increased notably in those patients consuming a standard dose of DMB over 768 time. Several studies have shown that the degree of the taste-modifying effect of miracle 769 berries differs according to fruit type, source or preparation [109] since it determines the 770

miraculin content. The smaller quantity the lower the sweetness intensity and *vice versa* 771 [107]. A high dose of DMB, with a higher miraculin content, probably provided high 772 sweetness intensity and persistence, significantly modifying the cancer patient's taste of 773 sour foods. This is because miraculin stimulates a sweet taste 400,000 times greater than 774 sucrose [110] and its effect can linger up to two hours until miraculin dissociates from the 775 taste receptors by the action of salivary amylase [111].

While the energetic contribution of dietary lipids increased significantly in those con-777 suming the standard dose of DMB, its continued consumption for 3 months did not alter 778 the blood lipid profile. Triterpenoids isolated from the miracle fruit can act as cholesterol-779 lowering agents [112] and as effective antihyperglycemic agents [113] by increasing insu-780 lin synthesis, inhibiting carbohydrate metabolizing enzymes [114] and improving insulin 781 sensitivity [115]. In this regard, it is worth mentioning that the plasma lipid profile, as well 782 as glucose metabolism parameters, remained stable and within normal ranges throughout 783 the intervention. 784

Habitual consumption of a standard dose of DMB may have a hepatoprotective effect 785 since the placebo patients had liver markers such as ALT and GGT above normal ranges. 786 The hepatoprotective effect of miracle berries has already been described in previous experimental studies [113]. Kidney protection was also been observed when miracle fruit 788 extracts were used. Indeed, it has been proposed as a novel plasma uric-lowering agent 789 [116]. In this sense, it was observed that patients consuming a standard dose of DMB 790 tended to reduce, within normal ranges, the concentration of uric acid. 791

The major strength of the present clinical trial was the use of objective analysis in the 792 evaluation of the effect of habitual consumption of a food supplement containing mirac-793 ulin on electrochemical taste perception in cancer patients undergoing active treatment. 794 Due to the exploratory nature of the present study, one of the limitations was the reduced 795 number of patients evaluated. Additionally, the complexity of managing cancer patients 796 (polypharmacy, complications, intercurrent diseases, etc.) may have conditioned the high 797 treatment dropout rate. However, based on the results obtained at the present study, the 798 calculation of the ideal sample size will allow us to confirm and expand the results in 799 future clinical trials as the DMB optimal dose has now been established. 800

#### 5. Conclusions

Habitual consumption of a standard dose of DMB, equivalent to 150 mg of the dried 802 berry, before each main meal, improves electrochemical food perception allowing greater 803 food intake and a better quantity and quality of the lipid profile reflected in the diet and 804 membrane fatty acids. Additionally, a standard dose of DMB increases fat-free mass and 805 reduces fat mass but also promotes improvements in quality-of-life such as constipation. 806 The nutritional status of cancer patients who consumed a standard dose of DMB also im-807 proved. Additionally, the habitual consumption of DMB appears to be safe with no 808 changes in major biochemical parameters associated with health status. 809

801

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at:810www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1, Table S1: Perception of food consumption depending on treatment; Table811S2: Nutritional status depending on treatment; Table S3: Perceived effectiveness of the product depending on treatment; Table S4: Adverse events depending on the assigned treatment group; Table813S5: Vitamins and Minerals depending on treatment.814

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, B.L.-P., A.G., and S.P.-M.; methodology, B.L.-P., T.H.,815and J.F.-B.; software, J.D.-P.; validation, F.J.R.-O, and M.B.-H.; formal data analysis, J.D.-P.; investi-816gation, B.L.-P and L.A.-C.; resources, S.P.-M.; data curation, L.A.-C; writing—original draft prepa-817ration, B.L.-P., A.I.A.-M, A.G.; writing—review and editing, B.L.-P and A.G.; visualization, A.I.A.-818M.; supervision, S.P.-M and A.G.; project administration, B.L.-P; funding acquisition, S.P.-M. All819authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.820

Funding: This study is funded by Medicinal Gardens S.L. through the Center for Industrial Tech-<br/>nological Development (CDTI), "Cervera" Transfer R&D Projects. Ref. IDI-20210622. (Science and<br/>Education Ministry, Spain).821823

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted following the Declaration of Hel-824sinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of Hospital Universitario La Paz (protocol code 6164825and Jun 23rd 2022 date of approval).826

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study. 828

Data Availability Statement: The data used to support the findings of this study are available from830the corresponding author upon request.831

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Medicinal Gardens S.L. (Baïa Food Co.) for providing the orodispersible DMB<sup>®</sup> tablets (TasteCare<sup>®</sup>) and for its support and technical advice. 833

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

#### References

835

834

- 1. Gamper, E.M.; Giesinger, J.M.; Oberguggenberger, A.; Kemmler, G.; Wintner, L.M.; Gattringer, K.; Sperner-Unterweger, B.; 836 Holzner, B.; Zabernigg, A. Taste Alterations in Breast and Gynaecological Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: 837 Prevalence, Course of Severity, and Quality of Life Correlates. Acta Oncol. 2012, 51, 490-496, 838 doi:10.3109/0284186X.2011.633554. 839
- Zabernigg, A.; Gamper, E.-M.; Giesinger, J.M.; Rumpold, G.; Kemmler, G.; Gattringer, K.; Sperner-Unterweger, B.; Holzner,
   B. Taste Alterations in Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: A Neglected Side Effect? *Oncologist* 2010, *15*, 913–920,
   doi:10.1634/THEONCOLOGIST.2009-0333.
- Bernhardson, B.M.; Tishelman, C.; Rutqvist, L.E. Self-Reported Taste and Smell Changes during Cancer Chemotherapy.
   *Support. Care Cancer* 2008, *16*, 275–283, doi:10.1007/S00520-007-0319-7.
- Bernhardson, B.M.; Tishelman, C.; Rutqvist, L.E. Chemosensory Changes Experienced by Patients Undergoing Cancer 4. 845 Interview Study. Pain 2007, Chemotherapy: А Qualitative I. Symptom Manage. 34. 403-412, 846 doi:10.1016/J.JPAINSYMMAN.2006.12.010. 847
- Heckmann, J.G.; Heckmann, S.M.; Lang, C.J.G.; Hummel, T. Neurological Aspects of Taste Disorders. *Arch. Neurol.* 2003, 60, 848 667–671, doi:10.1001/ARCHNEUR.60.5.667.
- Epstein, J.B.; Barasch, A. Taste Disorders in Cancer Patients: Pathogenesis, and Approach to Assessment and Management.
   Oral Oncol. 2010, 46, 77–81, doi:10.1016/J.ORALONCOLOGY.2009.11.008.
   851
- Abasaeed, R.; Coldwell, S.E.; Lloid, M.E.; Soliman, S.H.; Macris, P.C.; Schubert, M.M. Chemosensory Changes and Quality of Life in Patients Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. *Support. Care Cancer* 2018, 26, 3553–3561, 853 doi:10.1007/S00520-018-4200-7/METRICS.
- Shah, M.H.; Kloos, R.T.; Ringel, M.D.; Knopp, M. V.; Hall, N.C.; King, M.; Stevens, R.; Liang, J.; Wakely, P.E.; Vasko, V. V.; et 855
   al. Phase II Trial of Sorafenib in Metastatic Thyroid Cancer. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2009, 27, 1675–1684, 856
   doi:10.1200/JCO.2008.18.2717/ASSET/IMAGES/ZLJ9990984060006.JPEG. 857
- Adjei, A.A.; Molina, J.R.; Mandrekar, S.J.; Marks, R.; Reid, J.R.; Croghan, G.; Hanson, L.J.; Jett, A.R.; Xia, C.; Lathia, C.; et al.
   Phase I Trial of Sorafenib in Combination with Gefitinib in Patients with Refractory or Recurrent Non–Small Cell Lung
   Cancer. Clin. Cancer Res. 2007, 13, 2684–2691, doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-2889.
- Buttiron Webber, T.; Briata, I.M.; DeCensi, A.; Cevasco, I.; Paleari, L. Taste and Smell Disorders in Cancer Treatment: Results
   from an Integrative Rapid Systematic Review. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2023, 24, doi:10.3390/IJMS24032538.
   862
- de Vries, Y.C.; Winkels, R.M.; van den Berg, M.M.G.A.; de Graaf, C.; Kelfkens, C.S.; de Kruif, J.T.C.M.; Göker, E.; Grosfeld,
   S.; Sommeijer, D.W.; van Laarhoven, H.W.M.; et al. Altered Food Preferences and Chemosensory Perception during
   864

Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer Patients: A Longitudinal Comparison with Healthy Controls. Food Qual. Prefer. 2018, 63, 135-865 143, doi:10.1016/J.FOODQUAL.2017.09.003. 866 12. Postma, E.M.; de Vries, C.; Boesveldt, S. Tasty Food for Cancer Patients: The Impact of Smell and Taste Alterations on Eating 867 Behaviour. Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd 2017, 160, D748. 868 Von Grundherr, J.; Koch, B.; Grimm, D.; Salchow, J.; Valentini, L.; Hummel, T.; Bokemeyer, C.; Stein, A.; Mann, J. Impact of 13. 869 Taste and Smell Training on Taste Disorders during Chemotherapy - TASTE Trial. Cancer Manag. Res. 2019, 11, 4493–4504, 870 doi:10.2147/CMAR.S188903. 871 14. Hovan, A.J.; Williams, P.M.; Stevenson-Moore, P.; Wahlin, Y.B.; Ohrn, K.E.O.; Elting, L.S.; Spijkervet, F.K.L.; Brennan, M.T. 872 A Systematic Review of Dysgeusia Induced by Cancer Therapies. Support. Care Cancer 2010, 18, 1081-1087, 873 doi:10.1007/S00520-010-0902-1. 874 15. Ghias, K.; Jiang, Y.; Gupta, A. The Impact of Treatment-Induced Dysgeusia on the Nutritional Status of Cancer Patients. 2023, 875 doi:10.1016/j.nutos.2023.06.004. 876 Brand, J.G. Within Reach of an End to Unnecessary Bitterness? Lancet 2000, 356, 1371–1372, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02836-16. 877 1. 878 Cohen, J.; E. Wakefield, C.; G. Laing, D. Smell and Taste Disorders Resulting from Cancer and Chemotherapy. Curr. Pharm. 17. 879 Des. 2016, 22, 2253-2263, doi:10.2174/1381612822666160216150812. 880 Nolden, A.; Joseph, P. V.; Kober, K.M.; Cooper, B.A.; Paul, S.M.; Hammer, M.J.; Dunn, L.B.; Conley, Y.P.; Levine, J.D.; 18. 881 Miaskowski, C. Co-Occurring Gastrointestinal Symptoms Are Associated With Taste Changes in Oncology Patients 882 Receiving Chemotherapy. J. Pain Symptom Manage. 2019, 58, 756–765, doi:10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2019.07.016. 883 Özkan, İ.; Taylan, S.; Eroğlu, N.; Kolaç, N. The Relationship between Malnutrition and Subjective Taste Change Experienced 19. 884 by Patients with Cancer Receiving Outpatient Chemotherapy Treatment. Nutr. Cancer 2022, 74, 1670–1679, 885 doi:10.1080/01635581.2021.1957485. 886 Bromley, S.M. Smell and Taste Disorders: A Primary Care Approach. Am Farm Physician 2000, 61, 427-436. 20. 887 21. De Melo Silva, F.R.; De Oliveira, M.G.O.A.; Souza, A.S.R.; Figueroa, J.N.; Santos, C.S. Factors Associated with Malnutrition 888 in Hospitalized Cancer Patients: A Croos-Sectional Study. Nutr. J. 2015, 14, 1-8, doi:10.1186/S12937-015-0113-1/TABLES/4. 889 22. Brown, D.; Loeliger, J.; Stewart, J.; Graham, K.L.; Goradia, S.; Gerges, C.; Lyons, S.; Connor, M.; Stewart, S.; Di Giovanni, A.; 890 et al. Relationship between Global Leadership Initiative on Malnutrition (GLIM) Defined Malnutrition and Survival, Length 891 of Stay and Post-Operative Complications in People with Cancer: A Systematic Review. Clin. Nutr. 2023, 42, 255–268, 892 doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2023.01.012. 893 23. Matsui, R.; Rifu, K.; Watanabe, J.; Inaki, N.; Fukunaga, T. Impact of Malnutrition as Defined by the GLIM Criteria on 894 Treatment Outcomes in Patients with Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Clin. Nutr. 2023, 42, 615-624, 895 doi:10.1016/J.CLNU.2023.02.019/ATTACHMENT/F4B5A529-8AB6-427A-A536-52258C2BBB25/MMC2.DOCX. 896 24. Xu, J.; Jie, Y.; Sun, Y.; Gong, D.; Fan, Y. Association of Global Leadership Initiative on Malnutrition with Survival Outcomes 897 in Patients with Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Clin. Nutr. 2022, 41, 1874–1880, 898 doi:10.1016/J.CLNU.2022.07.007. 899 25. de Vries, Y.C.; Winkels, R.M.; van den Berg, M.M.G.A.; de Graaf, C.; Kelfkens, C.S.; de Kruif, J.T.C.M.; Göker, E.; Grosfeld, 900 S.; Sommeijer, D.W.; van Laarhoven, H.W.M.; et al. Altered Food Preferences and Chemosensory Perception during 901 Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer Patients: A Longitudinal Comparison with Healthy Controls. Food Qual. Prefer. 2018, 63, 135-902 143, doi:10.1016/J.FOODQUAL.2017.09.003. 903

26. Gamper, E.M.; Giesinger, J.M.; Oberguggenberger, A.; Kemmler, G.; Wintner, L.M.; Gattringer, K.; Sperner-Unterweger, B.; 904 Holzner, B.; Zabernigg, A. Taste Alterations in Breast and Gynaecological Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: 905 Quality Prevalence, Course of Severity, and of Life Correlates. Acta Oncol. 2012, 51, 490-496, 906

907

doi:10.3109/0284186X.2011.633554.

27.	Berteretche, M. V.; Dalix, A.M.; D'Ornano, A.M.C.; Bellisle, F.; Khayat, D.; Faurion, A. Decreased Taste Sensitivity in Cancer	908									
	Patients under Chemotherapy. Support. Care Cancer 2004, 12, 571–576, doi:10.1007/S00520-004-0589-2.	909									
28.	Ejder, Z.B.; Sanlier, N. The Relationship between Loneliness, Psychological Resilience, Quality of Life and Taste Change in	910									
	Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy. Support. Care Cancer 2023, 31, doi:10.1007/S00520-023-08156-W.	911									
29.	Comeau, T.B.; Epstein, J.B.; Migas, C. Taste and Smell Dysfunction in Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: A Review of Current										
	Knowledge. Support. Care Cancer 2001, 9, 575–580, doi:10.1007/S005200100279/METRICS.										
30.	Ito, K.; Yuki, S.; Nakatsumi, H.; Kawamoto, Y.; Harada, K.; Nakano, S.; Saito, R.; Ando, T.; Sawada, K.; Yagisawa, M.; et al.										
	Multicenter, Prospective, Observational Study of Chemotherapy-Induced Dysgeusia in Gastrointestinal Cancer. Support. Care	915									
	Cancer 2022, 30, 5351–5359, doi:10.1007/S00520-022-06936-4/TABLES/2.	916									
31.	Fujii, H.; Hirose, C.; Ishihara, M.; Iihara, H.; Imai, H.; Tanaka, Y.; Matsuhashi, N.; Takahashi, T.; Yamaguchi, K.; Yoshida, K.;										
	et al. Improvement of Dysgeusia by Polaprezinc, a Zinc-L-Carnosine, in Outpatients Receiving Cancer Chemotherapy.										
	Anticancer Res. 2018, 38, 6367–6373, doi:10.21873/ANTICANRES.12995.										
32.	Strasser, F.; Demmer, R.; Böhme, C.; Schmitz, SF.H.; Thuerlimann, B.; Cerny, T.; Gillessen, S. Prevention of Docetaxel- or	920									
	Paclitaxel-Associated Taste Alterations in Cancer Patients with Oral Glutamine: A Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Double-	921									
	Blind Study. Oncologist 2008, 13, 337–346, doi:10.1634/THEONCOLOGIST.2007-0217.	922									
33.	Turcotte, K.; Touchette, C.J.; Iorio-Morin, C.; Fortin, D. Successful Management of Glioblastoma Chemotherapy-Associated	923									
	Dysgeusia with Gabapentin. Can. J. Neurol. Sci. 2020, 47, 839–841, doi:10.1017/CJN.2020.115.	924									
34.	Sevryugin, O.; Kasvis, P.; Vigano, M.L.; Vigano, A. Taste and Smell Disturbances in Cancer Patients: A Scoping Review of	925									
	Available Treatments. Support. Care Cancer 2021, 29, 49-66, doi:10.1007/S00520-020-05609-4/TABLES/3.	926									
35.	Kurihara, K.; Beidler, L.M. Taste-Modifying Protein from Miracle Fruit. Science 1968, 161, 1241-1243,	927									
	doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.161.3847.1241.	928									
36.	Misaka, T. Molecular Mechanisms of the Action of Miraculin, a Taste-Modifying Protein. Semin. Cell Dev. Biol. 2013, 24, 222-	929									
	225, doi:10.1016/J.SEMCDB.2013.02.008.	930									
37.	Rodrigues, J.F.; Andrade, R. da S.; Bastos, S.C.; Coelho, S.B.; Pinheiro, A.C.M. Miracle Fruit: An Alternative Sugar Substitute	931									
	in Sour Beverages. Appetite <b>2016</b> , 107, 645–653, doi:10.1016/J.APPET.2016.09.014.	932									
38.	Penna, S. Chemotherapy-Induced Taste Alteration. Clin. J. Oncol. Nurs. 2023, 27, 479–485, doi:10.1188/23.CJON.479-485.	933									
39.	Soares, H.P.; Cusnir, M.; Schwartz, M.A.; Pizzolato, J.F.; Lutzky, J.; Campbell, R.J.; Beaumont, J.L.; Eton, D.; Stonick, S.;	934									
	Lilenbaum, R. Treatment of Taste Alterations in Chemotherapy Patients Using the "Miracle Fruit": Preliminary Analysis of	935									
	a Pilot Study. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2010.28.15_suppl.e19523 <b>2010</b> , 28, e19523–e19523,	936									
	doi:10.1200/JCO.2010.28.15_SUPPL.E19523.	937									
40.	Wilken, M.K.; Satiroff, B.A. Pilot Study of "Miracle Fruit" to Improve Food Palatability for Patients Receiving Chemotherapy.	938									
	Clin. J. Oncol. Nurs. 2012, 16, doi:10.1188/12.CJON.E173-E177.	939									
41.	Turck, D.; Castenmiller, J.; De Henauw, S.; Hirsch-Ernst, K.I.; Kearney, J.; Maciuk, A.; Mangelsdorf, I.; McArdle, H.J.; Naska,	940									
	A.; Pelaez, C.; et al. Safety of Dried Fruits of Synsepalum Dulcificum as a Novel Food Pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2015/2283.	941									
	EFSA journal. Eur. Food Saf. Auth. 2021, 19, doi:10.2903/J.EFSA.2021.6600.	942									
42.	López-Plaza, B.; Gil, Á.; Menéndez-Rey, A.; Bensadon-Naeder, L.; Hummel, T.; Feliú-Batlle, J.; Palma-Milla, S. Effect of	943									
	Regular Consumption of a Miraculin-Based Food Supplement on Taste Perception and Nutritional Status in Malnourished	944									
	Cancer Patients: A Triple-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial-CLINMIR Pilot Protocol. Nutrients 2023, 15,	945									
	doi:10.3390/NU15214639/S1.	946									
43.	Cederholm, T.; Jensen, G.L.; Correia, M.I.T.D.; Gonzalez, M.C.; Fukushima, R.; Higashiguchi, T.; Baptista, G.; Barazzoni, R.;	947									
	Blaauw, R.; Coats, A.; et al. GLIM Criteria for the Diagnosis of Malnutrition – A Consensus Report from the Global Clinical	948									

Nutrition Community. Clin. Nutr. 2019, 38, 1–9, doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2018.08.002.

- 44. Arbeitsgemeinschaft OuG, S. AWMF: Aktuelle Leitlinien 1996,.
- 45. Arraras, J.I.; Arias, F.; Tejedor, M.; Pruja, E.; Marcos, M.; Martínez, E.; Valerdi, J. The EORTC QLQ-C30 (Version 3.0) Quality
   951 of Life Questionnaire: Validation Study for Spain with Head and Neck Cancer Patients. *Psychooncology.* 2002, 11, 249–256,
   952 doi:10.1002/PON.555.

949

- 46. Cancer Institute, N. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse
   954
   Events (CTCAE) v5.0. 2017.
   955
- de la Torre-Aguilar, M.J.; Gomez-Fernandez, A.; Flores-Rojas, K.; Martin-Borreguero, P.; Mesa, M.D.; Perez-Navero, J.L.;
  Olivares, M.; Gil, A.; Gil-Campos, M. Docosahexaenoic and Eicosapentaenoic Intervention Modifies Plasma and Erythrocyte
  Omega-3 Fatty Acid Profiles But Not the Clinical Course of Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Randomized
  Control Trial. *Front. Nutr.* 2022, 9, doi:10.3389/FNUT.2022.790250.
- Lepage, G.; Roy, C.C. Specific Methylation of Plasma Nonesterified Fatty Acids in a One-Step Reaction. J. Lipid Res. 1988, 29, 960
   227–235, doi:10.1016/S0022-2275(20)38553-9. 961
- Hutton, J.L.; Baracos, V.E.; Wismer, W. V. Chemosensory Dysfunction Is a Primary Factor in the Evolution of Declining 962 Nutritional Status and Quality of Life in Patients with Advanced Cancer. J. Pain Symptom Manage. 2007, 33, 156–165, 963 doi:10.1016/J.JPAINSYMMAN.2006.07.017.
- 50. Brisbois, T.D.; Hutton, J.L.; Baracos, V.E.; Wismer, W.V. Taste and Smell Abnormalities as an Independent Cause of Failure 965 of Food Intake in Patients with Advanced Cancer--an Argument for the Application of Sensory Science. J. Palliat. Care 2006, 966 22, 111–114, doi:10.1177/082585970602200208. 967
- 51. Obayashi, N.; Sugita, M.; Shintani, T.; Nishi, H.; Ando, T.; Kajiya, M.; Kawaguchi, H.; Ohge, H.; Naito, M. Taste-Taste
   968 Associations in Chemotherapy-Induced Subjective Taste Alterations: Findings from a Questionnaire Survey in an Outpatient
   969 Clinic. Support. Care Cancer 2023, 31, doi:10.1007/S00520-023-08013-W.
   970
- Pedersini, R.; Zamparini, M.; Bosio, S.; di Mauro, P.; Turla, A.; Monteverdi, S.; Zanini, A.; Amoroso, V.; Vassalli, L.; Cosentini,
   D.; et al. Taste Alterations during Neo/Adjuvant Chemotherapy and Subsequent Follow-up in Breast Cancer Patients: A
   Prospective Single-Center Clinical Study. *Support. Care Cancer* 2022, *30*, 6955–6961, doi:10.1007/S00520-022-07091-6.
- 53. Rehwaldt, M.; Wickham, R.; Purl, S.; Tariman, J.; Blendowski, C.; Shott, S.; Lappe, M. Self-Care Strategies to Cope with Taste
   974
   Changes after Chemotherapy. Oncol. Nurs. Forum 2009, 36, doi:10.1188/09.ONF.E47-E56.
   975
- Ishikawa, T.; Morita, J.; Kawachi, K.; Tagashira, H. [Incidence of Dysgeusia Associated with Chemotherapy for Cancer]. *Gan To Kagaku Ryoho.* 2013, 40, 1049–1054.
- Haemmerle, R.J.; Jatoi, A. Loss of Appetite in Patients with Cancer: An Update on Characterization, Mechanisms, and
   Palliative Therapeutics. *Curr. Opin. Support. Palliat. Care* 2023, 17, 168–171, doi:10.1097/SPC.00000000000669.
- de Vries, Y.C.; van den Berg, M.M.G.A.; de Vries, J.H.M.; Boesveldt, S.; de Kruif, J.T.C.M.; Buist, N.; Haringhuizen, A.; Los,
   M.; Sommeijer, D.W.; Timmer-Bonte, J.H.N.; et al. Differences in Dietary Intake during Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer
   Patients Compared to Women without Cancer. *Support. Care Cancer* 2017, 25, 2581–2591, doi:10.1007/S00520-017-3668-X.
- Yang, J.; Wei, H.; Zhou, Y.; Szeto, C.H.; Li, C.; Lin, Y.; Coker, O.O.; Lau, H.C.H.; Chan, A.W.H.; Sung, J.J.Y.; et al. High-Fat
   Diet Promotes Colorectal Tumorigenesis Through Modulating Gut Microbiota and Metabolites. *Gastroenterology* 2022, 162,
   135-149.e2, doi:10.1053/J.GASTRO.2021.08.041.
- Tong, Y.; Gao, H.; Qi, Q.; Liu, X.; Li, J.; Gao, J.; Li, P.; Wang, Y.; Du, L.; Wang, C. High Fat Diet, Gut Microbiome and
   Gastrointestinal Cancer. *Theranostics* 2021, *11*, 5889–5910, doi:10.7150/THNO.56157.
- Shao, X.; Liu, L.; Zhou, Y.; Zhong, K.; Gu, J.; Hu, T.; Yao, Y.; Zhou, C.; Chen, W. High-Fat Diet Promotes Colitis-Associated
   Tumorigenesis by Altering Gut Microbial Butyrate Metabolism. *Int. J. Biol. Sci.* 2023, *19*, 5004–5019, doi:10.7150/IJBS.86717.
   989
- 60. Hayashi, T.; Fujita, K.; Nojima, S.; Hayashi, Y.; Nakano, K.; Ishizuya, Y.; Wang, C.; Yamamoto, Y.; Kinouchi, T.; Matsuzaki, 990

K.; et al. High-Fat Diet-Induced Inflammation Accelerates Prostate Cancer Growth via IL6 Signaling. *Clin. Cancer Res.* **2018**, 991 24, 4309–4318, doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-18-0106. 992

- 61. Zhang, J.; Guo, S.; Li, J.; Bao, W.; Zhang, P.; Huang, Y.; Ling, P.; Wang, Y.; Zhao, Q. Effects of High-Fat Diet-Induced 993
   Adipokines and Cytokines on Colorectal Cancer Development. *FEBS Open Bio* 2019, *9*, 2117–2125, doi:10.1002/2211- 994
   5463.12751. 995
- Arita, S.; Kinoshita, Y.; Ushida, K.; Enomoto, A.; Inagaki-Ohara, K. High-Fat Diet Feeding Promotes Stemness and Precancerous Changes in Murine Gastric Mucosa Mediated by Leptin Receptor Signaling Pathway. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* 997 2016, 610, 16–24, doi:10.1016/J.ABB.2016.09.015.
- Ruan, L.; Cheng, S.P.; Zhu, Q.X. Dietary Fat Intake and the Risk of Skin Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of
   Observational Studies. *Nutr. Cancer* 2020, 72, 398–408, doi:10.1080/01635581.2019.1637910.
- Kim, Y.; Je, Y.; Giovannucci, E.L. Association between Dietary Fat Intake and Mortality from All-Causes, Cardiovascular 1001
   Disease, and Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Clin. Nutr.* 2021, 40, 1060–1070, 1002
   doi:10.1016/J.CLNU.2020.07.007. 1003
- Hunter, D.J.; Spiegelman, D.; Adami, H.-O.; Beeson, L.; van den Brandt, P.A.; Folsom, A.R.; Fraser, G.E.; Goldbohm, R.A.;
  Graham, S.; Howe, G.R.; et al. Cohort Studies of Fat Intake and the Risk of Breast Cancer--a Pooled Analysis. N. Engl. J. Med. **1996**, 334, 356–361, doi:10.1056/NEJM199602083340603.
- 66. Cao, D. xing; Wu, G. hao; Zhang, B.; Quan, Y. jun; Wei, J.; Jin, H.; Jiang, Y.; Yang, Z. ang Resting Energy Expenditure and
   Body Composition in Patients with Newly Detected Cancer. *Clin. Nutr.* 2010, *29*, 72–77, doi:10.1016/J.CLNU.2009.07.001.
   1008
- Brennan, S.F.; Woodside, J. V.; Lunny, P.M.; Cardwell, C.R.; Cantwell, M.M. Dietary Fat and Breast Cancer Mortality: A 1009
   Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Crit. Rev. Food Sci. Nutr.* 2017, *57*, 1999–2008, doi:10.1080/10408398.2012.724481.
- Bojková, B.; Winklewski, P.J.; Wszedybyl-Winklewska, M. Dietary Fat and Cancer-Which Is Good, Which Is Bad, and the
   Body of Evidence. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2020, *21*, 1–56, doi:10.3390/IJMS21114114.
- 69. Sellem, L.; Srour, B.; Guéraud, F.; Pierre, F.; Kesse-Guyot, E.; Fiolet, T.; Lavalette, C.; Egnell, M.; Latino-Martel, P.; Fassier, P.; 1013
  et al. Saturated, Mono- and Polyunsaturated Fatty Acid Intake and Cancer Risk: Results from the French Prospective Cohort 1014
  NutriNet-Santé. *Eur. J. Nutr.* 2019, *58*, 1515–1527, doi:10.1007/S00394-018-1682-5. 1015
- Guasch-Ferré, M.; Zong, G.; Willett, W.C.; Zock, P.L.; Wanders, A.J.; Hu, F.B.; Sun, Q. Associations of Monounsaturated Fatty 1016
   Acids From Plant and Animal Sources With Total and Cause-Specific Mortality in Two US Prospective Cohort Studies. *Circ.* 1017
   *Res.* 2019, 124, 1266–1275, doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.313996. 1018
- Gunstone, F.D. Fatty Acids—Nomenclature, Structure, Isolation and Structure Deter-Mination, Biosynthesis and Chemical 1019 Synthesis.Tle. In *Fatty Acid and Lipid Chemistry*; Springer US: Boston, MA, USA., 1996; pp. 1–34.
- Psaltopoulou, T.; Kosti, R.I.; Haidopoulos, D.; Dimopoulos, M.; Panagiotakos, D.B. Olive Oil Intake Is Inversely Related to
   Cancer Prevalence: A Systematic Review and a Meta-Analysis of 13,800 Patients and 23,340 Controls in 19 Observational
   Studies. *Lipids Health Dis.* 2011, 10, doi:10.1186/1476-511X-10-127.
- Yao, X.; Tian, Z. Saturated, Monounsaturated and Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids Intake and Risk of Pancreatic Cancer: 1024
   Evidence from Observational Studies. *PLoS One* 2015, 10, doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0130870. 1025
- 74. Wu, Q.J.; Gong, T.T.; Wang, Y.Z. Dietary Fatty Acids Intake and Endometrial Cancer Risk: A Dose-Response Meta-Analysis 1026 of Epidemiological Studies. *Oncotarget* 2015, *6*, 36081–36097, doi:10.18632/ONCOTARGET.5555.
- Harris, W.S.; Von Schacky, C. The Omega-3 Index: A New Risk Factor for Death from Coronary Heart Disease? *Prev. Med.* 1028 (*Baltim*). 2004, 39, 212–220, doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.02.030.
- 76. Chen, Q.; Wang, J.; Wang, J.; Lin, J.; Chen, L.; Lin, L. song; Pan, L. zhen; Shi, B.; Qiu, Y.; Zheng, X. yan; et al. Erythrocyte ω-3 1030
   Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids Are Inversely Associated with the Risk of Oral Cancer: A Case-Control Study. *Nutr. Diabetes* 1031
   2020, 10, doi:10.1038/S41387-020-00140-1. 1032

- Hanson, S.; Thorpe, G.; Winstanley, L.; Abdelhamid, A.S.; Hooper, L.; Abdelhamid, A.; Ajabnoor, S.; Alabdulghafoor, F.; 1033
  Alkhudairy, L.; Biswas, P.; et al. Omega-3, Omega-6 and Total Dietary Polyunsaturated Fat on Cancer Incidence: Systematic 1034
  Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised Trials. *Br. J. Cancer* 2020, *122*, 1260–1270, doi:10.1038/S41416-020-0761-6. 1035
- 78. Koundouros, N.; Poulogiannis, G. Reprogramming of Fatty Acid Metabolism in Cancer. Br. J. Cancer 2020, 122, 4–22, 1036 doi:10.1038/S41416-019-0650-Z.
   1037
- Amézaga, J.; Arranz, S.; Urruticoechea, A.; Ugartemendia, G.; Larraioz, A.; Louka, M.; Uriarte, M.; Ferreri, C.; Tueros, I.
   Altered Red Blood Cell Membrane Fatty Acid Profile in Cancer Patients. *Nutrients* 2018, 10, doi:10.3390/NU10121853.
- Hamaker, M.E.; Oosterlaan, F.; van Huis, L.H.; Thielen, N.; Vondeling, A.; van den Bos, F. Nutritional Status and 1040 Interventions for Patients with Cancer - A Systematic Review. J. Geriatr. Oncol. 2021, 12, 6–21, doi:10.1016/J.JGO.2020.06.020.
   1041
- Fuentes, N.R.; Kim, E.; Fan, Y.Y.; Chapkin, R.S. Omega-3 Fatty Acids, Membrane Remodeling and Cancer Prevention. *Mol.* 1042
   *Aspects Med.* 2018, 64, 79–91, doi:10.1016/J.MAM.2018.04.001. 1043
- 82. Serhan, C.N.; Sulciner, M.L. Resolution Medicine in Cancer, Infection, Pain and Inflammation: Are We on Track to Address 1044 the next Pandemic? *Cancer Metastasis Rev.* 2023, 42, 13–17, doi:10.1007/S10555-023-10091-5.
- Biosynthesis, Structures, and Functions. *Prog. Lipid Res.* 2022, *86*, doi:10.1016/J.PLIPRES.2022.101165.
  Dyall, S.C.; Balas, L.; Bazan, N.G.; Brenna, J.T.; Chiang, N.; da Costa Souza, F.; Dalli, J.; Durand, T.; Galano, J.M.; Lein, P.J.; et 1046
  Biosynthesis, Structures, and Functions. *Prog. Lipid Res.* 2022, *86*, doi:10.1016/J.PLIPRES.2022.101165.
- Serhan, C.N.; Chiang, N.; Dalli, J. The Resolution Code of Acute Inflammation: Novel pro-Resolving Lipid Mediators in 1049 Resolution. *Semin. Immunol.* 2015, 27, 200–215, doi:10.1016/J.SMIM.2015.03.004.
- Freitas, R.D.S.; Campos, M.M. Protective Effects of Omega-3 Fatty Acids in Cancer-Related Complications. *Nutrients* 2019, 1051 11, doi:10.3390/NU11050945.
- Körner, A.; Schlegel, M.; Theurer, J.; Frohnmeyer, H.; Adolph, M.; Heijink, M.; Giera, M.; Rosenberger, P.; Mirakaj, V. 1053
   Resolution of Inflammation and Sepsis Survival Are Improved by Dietary Ω-3 Fatty Acids. *Cell Death Differ*. 2018, 25, 421– 1054
   431, doi:10.1038/CDD.2017.177.
- 87. Saini, R.K.; Prasad, P.; Sreedhar, R.V.; Naidu, K.A.; Shang, X.; Keum, Y.S. Omega-3 Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids (PUFAs): 1056
   Emerging Plant and Microbial Sources, Oxidative Stability, Bioavailability, and Health Benefits-A Review. *Antioxidants (Basel, Switzerland)* 2021, 10, doi:10.3390/ANTIOX10101627. 1058
- 88. Thiagarajan, P.; Parker, C.J.; Prchal, J.T. How Do Red Blood Cells Die? Front. Physiol. 2021, 12, doi:10.3389/FPHYS.2021.655393. 1059
- Breitkreutz, R.; Tesdal, K.; Jentschura, D.; Haas, O.; Leweling, H.; Holm, E. Effects of a High-Fat Diet on Body Composition 1060 in Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: A Randomized Controlled Study. *Wien. Klin. Wochenschr.* 2005, *117*, 685–692, 1061 doi:10.1007/S00508-005-0455-3.
- 90. Kyle, U.G.; Bosaeus, I.; De Lorenzo, A.D.; Deurenberg, P.; Elia, M.; Gómez, J.M.; Heitmann, B.L.; Kent-Smith, L.; Melchior, 1063
   J.C.; Pirlich, M.; et al. Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis-Part II: Utilization in Clinical Practice. *Clin. Nutr.* 2004, 23, 1430–1453, 1064
   doi:10.1016/J.CLNU.2004.09.012. 1065
- Bozzetti, F.; Pagnoni, A.M.; Del Vecchio, M. Excessive Caloric Expenditure as a Cause of Malnutrition in Patients with Cancer. 1066
   Surg. Gynecol. Obstet. 1980, 150, 229–234. 1067
- 92. Lim, H.S.; Lee, B.; Cho, I.; Cho, G.S. Nutritional and Clinical Factors Affecting Weight and Fat-Free Mass Loss after
   1068
   Gastrectomy in Patients with Gastric Cancer. *Nutrients* 2020, *12*, 1–13, doi:10.3390/NU12071905.
   1069
- Baracos, V.; Kazemi-Bajestani, S.M.R. Clinical Outcomes Related to Muscle Mass in Humans with Cancer and Catabolic 1070
   Illnesses. Int. J. Biochem. Cell Biol. 2013, 45, 2302–2308, doi:10.1016/J.BIOCEL.2013.06.016. 1071
- Martin, L.; Birdsell, L.; MacDonald, N.; Reiman, T.; Clandinin, M.T.; McCargar, L.J.; Murphy, R.; Ghosh, S.; Sawyer, M.B.;
   Baracos, V.E. Cancer Cachexia in the Age of Obesity: Skeletal Muscle Depletion Is a Powerful Prognostic Factor, Independent
   of Body Mass Index. J. Clin. Oncol. 2013, 31, 1539–1547, doi:10.1200/JCO.2012.45.2722.

95.	Sadeghi, M.; Keshavarz-Fathi, M.; Baracos, V.; Arends, J.; Mahmoudi, M.; Rezaei, N. Cancer Cachexia: Diagnosis, Assessment,	1075
	and Treatment. Crit. Rev. Oncol. Hematol. 2018, 127, 91-104, doi:10.1016/J.CRITREVONC.2018.05.006.	1076
96.	Lewandowska, A.; Rudzki, G.; Lewandowski, T.; Próchnicki, M.; Rudzki, S.; Laskowska, B.; Brudniak, J. Quality of Life of	1077
	Cancer Patients Treated with Chemotherapy. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2020, 17, 1–16, doi:10.3390/IJERPH17196938.	1078
97.	Polański, J.; Chabowski, M.; Świątoniowska-Lonc, N.; Dudek, K.; Jankowska-Polańska, B.; Zabierowski, J.; Mazur, G.	1079
	Relationship between Nutritional Status and Clinical Outcome in Patients Treated for Lung Cancer. Nutrients 2021, 13,	1080
	doi:10.3390/NU13103332.	1081
98.	Maia, F. de C.P.; Silva, T.A.; Generoso, S. de V.; Correia, M.I.T.D. Malnutrition Is Associated with Poor Health-Related	1082
	Quality of Life in Surgical Patients with Gastrointestinal Cancer. Nutrition 2020, 75–76, doi:10.1016/J.NUT.2020.110769.	1083
99.	Firkins, J.; Hansen, L.; Driessnack, M.; Dieckmann, N. Quality of Life in "Chronic" Cancer Survivors: A Meta-Analysis. J.	1084
	Cancer Surviv. 2020, 14, 504–517, doi:10.1007/S11764-020-00869-9.	1085
100.	Fearon, K.; Strasser, F.; Anker, S.D.; Bosaeus, I.; Bruera, E.; Fainsinger, R.L.; Jatoi, A.; Loprinzi, C.; MacDonald, N.; Mantovani,	1086
	G.; et al. Definition and Classification of Cancer Cachexia: An International Consensus. Lancet. Oncol. 2011, 12, 489-495,	1087
	doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70218-7.	1088
101.	Salvetti, M. de G.; Machado, C.S.P.; Donato, S.C.T.; da Silva, A.M. Prevalence of Symptoms and Quality of Life of Cancer	1089
	Patients. Rev. Bras. Enferm. 2020, 73, doi:10.1590/0034-7167-2018-0287.	1090
102.	Juhé-Beaulaton, D. Le Fruit Miracle (Synsepalum Dulcificum): Des Voyageurs Sur La Cote Ouest Africaine Auxlaboratoires	1091
	Pharmaceutiques.; Paris, France, 2014; Vol. 11;.	1092
103.	Wong, J.M.; Kern, M. Miracle Fruit Improves Sweetness of a Low-Calorie Dessert without Promoting Subsequent Energy	1093
	Compensation. Appetite 2011, 56, 163–166, doi:10.1016/J.APPET.2010.10.005.	1094
104.	Capitanio, A.; Lucci, G.; Tommasi, L. MIXING TASTE ILLUSIONS: THE EFFECT OF MIRACULIN ON BINARY AND	1095
	TRINARY MIXTURES. J. Sens. Stud. 2011, 26, 54–61, doi:10.1111/J.1745-459X.2010.00321.X.	1096
105.	Igarashi, G.; Higuchi, R.; Yamazaki, T.; Ito, N.; Ashida, I.; Miyaoka, Y. Differential Sweetness of Commercial Sour Liquids	1097
	Elicited by Miracle Fruit in Healthy Young Adults. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1082013212443060 2013, 19, 243-249,	1098
	doi:10.1177/1082013212443060.	1099
106.	Hudson, S.D.; Sims, C.A.; Odabasi, A.Z.; Colquhoun, T.A.; Snyder, D.J.; Stamps, J.J.; Dotson, S.C.; Puentes, L.; Bartoshuk,	1100
	L.M. Flavor Alterations Associated with Miracle Fruit and Gymnema Sylvestre. Chem. Senses 2018, 43, 481-488,	1101
	doi:10.1093/CHEMSE/BJY032.	1102
107.	Andrade, A.C.; Martins, M.B.; Rodrigues, J.F.; Coelho, S.B.; Pinheiro, A.C.M.; Bastos, S.C. Effect of Different Quantities of	1103
	Miracle Fruit on Sour and Bitter Beverages. LWT 2019, 99, 89–97, doi:10.1016/J.LWT.2018.09.054.	1104
108.	Tafazoli, S.; Vo, T.D.; Roberts, A.; Rodriguez, C.; Viñas, R.; Madonna, M.E.; Chiang, Y.H.; Noronha, J.W.; Holguin, J.C.; Ryder,	1105
	J.A.; et al. Safety Assessment of Miraculin Using in Silico and in Vitro Digestibility Analyses. Food Chem. Toxicol. 2019, 133,	1106
	doi:10.1016/J.FCT.2019.110762.	1107
109.	Choi, S.E.; Garza, J. Effects of Different Miracle Fruit Products on the Sensory Characteristics of Different Types of Sour Foods	1108
	by Descriptive Analysis. J. Food Sci. 2020, 85, 36–49, doi:10.1111/1750-3841.14988.	1109
110.	Temussi, P.A. Natural Sweet Macromolecules: How Sweet Proteins Work. Cell. Mol. Life Sci. 2006, 63, 1876–1888,	1110
	doi:10.1007/S00018-006-6077-8.	1111
111.	Kurihara, Y. Characteristics of Antisweet Substances, Sweet Proteins, and Sweetness-Inducing Proteins. Crit. Rev. Food Sci.	1112
	Nutr. 1992, 32, 231–252, doi:10.1080/10408399209527598.	1113
112.	Huang, W.; Chung, H.Y.; Xuan, W.; Wang, G.; Li, Y. The Cholesterol-Lowering Activity of Miracle Fruit (Synsepalum	1114
	Dulcificum). J. Food Biochem. 2020, 44, e13185, doi:10.1111/JFBC.13185.	1115

113. Haddad, S.G.; Mohammad, M.; Raafat, K.; Saleh, F.A. Antihyperglycemic and Hepatoprotective Properties of Miracle Fruit 1116

(Synsepalum Dulcificum) Compared to Aspartame in Alloxan-Induced Diabetic Mice. J. Integr. Med. 2020, 18, 514–521, 1117 doi:10.1016/J.JOIM.2020.09.001.

- Obafemi, T.O.; Olaleye, M.T.; Akinmoladun, A.C. Antidiabetic Property of Miracle Fruit Plant (Synsepalum Dulcificum 1119 Shumach. & Thonn. Daniell) Leaf Extracts in Fructose-Fed Streptozotocin-Injected Rats via Anti-Inflammatory Activity and 1120 Inhibition of Carbohydrate Metabolizing Enzymes. J. Ethnopharmacol. 2019, 244, 112124–112124, doi:10.1016/J.JEP.2019.112124.
- 115. Chen, C.C.; Liu, I.M.; Cheng, J.T. Improvement of Insulin Resistance by Miracle Fruit (Synsepalum Dulcificum) in Fructose 1122
   Rich Chow-Fed Rats. *Phyther. Res.* 2006, 20, 987–992, doi:10.1002/PTR.1919.
   1123
- Shi, Y.C.; Lin, K.S.; Jhai, Y.F.; Lee, B.H.; Han, Y.; Cui, Z.; Hsu, W.H.; Wu, S.C. Miracle Fruit (Synsepalum Dulcificum) Exhibits
   as a Novel Anti-Hyperuricaemia Agent. *Molecules* 2016, 21, doi:10.3390/MOLECULES21020140.