SCIENTIFIC REPORTS

Received: 5 December 2016 Accepted: 16 May 2017 Published online: 11 July 2017

OPEN The Association between High Fat Diet around Gestation and Metabolic Syndrome-related **Phenotypes in Rats: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis**

Mariana L. Tellechea^{1,2}, Melisa F. Mensegue^{1,2} & Carlos J. Pirola 1,2

Numerous rodent studies have evaluated the effects of a maternal high-fat diet (HFD) on later in life susceptibility to Metabolic Syndrome (MetS) with varying results. Our aim was to quantitatively synthesize the available data on effects of maternal HFD around gestation on offspring's body mass, body fat, plasma leptin, glucose, insulin, lipids and systolic blood pressure (SBP). Literature was screened and summary estimates of the effect of maternal HFD on outcomes were calculated by using fixed- or random-effects models. 362 effect sizes from 68 studies together with relevant moderators were collected. We found that maternal HFD is statistically associated with higher body fat, body weight, leptin, glucose, insulin and triglycerides levels, together with increased SBP in offspring later in life. Our analysis also revealed non-significant overall effect on offspring's HDL-cholesterol. A main source of variation among studies emerged from rat strain and lard-based diet type. Strain and sex -specific effects on particular data subsets were detected. Recommendations are suggested for future research in the field of developmental programming of the MetS. Despite significant heterogeneity, our meta-analysis confirms that maternal HFD had long-term metabolic effects in offspring.

Metabolic syndrome (MetS) is defined as a cluster of important risk factors including central obesity, high fasting plasma glucose or glucose intolerance, low high density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-c), high triglycerides, and elevated blood pressure, which are multiple metabolic risk factors for diabetes and cardiovascular morbimortality^{1,2}. MetS is a common multifactorial disease with rising prevalence worldwide, which relates largely to increasing obesity caused by western diet and sedentary lifestyles. MetS is considered a consequence of a complex interplay between genetic and environmental factors, and according to the "developmental origins of health and disease" hypothesis, the MetS can also be considered as a developmental process that can be modified by changes in the environment early in life. The "developmental origins of health and disease" hypothesis, also called developmental programming, can be defined as the response to a specific challenge during a critical developmental time period that changes the trajectory of development with resulting effects on health that linger throughout life³. The fetal origins of obesity, insulin resistance and cardiovascular disease have been investigated in a broad range of epidemiological and animal studies.

The late onset of such diseases in response to earlier transient experiences has led to the suggestion that developmental programming may have an epigenetic component, as epigenetic marks such as DNA methylation or covalent posttranslational histone modifications, both involving chromatin remodeling, could provide a persistent remembrance of earlier nutritional states⁴⁻⁶. A growing body of evidence supports the notion that epigenetic changes contribute to fetal metabolic programming⁴⁻⁸, however the mechanisms by which early environmental insults may have long-term effects on offspring are relatively unclear. To date, these mechanisms include changes

¹University of Buenos Aires, Institute of Medical Research A Lanari, Buenos Aires, Argentina. ²National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET) - University of Buenos Aires, Institute of Medical Research (IDIM), Department of Molecular Genetics and Biology of Complex Diseases, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to M.L.T. (email: mariana.tellechea@conicet.gov.ar) or C.J.P. (email: pirola.carlos@lanari.fmed.uba.ar)

in gene expression caused by epigenetic modifications, permanent changes in cellular composition and ageing, and permanent structural changes to the organ^{4, 6}.

Whilst the programming of obesity is undoubtedly a multifactorial process, the diversity of models with a common end-point might suggest some common pathways^{9, 10}. Several studies conducted in different animal species have shown that maternal high fat diet (HFD) consumption leads to metabolic abnormalities in offspring during adult lifetime such as increased body weight and fat mass, reduced insulin sensitivity, increased blood glucose and triglycerides levels, increased lipid deposition, vascular endothelial cell dysfunction and increased serum leptin levels^{3, 11, 12}. Altogether this evidence suggest that consumption of a HFD by female rats results in an adverse maternal intrauterine environment predisposing the offspring to a MetS-like phenotype later in life.

The maternal HFD-induced phenotype varies distinctly among different studies because this intervention is not standardized. Diets with dissimilar fatty acid compositions are designated under the term HFD in bibliography. And it is not only the quantity of fat but also the type of fat that influences offspring phenotype. Furthermore, variation in diet macronutrient composition may explain differences among the results reported. However, diverse experimental results seem not likely explained only by the characteristics of the diet. There are also many other likely sources of heterogeneity among the results, including the diversity of experimental designs. How much intervention is needed? How long should intervention continue? Answers to these questions are needed. If the intervention time and duration is inappropriate, researchers may construct an unsuccessful model, with all the implications that this has for the advancement of science and for animal welfare. It also remains to be tested which biological factors, such as strain, offspring sex and age at measurement, should be taken into account when designing experimental protocols.

Our main aim was to quantify the overall effect of maternal HFD consumption on developmental programming of offspring's metabolism. We collected the vast experimental data available on rats for the long-term effects of maternal HFD on MetS-related phenotypes: (1) body fat (adiposity was also estimated indirectly by body weight and plasma leptin concentration), (2) plasma fasting glucose and insulin concentrations, (3) HDL-c, (4) plasma triglycerides, and (5) systolic blood pressure (SBP). We selected studies in which offspring were given a standard diet after weaning. We assessed the long-term programming effects collecting data on phenotypes at different time points after weaning. Then, using meta-regression, we evaluated the influence of biological (offspring's age and sex) and experimental factors (duration of maternal dietary manipulation, litter size and experimental diet macronutrient composition). Finally, we also reviewed the influence of additional moderators: maternal weight and birthweight. We predict that the above-mentioned moderators may account for the ambiguous results from different experimental studies. As far as possible, we had try to establish whether there is an ideal maternal HFD protocol to model MetS in rat offspring.

This meta-analysis is not intended to throw light on the subjacent mechanisms at the gene or cellular level. However, since mechanisms by which maternal dietary imbalance affects fetal and postnatal development remain poorly understood, we believe that this study will be a good start point for future maternal HFD experiments.

Results

Study characteristics. The characteristics of the selected studies are shown in Table 1. The experimental rat strains were predominantly Sprague Dawley and Wistar, and outcomes were reported either for males, females or mixed-sex groups. We extracted 362 effect sizes from 68 studies. Summary information for each data subset is presented in Supplementary Table S1. The number of data points (effect sizes) within each outcome ranged from 14 to 75 and the number of studies these data points were derived from ranged from 9 to 49. In experiments where different groups were subjected to different diet exposure or composition, we considered the groups to be independent. In 3 studies, male genitor rats were also provided with the same experimental diet as the female rats^{13–15}. Data on timing of maternal dietary manipulations for each outcome are presented in Supplementary Fig. S1. The duration of the interventions ranged from 9 (gestation only) to 154 (inclusive of a pre-mating period, gestation and lactation) days. Dam nutritional manipulation was ceased at birth in 7.3% cases meanwhile in the remaining cases exposure extended into lactation.

The characteristics of the maternal diets are shown in Supplementary Table S2. Diets differed in their macronutrient composition among the experiments. Fat content in maternal HFD ranged from 13% to 74% calories from fat, and the main fat component varied between animal-derived fats (e.g. lard) and vegetal oils. Maternal HFD usually contained more energy from fat (increase by 3 to 53% energy relative to the control group) and less carbohydrates (decrease by 16% to 52% energy relative to the control group) than control diets. Protein content was also reduced in many cases (Supplementary Fig. S2). Metabolic energy in maternal HFD ranged from 4.0 to 5.8 Kcal/g. HFD treatment was imposed on dams by feeding with well-defined commercial (35 studies), custom made (13 studies), or chow-based diets (11 studies) mostly with high fat content. Feeding was reported as *ad libitum* in 45 of 47 studies (in two studies food availability was set, refs 16 and 17) Offspring were reared on the same or similar diet to the one fed to control dams (data not shown).

Main findings. Overall, we found evidence for the effects of maternal HFD consumption around gestation time on the investigated offspring outcomes with just one exception, HDL-c (Figs 1–8, Table 2). The pooled estimates for the effects of maternal HFD consumption on outcomes are summarized in Table 2. Changes in body fat, body weight, leptin, glucose, insulin, triglycerides and SBP in offspring of dams exposed to HFD were significantly different from those in offspring of control-fed dams. Heterogeneity was not detected in SBP subset (I-squared = 0, Q statistic p-value = 0.5). Nonetheless, moderate to high levels of heterogeneity were found in the other seven data subsets (I2 between 59.8 and 78.5%, Table 2); therefore, we performed a random-effect analysis in the extended dataset, except for SBP. When separate analyzes were ran for studies using experimental diets based on animal fat, heterogeneity was found in every subgroup, except for the SBP subset as expected (extended dataset, Fig. 9).

Reference	Strain	Sex	Main fat source	Duration of Intervention (days)	Age	Outcomes
	ottuiii			(uujo)	stuge	FAT. BW. LEP. GLU, INS.
Burgueño A.L. ^{26a,b}	W	M, F	lard	57	A	TG, HDL
Srinivasan M. ^{43a}	SD	М	lard	141	PPP	INS
Srinivasan M. ^{43b}	SD	М	lard	141	YA	BW, GLU, INS, TG
Tamashiro K.L. ^{47a}	SD	М	lard	40	YA	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS
Tamashiro K.L. ^{47b}	SD	F	lard	40	YA	FAT, BW
Sun B. ^{48a,b}	SD	M, F	lard	40	YA	FAT
Sun B. ^{48c,d}	SD	M, F	lard	19	YA	FAT
Sun B. ^{49a}	SD	М	lard	40	PPP	LEP
Sun B. ^{49b}	SD	М	lard	40	YA	FAT, LEP
White C.L., Bruce-Keller A.J. ⁵⁰	LE	М	lard	70	PPP	BW
White C.L., Morrison C.D. ^{17a}	LE	М	lard	70	PPP	FAT, GLU
White C.L., Morrison C.D. ^{17b}	LE	М	lard (food availability set)	70	PPP	FAT, GLU
Sasaki A. ^{51a,b}	LE	M, F	lard	70	YA	BW
Marco A. 52D:\preeditjobs\Springernature\ Scirep\5344\reprogrammed - MEP_L_bib52	w	F	lard	100	YA	BW, LEP
Lecoutre S. ^{53a,b}	W	M, F	lard	154	Α	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS, TG
Ambrosetti V. ^{54a}	SD	F	lard	па	PPP	BW, INS
Ambrosetti V. ^{54b}	SD	F	lard	na	YA	BW
Guberman C. ^{55a,b}	SD	М	lard	98.77	YA	BW. SBP
Seet F. L. ⁵⁶	SD	M	lard	98	YA	TG
Desai M ^{57a,c}	SD	ME	lard	98	PPP	SBP
Desai M ^{57b,d}	SD SD	M F	lard	98	VA	FAT BW LEP GLU INS TO
Desai M ⁵⁷ e.g	SD SD	M E	lard	77	DDD	CRD
Desai M. 57fh	SD SD	M E	lard	77	VA	EAT DWLED CITLING TO
Desai M. ⁵⁸	SD SD	М, Г М	land	//	IA	FAI, DW, LEP, GLU, INS, IG
Desai M. ³⁰	SD	M	lard	98	A	FAI, BW, GLU, INS, IG
Walker C.D. ⁵⁹	SD	M	lard	28	PPP	FAI, INS
Walker C.D.	SD	M	lard	28	YA	FAI, BW, LEP
Naet L.	SD	М	lard	28	YA	FAT, BW
Koukkou E.	SD	na	lard	47	РРР	TG
Mendes-da-Silva C. ⁶²	W	both	lard	21	YA	BW
Taylor P.D. ⁶³	SD	F	lard	52	na	LEP
Khan I.Y. ^{21a,b}	SD	М	lard	52	YA, A	GLU, INS, HDL, TG
Khan I.Y. ^{21c}	SD	F	lard	52	YA	GLU, INS, HDL, TG, SBP
Khan I.Y. ^{20d}	SD	F	lard	52	A	BW, GLU, INS, HDL, TG, SBP
Khan I.Y. ^{21a,d}	SD	М	lard	52, 31	YA	FAT, BW, GLU, HDL, TG
Khan I.Y. ^{21b,e}	SD	F	lard	52, 31	YA	FAT, BW, GLU, HDL, TG, SBP
Khan I.Y. ^{21c,f}	SD	both	lard	52, 31	YA	INS
Khan I.Y. ^{19a}	SD	М	lard	52	YA	BW, GLU, INS, HDL, TG
Khan I.Y. ^{19b}	SD	F	lard	52	YA	GLU, INS, HDL, TG, SBP
Armitage J.A. ^{64a,b}	SD	M, F	lard	52	YA	BW
Eleftheriades M. ⁶⁵	W	both	lard	9	A	BW, GLU, HDL, TG
Vega C.C. ^{66a,b}	W	M, F	lard	141	PPP	FAT, LEP, GLU, INS, TG
Bautista C.J. ^{67a,b}	W	M, F	lard	141	PPP	FAT, BW
Rodríguez-González G.L. 2015 ^{a,b68}	W	М	lard	141	YA, A	FAT, BW
Zambrano E. ⁶⁹	W	М	lard	141	YA	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS
Santos M. ⁷⁰	W	М	lard	141	A	FAT, BW
Zhang X. ⁷¹	SD	М	lard	42	YA	TG
Page K.C. ⁷²	SD	М	lard	73	YA	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS
Howie G.J. ^{44a,b}	W	M, F	lard	42	YA	FAT, LEP, GLU, INS
Howie G.J. ^{44c,d}	W	M, F	lard	140	YA	FAT, LEP, GLU, INS
Howie G.J. ^{73a,b}	W	M	lard	42, 140	YA	BW
Smith T. ⁷⁴	W	М	lard	42	YA	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS, HDL
Pereira T.J. ^{75a}	SD	М	lard	84	YA	FAT, LEP, GLU, INS
Pereira T.J. ^{75b}	SD	F	lard	84	YA	FAT, GLU, INS
Continued					I	

Reference	Strain	Sex	Main fat source	Duration of Intervention (days)	Age stage	Outcomes
Cordero P. ^{76a,b}	W	M, F	lard	42	YA	FAT, BW
Sloboda D.M. ^{77a,b}	W	F	lard	42, 140	PPP	BW
Tsoulis M.W. ⁷⁸	W	F	lard	42	YA	BW, LEP, INS
Gray C., Reynolds C.M. ⁷⁹	SD	М	lard	52	YA	FAT, BW, HDL, TG, SBP
Reynolds C.M. ⁸⁰	SD	F	lard	52	YA	FAT, LEP, HDL, TG
Pileggi C.A. ⁸¹	SD	М	lard	52	YA	BW
Song Y. ⁸²	SD	М	lard	105	YA	FAT, BW, LEP
Latouche C. ⁸³	SD	М	lard	63	А	FAT, BW, GLU, INS
Yang K.F. ⁸⁴	SD	F	lard	42	YA	GLU, INS, TG
Ghosh P. ⁸⁵	SD	F	lard	52	YA	BW, HDL, TG
Miotto P.M. ^{86a,b}	W	M, F	lard	110	YA	FAT, LEP
MacPherson R.E. ⁸⁷	W	both	lard	110	YA	FAT, BW
Hanafi M.Y. ^{88a,c}	W	M, F	lard	na	YA	LEP
Hanafi M.Y. ^{88b,d}	W	M, F	lard	na	А	LEP, GLU, INS, HDL, TG
Mazzucco M.B. ^{89a,b}	W	M, F	butter	98	YA	BW, GLU, TG
Kozak R. ⁹⁰	LE	М	margarine	na	YA	BW, GLU, INS
Adamu H.A. ¹⁶	SD	М	corn oil+cream milk	49	РРР	BW, LEP, INS
Trottier G. ^{38, 91}	SD	both	corn oil+cream milk	26.5	РРР	FAT, LEP
Couvreur O. ^{92a,b}	W	M, F	palm oil	89	YA	BW, LEP, GLU, INS, TG
Férézou-Viala J. ^{93a,b}	W	M, F	palm oil	91	YA	BW, LEP, GLU, INS, TG
Hellgren L.I. ⁹⁴	SD	М	palm oil	52	YA	INS
Gregersen S. ^{15a,b}	W	М	coconut oil	70, 42	YA	FAT, BW
Dyrskog S.E. ^{14a,b}	W	М	coconut oil	70, 42	YA	BW, INS
Dong Y.M. 2010 ^{a23}	W	М	coconut oil	21	PPP	FAT, BW, HDL, TG
Dong Y.M. 2010 ^{b23}	W	М	soybean oil	21	PPP	FAT, BW, HDL, TG
Burckley A.J. 2005 ¹³	W	М	safflower oil	49	YA	BW, FAT
Chen H. ⁹⁵	SD	М	hydrogenated vegetable oil + canola oil	76	YA	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS, TG
Rajia S. ⁹⁶	SD	F	hydrogenated vegetable oil + canola oil	76	YA	FAT, BW, LEP, GLU, INS, TG, SBP
Chen H. ⁹⁷	SD	М	hydrogenated vegetable oil + canola oil	83	YA	FAT, BW, GLU, INS, TG
Xue Q. ^{98a,b}	SD	M, F	hydrogenated vegetable oil + canola oil	21	YA BW	
Sun B. ⁹⁹ a,b	SD	M, F	na	40	YA	FAT, BW, LEP
Gray C., Vickens M.H.99	SD	М	na	63	YA	SBP
Zaborska K.E. ¹⁰¹	SD	М	na	na	YA	FAT, INS
Hou M	SD	М	na	56	ppp	FAT GLU INS TG

Table 1. Characteristics of the selected studies. Some studies appear more than one time with different sex, age stage or timing of the intervention. Some of the studies reported more than one experiment and therefore sometimes more than one experimental group could be identified for the purposes of our analysis. The same data point was used once in the meta-analysis, even if it appeared in multiple publications. Abbreviations: M: Male, F: Female, W: Wistar, SD: Sprague Dawley, LE: Long Evans. PPP: Prepubertal/Pubertal. YA: Young Adult. A: Adult. BW: Body Weight. FAT: Body Fat. LEP: Leptin. GLU: Glucose. INS: Insulin. TRI: Triglycerides. SBP: Systolic Blood Pressure. *na: not available data*.

The main data set was processed and meta-analyzed in the same manner as the extended data. We extracted 240 effect sizes from 44 studies, and the analysis for the main data subsets revealed the same pattern of effects as the meta-analysis of the extended dataset (Table 2, Supplementary Fig. S3). Namely, we confirmed the effect of the maternal nutritional manipulation on the seven outcomes and the effect on the changes in HDL-c levels remained not significant. Heterogeneity was found with respect to all outcomes except for leptin (I-squared = 32.6, Q statistic p-value = 0.06) and SBP (I-squared = 0, Q statistic p-value = 1, Table 2) in main dataset. To evaluate the robustness of our results against influential studies, a leaving-one-out sensitivity analysis was performed. All

			Effect size		One study removed	Heterogeneit	ty
Outcome	Dataset	N	Std diff in means \pm Std error	p-value	p-value	I-squared	Q statistic p-value
Body weight	extended	75	0.52 ± 0.11	1.10-6	1.10-6	75.1	< 0.001
Outcome D Body weight ex Body fat m Body fat m Leptin ex Glucose m Insulin m HDL-c m	main	49	0.81 ± 0.13	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	67.1	< 0.001
Body fat	extended	63	1.26 ± 0.13	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	69.9	< 0.001
body fat	main	47	1.38 ± 0.16	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	70.8	< 0.001
Lontin	extended	43	0.93 ± 0.12	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	61.8	<0.001
Leptin m Glucose ex	main	26	$1.02 \pm 0.10^*$	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	32.6	0.06
Chucana	extended	50	0.49 ± 0.11	2.10-5	2.10-5	61.6	< 0.001
Glucose -	main	33	0.64 ± 0.16	9.10-5	9.10-5	68.8	<0.001
Inculin	extended	52	0.99 ± 0.15	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	78.5	<0.001
Insum	main	set N S ided 75 0 49 0 ided 63 1 ided 63 1 ided 63 1 ided 63 1 ided 47 1 ided 43 0 ided 50 0 ided 50 0 ided 52 0 ided 52 0 ided 21 - ided 21 - ided 44 0 ided 26 0 ided 44 0 ided 44 0 ided 14 - ided 14 1 ided 14 1	1.37 ± 0.22	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	81.0	< 0.001
HDL c	extended	21	-0.28 ± 0.19	0.1	0.1	59.8	<0.001
IIDL-C	main	14	-0.21 ± 0.29	0.5	0.5	70.6	<0.001
Trighteoridae	extended	44	0.54 ± 0.14	0.0001	0.0001	70.1	<0.001
ingiycendes	main	26	0.83 ± 0.17	1.10-6	1.10-6	60.0	<0.001
SBD	extended	14	$1.26 \pm 0.16*$	<1.10-8	0.0003	0.0	0.5
351	main	12	$1.52 \pm 0.18*$	<1.10-8	<1.10-8	0.0	1.0

Table 2. Data analysis summary. For each outcome, effect size stands for Cohen's standardized difference in means (D), which was the difference of means between groups (experimental vs. control) divided by the common within-group SD. We used a random-effect model if heterogeneity was observed, while the fixed-effect model (*) was applied in the absence of heterogeneity. We performed sensitivity analyses by omitting one study at a time and calculating the pooled effect size for the remainder of the studies. Heterogeneity was evaluated with the Q statistic and I-squared statistic.

sensitivity analyses confirmed the stability of our analysis as no influential individual study could be identified (data not shown, p-values available on Table 2).

Subgroup analysis for subsets that have proven to have heterogeneity is shown in Fig. 9 (summarized effects, D for the extended dataset), Supplementary Fig. S4 (HDL-c extended dataset) and in Supplementary Fig. S5 (main dataset). We decided not to focus on results from subgroups consisting only of few data points. Heterogeneity, where it could be tested, could not be eliminated except for some exceptions in main dataset (Supplementary Fig. S5). Exceptions are: 1) when limiting the analysis to Wistar rats, heterogeneity was solved for glucose and insulin subsets; and 2) when repeating the analysis on chow-based diets only, heterogeneity was solved for four outcomes: body fat, glucose, insulin and triglycerides. Restricting the analysis to males or females, Sprague Dawley strain, young adult offspring, young adult dams, perinatal intervention, or commercial lard-based experimental diet, did not eliminate the heterogeneity.

A diet enriched with animal fat mainly consists of non-essential fatty acids (saturated and polyunsaturated ω -9) as opposed to that of vegetable origin that primarily contains essential fatty acids (polyunsaturated ω -6 and, to a lesser extent, ω -3). The results of the subgroup analysis quantifying differences between different main fat sources are included in Fig. 9. Experimental offspring is not likely to have the full plethora of deleterious effects when their mothers were fed vegetable fats, given that the effect of maternal HFD on offspring remained only on two outcomes: body fat and glucose levels. However it should be bear in mind that, because the number of studies was too small to create several groups, we have grouped together diets with different fatty acid composition under the denomination of vegetable fat- rich diets. The evidence suggests that the consumption of polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs), in particular long-chain PUFAs, during crucial periods of fetal development plays a beneficial physiologic and metabolic role in the health of offspring¹⁸. However, only few studies have been undertaken to directly compare the effects of the differences in the type of fat in the maternal diet; thus, it is yet not possible to determine whether the maternal intake of a specific fatty acid type during pregnancy and/or lactation correlates with the development of a particular phenotype of the offspring. The metabolic consequences of the maternal consumption of different types of fatty acids have been reviewed elsewhere¹⁸.

We observed that the effect of maternal lard consumption on the outcomes was independent of the type of diet (Supplementary Fig. S5), except for triglycerides. We found that when experimental dams were given a chow-based HFD, their offspring had no hypertriglyceridemia; however it should be noted that these results derive from three studies of the same group of authors¹⁹⁻²¹.

Subgroup analysis did not detect any substantial effect on levels of HDL-c in any subgroup.

We used meta-regression models to uncover the potential influence of differences in experimental protocols, such as: 1) offspring age at measurement, 2) maternal age, 3) duration of maternal dietary manipulation, 4) litter size, 5) increase in fat content in experimental diet with respect to control diet, and 6) protein-to-non protein ratio in experimental diet. Statistical summaries of results from meta-regression are shown in Supplementary Fig. S6. Visual inspection of the effect plots suggested that some of the results obtained could be driven by single data points, so we decided not to focus on those results.

Offspring's age is a biological variable likely to contribute to variability in results. The offspring's age at the time of outcome measurement was 151 ± 89 (mean \pm SD) days, indicating that most of the measurements were taken

Model	Study name	Subgroup within study	Outcome		Stati	istics for each	study		Std_diff in means and 95% CI
				Std diff	Standard	Lower	Upper	n-Value	
	Duran # 0040 -	lead	had to fait	0.400	0.504	0.750	4.500	0 400000745	1 IImI
	Burgueño AL 2013 a	lard	body fat	1 272	0.591	-0.750	0.000	0.409332715	
	Tamachiro KL 2000 a	lard	body fat	0.000	0.645	-1.265	1 265	1.000000000	
	Tamachiro KL 2009 a	lard	body fat	0.000	0.702	-1.203	2 253	0.211552673	
	Sun B 2012 a	lard	body fat	0.846	0.522	-0.177	1.868	0.105172055	
	Sun B 2012 b	lard	body fat	1.462	0.563	0.359	2 565	0.000302004	
	Sun B 2012 c	lard	body fat	-0.179	0.500	-1 161	0.803	0.721309213	
	Sun B 2012 d	lard	body fat	-0.500	0.508	-1 495	0.495	0.324755765	
	Sun B 2013 b	lard	body fat	3.319	0.890	1.575	5.064	0.000192410	
	White CL. Morrison CD 2009 a	a lard	body fat	1.075	0.338	0.412	1.738	0.001481881	
	White CL. Morrison CD 2009 b	ard	body fat	0.126	0.317	-0.494	0.747	0.689441901	
	Lecoutre S 2016 a	lard	body fat	0.967	0.374	0.235	1.700	0.009638945	
	Lecoutre S 2016 b	lard	body fat	-0.105	0.354	-0.799	0.588	0.765912290	
	Desai M 2014 b	lard	body fat	3.029	0.733	1.593	4,465	0.000035578	
	Desai M 2014 d	lard	body fat	2.268	0.641	1.012	3.524	0.000402046	
	Desai M 2014 f	lard	body fat	2.542	0.672	1.224	3.859	0.000156174	
	Desai M 2014 h	lard	body fat	1.441	0.561	0.341	2.541	0.010222565	
	Desai M 2015	lard	body fat	3.165	0.866	1.467	4.864	0.000259176	
	Walker CD 2008 a	lard	body fat	1.021	0.804	-0.554	2.596	0.203873273	
	Walker CD 2008 b	lard	body fat	0.554	0.770	-0.956	2.063	0.472230779	
	Naef L 2008	lard	body fat	0.566	0.496	-0.405	1.538	0.253059463	
	Khan IY 2005 a	lard	body fat	1.328	0.494	0.359	2.296	0.007198498	
	Khan IY 2005 b	lard	body fat	1.429	0.501	0.447	2.412	0.004335589	
	Khan IY 2005 d	lard	body fat	1.890	0.569	0.774	3.006	0.000901627	
	Khan IY 2005 e	lard	body fat	0.909	0.498	-0.067	1.885	0.067928589	
	Vega CC 2015 a	lard	body fat	1.024	0.532	-0.018	2.067	0.054066228	
	Vega CC 2015 b	lard	body fat	1.410	0.559	0.315	2.505	0.011595568	
	Bautista CJ 2016 a	lard	body fat	1.387	0.704	0.006	2.767	0.048982027	
	Bautista CJ 2016 b	lard	body fat	1.916	0.764	0.419	3.413	0.012146846	
	Rodríguez-González GL 2015 a	a lard	body fat	3.561	0.969	1.660	5.461	0.000240021	
	Rodríguez-González GL 2015 I	b lard	body fat	1.787	0.713	0.389	3.185	0.012225694	
	Zambrano E 2010	lard	body fat	4.531	1.194	2.190	6.872	0.000148439	
	Santos M 2015	lard	body fat	2.920	0.909	1.138	4.701	0.001317443	
	Page KC 2009	lard	body fat	2.934	0.588	1.781	4.087	0.00000611	
	Howie GJ 2009 a	lard	body fat	2.875	0.672	1.557	4.192	0.000018938	
	Howie GJ 2009 b	lard	body fat	2.091	0.586	0.942	3.240	0.000361450	
	Howie GJ 2009 c	lard	body fat	2.836	0.668	1.527	4.144	0.000021549	
	Howie GJ 2009 d	lard	body fat	1.796	0.558	0.701	2.890	0.001300426	
	Smith T 2014	lard	body fat	3.326	0.690	1.973	4.679	0.000001450	
	Pereira TJ 2015 a	lard	body fat	2.746	0.805	1.169	4.323	0.000643715	
	Pereira TJ 2015 b	lard	body fat	-0.639	0.592	-1.799	0.521	0.280159271	
	Cordero P 2015 a	lard	body fat	1.142	0.598	-0.030	2.314	0.056251931	
	Cordero P 2015 b	lard	body fat	0.215	0.556	-0.875	1.305	0.699313657	
	Gray C, Reynolds CM 2015	lard	body fat	2.309	0.645	1.044	3.574	0.000347477	
	Reynolds CM 2015	lard	body fat	0.804	0.600	-0.372	1.981	0.180277843	
	Song Y 2015	lard	body fat	0.734	0.462	-0.172	1.039	0.112279149	
	Miotto PM 2013 a	lard	body fat	1.410	0.074	0.094	2.737	0.035770733	
	Miotto PM 2013 a	lard	body fat	0.157	0.472	-0.769	0.974	0.139039439	
	MacDhoreon DE 2015	lard	body fat	-0.050	0.336	-0.974	1.013	0.914049125	
	Trattion G 1009	aiu soutoon oil shortoning	body fat	0.333	0.530	-0.304	1 201	0.290943124	
	Gregorian S 2005 a	coconut oil	body fat	0.548	0.416	-0.267	1.363	0.436170962	
	Gregersen S 2005 b	coconut oil	body fat	0.289	0.410	-0.516	1.003	0.481886287	
	Dong YM 2011 a	coconut oil	body fat	-0.133	0.448	-1.011	0.744	0 766349297	
	Dong YM 2011 b	sovbean oil	body fat	0.060	0.447	-0.817	0.936	0.893895905	
	Burckley AJ 2005	safflower oil	body fat	1.211	0.486	0.257	2.164	0.012828800	
	Chen H 2012	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	body fat	2.382	0.534	1.336	3.428	0.000008103	
	Raija S 2013	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	body fat	1.971	0.532	0.928	3.015	0.000213240	
	Chen H 2014	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	body fat	1.467	0.446	0.593	2.341	0.001007180	
	Sun B 2014 a	NA	body fat	1.937	0.495	0.967	2.906	0.000090668	
	Sun B 2014 b	NA	body fat	0.717	0.421	-0.108	1.542	0.088689319	
	Zaborska KE 2016	NA	body fat	1.295	0.357	0.596	1.995	0.000283320	
	Hou M 2015	NA	body fat	2.471	0.686	1.127	3.815	0.000313530	
Fixed			-	1.047	0.067	0.917	1.178	0.000000000	
tandom				1.260	0.125	1.014	1.505	0.000000000	
									-4.00 -2.00 0.00 2.00 4

Figure 1. Forest Plot for Body Fat, extended dataset. Summary estimates for standardized difference in means (D, effect); the corresponding 95% CI (lower and upper) and significance (p-value) were estimated by fixed and random effects analysis. The first author of the study and the year of publication are shown. In the graph, numbers indicate D values, filled squares stand for the effect of individual studies, and filled diamonds express combined fixed and random effects. NA: not available.

on young adult individuals. Restriction of the analysis only to the young adult subgroup (PND63 to PND209) confirmed results but did not eliminate heterogeneity (Fig. 9 and Supplementary Fig. S5). Meta-regression analysis was ran to estimate if variation within this group depends on age (Supplementary Fig. S6), and according to our analyses age of offspring at testing had detectable influence on four outcomes: body fat (slope \pm SE = 0.01 \pm 0.002 and 0.02 ± 0.003 for extended and main datasets respectively), leptin (slope \pm SE = 0.007 \pm 0.0003, main dataset), insulin (slope \pm SE = 0.006 \pm 0.0002, extended dataset) and SBP (slope \pm SE = 0.01 \pm 0.006, extended dataset).

Young female dams were used in included studies, with maternal age ranging from 42 to 154 days at mating or conception, except for two studies designed with middle aged dams (32 weeks of age). When we repeated our statistical analyses on the young adult subset, heterogeneity was not solved (Fig. 9 and Supplementary Fig. S5). As shown in Supplementary Fig. S6, maternal age had detectable influence on blood glucose (main and extended dataset), blood insulin (main dataset) and triglycerides levels (main and extended dataset). Effect sizes were likely to be bigger when dams were younger. This finding is partly in disagreement with our hypotheses that older mothers would produce offspring that are more susceptible to MetS in a HFD environment.

Limiting the analysis only to studies where intervention was done during the perinatal period, by means of excluding studies where manipulation was done exclusively during gestation, heterogeneity was still evident. Through regression we observed that within this group of perinatal intervention, the starting point of manipulation appeared to significantly affect offspring insulin (slope \pm SE = 0.004 \pm 0.002 and 0.004 \pm 0.002 for extended and main datasets respectively) and glucose levels (slope \pm SE = -0.005 ± 0.002 and -0.006 ± 0.002 for extended and main datasets respectively).

Other differences in the experimental protocols such as litter size and fat content in experimental diet had poor detectable influence on the studied outcomes. Litter size threshold is usually set to prevent the possibility of under- or overnutrition during suckling. For 52 cohorts, upon birth litter sizes were adjusted to the same number of pups per dam, usually 8 pups/dam (ranging from 5 to 11). In the remaining 16 cases information

Pan

HFD

Mode

Study name	Subgroup within study	Outcome		Statis	tics for each	study		
			Std diff	Standard	Lower	Upper	n Voluo	
			in means	enor			p-value	
Burgueno AL 2013 a	lard	body weight	0.301	0.589	-0.853	1.455	0.609471020	
Stinivasan M 2006 b	lard	body weight	-0.779	0.669	-2.090	2 147	0.243030310	
Tomoshiro KI 2000 p	lard	body weight	2.013	0.579	0.079	3.147	0.000303394	I
Tamachiro KL 2009 a	lard	body weight	0.307	0.049	-1.606	0.056	0.030374493	I
White CL Bruce-Keller & L2	lard lard	body weight	1 213	0.493	0.246	2 170	0.013807738	I
Sacaki A 2013 a	lard	body weight	0.668	0.414	-0.143	1 479	0.106660902	I
Sacaki A 2013 a	lard	body weight	0.000	0.300	-0.201	1.974	0.218440228	I
Marco A 2014	lard	body weight	1.050	0.477	0.115	1 985	0.027768957	I
Lecoutre S 2016 a	lard	body weight	0.433	0.358	-0.268	1 134	0 225663521	I
Lecoutre S 2016 b	lard	body weight	-0.275	0.355	-0.971	0.421	0.438902698	I
Ambrosetti V 2016 a	lard	body weight	2.257	0.653	0.978	3.536	0.000542316	I
Ambrosetti V 2016 b	lard	body weight	1.882	0.647	0.614	3,149	0.003615887	I
Guberman C 2013 a	lard	body weight	-0.148	0.578	-1.281	0.985	0.797859549	I
Guberman C 2013 b	lard	body weight	2.569	0.780	1.040	4.097	0.000989455	I
Desai M 2014 b	lard	body weight	2.192	0.633	0.952	3.431	0.000530469	I
Desai M 2014 d	lard	body weight	1.742	0.587	0.591	2.894	0.003006007	I
Desai M 2014 f	lard	body weight	0.540	0.509	-0.457	1.538	0.288421266	I
Desai M 2014 h	lard	body weight	0.197	0.501	-0.786	1.179	0.694623102	I
Desai M 2015	lard	body weight	3.695	0.950	1.834	5.557	0.000100151	I
Walker CD 2008 b	lard	body weight	0.932	0.372	0.202	1.662	0.012295609	I
Naef L 2008	lard	body weight	-0.229	0.487	-1.185	0.726	0.638413195	I
Mendes-da-Silva C 2014	lard	body weight	1.647	0.372	0.919	2.375	0.000009318	I
Khan IY 2003 d	lard	body weight	1.198	0.504	0.211	2.185	0.017394413	I
Khan IY 2005 a	lard	body weight	0.726	0.462	-0.179	1.631	0.116042994	I
Khan IY 2005 b	lard	body weight	0.260	0.449	-0.620	1.140	0.562390736	I
Khan IY 2005 d	lard	body weight	-0.644	0.486	-1.597	0.310	0.185669113	I
Khan IY 2005 e	lard	body weight	-0.346	0.478	-1.283	0.590	0.468754906	I
Khan IY 2004 a	lard	body weight	0.726	0.462	-0.178	1.631	0.115622748	I
Armitage JA 2005 a	lard	body weight	0.934	0.608	-0.257	2.126	0.124398790	I
Armitage JA 2005 b	lard	body weight	0.346	0.610	-0.850	1.541	0.570892190	I
Eletthenades M 2014	lard	body weight	-0.692	0.383	-1.442	0.058	0.070487487	I
Bautista CJ 2016 a	lard	body weight	0.100	0.634	-1.076	1.407	0.793074092	I
Bautista CJ 2016 D	lard	body weight	0.620	0.647	-0.649	1.888	0.338040190	I
Rodriguez-Gonzalez GL 201	Da laid	body weight	1.201	0.046	0.011	2.001	0.040052297	I
Zembrone E 2010	DIBI C C C	body weight	0.252	0.690	0.303	1.409	0.012947003	I
Santor M 2015	lard	body weight	1 772	0.035	-0.991	2 226	0.009971001	I
Page KC 2000	lard	body weight	1.778	0.482	0.310	2 723	0.000226672	I
Howie G 2003	lard	body weight	1.253	0.399	0.470	2.036	0.000220072	I
Howie GJ 2013 b	lard	body weight	1 324	0.403	0.534	2 115	0.001020580	I
Smith T 2014	lard	body weight	1.499	0.506	0.507	2 491	0.003061565	I
Cordero P 2015 a	lard	body weight	0.718	0.562	-0.384	1.819	0.201492575	I
Cordero P 2015 b	lard	body weight	0.855	0.569	-0.260	1.970	0 132932350	I
Sloboda DM 2009 a	lard	body weight	-0.947	0.362	-1.657	-0.237	0.008958922	I
Sloboda DM 2009 b	lard	body weight	-0.538	0.350	-1.223	0.147	0 123955354	I
Tsoulis MW 2016	lard	body weight	0.214	0.528	-0.822	1.250	0.685949007	I
Grav C. Revnolds CM 2015	lard	body weight	1.613	0.665	0.310	2.916	0.015222084	I
Pileggi CA 2016	lard	body weight	1.382	0.643	0.122	2.641	0.031512731	I
Song Y 2015	lard	body weight	2.237	0.570	1.119	3.354	0.000087356	I
Latouche C 2014	lard	body weight	0.064	0.646	-1.202	1.329	0.921515270	I
Ghosh P 2001	lard	body weight	0.487	0.454	-0.402	1.377	0.282955088	I
MacPherson RE 2015	lard	body weight	0.133	0.334	-0.521	0.787	0.689341706	I
Mazzucco MB 2016 a	butter	body weight	1.097	0.619	-0.117	2.310	0.076532488	
Mazzucco MB 2016 b	butter	body weight	0.887	0.605	-0.299	2.073	0.142573776	I
Kozak R 2000	margarine	body weight	-0.825	0.279	-1.373	-0.278	0.003112419	
Adamu HA 2016	corn oil, cream milk	body weight	3.745	0.958	1.867	5.622	0.000092614	
Couvreur O 2011 a	palm oil	body weight	-1.205	0.336	-1.863	-0.547	0.000333074	
Couvreur O 2011 b	palm oil	body weight	-0.701	0.308	-1.304	-0.098	0.022768764	
Férézou-Viala J 2007 a	palm oil	body weight	-0.065	0.432	-0.911	0.781	0.880413769	
Férézou-Viala J 2007 b	palm oil	body weight	-0.746	0.446	-1.620	0.129	0.094716666	
Gregersen S 2005 a	coconut oil	body weight	0.161	0.289	-0.406	0.727	0.578161453	
Gregersen S 2005 b	coconut oil	body weight	-0.800	0.300	-1.388	-0.212	0.007627483	
Dyrskog SE 2005 a	coconut oil	body weight	0.405	0.287	-0.157	0.968	0.158055448	
Dyrskog SE 2005 b	coconut oil	body weight	0.057	0.284	-0.500	0.615	0.840307499	
Dong YM 2011 a	coconut oil	body weight	-1.080	0.479	-2.019	-0.142	0.024023078	
Dong YM 2011 b	soybean oil	body weight	-0.293	0.450	-1.174	0.588	U.514329364	1
Burckley AJ 2005	safflower oil	body weight	-0.295	0.450	-1.177	0.586	0.511263665	
Chen H 2012	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	body weight	1.029	0.434	0.178	1.881	0.017825465	
Rajia S 2013	nyarogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	body weight	1.451	0.491	0.489	2.413	0.003123465	
Unen H 2014	nyorogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	body weight	1.175	0.429	0.334	2.016	0.006190688	
AUB Q 2015 8	NA	body weight	-0.029	0.500	-1.009	0.951	0.953062705	1
xue Q 2015 b	NA	body weight	-0.624	0.512	-1.627	0.380	0.223299312	
Sun B 2014 8	NA NA	body weight	0.125	0.409	-0.070	0.920	0.750991040	
3011 D 2014 D	NA	body weight	0.114	0.409	-0.080	0.915	0.119430315	1
			0.523	0.000	0.221	0.420	0.000001404	



HED

-4.00

control

Figure 2. Forest Plot for Body Weight, extended dataset.

.....

on standardization was not available. Litter size should be critical in determining how and to what extent the metabolism is affected, however we did not find a statistically significant litter size effect, with few exceptions. It is presumed that individuals in small litters have greater access to milk during the suckling period; however, in narrow ranges of litter sizes this effect would be negligible. By decreasing the number of pups in the litter, increases the effect of maternal HFD only on leptin, insulin and triglycerides (slope \pm SE = -0.3 ± 0.07 , -0.2 ± 0.06 and -0.1 ± 0.05 in extended dataset respectively, Supplementary Fig. S6).

When analyzing the extended dataset we found that fat content affects two outcomes contrary as expected: body weight (slope \pm SE = -0.02 ± 0.006) and insulin (slope \pm SE = -0.02 ± 0.006). As discussed below, it could be associated with a lower protein content of HFD and then related to a decrease in the lean body mass; however these findings were not observed when repeating the analysis only on studies of dams fed animal fat (data not shown) or in main dataset. This could also indicate that the effects of vegetable oil rich- diets confound results. Main dataset is a refined subset that includes studies based on lard-based diets of a relatively narrow fat content (40–60 kcal%). Given these conditions, only glucose concentration increased depending on experimental fat content (slope \pm SE = 0.03 ± 0.01 , main dataset). Besides, the severity of the protein dietary manipulation has also shown to influence results. The effect of prenatal HFD on body weight, leptin, insulin and triglycerides depended on the proportional protein content in experimental diet (slope \pm SE = 3.7 ± 0.7 , 5.6 ± 1.1 , 6.0 ± 1.2 and 6.1 ± 1.2 for body mass, leptin, insulin and triglycerides in extended dataset). When analysis was however repeated on main dataset, within studies where experimental diet had no extremely decreased protein content, variation was observed only on insulin (slope \pm SE = 3.7 ± 1.8).

Finally, as expected, we did not find any statistically significant overall effects of moderators on SBP besides the aforementioned effect of offspring age.

Mode

Fixe Randor

!	Study name	Subgroup within study	Outcome		Stati	istics for each	study	Std_diff in means and 95% CI					
				Std diff in means	Standard error	Lower	Upper limit	p-Value					
	Burgueño AL 2013 a	lard	leptin	-0.166	0.587	-1.315	0.984	0.777391955		I –	_		- I
	Burgueño AL 2013 b	lard	leptin	1.186	0.698	-0.182	2.553	0.089311916					
	Tamashiro KL 2009 a	lard	leptin	0.468	0.654	-0.814	1.749	0.474521059				<u> </u>	
	Sun B 2013 a	lard	lentin	3 412	0.905	1 639	5 185	0.000162158			1-		
	Sun B 2013 b	lard	leptin	2 478	0.768	0.974	3 982	0.001245114					- 1
	Marco A 2014	lard	leptin	1 269	0.586	0.121	2 418	0.030275332					
	Lecoutre S 2016 a	lard	leptin	1.038	0.377	0.300	1 777	0.005830399					
	Lecoutre S 2016 b	lard	leptin	0.610	0.362	-0.099	1 319	0.091671961				_	
	Desai M 2014 h	lard	lentin	1 908	0.603	0.726	3,090	0.001561700					- 1
	Desai M 2014 d	lard	lentin	1 593	0.574	0.468	2 717	0.005509621					
	Desai M 2014 f	lard	lentin	1 282	0.549	0.206	2 358	0.019552190					
	Docai M 2014 h	lard	loptin	1 152	0.540	0.004	2 211	0.022796712					
	Walker CD 2008 b	lard	leptin	0.614	0.341	-0.054	1 282	0.071084071					
	Tender DD 2000 D	lard	loptin	0.014	0.341	-0.033	1.202	0.0517304371					
	Vogo CC 2015 o	lard	leptin	1.009	0.470	-0.011	2.140	0.032773039					
	Vega CC 2015 a	lard	loptin	1.090	0.530	0.047	2.149	0.040011123					
	Zambrano E 2010	lard	loptin	2 109	0.332	-0.014	2.012	0.007529547					
	Zambrano E 2010	lard	leptin	2.100	0.769	0.562	3.053	0.007536347					— I
	Page KC 2009 Howio C L 2000 o	lard	leptin	1.207	0.410	-0.517	1.091	0.404030430					
	Howle GJ 2009 a	laid	lepun	1.215	0.397	0.430	1.994	0.002232302					
	Howie GJ 2009 b	lard	leptin	1.179	0.396	0.404	1.955	0.002876303					
	Howie GJ 2009 C	lard	lepun	1.020	0.300	0.259	1.701	0.000594950					
	Howle GJ 2009 d	lard	leptin	0.638	0.374	-0.096	1.371	0.088532760				- I	
	Smith 1 2014	lard	leptin	1.965	0.545	0.897	3.032	0.000308385			·		- 1
	Pereira 1J 2015 a	lard	leptin	0.346	0.582	-0.794	1.480	0.551883498				- I	
	Tsoulis MW 2016	lard	leptin	-0.395	0.532	-1.437	0.648	0.458183191		_ I —		L	
	Reynolds CM 2015	lard	leptin	2.089	0.718	0.682	3.496	0.003609616			_ I -		-
	Song Y 2015	lard	leptin	1.456	0.503	0.470	2.441	0.003801074					
	Miotto PM 2013 a	lard	leptin	0.410	0.476	-0.524	1.343	0.389913335				-	
	Miotto PM 2013 b	lard	leptin	-0.117	0.578	-1.250	1.015	0.838889552				·_ I	
	Hanafi MY 2016 a	lard	leptin	1.248	0.489	0.290	2.206	0.0106/2112					
	Hanafi MY 2016 c	lard	leptin	1.525	0.508	0.530	2.521	0.002680609					
	Hanafi MY 2016 b	lard	leptin	1.994	0.547	0.922	3.067	0.000268118					-
	Hanafi MY 2016 d	lard	leptin	1.811	0.531	0.770	2.851	0.000649696					· I
	Adamu HA 2016	corn oil, cream milk	leptin	1.000	0.612	-0.200	2.200	0.102470435			_+	▰┽	
	Trottier G 1998	soybean oil, shortening	leptin	-0.333	0.475	-1.264	0.597	0.482525212					
	Couvreur O 2011 a	palm oil	leptin	-0.268	0.310	-0.876	0.341	0.388313859					
	Couvreur O 2011 b	palm oil	leptin	-0.245	0.300	-0.833	0.343	0.414149711					
	Férézou-Viala J 2007 a	palm oil	leptin	0.537	0.588	-0.614	1.689	0.360486854				— I	
	Férézou-Viala J 2007 b	palm oil	leptin	-0.970	0.610	-2.166	0.226	0.112014868					
	Chen H 2012	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	leptin	0.956	0.431	0.112	1.801	0.026457331				∎—I	
	Rajia S 2013	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	leptin	2.481	0.567	1.369	3.592	0.000012208				▁─┼▆੶	— I
	Sun B 2014 a	NA	leptin	1.049	0.435	0.196	1.903	0.015957306			_ I—I	∎—	
	Sun B 2014 b	NA	leptin	0.432	0.413	-0.378	1.241	0.295684239			-+	- 1	
d				0.811	0.073	0.667	0.954	0.000000000			•	,	
n				0.925	0.122	0.686	1.164	0.000000000			_ ∢	▶	
									-4.00	-2.00	0.00	2.00	4.00

Figure 3. Forest Plot for Leptin, extended dataset.

.....

Methodological quality and publication bias. A summary of the methodological assessment for each included study is shown in Supplementary Table S3. The methodological quality scores ranged from 1 to 5, with 72% of studies scoring 4 or 5 points. In general, study design and reported statistics raised no concerns about good scientific practice. The median impact factor for all the included studies was 2.77 (J Neurochem, IF2014: 0.09 – Diabetes, IF2009: 8.35). We used funnel plot asymmetry to detect any publication bias in the meta-analysis, and Egger's regression test to measure funnel plot asymmetry (Supplementary Fig. S7). In general, visual inspection of funnel plots indicated little to moderate asymmetry, with an intercept of Egger's regression significantly different from zero. This finding suggests that publication bias cannot be completely excluded as a confounder of our meta-analysis. It remains possible that small studies yielding inconclusive results have not been published. No evidence of publication bias was found in two data subsets: HDL-c subset in extended dataset and SBP subset in main dataset.

Discussion

We conducted a meta-analysis of the effect of maternal HFD on offspring's phenotypic characteristics of the MetS. Results indicate that a maternal HFD around gestation appears to have a detrimental effect on the studied outcomes, relative to the control group. Maternal HFD resulted in increased body fat, body weight, leptin, glucose, insulin, triglycerides levels and SBP in young adult offspring.

We found no general effect of maternal HFD on HDL-c. The simplest explanation of the limited evidence for changes in HDL-c in the offspring of nutritionally challenged mothers is that such an effect is too small to be statistically detectable with the current sample (21 and 14 data points in extended and main datasets, respectively, although with a acceptable sample size of 316 animals). Few authors have evaluated HDL-c concentrations. Of course it could also happen that early-life programming of offspring HDL-c levels via maternal nutrition does not occur in rats. A third possible explanation is that offspring may not show some of the effects of maternal nutritional programming at some point after offspring had access to a standard diet. Optimal nutritional conditions could potentially reverse the effects of the maternal HFD²². However this hypothesis remains to be explored because in our meta-analysis no effect on HDL-c was detected in the prepubertal/pubertal group (2 datasets, data not shown)²³. Finally, dyslipidemia is central to the diagnosis of the MetS, however it should be mentioned that the rat is not ideal as a model of human dyslipidemia because of the different lipid metabolism, and in general the rat is resistant to the development of atherosclerosis²⁴.

We observed significant medium to high heterogeneity across all of our data, except in SBP data subset in both extended and main datasets, and in leptin subset in main dataset (Table 1). Heterogeneity suggests that only under some specific conditions, maternal nutrition may negatively influence offspring body fat, body weight, glucose, insulin and triglycerides levels. Anyway, a random effects-analysis was performed, in which heterogeneity is no longer an issue. Heterogeneity can be partly attributable to some of the moderators included in our study. To further explore heterogeneity that may be associated with differences in strain, offspring traits (sex and age) and experimental design (i.e. lard-based diet type and timing of manipulation), we performed sub-group analysis (Fig. 9 and Supplementary Fig. S5). None of the categorical variables clearly explained the observed variation

HFD



Figure 4. Forest Plot for Glucose, extended dataset.

among studies, except for rat strain and type of lard-based diet in specific subsets. Due to the unbalanced nature of sample sizes in our data subsets, we could not perform all of the planned subgroup analysis.

Overall, according to subgroup analyses, the differences in the experimental protocols used in the included studies had some detectable influence on body mass, plasma glucose and triglycerides levels. First, we observed strain -specific effects on these data subsets (Fig. 9 and Supplementary Fig. S5). Maternal HFD appeared not to affect body weight (extended dataset), plasma glucose (both datasets) or triglycerides levels (both datasets) in Wistar offspring. Thus, strain can influence the conclusions of different studies. Otherwise, it is still possible that effects were too small to be reliably detected.

On the other hand, the existence of sex specific differences in animal models of developmental programming is well described in currently available literature. The molecular and phenotypic outcomes of adverse *in utero* conditions are often more prominent in male than female offspring, although there is short regard given to the basis for this observation in most studies²⁵. We have previously hypothesized that the metabolic programming effect of maternal HFD is sex specific²⁶. Disparities in the sex specific genome and epigenome, the influence of sex hormones, and differences in placental function are important factors in this regard^{27, 28}. Recently, some studies have reported a gender-specific regulation of the expression of genes involved in varying metabolic pathways in response to a HFD or a cafeteria diet^{29–31}. A proteomic study have identified numerous proteins showing sex dimorphism in skeletal muscle in response to HFD feeding³². The lower tendency to undergo MetS in response to HFD in female rats may be related to lower reliance on lipid as an energy fuel, lower lipogenesis, as well as increased mitochondrial oxidative capacity³³.

Differences between the sexes appear both morphologically and in the transcriptome at a very early time in mammalian development. Apart from innate differences between the sexes, male and female fetuses may adapt differently to early-life nutritional conditions. Several studies reported sex specific differences in the placenta during fetal life. Mao J. *et al.* have examined the impact of diet (very-high-fat, low-fat and chow diets) and fetal sex on placental gene expression in mice and interestingly found that each diet provides a distinctive signature of sexually dimorphic genes³⁴. Maternal diet might also influence imprinted gene expression and epigenetic DNA methylation in male and female foetuses. The placentae of foetuses from mothers fed a HFD during pregnancy displays changes in both the expression of selected imprinted genes from different clusters, and in DNA methylation, with these changes differing between sexes³⁵.

We found a sex-specific effect of the maternal nourishment on body weight- extended data subset (Fig. 9) and on glucose- main data subset (Supplementary Fig. S5) when data from male and female offspring were analyzed separately. We additionally ran a meta-regression with gender as predictor variable to estimate the impact of sex on effect size. Given that values of 1 for males and 2 for females were arbitrarily assigned, a negative slope would indicate a larger effect size in males. Specifically, we observed negative slopes in 3 outcomes: body fat, body weight and HDL-c (Supplementary Fig. S6), and no variation for sex in the other data subsets. A comparative microarray analysis in soleus muscle between male and female rats revealed 35 differentially expressed transcripts in response to HFD³¹. It has been suggested that lower weight gain in HFD female rats is, at least in part, associated with lower expression of genes involved in glycolysis and higher expression of genes involved in fatty acid oxidation³¹.



Figure 5. Forest Plot for Insulin, extended dataset.

In terms of sexual dimorphism in animal models of developmental programming, phenotypic differences exist not only at the outcome level (eg. the difference reported here in body weight), but also at the molecular level. It is possible that even the same phenotype may be a consequence of different molecular mechanisms in males and females.

Timing of the maternal nutritional insult is another important factor to take into consideration. Subgroup analyses revealed that the effect of maternal HFD was unequivocally significant with a perinatal intervention including suckling period. But alternatively, in studies where maternal HFD was applied only during gestation, maternal effects were not significant on body weight (extended and main dataset), plasma glucose (extended and main dataset) and triglycerides levels (main dataset). This may be either because the effects were too small to be detected, and/or because we have insufficient data to detect the impact. This may also be because some outcomes are indeed affected by the duration of the manipulation. It is important to emphasize that this finding is in accordance with a previous meta-analysis where exposure to a maternal obesogenic diet that extended into the suckling period was more influential for programming of the offspring's adult body weight than the exposure during gestation only³⁶. Evidence in rats from cross-fostering studies in models of fat feeding and other models of postnatal overfeeding clearly shows that the suckling period is critical for developmental programming^{7, 9}.

The nutritional composition of the breast milk is likely to be affected by the pre-existing maternal obesity, the diet during pregnancy and the diet during lactation. It seems clear that alterations in milk composition, pup ingestive behavior and maternal care during lactation may contribute to the long-term metabolic changes induced by the maternal HDF, however this parameters are not frequently addressed. HFD fed to rats during pregnancy and lactation increases milk lipid concentration³⁷⁻⁴⁰. More specifically, HFD changes the fatty acid composition by increasing the long-chain fatty acid content at the expense of medium-chain fatty acids⁴¹. Furthermore, feed-ing a cafeteria diet only during the suckling period also increases the fat, the energy and the long-chain fatty acid content in the milk of obese rats⁴².

As mentioned in results section, the effect of prenatal HFD depended also on the time at which dam diet manipulation had started in mothers who received HFD during gestation and lactation. Owing to differences in the duration of the high-fat dietary regimen, the maternal intrauterine environment may be differently affected, and consequently the severity of the metabolic abnormalities in the progeny would be different. Longer durations of maternal HFD contributed to the higher insulinemia, but to lower glycemia, in the experimental offspring relative to the control offspring. The direction of the effect on blood glucose was in opposition to that predicted. We predicted that offspring of mothers experiencing longer exposure to HFD should be "programmed" to have an overall worse phenotype. Long-term HFD regimen better represents the present dietary habits of humans in Western societies⁴³. However there is little research on this specific issue. Howie GJ and colleagues⁴⁴ have shown that lifetime consumption of a HFD appears to have similar influences on offspring phenotype compared to HFD consumption restricted to pregnancy and lactation alone⁴⁴. Anyway, the effect of diet duration on glycemic control deserves further study.

Model	Study name	Subgroup within study	Outcome		Sta	tistics for each s		Std diff in means and 95% CI					
				Std diff in means	Standard error	Lower	Upper limit	p-Value					
	Burgueño AL 2013 a	lard	HDL-c	-0.913	0.615	-2.118	0.291	0.137158210	1	- +		1	- I
	Burgueño AL 2013 b	lard	HDL-c	-0.853	0.673	-2.173	0.466	0.204870285					
	Khan IY 2003 a	lard	HDL-c	-0.778	0.599	-1.951	0.396	0.194070132					
	Khan IY 2003 b	lard	HDL-c	-2.083	0.717	-3.489	-0.678	0.003668155	_ I —		-		
	Khan IY 2003 c	lard	HDL-c	-0.444	0.640	-1.699	0.810	0.487550438		T—	╼┼─		
	Khan IY 2003 d	lard	HDL-c	-2.500	0.771	-4.010	-0.990	0.001176866	÷ –		. – I		
	Khan IY 2005 a	lard	HDL-c	0.672	0.593	-0.491	1.836	0.257184281		- 1			
	Khan IY 2005 b	lard	HDL-c	-0.139	0.578	-1.271	0.994	0.810582788		<u> </u>		-	
	Khan IY 2005 d	lard	HDL-c	0.500	0.586	-0.649	1.649	0.393768635				_	
	Khan IY 2005 e	lard	HDL-c	0.430	0.584	-0.715	1.574	0.462023786			-+	<u> </u>	
	Khan IY 2004 a	lard	HDL-c	0.240	0.536	-0.812	1.291	0.655181166				- 1	
	Khan IY 2004 b	lard	HDL-c	-0.236	0.558	-1.330	0.858	0.672364534		<u> </u>			
	Eleftheriades M 2014	lard	HDL-c	-0.324	0.374	-1.057	0.410	0.386962186		- I -			
	Smith T 2014	lard	HDL-c	1.478	0.505	0.489	2.468	0.003391223			I _		
	Gray C, Reynolds CM 2015	lard	HDL-c	0.000	0.577	-1.132	1.132	1.000000000		_ I -		- 1	
	Reynolds CM 2015	lard	HDL-c	0.833	0.602	-0.346	2.013	0.166195169					
	Ghosh P 2001	lard	HDL-c	-1.666	0.519	-2.684	-0.649	0.001325413			- 1 -	-	
	Hanafi MY 2016 c	lard	HDL-c	-0.320	0.450	-1.203	0.562	0.476409632		− -			
	Hanafi MY 2016 d	lard	HDL-c	-0.895	0.469	-1.815	0.024	0.056287816		_ I — I			
	Dong YM 2011 a	coconut oil	HDL-c	0.151	0.448	-0.727	1.029	0.736171416		·		-	
	Dong YM 2011 b	soybean oil	HDL-c	-0.059	0.447	-0.935	0.818	0.895555281			_		
Fixed				-0.237	0.118	-0.468	-0.007	0.043771469			•		
Random				-0.277	0.189	-0.647	0.092	0.141561956					
									-4.00	-2.00	0.00	2.00	4.00
										control		HED	

Figure 6. Forest Plot for HDL-c, extended dataset.

The influence of protein content was also analyzed by meta-regression. As discussed previously, the fat component usually replaces carbohydrate and/or protein in experimental diets leading to an unbalanced diet composition with respect to macronutrients, especially protein (Supplementary Fig. S2), which might confound the fat effect. Indeed, the protein-to-non protein ratio is significantly decreased in custom-made and chow-based diets with respect to commercial diets (ANOVA p < 1.10-5, data not shown) showing a that those diets have greater nutritional imbalance. Lagisz M. *et al.*³⁶ in their previous meta-analysis found that decreased offspring body weight was more likely when maternal obesogenic diet contained low ratios of protein³⁸. We found similar results. Indeed, increased effect sizes with increasing levels of protein-to-non protein ratios are also seen for leptin, insulin and triglycerides levels.

Finally, in our study we have also focused on other two moderator variables considered to be of biological significance: maternal weight and birthweight. An interesting fact to consider is that none of these two factors were dependent of energy from fat and protein-to-non protein ratio in experimental diet (ANOVA, data not shown). It has been previously described in a narrative review of data from eleven studies that poor glycemic control in male offspring exposed to perinatal HFD appears to be independent of maternal obesity and birthweight¹². For the purpose of this meta-analysis we collected data on whether body weight of experimental dams was reported as significantly increased or not in comparison to control dams during gestation. This data represents in some studies not only the gestational weight gain but also pre-conceptional weight gain. Interestingly, the effects of maternal HFD on glycemia and triglyceridemia appear to be dependent on maternal obesity (Fig. 9 and Supplementary Fig. S5). Then, in mothers who did not present high body weight, no effects on offspring glucose and triglycerides were observed. This could also be attributed to the minority of our data coming from studies where dams had normal weight: augmented body weight was presented in 68% dams. Increases in body size, body fat, leptin, insulin and SBP levels occurred in offspring of dams with elevated body weight but also in dams with normal weight. As both obesity and maternal weight gain are commonly induced by feeding dams an obesogenic diet during gestation, it is hard to isolate the effects of maternal gestational weight gain, maternal obesity and maternal diet per se. Therefore, any observable outcomes in offspring may be a result of the diet, maternal obesity, or an interaction between the two. Furthermore, a deeper understanding behind the causal factors associated with maternal obesity, such as hyperglycemia, hyperinsulinemia, and hyperleptinemia, would be of valuable help¹⁰.

Epidemiological studies and animal models have linked birthweight to risk of adult obesity and MetS, including insulin resistance. Deviations from "optimal" *in utero* growth, be it from limited or excess nutrition, increase the relative risk of MetS in adulthood⁶. The association between birthweight and obesity was reviewed elsewhere⁶. Maternal HFD has been reported to have variable effects on birthweight. In our meta-analysis, leptinemia and insulinemia were increased regardless of birthweight (Fig. 9 and Supplementary Fig. S5). When analyzing the extended dataset we identified three outcomes not affected by the maternal diet in low birthweight experimental offspring: body weight, blood glucose and plasma triglycerides (Fig. 9); although this lack of effect was observed only on glucose levels in main dataset (Supplementary Fig. S5). Interestingly, the effects on body fat and glycemia were not observed in the subgroup of large babies; and we have no concluding data on the effect of maternal HFD on triglycerides and HDL-c when birthweight is increased. Again, conclusions should be taken with caution because these results may be subjected to effects too small to be reliably detected, or to insufficient data to uncover an effect. The number of effect sizes in extended dataset range from 5 to 13 in low-birthweight subgroup and from 0 to 5 in high-birthweight subgroup. These data also show that in general there are no alterations of the birthweight in this model, which it is in accordance to a previous review on maternal HFD¹². This fact establishes further evidence of *in utero* programming since adult offspring still consistently exhibit metabolic abnormalities.

Through conducting this review, results enable us to provide preliminary recommendations for future research in the field of developmental programming of the MetS. Firstly, in order to obtain optimal and reproducible benefits, animal fat is more effective than vegetable oils. More specifically, lard based diets (rich in saturated fatty acids) with fat energy content between 40 and 60% are recommended. Within this range, only plasma glucose concentrations appeared to be sensitive to the level of fat content in maternal diet. Secondly, optimizing macronutrient balance in the maternal diet is very important. Differences across studies in protein amounts available to the dams could potentially explain some of the contradictory experimental results³⁸. As long as the protein difference Model

Fixer

Study name	Subgroup within study	Outcome	Statistics for each study							
			Std diff in means	Standard error	Lower limit	Upper limit	p-Value			
Burgueño AL 2013 a	lard	triglycerides	-1.014	0.621	-2.232	0.203	0.102411528			
Burgueño AL 2013 b	lard	triglycerides	0.530	0.656	-0.757	1.816	0.419669062			
Srinivasan M 2006 b	lard	triglycerides	1.699	0.550	0.621	2.777	0.002004998			
Lecoutre S 2016 a	lard	triglycerides	0.269	0.355	-0.427	0.966	0.448054093			
Lecoutre S 2016 b	lard	triglycerides	-0.260	0.355	-0.956	0.436	0.463661525			
Seet EL 2015	lard	trialvcerides	1.358	0.640	0.103	2.613	0.033964220			
Desai M 2014 b	lard	triglycerides	1.224	0.545	0.156	2.291	0.024699935			
Desai M 2014 d	lard	triglycerides	3.046	0.735	1.606	4.486	0.000033938			
Desai M 2014 f	lard	triglycerides	1.219	0.544	0.152	2.286	0.025202720			
Desai M 2014 h	lard	trialycerides	1.461	0.563	0.358	2.565	0.009411711			
Desai M 2015	lard	triglycerides	1.641	0.668	0.333	2.950	0.013937027			
Koukkou E 1998	lard	triglycerides	1.185	0.580	0.049	2.321	0.040891851			
Khan IY 2003 a	lard	trialvcerides	-0.161	0.578	-1.295	0.972	0.780395467			
Khan IY 2003 b	lard	trialvcerides	-0.417	0.584	-1.560	0.727	0.475238177			
Khan IY 2003 c	lard	triglycerides	1.035	0.673	-0.285	2.355	0.124330790			
Khan IY 2003 d	lard	trialycerides	1.287	0.634	0.044	2.530	0.042485542			
Khan IY 2005 a	lard	trialvcerides	0.776	0.599	-0.398	1.949	0.195175331			
Khan IY 2005 b	lard	trialycerides	0.167	0.578	-0.967	1 300	0 773212583			
Khan IY 2005 d	lard	trialycerides	0.325	0.581	-0.814	1.464	0.576440317			
Khan IY 2005 e	lard	trialvcerides	0.405	0.583	-0.738	1.548	0.487683465			
Khan IY 2004 a	lard	trialvcerides	-0.769	0.554	-1.855	0.316	0.164936375			
Khan IY 2004 b	lard	trialycerides	0.195	0.558	-0.898	1 288	0 726269396			
Eleftheriades M 2014	lard	trialycerides	0.195	0.372	-0.535	0.925	0.601432110			
Vega CC 2015 a	lard	trialvcerides	3.327	0.772	1.814	4.840	0.000016332			
Vega CC 2015 b	lard	trialycerides	0 749	0.517	-0.265	1 763	0 147462244			
Zhang X 2011	lard	trialycerides	1.381	0.511	0.379	2 383	0.006905082			
Grav C. Revnolds CM 201	5 lard	trialvcerides	1.248	0.631	0.011	2.484	0.048034033			
Reynolds CM 2015	lard	trialycerides	1 262	0.632	0.023	2 501	0.045900565			
Yang KF 2012	lard	trialycerides	0.085	0.447	-0.792	0.962	0.848942767			
Ghosh P 2001	lard	trialycerides	0.993	0.474	0.064	1.921	0.036248754			
Hanafi MY 2016 c	lard	trialycerides	2 509	0.598	1.337	3 680	0.000027071			
Hanafi MY 2016 d	lard	triglycerides	0.421	0.452	-0.466	1.307	0.352232003			
Mazzucco MB 2016 a	butter	trialycerides	-0.115	0.578	-1.248	1.017	0.841609300			
Mazzucco MB 2016 b	butter	trialycerides	-0.181	0.579	-1.315	0.953	0 753855264			
Couvreur O 2011 a	palmoil	triglycerides	-0.590	0.316	-1.209	0.028	0.061346645			
Couvreur O 2011 b	palm oil	trialycerides	-0.524	0.304	-1.119	0.072	0.084818233			
Férézou-Viala J 2007 a	palm oil	trialvcerides	-0.034	0.426	-0.870	0.801	0.935887864			
Férézou-Viala J 2007 h	palm oil	trialvcerides	0.081	0.427	-0.755	0.918	0.848518937			
Dong YM 2011 a	coconut oil	triglycerides	-0.958	0.472	-1.883	-0.032	0.042498838			
Dong YM 2011 b	sovbean oil	trialycerides	-0.371	0.451	-1.255	0.513	0.411277245			
Chen H 2012	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	trialvcerides	1.913	0.493	0.947	2.879	0.000103643			
Raija S 2013	hydrogenated vegetable oil canola oil	triglycerides	1 263	0.467	0.347	2 178	0.006850826			
Chen H 2014	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	triglycerides	-0.757	0.598	-1.928	0.415	0.205440139			
Hou M 2015	NA	trialycerides	-0.463	0.507	-1.456	0.530	0.361067154			
			0.384	0.076	0.236	0.533	0.000000413			



HFD

Figure 7. Forest Plot for Triglycerides, extended dataset.

Model	Study name	Subgroup within study	Outcome		Stat	stics for each	<u>stu</u> dy		Std_diff in means and 95% CI				
				Std diff in means	Standard error	Lower limit	Upper limit	p-Value					
	Guberman C 2013 a	lard	SBP	1.354	0.640	0.099	2.608	0.034442250	1	1	I		
	Guberman C 2013 b	lard	SBP	1.526	0.656	0.240	2.812	0.020022603					
	Desai M 2014 a	lard	SBP	1.321	0.552	0.239	2.402	0.016681515					
	Desai M 2014 c	lard	SBP	1.728	0.586	0.580	2.877	0.003181084			- 1 -		
	Desai M 2014 e	lard	SBP	1.181	0.542	0.119	2.244	0.029229088				╼╼┼	
	Desai M 2014 g	lard	SBP	2.384	0.654	1.103	3.666	0.000266318					_
	Khan IY 2003 c	lard	SBP	1.414	0.707	0.028	2.799	0.045574105					
	Khan IY 2003 d	lard	SBP	1.464	0.650	0.190	2.738	0.024353050					
	Khan IY 2005 b	lard	SBP	1.491	0.604	0.306	2.675	0.013623071					
	Khan IY 2005 e	lard	SBP	1.513	0.631	0.277	2.748	0.016432339					
	Khan IY 2004 b	lard	SBP	1.491	0.604	0.306	2.675	0.013623071					
	Gray C, Reynolds CM 2015	lard	SBP	1.571	0.660	0.277	2.866	0.017367718					
	Rajia S 2013	hydrogenated vegetable oil, canola oil	SBP	0.113	0.437	-0.744	0.970	0.795872974				• -	
	Gray C, Vickens MH 2015	NA	SBP	0.774	0.464	-0.134	1.683	0.094923453				⊢	
Fixed				1.258	0.156	0.953	1.563	0.000000000				•	
Random				1.258	0.156	0.953	1.563	0.000000000				۰ ا	
									-4 00	-2.00	0.00	2.00	4 00

Figure 8. Forest Plot for Systolic Blood Pressure, extended dataset.

.....

between control and experimental diets remains below 10%, there would not be much variation in the phenotype, with one exception: lower protein content is associated with lower insulin concentration in offspring. Third, lactation is a critical period for programming offspring metabolism later in life. Lagisz M and colleges³⁶ have previously provided review-generated evidence of the importance of the timing of diet manipulation³⁸. Antenatal intervention alone can contribute to contradictory results. On the other hand, the beginning of the intervention would not be an important variable except for two outcomes, insulinemia and glycemia. Fourth, maternal obesity might be a key factor determining the extent of maternal effects on offspring phenotypes. Finally, we suggest studying the response of both sexes to maternal dietary interventions, and where possible, effects should be investigated in a sex-specific manner. We strongly discourage reporting outcomes of mixed-sex groups.

Some aspects of our meta-analysis deserve discussion. Despite extensive searches, some of our findings are based on a limited number of rats and strains of rats and, thus, our conclusions are not necessarily transferable to other laboratory rodents or mammals.

We found evidence for publication bias in our data sets that warrants further investigation of the factors influencing offspring phenotypes in later life. However, given the levels of quantified heterogeneity within our data sets and the described methodological differences in experimental designs, we believe funnel plot asymmetry may be ascribed to between-study variation, but we cannot disregard publication bias favoring significant results. It is strongly recommended the publication of good quality papers even with negative results.

Maternal HFD studies seem even more likely to be confounded by the details of experimental set-ups. Experimental designs varied widely among the studies included in our dataset. Moreover, in the present meta-analysis we did not take into account the physical form of the diet (powder, pellet, liquid), nor the methods



Figure 9. Subgroup analyses for extended dataset. Horizontal lines represent the 95% CIs for the data. The summarized effects (D) are considered statistically significant when their 95% CIs do not cross zero. We used a random-effect model (filled circles) whether heterogeneity was observed, while the fixed-effect model was applied in the absence of heterogeneity (filled squares). Included moderators for the extended data set are: strain (Sprague Dawley, Wistar), sex (male, female), offspring age at testing (young adult), maternal age (young adult), intervention timing [perinatal (gestation and lactation) vs. restricted to gestation period], maternal body weight (increased, not increased), birthweight (decreased, increased, not different), and main fat source (animal, vegetal, mixed; extended dataset). Subgroup analyses for HDL-c extended dataset is available in Supplementary Fig. S4. Subgroup analysis of subsets where heterogeneity was not significant was not performed (SBP subset). Abbreviations: n: number of data points, SD: Sprague Dawley, YA: Young Adult, GES: gestation period only, GES + LAC: gestation and suckling periods.

.....

of determination of the outcomes. Varied assessment tools were implemented in the determination of body fat and blood pressure. For example, adiposity was assessed by markedly different methods such as calorimetry, bioimpedance, nuclear magnetic resonance, and dual x-ray absorptiometry (8/37 studies), or alternatively was estimated as fat pad weight (24/37 studies). We do not expect publication bias to exist strictly in these data sets because most of the included articles were not originally designed to investigate the effect of maternal HFD on the phenotypes that are here studied as primary outcome. Researchers usually are specially concerned with testing of hypotheses rather than with rigorous animal model generation. In line with this, the quality of the included studies was scored as acceptable in 49 of 68 cases, with 63.0% of the included studies reporting randomization of the animals (Supplementary Table S3). Many papers on animal experiments are incomplete in reporting the necessary details^{45, 46}. The quality of animal experimental work could be improved by standardized animal models, and therefore the reliability of its findings. Standardization in future studies may provide a good platform with which to evaluate the effects of maternal HFD and will help to reduce potentially confounding effects for among-study comparisons. Furthermore, today the 3Rs (Replacement, Reduction and Refinement) are increasingly seen as a



PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit <u>www.prisma-statement.org</u>.

Figure 10. PRISMA flow chart summarizing study selection processes.

framework for conducting high quality science. Improved experimental design would minimize the number of animals used per experiment or study.

In summary, this systematic review suggests transgenerational metabolic effects of maternal HFD in rat offspring. We infer that maternal HFD can drive to MetS in offspring by increasing body fat, body weight, and the levels of leptin, by also increasing plasma glucose, insulin, triglycerides concentrations, with the concomitant raise in blood pressure. These findings generally support the fetal origins hypothesis.

Methods

Search strategy. Systematic literature search was performed following guidelines outlined in PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement. We searched for published studies on Pubmed database and additionally obtained the citations of relevant articles by reviewing the references of retrieved studies and review articles. The literature search was done on articles published up to 30 June, 2016. Key MeSH terms used in the search strategy include: high fat, high-fat, lard-fed, fat-rich, mothers, maternal, pregnancy, gestation, rat and offspring. See Supplementary Table S4 for complete search strategy. Searches were restricted to studies on rats that were published in English. After screening of titles and abstracts, two reviewers independently examined full text articles. Disagreements were resolved in consensus discussions.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. Retrieved articles were screened to identify experimental studies on rats where dams were subjected to a HFD around gestation time and phenotypes were measured in offspring older than 30 days of life. One of the following eight phenotypes should have been reported in offspring: body fat, body weight, leptin, glucose, insulin, HDL-c, triglycerides or SBP. We further screened articles using the following inclusion criteria: (1) the study used healthy wild-type laboratory rats: Wistar, Sprague Dawley or Long Evans (obese, diabetic or hypertensive rats were excluded); (2) experimental dams were fed HFD before and/or during whole or any part of pregnancy and a control group was available where dams were fed standard diet; (3) dams and offspring were only subjected to nutritional manipulation (no surgery, drugs, stress, exercise and so on used); and (4) offspring of both control and HFD-fed dams received control diet after maternal dietary intervention. Experiments include a control group of dams on a standard diet consisting in standard chow or any custom-made

or home-made diet with normal fat content. HFD consisted of commercial HFD, custom-made or chow-based HFD; based on animal or vegetable fats. Additional exclusion criteria were applied: (1) dams or offspring were subjected to preference tests; (2) parenteral nutrition or any other than natural feeding (force-feeding by gavage); (3) repeated administration of vehicle (although one injection with saline was allowed); (4) normolipidemic diets and comparisons of groups fed diets differing only in qualitative changes in fat content; (5) cafeteria diets or junk food diets (chow or HFD supplemented with obesogenic food items), or other specific diets based on e.g. diet supplements; and (6) animals fed the HFD and also provided with water containing fructose. We excluded the so called cafeteria diets or junk food diets because, in general, it is not easy to quantify the exact ratios of macronutrients eaten by the animals.

Data Collection. Two review authors independently collected data on study characteristics, quality and results using a standardized data collection form. The detailed technical description of the coding of extracted data and parameters are presented in Supplementary Table S5. Differences were solved by mutual agreement, if needed. We extracted the mean, standard deviation (SD) and sample size for the control and experimental groups for each outcome. Studies that reported results as mean and standard error, and number of animals per group, were also used for meta-analysis. When data were provided in 2D bar plots instead of in a table or text, we extracted the values using WebPlotDigitizer Version 3.10. Data from XY plots were not extracted. We also gathered information on several moderator variables to explain potential heterogeneity in the data: rat strain, offspring sex, age at testing, maternal diet composition (macronutrient composition and caloric density), litter size, timing and duration of maternal dietary manipulation, maternal age at mating or conception, maternal weight during gestation, and birthweight. Finally, information on author's names, publication year and journal, male genitor diet, maternal food availability, methods of measurement, and any other potentially relevant information, was also recorded. In studies with multiple experimental and control groups, we only extracted data for the pairs of experimental and control groups that matched our inclusion criteria. When outcomes were measured at several time points, we extracted only the last measure of outcome at each different "stage of life" (off_age_stage, see Supplementary Table S5).

Selection of included studies. The Pubmed search strategy resulted in 380 hits. Reviews and experimental papers were used to perform further searches resulting in approximately additional 50 records. Literature search is summarized in the PRISMA diagram presented in Fig. 10. The initial screen was based on the paper's title, abstract and occasional whole-text scan and then after in-depth screening, 203 relevant citations remained for further review. Finally, 68 citations were used in meta-analysis^{13–17, 19–21, 23, 26, 38, 43, 44, 47–101}. The 135 excluded studies with the reasons for their exclusion are available in Supplementary Table S6.

Assessment of methodological quality. Methodological quality was assessed based on statements of 1) random allocation into treatment and control groups, 2) husbandry conditions, 3) compliance with animal welfare regulations, and 4) potential conflicts of interests, and whether the study appeared in a peer-reviewed publication¹⁰². Each article was assessed independently by two reviewers and scored on a scale from 0 to 5 points.

Data Analysis. *Extended data set.* We performed the analyses independently for the eight outcomes which were extracted or calculated from the collected data. For each outcome, effect size stands for Cohen's standardized mean difference (D), which was the difference of means between groups (experimental vs. control) divided by the common within-group SD. Where a standard error was presented, the value was converted to a standard deviation. Forest plots were generated to illustrate the study-specific effect sizes along with 95% CI. While the fixed-effect model was applied in the absence of heterogeneity, in general we used a random-effect model. To test robustness of the estimates, we performed sensitivity analyses by omitting one study at a time and calculating the pooled effect size for the remainder of the studies. Meta-regression was used to uncover the potential influence of moderators. These moderators were: age of offspring at testing, maternal age at mating/conception, starting time of manipulation, litter size, increase in energy from fat in experimental diet with respect to control diet, and protein-to-non protein ratio in experimental diet.

Heterogeneity was evaluated with the Q statistic and I-squared statistic. Subgroup analyses were conducted to examine possible sources of heterogeneity. We ran a separate analysis for each level of rat strain, offspring's sex, offspring's age, maternal age, timing of maternal diet manipulation, maternal weight, and birthweight. Subgroup analyses were further conducted on extended dataset for the type of fat source in the experimental diet. To check for publication bias we used the Egger's test and visual inspection of funnel plots for the presence of data distribution asymmetry.

Main data set. We created a main data set including only the experiments where lard-based diets were fed to the dams, where we had reliable information on diet caloric density and macronutrient composition, where energy from fat were between 40 and 60% energy and the decrease in protein content was up to 10% energy in the experimental diet with respect to the control diet. We excluded those studies with male genitor HFD and restrictions in maternal food availability. The main data set was processed and analyzed in the same manner as the extended data set. Further subgroup analyses were conducted for the type of experimental diet in main dataset.

Calculations were performed using the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis computer program (Biostat, Englewood, NJ, USA). Between groups comparisons of energy from fat and protein-to-non protein ratio were performed by using ANOVA (CSS/Statistica program package, StatSoft V 6.0, Tulsa, USA). A p-value < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

References

- Alberti, K. G. *et al.* Harmonizing the metabolic syndrome: a joint interim statement of the International Diabetes Federation Task Force on Epidemiology and Prevention; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; American Heart Association; World Heart Federation; International Atherosclerosis Society; and International Association for the Study of Obesity. *Circulation* 120, 1640–1645 (2009).
- 2. Symonds, M. E., Sebert, S. P., Hyatt, M. A. & Budge, H. Nutritional programming of the metabolic syndrome. *Nat. Rev. Endocrinol* 5, 604–610 (2009).
- Zambrano, E. et al. Maternal Obesity: Lifelong Metabolic Outcomes for Offspring from Poor Developmental Trajectories During the Perinatal Period. Arch. Med. Res. 47, 1–12 (2016).
- 4. Vickers, M. H. Early life nutrition, epigenetics and programming of later life disease. Nutrients 2, 2165-78 (2014).
- Sookoian, S., Gianotti, T. F., Burgueno, A. L. & Pirola, C. J. Fetal metabolic programming and epigenetic modifications: a systems biology approach. *Pediatr. Res.* 73, 531–542 (2013).
- 6. Desai, M., Beall, M. & Ross, M. G. Developmental origins of obesity: programmed adipogenesis. Curr. Diab. Rep 13, 27–33 (2013).
- 7. Lillycrop, K. A. & Burdge, G. C. Epigenetic changes in early life and future risk of obesity. Int. J. Obes. (Lond) 35, 72–83 (2011).
- Sookoian, S., Gianotti, T. F., Burgueno, A. L. & Pirola, C. J. Insulin resistance and epigenetic regulation: insights from human studies and prospects for future research. *Biomol. Concepts* 2, 445–457 (2011).
- 9. Taylor, P. D. & Poston, L. Developmental programming of obesity in mammals. *Exp. Physiol* 92, 287–298 (2007).
- 10. Alfaradhi, M. Z. & Ozanne, S. E. Developmental programming in response to maternal overnutrition. Front Genet 2, 27 (2011).
- Armitage, J. A., Khan, I. Y., Taylor, P. D., Nathanielsz, P. W. & Poston, L. Developmental programming of the metabolic syndrome by maternal nutritional imbalance: how strong is the evidence from experimental models in mammals? *J. Physiol* 561, 355–377 (2004).
- 12. Ainge, H., Thompson, C., Ozanne, S. E. & Rooney, K. B. A systematic review on animal models of maternal high fat feeding and offspring glycaemic control. *Int. J. Obes. (Lond)* 35, 325–335 (2001).
- Buckley, A. J. et al. Altered body composition and metabolism in the male offspring of high fat-fed rats. Metabolism 54, 500–507 (2005).
- Dyrskog, S. E., Gregersen, S. & Hermansen, K. High-fat feeding during gestation and nursing period have differential effects on the insulin secretory capacity in offspring from normal Wistar rats. *Rev. Diabet. Stud* 2, 136–145 (2005).
- Gregersen, S., Dyrskog, S. E., Storlien, L. H. & Hermansen, K. Comparison of a high saturated fat diet with a high carbohydrate diet during pregnancy and lactation: effects on insulin sensitivity in offspring of rats. *Metabolism* 54, 1316–1322 (2005).
- Adamu, H. A. et al. Perinatal exposure to germinated brown rice and its gamma amino-butyric acid-rich extract prevents high fat diet-induced insulin resistance in first generation rat offspring. Food Nutr. Res 60, 30209 (2016).
- White, C. L., Purpera, M. N. & Morrison, C. D. Maternal obesity is necessary for programming effect of high-fat diet on offspring. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 296, R1464–R1472 (2009).
- Mennitti, L. V. et al. Type of fatty acids in maternal diets during pregnancy and/or lactation and metabolic consequences of the offspring. J Nutr Biochem 26, 99–111 (2015).
- Khan, I., Dekou, V., Hanson, M., Poston, L. & Taylor, P. Predictive adaptive responses to maternal high-fat diet prevent endothelial dysfunction but not hypertension in adult rat offspring. *Circulation* 110, 1097–1102 (2004).
- 20. Khan, I. Y. et al. Gender-linked hypertension in offspring of lard-fed pregnant rats. Hypertension 41, 168-175 (2003).
- Khan, I. Y. et al. A high-fat diet during rat pregnancy or suckling induces cardiovascular dysfunction in adult offspring. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 288, R127–R133 (2005).
- Besson, A. A., Lagisz, M., Senior, A. M., Hector, K. L. & Nakagawa, S. Effect of maternal diet on offspring coping styles in rodents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* 91, 1065–1080 (2016).
- Dong, Y. M. et al. High dietary intake of medium-chain fatty acids during pregnancy in rats prevents later-life obesity in their offspring. J. Nutr. Biochem. 22, 791–797 (2011).
- Russell, J. C. & Proctor, S. D. Small animal models of cardiovascular disease: tools for the study of the roles of metabolic syndrome, dyslipidemia, and atherosclerosis. *Cardiovasc. Pathol.* 15, 318–330 (2006).
- 25. Aiken, C. E. & Ozanne, S. E. Sex differences in developmental programming models. *Reproduction.* 145, R1–13 (2013).
- Burgueño, A. L., Cabrerizo, R., Gonzales, M. N., Sookoian, S. & Pirola, C. J. Maternal high-fat intake during pregnancy programs metabolic-syndrome-related phenotypes through liver mitochondrial DNA copy number and transcriptional activity of liver PPARGC1A. J. Nutr. Biochem. 24, 6–13 (2013).
- Reichetzeder, C., Dwi Putra, S. E., Li, J. & Hocher, B. Developmental Origins of Disease Crisis Precipitates Change. Cell Physiol Biochem 39, 919–938 (2016).
- Gilbert, J. S. & Nijland, M. J. Sex differences in the developmental origins of hypertension and cardiorenal disease. Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol 295, R1941–52 (2008).
- Priego, T., Sánchez, J., Picó, C. & Palou, A. Sex-differential expression of metabolism-related genes in response to a high-fat diet. Obesity (Silver Spring) 16, 819–26 (2008).
- Rodríguez, E., Ribot, J., Rodríguez, A. M. & Palou, A. PPAR-gamma2 expression in response to cafeteria diet: gender- and depotspecificeffects. Obes Res 12, 1455–63 (2004).
- Oh, T. S. & Yun, J. W. DNA microarray analysis reveals differential gene expression in the soleus muscle between male and female rats exposed to a high fat diet. *Mol Biol Rep* 39, 6569–80 (2012).
- Oh, T. S. et al. Gender dimorphism in skeletal muscle proteome between lean and diet-induced obese rats. Cell Physiol Biochem 28, 981–96 (2011).
- Mukherjee, R. et al. Gender-dependent protein expression in white adipose tissues of lean and obese rats fed a high fat diet. Cell Physiol Biochem 29, 617–34 (2012).
- Mao, J. et al. Contrasting effects of different maternal diets on sexually dimorphic gene expression in the murine placenta. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 107, 5557–62 (2010).
- 35. Gallou-Kabani, C. et al. Sex- and diet-specific changes of imprinted gene expression and DNA methylation in mouse placenta under a high-fat diet. PLoS One. 5, e14398 (2010).
- Lagisz, M. et al. Little appetite for obesity: meta-analysis of the effects of maternal obesogenic diets on offspring food intake and body mass in rodents. Int. J. Obes. (Lond) 39, 1669–1678 (2015).
- Del Prado, M., Delgado, G. & Villalpando, S. Maternal lipid intake during pregnancy and lactation alters milk composition and production and litter growth in rats. J Nutr. 127, 458–62 (1997).
- Trottier, G. et al. Increased fat intake during lactation modifies hypothalamic-pituitary adrenal responsiveness in developing rat pups: a possible role for leptin. Endocrinology. 139, 3704–3711 (1998).
- Franco, J. G. *et al.* Maternal high-fat diet induces obesity and adrenal and thyroid dysfunction in male rat offspring at weaning. J Physiol 590, 5503–18 (2012).
- 40. Purcell, R. H. *et al.* Maternal stress and high-fat diet effect on maternal behavior, milk composition, and pupingestive behavior. *Physiol Behav.* **104**, 474–9 (2011).
- 41. Brandorff, N. P. The effect of dietary fat on the fatty acid composition of lipids secreted in rats'milk. Lipids. 15, 276-278 (1980).
- Rolls, B. A., Gurr, M. I., van Duijvenvoorde, P. M., Rolls, B. J. & Rowe, E. A. Lactation in lean and obese rats: effect of cafeteria feeding and of dietary obesity on milk composition. *Physiol Behav.* 38, 185–90 (1986).

- Srinivasan, M., Katewa, S. D., Palaniyappan, A., Pandya, J. D. & Patel, M. S. Maternal high-fat diet consumption results in fetal malprogramming predisposing to the onset of metabolic syndrome-like phenotype in adulthood. *Am. J. Physiol Endocrinol. Metab* 291, E792–E799 (2006).
- 44. Howie, G. J., Sloboda, D. M., Kamal, T. & Vickers, M. H. Maternal nutritional history predicts obesity in adult offspring independent of postnatal diet. J. Physiol 587, 905–915 (2009).
- 45. Kilkenny, C. et al. Survey of the quality of experimental design, statistical analysis and reporting of research using animals. PLoS. One. 4, e7824 (2009).
- Hooijmans, C. R. & Leenaars, M. Ritskes-Hoitinga, M. A gold standard publication checklist to improve the quality of animal studies, to fully integrate the Three Rs, and to make systematic reviews more feasible. *Altern. Lab Anim* 38, 167–182 (2010).
- 47. Tamashiro, K. L., Terrillion, C. E., Hyun, J., Koenig, J. I. & Moran, T. H. Prenatal stress or high-fat diet increases susceptibility to diet-induced obesity in rat offspring. *Diabetes* 58, 1116–1125 (2009).
- Sun, B. *et al.* Maternal high-fat diet during gestation or suckling differentially affects offspring leptin sensitivity and obesity. *Diabetes* 61, 2833–2841 (2012).
- Sun, B. et al. Early postweaning exercise improves central leptin sensitivity in offspring of rat dams fed high-fat diet during pregnancy and lactation. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 305, R1076–R1084 (2013).
- White, C. L. et al. Effects of high fat diet on Morris maze performance, oxidative stress, and inflammation in rats: contributions of maternal diet. Neurobiol. Dis. 35, 3–13 (2009).
- Sasaki, A., de Vega, W. C., St-Cyr, S., Pan, P. & McGowan, P. O. Perinatal high fat diet alters glucocorticoid signaling and anxiety behavior in adulthood. *Neuroscience* 240, 1–12 (2013).
- Marco, A., Kisliouk, T., Tabachnik, T., Meiri, N. & Weller, A. Overweight and CpG methylation of the Pomc promoter in offspring of high-fat-diet-fed dams are not "reprogrammed" by regular chow diet in rats. *FASEB J.* 28, 4148–4157 (2014).
- 53. Lecoutre, S. et al. Depot- and sex-specific effects of maternal obesity in offspring's adipose tissue. J. Endocrinol. 230, 39-53 (2016).
- 54. Ambrosetti, V. *et al.* Increase in endogenous estradiol in the progeny of obese rats is associated with precocious puberty and altered follicular development in adulthood. *Endocrine.* 53, 258–270 (2016).
- 55. Guberman, C., Jellyman, J. K., Han, G., Ross, M. G. & Desai, M. Maternal high-fat diet programs rat offspring hypertension and activates the adipose renin-angiotensin system. *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.* **209**, 262–268 (2013).
- 56. Seet, E. L. et al. Maternal high-fat-diet programs rat offspring liver fatty acid metabolism. Lipids 50, 565-573 (2015).
- 57. Desai, M. et al. Maternal obesity and high-fat diet program offspring metabolic syndrome. Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol. 211, 237 (2014).
- 58. Desai, M., Jellyman, J. K., Han, G., Lane, R. H. & Ross, M. G. Programmed regulation of rat offspring adipogenic transcription factor (PPARgamma) by maternal nutrition. J. Dev. Orig. Health Dis 6, 530–538 (2015).
- 59. Walker, C. D. *et al.* Perinatal maternal fat intake affects metabolism and hippocampal function in the offspring: a potential role for leptin. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci* **1144**, 189–202 (2008).
- Naef, L. et al. Maternal high fat diet during the perinatal period alters mesocorticolimbic dopamine in the adult rat offspring: reduction in the behavioral responses to repeated amphetamine administration. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 197, 83–94 (2008).
- Koukkou, E., Ghosh, P., Lowy, C. & Poston, L. Offspring of normal and diabetic rats fed saturated fat in pregnancy demonstrate vascular dysfunction. *Circulation* 98, 2899–2904 (1998).
- 62. Mendes-da-Silva, C. et al. Maternal high-fat diet during pregnancy or lactation changes the somatic and neurological development of the offspring. Arq Neuropsiquiatr 72, 136–144 (2014).
- Taylor, P. D. et al. Impaired glucose homeostasis and mitochondrial abnormalities in offspring of rats fed a fat-rich diet in pregnancy. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 288, R134-R139 (2005).
- Armitage, J. A. *et al.* Developmental programming of aortic and renal structure in offspring of rats fed fat-rich diets in pregnancy. *J. Physiol* 565, 171–184 (2005).
- Eleftheriades, M. et al. Metabolic profiles of adult Wistar rats in relation to prenatal and postnatal nutritional manipulation: the role of birthweight. Hormones (Athens.) 13, 268–279 (2014).
- Vega, C. C. et al. Exercise in obese female rats has beneficial effects on maternal and male and female offspring metabolism. Int. J. Obes. (Lond) 39, 712–719 (2015).
- 67. Bautista, C. J. et al. Changes in milk composition in obese rats consuming a high-fat diet. Br. J. Nutr. 115, 538-546 (2016).
- Rodriguez-Gonzalez, G. L. et al. Maternal obesity and overnutrition increase oxidative stress in male rat offspring reproductive system and decrease fertility. Int. J. Obes. (Lond) 39, 549–556 (2015).
- Zambrano, E., Martinez-Samayoa, P. M., Rodriguez-Gonzalez, G. L. & Nathanielsz, P. W. Dietary intervention prior to pregnancy reverses metabolic programming in male offspring of obese rats. J. Physiol 588, 1791–1799 (2010).
- Santos, M. et al. Adult exercise effects on oxidative stress and reproductive programming in male offspring of obese rats. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 308, R219–R225 (2015).
- Zhang, X., Strakovsky, R., Zhou, D., Zhang, Y. & Pan, Y. X. A maternal high-fat diet represses the expression of antioxidant defense genes and induces the cellular senescence pathway in the liver of male offspring rats. J. Nutr. 141, 1254–1259 (2011).
- Page, K. C., Malik, R. E., Ripple, J. A. & Anday, E. K. Maternal and postweaning diet interaction alters hypothalamic gene expression and modulates response to a high-fat diet in male offspring. *Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol* 297, R1049–R1057 (2009).
- Howie, G. J., Sloboda, D. M., Reynolds, C. M. & Vickers, M. H. Timing of maternal exposure to a high fat diet and development of obesity and hyperinsulinemia in male rat offspring: same metabolic phenotype, different developmental pathways? *J. Nutr. Metab* 2013, 517384 (2013).
- Smith, T., Sloboda, D. M., Saffery, R., Joo, E. & Vickers, M. H. Maternal nutritional history modulates the hepatic IGF-IGFBP axis in adult male rat offspring. *Endocrine*. 46, 70–82 (2014).
- Pereira, T. J. et al. Maternal obesity characterized by gestational diabetes increases the susceptibility of rat offspring to hepatic steatosis via a disrupted liver metabolome. J. Physiol 593, 3181–3197 (2015).
- Cordero, P., Gonzalez-Muniesa, P., Milagro, F. I., Campion, J. & Martinez, J. A. Perinatal maternal feeding with an energy dense diet and/or micronutrient mixture drives offspring fat distribution depending on the sex and growth stage. J. Anim Physiol Anim Nutr. (Berl) 99, 834–840 (2015).
- 77. Sloboda, D. M., Howie, G. J., Pleasants, A., Gluckman, P. D. & Vickers, M. H. Pre- and postnatal nutritional histories influence reproductive maturation and ovarian function in the rat. *PLoS. One* **4**, e6744 (2009).
- 78. Tsoulis, M. W. *et al.* Maternal High-Fat Diet-Induced Loss of Fetal Oocytes Is Associated with Compromised Follicle Growth in Adult Rat Offspring. *Biol. Reprod* **94**, 94 (2016).
- Gray, C., Vickers, M. H., Segovia, S. A., Zhang, X. D. & Reynolds, C. M. A maternal high fat diet programmes endothelial function and cardiovascular status in adult male offspring independent of body weight, which is reversed by maternal conjugated linoleic acid (CLA) supplementation. *PLoS. One* 10, e0115994 (2015).
- Reynolds, C. M., Segovia, S. A., Zhang, X. D., Gray, C. & Vickers, M. H. Conjugated linoleic Acid supplementation during pregnancy and lactation reduces maternal high-fat-diet-induced programming of early-onset puberty and hyperlipidemia in female rat offspring. *Biol. Reprod* 92, 40 (2015).
- Pileggi, C. A. et al. Maternal conjugated linoleic acid supplementation reverses high-fat diet-induced skeletal muscle atrophy and inflammation in adult male rat offspring. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 310, R432–R439 (2016).

- Song, Y. *et al.* Maternal high-fat diet feeding during pregnancy and lactation augments lung inflammation and remodeling in the offspring. *Respir. Physiol Neurobiol.* 207, 1–6 (2015).
- 83. Latouche, C. *et al.* Maternal overnutrition programs changes in the expression of skeletal muscle genes that are associated with insulin resistance and defects of oxidative phosphorylation in adult male rat offspring. *J. Nutr.* **144**, 237–244 (2014).
- Yang, K. F., Shen, X. H. & Cai, W. Prenatal and early postnatal exposure to high-saturated-fat diet represses Wnt signaling and myogenic genes in offspring rats. *Exp. Biol. Med. (Maywood.)* 237, 912–918 (2012).
- Ghosh, P., Bitsanis, D., Ghebremeskel, K., Crawford, M. A. & Poston, L. Abnormal aortic fatty acid composition and small artery function in offspring of rats fed a high fat diet in pregnancy. J. Physiol 533, 815–822 (2001).
- Miotto, P. M. et al. Maternal high fat feeding does not have long-lasting effects on body composition and bone health in female and male Wistar rat offspring at young adulthood. Molecules. 18, 15094–15109 (2013).
- 87. MacPherson, R. E. *et al.* A maternal high fat diet has long-lasting effects on skeletal muscle lipid and PLIN protein content in rat offspring at young adulthood. *Lipids* **50**, 205–217 (2015).
- Hanafi, M. Y., Saad, M. I., Abdelkhalek, T. M., Saleh, M. M. & Kamel, M. A. In Utero Nutritional Manipulation Provokes Dysregulated Adipocytokines Production in F1 Offspring in Rats. *Scientifica. (Cairo.)* 2016, 3892890 (2016).
- Mazzucco, M. B. et al. Maternal saturated-fat-rich diet promotes leptin resistance in fetal liver lipid catabolism and programs lipid homeostasis impairments in the liver of rat offspring. J. Nutr. Biochem. 27, 61–69 (2016).
- Kozak, R., Burlet, A., Burlet, C. & Beck, B. Dietary composition during fetal and neonatal life affects neuropeptide Y functioning in adult offspring. *Brain Res. Dev. Brain Res.* 125, 75–82 (2000).
- 91. Couvreur, O. et al. Unexpected long-term protection of adult offspring born to high-fat fed dams against obesity induced by a sucrose-rich diet. PLoS. One. 6, e18043 (2011).
- Ferezou-Viala, J. et al. Long-term consequences of maternal high-fat feeding on hypothalamic leptin sensitivity and diet-induced obesity in the offspring. Am. J. Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp Physiol 293, R1056–R1062 (2007).
- Hellgren, L. I., Jensen, R. I., Waterstradt, M. S., Quistorff, B. & Lauritzen, L. Acute and perinatal programming effects of a fat-rich diet on rat muscle mitochondrial function and hepatic lipid accumulation. Acta Obstet. Gynecol. Scand. 93, 1170–1180 (2014).
- Chen, H., Simar, D., Ting, J. H., Erkelens, J. R. & Morris, M. J. Leucine improves glucose and lipid status in offspring from obese dams, dependent on diet type, but not caloric intake. J. Neuroendocrinol 24, 1356–1364 (2012).
- Rajia, S., Chen, H. & Morris, M. J. Voluntary post weaning exercise restores metabolic homeostasis in offspring of obese rats. Nutr. Metab Cardiovasc. Dis. 23, 574–581 (2013).
- Chen, H., Simar, D. & Morris, M. J. Maternal obesity impairs brain glucose metabolism and neural response to hyperglycemia in male rat offspring. J. Neurochem. 129, 297–303 (2014).
- Xue, Q. et al. Maternal High-Fat Diet Causes a Sex-Dependent Increase in AGTR2 Expression and Cardiac Dysfunction in Adult Male Rat Offspring. Biol Reprod 93, 49 (2015).
- Sun, B., Song, L., Tamashiro, K. L., Moran, T. H. & Yan, J. Large litter rearing improves leptin sensitivity and hypothalamic appetite markers in offspring of rat dams fed high-fat diet during pregnancy and lactation. *Endocrinology* 155, 3421–3433 (2014).
- Gray, C., Harrison, C. J., Segovia, S. A., Reynolds, C. M. & Vickers, M. H. Maternal salt and fat intake causes hypertension and sustained endothelial dysfunction in fetal, weanling and adult male resistance vessels. Sci. Rep. 5, 9753 (2015).
- Zaborska, K. E., Wareing, M., Edwards, G. & Austin, C. Loss of anti-contractile effect of perivascular adipose tissue in offspring of obese rats. Int. J. Obes. (Lond) 40, 1205–1214 (2016).
- Hou, M. et al. A high-fat maternal diet decreases adiponectin receptor-1 expression in offspring. J. Matern. Fetal Neonatal Med 28, 216–221 (2015).
- 102. Xu, X. M. *et al*. Beneficial Effects of Caloric Restriction on Chronic Kidney Disease in Rodent Models: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review. *PLoS. One.* **10**, e0144442 (2015).

Acknowledgements

M.L.T. and C.J.P. belong to Consejo National de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET). Two anonymous reviewers are thanked for critically reading the manuscript and suggesting substantial improvements.

Author Contributions

M.L.T. and M.F.M. collected data. M.L.T. and C.J.P. conceived and designed the meta-analysis, and analyzed data and wrote manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Additional Information

Supplementary information accompanies this paper at doi:10.1038/s41598-017-05344-7

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2017