Nuts, body weight and insulin resistance
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Traditionally, nuts have been considered a staple food, but because of their high energy and fat content are not considered good for body weight control or insulin sensitivity. Frequent consumption of nuts reduces the risk of coronary artery disease and type-2 diabetes and nut-enriched diets favourably alter blood lipids in normal and hypercholesterolemic individuals under controlled and free-living dietary conditions. However, whether or not frequent consumption of nuts can cause weight gain and impair insulin sensitivity is not fully understood. Review of the available data to date suggests that adding nuts to habitual diets of free-living individuals does not cause weight gain. In fact, nuts have a tendency to lower body weight and fat mass. In the context of calorie-restricted diets, adding nuts produces a more lasting and greater magnitude of weight loss among obese subjects while improving insulin sensitivity. Further studies are needed to clarify the effect of long-term (≥ year) consumption of nuts on body weight and their role in altering insulin sensitivity both in normal and type-2 diabetics. In the meantime, there is sufficient evidence to promote the inclusion of nuts as part of healthy diets.
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Traditionally, nuts have been used as a staple food for providing energy, protein, essential fatty acids and a host of vitamins and minerals. At the same time, since nuts are energy dense high fat foods, they have not been considered good for controlling body weight and improving insulin sensitivity. While the research on the role of nuts in body weight control and insulin resistance is relatively new, their cardio-protective benefits have been well established. In fact, the current recommendations by the American Heart Association (Krauss et al. 2000) for a heart-healthy diet include nuts as one of the desirable foods to improve blood lipid profile. To date, four large epidemiological studies (Fraser et al. 1992; Kushi et al. 1996; Hu et al. 1998; Albert et al. 2002) have shown that frequent consumption of nuts lowers the risk of fatal and non-fatal coronary heart disease even after adjusting for known coronary risk factors such as age, smoking, sex, family history of hypertension, body weight, physical activity and the intake of other protective foods. More recently, the Nurses Health Study demonstrated that frequent consumption of nuts is inversely related to the risk of type-2 diabetes (Jiang et al. 2002). Besides population based observations, several intervention studies with different kinds of nuts in well-controlled dietary conditions (Sabeté et al. 1993, 2003; Curb et al. 2000; Rajaram et al. 2001; Iwamoto et al. 2002; Sabaté, 2003) or in free living individuals on self-selected diets (Spiller et al. 1992; Abbey et al. 1994; Colquhoun et al. 1996; Chisholm et al. 1998; Spiller et al. 1998; Durak et al. 1999; Edwards et al. 1999; Morgan & Claysulte, 2000; Zambon et al. 2000; Almario et al. 2001; Hyon et al. 2002; Jenkins et al. 2002; Lovejoy et al. 2002; Morgan et al. 2002; Garg et al. 2003) have shown that nuts improve blood lipid parameters in both men and women with normal and hypercholesterolemia.

With the steady increase in the incidence of obesity and related chronic diseases, it becomes important to both scientists and health professionals to understand the role of nuts in body weight regulation (Garcia-Lorda et al. 2003; Sabaté, 2003; St-Onge, 2005) and insulin resistance. This review summarizes the data available to date by looking at three lines of evidence: (1) Data from population based studies on the association between nut intake and body weight and insulin resistance; (2) Data from nut intervention studies under controlled and free-living conditions with chronic disease risk factors as the primary outcome; and (3) Data from nut intervention trials with body weight outcome both in free-living healthy subjects and in the context of weight loss in obese individuals. Some of the potential mechanisms by which nuts may influence body weight and insulin resistance are also provided, followed by concluding remarks.

Nuts and body weight

Epidemiologic evidence

There is no epidemiological data to support the concern that nuts may cause weight gain. In Mediterranean countries where the per capita consumption of nuts is almost double that in the United States, the rate of obesity is significantly lower (Sabaté, 1993). A cross-sectional study of 800 schoolgirls in Spain found no differences in body weight in the various categories of nut intake ranging from zero to daily intake (Soriguer et al. 1995). In fact, Mediterranean dietary patterns, of which nuts are an integral part, have been inversely associated with BMI and obesity (Schroder et al. 2004). In the United States, data from the Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals (US Department of Agriculture & Agricultural Research Service, 2000) showed no association between nut intake and body mass index (BMI). In this
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survey, the nut-eater group consisted of individuals that reported consumption of tree nuts, peanuts or seeds on any of the 2 days in which the 24-hour recalls were collected. Data from the 1994–6 survey showed that young and adult nut eaters had lower BMI compared to non-nut-eaters in spite of higher energy intake among nut eaters. Also, among the nut eaters, the amount of nuts and seeds in their diets did not relate to BMI (Sabaté, 2003).

Large cohort studies that reported a decrease in the risk of coronary artery disease (CAD) with frequent consumption of nuts all show an inverse or no relationship between frequency of nut intake and BMI. In the Adventist Health Study (Fraser et al. 1992), a statistically significant negative effect was seen between consumption of nuts and BMI in a cohort of 31 200 subjects, suggesting that those who ate nuts more often were leaner than those who ate nuts infrequently. In addition, a substantial reduction in CAD risk was observed among both lean and obese subjects in this prospective study, with a ~50% risk reduction for individuals with either low or high BMI consuming nuts ~5 times/wk compared to their counterparts consuming nuts ~1 time/wk (Fig. 1). The Nurses Health Study (Hu et al. 1998) also observed a negative association between nut consumption and BMI among 86 000 female subjects and a similar cardio-protective effect of nuts in both obese and lean individuals. The Physicians’ Health Study (Albert et al. 2002) did not report any association between BMI and nut intake and the BMI’s by quartile of nut consumption were very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar. More recently, in a large cohort of women that were followed up for 16 years, the average weight change was very similar.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Diet intervention</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiller et al.</td>
<td>13 M, 13 F</td>
<td>Pre-post supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>100 g/d almonds supplemented to baseline diet</td>
<td>Energy intake:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey et al.</td>
<td>16 M</td>
<td>Pre-post consecutive supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>84 g/d almonds or 68 g/d walnuts added to reference diet to replace 50% fat energy, 3 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colquhoun et al.</td>
<td>7 M, 7 F</td>
<td>Randomized, Pre-post crossover field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>20% energy of baseline diet replaced with macadamia, 4 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiller et al.</td>
<td>12 M, 33 F</td>
<td>Randomized, parallel arm field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>100 g almonds added to baseline diet, 4 week duration</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey et al.</td>
<td>16 M</td>
<td>Pre-post consecutive supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>20% energy of low-fat diet replaced with walnuts, 4 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisholm et al.</td>
<td>7 M, 7 F</td>
<td>Randomized, crossover clinical study, dietary advice</td>
<td>20% energy of habitual diet replaced with pistachio, 3 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards et al.</td>
<td>4 M, 6 F</td>
<td>Randomized, crossover clinical study, dietary advice</td>
<td>18% energy of habitul diet replaced with walnuts</td>
<td>Energy intake: Not reported Body weight:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durak et al.</td>
<td>18 M, 12 F</td>
<td>Pre-post supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>68 g pecans added to self-selected diets, 8 week duration</td>
<td>Energy intake:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsambon et al.</td>
<td>28 M, 27 F</td>
<td>Randomized, crossover clinical study, dietary advice</td>
<td>48 g walnuts added to either habitual diet or low-fat diet, 6 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan et al.</td>
<td>4 M, 15 F</td>
<td>Randomized, pre-post parallel arm supplemental field study</td>
<td>50% of fat energy of habitual diet replaced with almonds or almond oil (~66g/d), 6 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almario et al.</td>
<td>5 M, 13 F</td>
<td>Pre-post consecutive supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>64 g walnuts added to low-fat diet, 6 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Dyslipidemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyson et al.</td>
<td>10 M, 12 F</td>
<td>Randomized pre-post crossover field study, dietary advice</td>
<td>73g almonds supplement added to baseline diet, 4 weeks each diet</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan et al.</td>
<td>42 M</td>
<td>Randomized, crossover clinical study, dietary advice</td>
<td>100g almonds/d added to habitual diet, 4 week</td>
<td>Energy intake:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hypercholesteremic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins et al.</td>
<td>15 M, 12 F</td>
<td>Randomized crossover clinical study, dietary advice</td>
<td>15% energy of habitual diet replaced with macadamia (40–90g/d), 4 week</td>
<td>Energy intake: No change Body weight:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hypercholesteremic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body weight: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovejoy et al.</td>
<td>10 M, 10 F</td>
<td>Pre-post supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garg et al.</td>
<td>17 M</td>
<td>Pre-post supplemental field study, dietary advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Hypercholesteremic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M—Males; F—Females
is no weight gain in healthy individuals and hypercholesterolemic patients. This is true either when the percent energy from fat after adding nuts remains the same (Sabaté et al. 1993) or is significantly increased (Rajaram et al. 2001; Sabaté et al. 2003).

**Nut feeding studies with body weight as primary outcome**

Three recent studies specifically investigated the effects on body weight of supplementing habitual diets with nuts in free-living subjects (Alper & Mattes, 2002; Fraser et al. 2002; Sabaté et al. 2005). One of these studies was on peanuts (Alper & Mattes, 2002), which although botanically classified as legumes, will be considered for discussion, since they are nutritionally very similar to tree nuts. In this study, 119kcal/d (500kcal/d) of peanut supplement was provided to fifteen adults with normal body weight. There were three phases to the study: the free-feeding phase in which subjects received peanuts without dietary guidance, an addition phase in which subjects were asked to add the peanuts to their habitual diet and a substitution phase in which they were asked to replace an equal amount of other fats in the diets for peanuts. During the substitution phase no weight gain was noted. In the free-feeding phase, subjects gained 1.0 kg during the 8-week intervention which is considerably lower than the predicted 3.6 kg based on the additional calories coming from the peanuts. Also, during the addition phase, subjects gained 0.6 kg as opposed to the 1.4 kg which was predicted. Part of this difference is attributed to the dietary compensation for a portion of the extra calories coming from peanuts. An increase in resting energy expenditure of 11 % was noted after peanut consumption despite no changes in physical activity level.

Fraser et al. (2002) reported that 6 mo of almond supplementation had minimal effects on body weight. Eighty-one subjects were provided with 42–70 g raw or dry-roasted almonds/d (averaging 76 kcal per person) with no instructions other than eating the almonds. Six months following nut supplementation, men gained 0.65 kg while women did not gain any significant weight (Table 2). Only lean subjects in the lowest tertile of baseline BMI gained weight and obese women (highest tertile of baseline BMI) actually lost weight. The average body weight increase for subjects during almond supplementation was 0.4 kg while the predicted weight gain based on the extra calories consumed from almonds is 6.4 kg. The physical activity report showed no significant difference in frequency and vigour of activity during the two diet phases nor was there a difference in resting energy expenditure. However, food displacement was seen following almond supplementation, and approximately 54 % (by 24-hour recalls) or 78 % (from food diary) of the extra calories from almonds was displaced by a reduction of intake in other foods of the habitual diet (Jaceldo-Siegl et al. 2004).

In a recent walnut supplemented trial (Sabaté et al. 2005), ninety free-living men and women were assigned to either a walnut supplemented diet (28–56 g walnuts/d) or habitual diet for 6 months each in a crossover fashion. Walnuts were supplemented to the habitual diets with no specific instructions other than to eat the allotted amount. The walnut supplementation caused an increase in daily energy intake of 557 kcal (133 kcal). Although this should have led to a weight gain of 3.1 kg over the 6 months, the observed increases in body weight was 0.4 kg, in BMI 0.2 kg/m² and in fat mass 0.2 kg. In fact, this small increase in body weight with the walnut supplement was not significant when energy differences between the two diets were controlled for. These findings confirm that adding nuts to habitual diets does not adversely affect body weight.

**Nut supplement in the context of weight loss diets**

There have been two trials so far that have looked at the efficacy of nuts in the context of weight loss diets. In one study (McManus et al. 2001), 101 overweight subjects received either a low fat (20 % energy from fat) or a moderate fat diet (35 % energy from fat) containing several nuts, peanut butter and olive oil. Following an 18-month intervention, the moderate fat group experienced weight loss and decrease in waist circumference while the low fat group regained weight progressively. After 2½ years, the moderate fat group still weighed significantly less than the low fat group.

In a weight reduction study (Wien et al. 2003), sixty-five overweight and obese individuals were randomized into either a complex carbohydrate enriched or an almond enriched low calorie diets for 24 weeks under free-living condition. Approximately 84 g/d of almonds was provided to the almond enriched diet group, which was equivalent to 39 % energy from fat as opposed to 18 % energy from fat in the carbohydrate enriched low calorie diet. As expected, both diet groups lost weight (Fig. 2), but the almond group experienced a sustained and 62 % greater weight reduction for the 24-week duration than the carbohydrate group. The almond group also had a 50 % greater decrease in waist circumference and a 62 % decrease in fat mass than the carbohydrate group. This study suggests that in the context of low caloric diets, including nuts may enhance weight loss and improve body composition indices. Additional benefits for nuts included in weight loss diets are that it may provide for variety in texture, contribute to satiety and improve long-term compliance.

**Potential mechanisms**

From the epidemiological studies we note an inverse relationship between nut consumption and body weight. Since nuts are

---

**Table 2.** Body weight changes after 6 months almond supplementation in free-living healthy subjects (mean values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Almonds</th>
<th>P Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body weight (kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>83.18</td>
<td>83.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>69.13</td>
<td>69.40</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waist/hip ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paired t test compares the means of the two diet periods. Adapted from Fraser et al. 2002.
a high fat, high energy food, it is possible that obese individ-
uals avoid them while lean individuals include them more
freely and this may result in the observed negative associ-
ation between nut intake and body weight. It is also likely that those
eating nuts frequently practice other healthy lifestyle habits,
such as increased physical activity. In fact, nut consump-
tion was associated with greater frequency of vigorous exercise
among participants of the Nurses Health Study (Hu et al.
1998). The Physicians’ Health Study also showed that men
who ate nuts frequently were also more physically active
(Albert et al. 2002). However, this was not substantiated in
an intervention study where almonds were supplemented
to the habitual diets of free-living subjects for 6 months. No
change in exercise frequency and vigour was observed (US
Department of Agriculture & Agricultural Research Service,
2000) in this study.

Several mechanisms can potentially explain why nuts do
not cause weight gain. Nuts are energy dense foods with
high fibre, protein and low glycaemic index, all of which
are dietary factors that have been shown to increase satiety
(Holt et al. 1995). In the 6-month almond supplemented
study (Fraser et al. 2002), 54–78% of the extra energy
from almonds was displaced by reductions in other foods
suggesting a satiety effect. Nuts are high in unsaturated fatty
acids and hence may influence diet-induced thermogenesis
by increasing resting energy expenditure. Both animal and
human studies have shown that unsaturated fat increases fat
oxidation because of higher diet-induced thermogenesis result-
ing in less body fat accumulation (van Marken Lichtenbelt
et al. 1997). While peanut supplementation for 19 weeks
resulted in an 11% increase in resting energy expenditure
(Alper & Mattes, 2002), daily almond supplementation for 6
months did not change resting energy expenditure (Fraser
et al. 2002).

Given that nuts are a complex matrix of nutrients, it is
likely that fatty acid availability from nuts is decreased
from incomplete digestion and or absorption. An earlier
study with peanuts showed that 76 g peanuts consumed for
4–6 days resulted in 17% excretion of dietary fat in stools
(Alper & Mattes, 2002). Visual inspection showed that
stools contained intact portions of the nuts indicating that
absorption was compromised. In an intervention feeding

Fig. 2. Body weight loss on a calorie restricted diet with almond or carbo-
hydrate supplement. Almond – Low calorie almond diet; CHO – Low calorie
carbohydrate diet. Reproduced with permission from Wien et al. (2003).

trial with pecans, we demonstrated that stool fat increased
(25 g/d) when subjects were on the nut diet compared to the
control diet (6 g/d). This represented 8 and 3% of the
dietary fat of the pecan and control diet, respectively
(Zemaitis & Sabaté, 2001). A similar observation was made
when the intervention food was almonds, although the per-
cent fat loss in stools was much less (4%) than on the
pecan or peanut diets. Recently Ellis et al. (2004) systemati-
ically looked at the bioavailability of fatty acids from almonds
by simulating chewing action and following up with a digest-
ibility study. They demonstrated that the mechanical disrup-
tion of almond tissue or the chewing process damaged only
the first layer of cells of the almond resulting in an incom-
plete release of the fatty acids. Further, consumption of
100–200 g/d of almonds by healthy volunteers caused a
3-fold increase in percent faecal fat excretion compared to
when they ate a nut free diet. Electron microscopy revealed
intact cell walls in the faecal samples that had resisted diges-
tion and thus retained some of the intracellular fatty acids
contained in the almonds.

Thus, the excretion of fat in the stools and the displacement
of foods from habitual diets together may account for the lack
of weight gain among nut eaters. Future studies need to further
explore the mechanism(s) by which nuts prevent weight gain or in some cases induce weight loss.

Nuts and insulin resistance/type-2 diabetes

Epidemiological evidence

A prospective cohort study of women (Jiang et al. 2002)
found that the frequency of nut consumption had a substi-
tional and highly significant inverse association with risk of
type-2 diabetes. The reduction in risk of developing type-2
diabetes was 30% lower in those consuming nuts five or
more times per week and 20% lower in those consuming
nuts 1–4 times a week compared to those that almost
never ate nuts (Table 3). The inverse association persisted
even after adjusting for other known risk factors including
age, obesity, physical activity, smoking, family history and
other dietary factors.

The protective effect of nut consumption on incidence of
type-2 diabetes was consistent among various subgroups in
women. The frequency of nut consumption was significantly
and inversely related to the risk of type-2 diabetes in both mul-
tivitamin users and non-users, those above or below mean
body mass index, and in those that consumed a high or low
glycaemic load. Similar findings were also noted for the con-
sumption of peanut butter. However, whether a similar
relationship will be observed in men remains to be determined
in future studies.

To date, this is the only study that has looked at the
association between nut intake and risk of diabetes although
previously, unsaturated fat intake has been shown to reduce
the risk of type-2 diabetes and improve glycaemic control in
diabetic patients (Hu et al. 2001).

Intervention studies

In a randomized, double-blind crossover study (Lovejoy et al.
2002), 34 men and women with type-2 diabetes were assigned
to one of four different diets: high fat-high almond diet, low fat-high almond diet, high fat-control diet and low fat-control diet for 4 weeks each. The fat source in the low fat and high fat control diets was olive or canola oil. The almond enriched diets used 10 % of energy from almonds (~85 g almonds/619 kJ diet). In this study no significant effect of fat amount or source was seen on plasma glucose and insulin levels during a 2-h oral glucose tolerance test. The almond enriched high fat diet had a favourable effect on serum total cholesterol without adversely affecting glycaemia. It is likely that nut intervention longer than 4 weeks and greater than 10 % of total energy intake is required to modify insulin sensitivity and glycaemic control. Similarly, 30 g a day of nuts added to the low-fat diet of type-2 diabetic patients improved blood lipid profiles by specifically increasing HDL-C/total-C ratio without adversely affecting glycosylated haemoglobin levels and body weight (Tapsell et al. 2004).

More recently, sixty-five overweight subjects (37 women, 28 men) completed a randomized dietary intervention trial for 24 weeks to determine the efficacy of an almond-based hypocaloric diet on dyslipidemia, insulin resistance and weight changes (Wien et al. 2003). Seventy percent of the participants had type-2 diabetes and the remainder had insulin resistant syndrome. Upon being selected, all participants followed a 2-week run-in period with no intervention apart from a multivitamin/mineral supplement. At the end of the 2 weeks, participants were randomized based on gender and presence or absence of type-2 diabetes into a formula-based low caloric diet on dyslipidemia, insulin resistance and weight changes (Wien et al. 2003). Seventy percent of the participants had type-2 diabetes and the remainder had insulin resistant syndrome. Upon being selected, all participants followed a 2-week run-in period with no intervention apart from a multivitamin/mineral supplement. At the end of the 2 weeks, participants were randomized based on gender and presence or absence of type-2 diabetes into a formula-based low caloric diet supplemented with either almonds (84 g/d per 238 kJ) or complex carbohydrates equivalent in calories for 24 weeks.

There was a 54 % reduction in fasting insulin levels in the almond supplemented group compared to the carbohydrate diet group (Table 4). Insulin resistance as measured by the homeostasis model analysis (HOMA-IR) was decreased significantly in both diet groups, but an improved beta cell function was only observed on the almond diet. Among subjects with type-2 diabetes, diabetes medication reduction was either sustained or reduced further in 96 % of the almond supplemented group compared to only 50 % among the carbohydrate supplemented group. There was also a significant increase in ketosis in the almond group indicating a greater fat oxidation which probably accounts for the greater magnitude of weight loss seen with almond supplementation. Thus, there is some evidence to suggest that almonds, and perhaps other nuts, may have a favourable effect on insulin sensitivity. More studies are needed to support these observations.

### Potential mechanism of action

The fatty acid composition of nuts may play a role in modifying insulin resistance, and therefore, the risk for type-2 diabetes. In fact, specific types of fatty acids are better predictors of the risk of type-2 diabetes than total dietary fat intake (Hu et al. 2001). A higher intake of n-3 PUFAs is associated with lower risk of type-2 diabetes whereas a higher intake of saturated and trans fatty acid intake adversely affects glycaemic control thereby increasing the risk of type-2 diabetes (Hu et al. 2001; Vessby et al. 2001). The mechanisms by which specific fatty acids affect insulin sensitivity are not clearly understood. However, it has been shown that the fatty acid composition of the phospholipids in the skeletal muscle cell membranes is directly related to insulin sensitivity in humans. A specific fatty acid in cell membranes could influence insulin action through altering insulin receptor binding or affinity and influencing ion permeability and cell signalling (Storlien et al. 1996). Monounsaturated fatty acids are also known to improve beta cell efficiency through enhanced

### Table 3. Relative risks of type 2 diabetes in women according to frequency of nut consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of nut consumption (28 g serving)</th>
<th>Never/almost never</th>
<th>&lt;1 time/week</th>
<th>1–4 times/week</th>
<th>≥5 times/week</th>
<th>P for trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases, no.</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-years</td>
<td>441.007</td>
<td>466.464</td>
<td>309.608</td>
<td>66.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-adjusted RR (95 % CI)</td>
<td>1·00</td>
<td>0·82 (0·76–0·89)</td>
<td>0·69 (0·63–0·76)</td>
<td>0·55 (0·45–0·66)</td>
<td>&lt;0·001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age- and BMI-adjusted RR (95 % CI)</td>
<td>1·00</td>
<td>0·91 (0·84–0·99)</td>
<td>0·83 (0·75–0·91)</td>
<td>0·74 (0·61–0·89)</td>
<td>&lt;0·001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivariate RR (95 % CI)*</td>
<td>1·00</td>
<td>0·92 (0·85–1·00)</td>
<td>0·84 (0·76–0·93)</td>
<td>0·73 (0·60–0·89)</td>
<td>&lt;0·001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RR, Relative risk; BMI, Body mass index; CI, Confidence interval.

* Relative risk was adjusted for age (5-year categories), BMI (<21, 21–0–22.9, 23.0–24.9, 25.0–27.9, 28.0–29.9, 30.0–34.9, 35.0, and missing information), family history of diabetes in a first-degree relative (yes or no), moderate/vigorous exercise (<1, 1, 2–3, 4–6, ≥7 h/week), cigarette smoking (never, past, or current smoking of 1–14, 15–24 or ≥25 cigarettes/d), alcohol consumption (0, 0·1–5·0, 5·1–15·0 or >15·0 g/d), and total energy intake. Reproduced with permission from Jiang et al. 2002.

### Table 4. Body weight and insulin sensitivity measures on two weight loss diets (least square mean values with their standard error)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Almond-LCD</th>
<th>Carbohydrate-LCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>111·3 (0·82)</td>
<td>111·2 (0·82)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>201·7 (2·3)</td>
<td>218·1 (2·2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat mass (kg)</td>
<td>46·6 (1·0)</td>
<td>46·4 (1·0)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat free mass (kg)</td>
<td>62·7 (0·63)</td>
<td>62·4 (0·63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin (µU/ml)</td>
<td>46 (5)</td>
<td>47 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucose (mg/dL)</td>
<td>152 (11)</td>
<td>152 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketone (mmol/L)</td>
<td>20 (4)</td>
<td>17 (4)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LCD, Low calorie diet. HOMA-IR, Homeostasis model analysis to measure insulin sensitivity. **(P<0·0001), *(P<0·02) and *(P<0·05) Statistically significant differences between groups. Adapted and reproduced with permission from Wien et al. 2003.
secretion of glucagon-like peptide-1 that is known to help in regulating postprandial glucose clearance and insulin sensitivity (Rocca et al. 2001).

In addition to the type of fatty acid in nuts, the non-lipid components of nuts (Table 5) may also contribute towards lowering the risk of type-2 diabetes. Several prospective studies (Paolissio et al. 1990; Salmeron et al. 1997) have shown that the risk of type-2 diabetes is lowered with higher intakes of fibre and magnesium and the inclusion of low glycaemic index foods. As reviewed by Salas-Salvadó et al. (2006) in this supplement, nuts provide a significant amount of fibre (~4–12 g/100 g). They are also considered a good source of magnesium (~120–300 mg/100 g), and magnesium intake is inversely associated with diabetes risk (Lopez-Ridaura et al. 2004). Being a whole food, it is reasonable to expect synergistic interaction between many of the nutrients and non-nutrients in nuts as they work to influence insulin resistance and, therefore, the risk of type-2 diabetes.

**Conclusions**

Although nuts are high in fat, the available data demonstrate that adding nuts to habitual diets of free-living individuals does not cause weight gain. In fact, there may be a tendency for nuts to decrease fat mass. As expected, isenergetic replacement of nuts for other foods does not result in changes in body weight. In the context of weight loss diets, adding nuts to a calorie-restricted diet in obese individuals produces a greater magnitude of weight loss. Studies over 1 year are required to prove the safety of consuming nuts under free-living conditions in the long-term.

New research is also pointing to a protective role for nuts in reducing the risk of type-2 diabetes and in improving insulin sensitivity in obese diabetics under weight loss situation. Clearly more research is needed in determining whether nuts do influence insulin sensitivity in both normal and type-2 diabetic individuals. Future studies on the role of nuts on body weight regulation and insulin sensitivity should attempt to understand the mechanism(s) by which nuts bring out the desirable effects. In the meanwhile, there is sufficient evidence to continue promoting the inclusion of nuts as part of healthy diets.
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**Table 5. Nutritional composition (per 100 g edible portion) of some selected tree nuts***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>Walnut</th>
<th>Almond</th>
<th>Pecan</th>
<th>Macadamia</th>
<th>Pistachio</th>
<th>Cashew</th>
<th>Hazelnut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiber (g)</td>
<td>19·2</td>
<td>21·3</td>
<td>20·6</td>
<td>12·0</td>
<td>14·0</td>
<td>8·9</td>
<td>11·6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbohydrate (g)</td>
<td>4·9</td>
<td>4·3</td>
<td>5·1</td>
<td>12·1</td>
<td>20·2</td>
<td>3·0</td>
<td>11·8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein (g)</td>
<td>6·1</td>
<td>5·0</td>
<td>4·8</td>
<td>7·9</td>
<td>5·9</td>
<td>6·6</td>
<td>7·9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated (g)</td>
<td>6·1</td>
<td>5·0</td>
<td>4·8</td>
<td>7·9</td>
<td>5·9</td>
<td>6·6</td>
<td>7·9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUFA (g)</td>
<td>8·9</td>
<td>32·2</td>
<td>40·8</td>
<td>58·9</td>
<td>8·8</td>
<td>15·0</td>
<td>14·3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUFA (g)</td>
<td>47·2</td>
<td>12·2</td>
<td>21·6</td>
<td>1·5</td>
<td>8·4</td>
<td>7·9</td>
<td>1·5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid (%)</td>
<td>6·7</td>
<td>21·1</td>
<td>32·9</td>
<td>17·6</td>
<td>16·7</td>
<td>21·3</td>
<td>16·7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium (mg)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium (mg)</td>
<td>0·2</td>
<td>0·3</td>
<td>0·3</td>
<td>0·4</td>
<td>0·6</td>
<td>0·5</td>
<td>0·2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper (mg)</td>
<td>1·0</td>
<td>0·9</td>
<td>1·2</td>
<td>0·3</td>
<td>1·2</td>
<td>2·2</td>
<td>1·5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: United States Department of Agriculture Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Release August 2005. *-tocopherol in walnuts is 17·2 mg, in pecans is 19·1 mg.


