



HAL
open science

Oral lipolysis and its association with diet and the perception and digestion of lipids: A systematic literature review

Hélène Brignot, Gilles Feron

► **To cite this version:**

Hélène Brignot, Gilles Feron. Oral lipolysis and its association with diet and the perception and digestion of lipids: A systematic literature review. Archives of Oral Biology, 2019, 108, pp.104550. 10.1016/j.archoralbio.2019.104550 . hal-02619465

HAL Id: hal-02619465

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02619465>

Submitted on 21 Dec 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Oral lipolysis and its association with diet and the perception and digestion of lipids: A**
2 **systematic literature review**

3 Hélène Brignot and Gilles Feron

4 Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation, AgroSup Dijon, CNRS, INRA, Univ.
5 Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-21000 Dijon, France.

6 Corresponding author: Gilles Feron, INRA, CSGA, 17 rue Sully, F-21000 Dijon, France,
7 Telephone: +33 380 69 32 78, E-mail address: gilles.feron@inra.fr

8

9 **Abstract**

10 *Objectives:* This systematic literature review aims to summarize the existing scientific
11 evidence on the association of oral lipolysis with diet and with the perception and digestion
12 of lipids in humans and rodents. *Methods:* A validated search strategy of two databases
13 (PubMed and ISI Web of Knowledge) was carried out and the contents were screened by
14 two independent reviewers. The quality of the included studies was critically evaluated on
15 the basis of the Quality Assessment Criteria for Evaluating Primary Research Papers. *Results:*
16 From the originally identified studies (n=2295), 17 articles met the eligibility criteria for
17 inclusion in the analysis. Among them, only 6 articles received the maximum assessment
18 score. The main reason for this finding was the absence of a control for the confounding bias
19 between lipases and esterases. In rodents, oral lipolysis was principally due to the activity of
20 lingual lipase, which was associated with the 3 selected parameters. In humans, the
21 association parameters were principally established through indirect evidence without a
22 clear demonstration of cause. Moreover, no specific lipase, such as lingual lipase in the case
23 of rodents, was identified at the oral level. *Conclusions:* Future research efforts should focus
24 on (i) establishing a standard procedure for oral lipolytic activity evaluation and, in

Abbreviations: SLR: systematic literature review; BMI : body mass index ; THL : tetrahydrolipstatin; PMSF:
phenylmethanesulfonyl fluoride

25 particular, a methodological control to address the lipase vs esterase confounding bias and
26 (ii) identifying the main lipases that contribute to the lipolytic activity in humans at the oral
27 level and their respective contribution to the association parameters defined in this review.

28

29 **Keywords:** lipolysis; saliva; lingual lipase; fat taste; diet; fat digestion

30

31 **Introduction**

32 Whole saliva is a complex mixture of fluids from major (parotid, submandibular, sublingual)
33 and minor salivary glands (e.g., Von Ebner), gingival crevicular fluid, oral bacteria and food
34 debris (Humphrey & Williamson, 2001). Saliva is 99% water and contains numerous proteins,
35 peptide metabolites and ions (Carpenter, 2013). Saliva contributes not only to the protection
36 of mucosa against pathogens but also to the ability to taste, detect and digest
37 macronutrients and micronutrients in food (Dawes et al., 2015). For instance, in the salt
38 taste in humans, sensitivity is directly related to salivary sodium levels (Feron, 2018).

39 With respect to digestion, salivary alpha-amylases **contribute** to the hydrolysis and post-
40 prandial metabolism of complex carbohydrates (Joubert et al., 2017; Kurahashi & Inomata,
41 1999; Lebenthal, 1987; Mandel & Breslin, 2012).

42 Moreover, salivary alpha-amylases can adapt to the carbohydrate content of the diet
43 (Squires, 1953). Recently, Perry et al. (2007) showed that populations with high starch diets
44 have more copies of the salivary alpha-amylase gene (AMY1) than those with traditionally
45 low-starch diets.

46 In regard to fats and other lipids, the role of salivary lipolysis in the oral detection and
47 digestion of dietary fat in rodents was discovered (Kawai & Fushiki, 2003; Sclafani & Ackroff,
48 2018) with the identification and characterization of a lingual lipase secreted by Von Ebner

49 glands (Hamosh & Scow, 1973). In humans, lipolysis occurs in the oral cavity and may be
50 substrate-specific (Lai, Chua, Gill, & Brownlee, 2019). However, the role of oral cavity
51 lipolysis in the detection and digestion of lipids is debated, with only indirect evidence
52 showing that oral lipolysis has an impact on lipid detection (Feron & Poette, 2013).
53 Moreover, the involvement of specific lipases, i.e., gastric lipase, in oral lipolysis remains
54 highly questionable.

55 In this context, the aim of this work was to review systematically original articles on studies
56 of oral lipolysis and its association with diet and with the perception and with the digestion
57 of lipids in humans and/or rodents.

58 **Materials and Methods**

59 • **Search strategy**

60 A review of the literature was conducted in May 2017 for all published articles containing
61 information on the association between oral lipolysis and diet and the perception and
62 digestion of lipids in humans and/or rodents.

63 The electronic databases PubMed and ISI Web of Knowledge were used to search for
64 relevant articles without date restrictions. A regular search was updated until June 2019, and
65 in this way, articles were added to the previous results.

66 Additionally, studies were identified from other sources (authors' literature base and the
67 reference lists in the screened articles).

68 The search strategy consisted of a set of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), and the terms
69 and free text words were subsequently combined. The search terms were defined based on
70 studies on the respective topics, keywords and the expertise of the working group members.

71 The following groups of key words were used (* indicates that the term was used as a

72 wildcard to search for certain terms that might represent any group of words associated
73 with these terms):

74 1) lipase*, lipolysis, lipolytic, (lipid* and hydrolysis), esterase;

75 2) oral, saliva, salivary, (saliva and gland), tongue, (buccal and mucosa), lingual, (oral
76 and mucosa), (oral and (microbiota, microbiome, bacteria, and flora)), (buccal and
77 (microbiota, microbiome, bacteria, and flora));

78 3) fat*, fatty*, (fatty and acid*), lipid*,oil*, (dietary fat*), triglyceride*, omega 3, omega
79 6, oleic, linoleic, linolenic, palmitoleic, stearic, palmitic, butyric, caprylic, lauric,
80 myristic, arachidic, LCFA (long chain fatty acids), OR myristoleic OR vaccenic OR
81 stearidonic OR gondoic OR arachid* OR behenic OR *pentaenoic OR erucic OR
82 *hexanoic;

83 4) detection, digestion, perception, suckling, eating, feeding, consumption, intake,
84 intensity, sensitivity, orosensitivity, liking, taste, flavour, preference, (taste and
85 threshold); and

86 5) human, mice, rat, (guinea and pig), mammals.

87

88 Articles identified in the limited initial search were screened by title, abstract and full text
89 following, whenever relevant, the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
90 Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines for systematic reviews (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff,
91 Altman, & Grp, 2009). Protocol and PRISMA checklist form (table S1) are presented in the
92 supplementary material file.

93 • **Selection criteria**

94 Articles were included only if they explored an association between lipolysis in the oral
95 cavity and one of the following characteristics: fat taste perception and/or digestion and/or

96 diet in human subjects or rodents.

97 Only articles with abstracts (no proceedings papers or reviews) and written in English were
98 included. There was no limitation on date. The study design and settings were not defined
99 with exclusion criteria because of the exploratory character of this review.

100 Two reviewers (GF and HB) independently screened titles and abstracts based on the
101 selection criteria. If the abstract did not provide enough information to decide upon
102 inclusion or exclusion, the full paper was retrieved for further screening.

103 • **Article extraction and synthesis**

104 Search database results were combined into a master reference database which is End Note
105 X7 (Thomson Reuters) and duplicate references were deleted. Two reviewers (GF and HB)
106 independently reviewed the initial list and compared selections, evaluating all against the
107 pre-defined criteria. Reviews, proceedings papers and non-English articles were set aside
108 manually. Variables for which data were sought were: control of specificity (lipase vs
109 esterase), biological material, substrate of the lipase, pH and T° of lipolysis measurement,
110 methodology for lipolysis measurement (titrimetry, spectrophotometry, etc ..), model
111 (human or rodent) and associated effect (lipid taste and preference, lipid digestion, lipid
112 diet)

113 • **Quality assessment**

114 The quality assessment of the articles was adapted for this review based on, “The quality
115 assessment criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields” (Kmet,
116 Cook, & Lee, 2004). The checklist of criteria included the following questions:

- 117 1. Is the objective of the study sufficiently described?
118 2. Is the study design evident and appropriate?
119 3. Are the outcomes related to lipolysis evaluation well defined and robust with regard

120 to the measurement(s) used? Was misclassification bias evident? Were the means of
121 assessment reported?

122 4. Are the analytical methods described, justified and appropriate?

123 5. Is some estimate of variance reported for the main results?

124 6. Are the results reported in sufficient detail?

125 7. Are the conclusions supported by the results?

126 Each question represents a parameter of quality and can be answered with 'yes', 'partial',
127 'no' or 'not applicable'. A score of 1 was allocated to each parameter for rigorous studies
128 with high standards. A score of 0 was allocated to a parameter that was not described, was
129 insufficiently described or was inadequately justified. Finally, a score of 0.5 was allocated to
130 a parameter that was insufficiently described or inadequately justified.

131 The summary score for each review was calculated by the total sum ((number of 'yes' scores
132 x 1) + (number of 'partial' scores x 0.5) + (number of 'no' or 'not applicable' scores x 0))
133 divided by total possible score (7).

134 **Results**

135 • **Selected articles**

136 The overview of the search strategy is shown in figure 1.

137 In May 2017, a total of 2295 articles were identified: PubMed (n=838) and ISI Web of
138 Knowledge (n=1457). Duplicate articles (n=257) were excluded. Another 1940 articles were
139 excluded because the inclusion criteria were not met (based on the title). Thus, the abstracts
140 of 97 articles were screened.

141 Eighty articles were excluded based on the following unmet criteria in the abstract: not
142 written in English (n=1), proceedings paper (n=4), a review (n=15), not on humans or rodents
143 (n=7), not on oral cavity or with no reference to lipolysis (n=28), only sensory experiments

144 are described (n=1) or no associations with oral lipolysis (as described previously) (n=24).
145 An alert in each database was created for backward citation chasing because of the delay in
146 writing. As a consequence of this approach, two new articles were found to be of interest for
147 this review and have been included. Moreover, two additional articles from sources other
148 than the databases were included. From these 21 articles, 4 articles were excluded after full
149 text screening for the following reasons: not in the oral cavity (n=1) and not linked with
150 associated parameters (n=3). The final group consisted of 17 articles (Table 1). All of them
151 were subjected to a methodological quality assessment.

152 • **Article quality evaluation**

153 The methodological quality of the included studies was judged to be good, in general.
154 Thirteen of the 17 selected articles had quality scores between 0.9 and 1 (Table 2).

155 The maximum score according to the abovementioned scoring procedure was attributed to
156 6 articles (Besnard et al., 2018; Méjean et al., 2015; Mounayar, Septier, Chabanet, Feron, &
157 Neyraud, 2013; Poette et al., 2014; Sclafani & Ackroff, 2018; Voigt et al., 2014). The lowest
158 score of the list was attributed to one article (Stewart et al., 2010).

159 In all articles, the objectives were clearly explained, and each earned the maximum score on
160 the rating scale. Of the 17 articles, a score of 1 was given for the study design and the
161 analytical methods for 13 and 14 articles, respectively.

162 In 11 articles, oral lipolysis evaluations (main outcome) are well defined and robust
163 according to the measurements without misclassification bias and with means of assessment
164 reported. In 6 articles, oral lipolysis evaluation did not meet all the requirements necessary
165 to earn the maximum score. The main reason for submaximal scoring was the absence of an
166 analytical procedure, i.e., an appropriate inhibitor of lipase or esterase was not chosen for
167 discriminating between lipase and esterase activity.

168 For 4 articles, the score for “results reported in sufficient detail” did not reach the maximum
169 possible. This lower score was attributed to papers that lacked a table showing the results
170 with standard deviation values of the oral lipolysis measured, or detailed lipolytic activity
171 data were not provided.

172 Finally, 5 articles showed conclusions that were not fully supported by the results, essentially
173 due to the absence of robust statistical analysis.

174 • **Study characteristics**

175 Seven of the selected articles were published after 2010 (table 1), and only 4 of them were
176 published before 1990. Therefore, most of the selected studies were carried out recently.

177 Humans were used as the system model in the studies described in 11 articles (table 3), and
178 people with obesity had been recruited in 4 of the 11 articles.

179 Six other articles were based on rodent studies. Among these, five studies had focused on
180 rats, and one had focused on mice.

181 • **Analytical methods for lipolysis evaluation**

182 Oral lipolysis was either determined or evaluated across all the selected studies (Table 3).
183 The studies differed by approach (*in vitro* or *in situ*), the control(s) (specificity), the
184 condition(s) of measurement and/or the substrate.

185 • *Control for lipase specificity*

186 Lipases and esterases belong to the same enzyme classification group EC 3.1.1: carboxylic
187 ester hydrolases. However, unlike esterases, lipases have substrate specificity towards fatty
188 acid esters (i.e., mono-, di-, tri-glycerides) and preferences for medium (C8 to C14) and long
189 (C>16) chains because of their insolubility in polar media (Robb, 1966). Thus, a control for
190 specificity, which eliminates the case of esterase activity, leads to the selection of only
191 lipase activity measurements. A inhibitor of lipase activity is THL (Tiss, Lengsfeld, Carriere, &

192 Verger, 2009), which was used in the studies described in 11 articles. In one case (Mennella,
193 Fogliano, & Vitaglione, 2014), the control consisted of adding 0.4 mM PMSF to inhibit
194 esterase activity to quantify the lipase activity – the 2 enzymes acted on the same substrate
195 (Kurooka, Okamoto, & Hashimoto, 1977). Contrary to applications for THL, PMSF is used to
196 measure lipase activity after esterase activity is suppressed. Indeed, it was demonstrated
197 that PMSF inhibits acetylcholine esterases (EC 3.1.1.7) of brain and hepatic serum origin
198 (Fahrney & Gold, 1963; Turini, Kurooka, Steer, Corbascio, & Singer, 1969); the type B
199 carboxylesterases are in the brain, and the aryl esterases (EC 3.1.1.2), which belong in the
200 type A carboxylesterase classification, are in hepatic serum (Kurooka et al., 1977). The
201 mechanism of inhibition involves the binding of PMSF to the active site of the esterase
202 (Fahrney & Gold, 1963). Nevertheless, it has not been proven that PMSF inhibits the esterase
203 activity in the oral cavity; for example, saliva contains other esterases, such as carbonic
204 anhydrases (EC 4.1.1.2), in abundance, and bacterial esterase, which could not be inhibited
205 by PMSF and could not have the same active site. Thus, in the attempt to control for the
206 confounding effects of esterase and lipase activity, this indirect method presents more
207 limitations than are presented by methods that use THL to measure lipolytic activity.

208 • *Approaches*

209 In vitro measures

210 Measurements described in 13 articles were taken from experiments performed *in vitro*.
211 Among them, the biological material was free saliva except in three: Armand et al. (1990)
212 and Hamosh (1978), in which the posterior part of the lingual tissue was collected, and
213 Kawai & Fushiki (2003) in which measurements was conducted on exposed circumvallate
214 papillae from collected tongues.

215 In Hamosh and Scow (1973), two types of biological materials were tested, i.e., free saliva

216 and tissue from the white tissue of the tongue in the region of circumvallate papillae which
217 consists of serous lingual (Von Ebner) glands and secretory ducts and various other parts of
218 the oral cavity.

219 Whole saliva was used in the oldest studies (Hamosh & Scow, 1973; Plucinski, Hamosh, &
220 Hamosh, 1979), and clarified saliva was used in the papers published in the past 10 years.

221 Whole saliva was frozen directly after collection, whereas clarified saliva was obtained after
222 centrifugation at 14 000 g for 10 to 20 minutes at 4°C (Neyraud, Palicki, Schwartz, Nicklaus,
223 & Feron, 2012). Indeed, pre-treatment standardization has become common practice
224 because the current techniques, such as fluorometry, require homogeneous micro volume
225 samples without large particles (Schipper, Silletti, & Vingerhoeds, 2007).

226 Saliva was collected according to the objective of the studies in stimulated or unstimulated
227 conditions. The stimulation was mechanical (Besnard et al., 2018) or was conferred by cream
228 consumption and rinsing (Stewart et al., 2010). Four articles used only unstimulated saliva as
229 biological material, 3 articles used unstimulated and stimulated saliva and three articles used
230 only stimulated saliva.

231 Evaluation in situ

232 Four studies were conducted *in situ*. Two studies measured lipase activity. In one case, the
233 substrate was placed on filter disk paper, and the amount of non-esterified fatty acids
234 released was measured *in situ* at the proximity of the secretory glands (Von Ebner gland
235 cells) (Voigt et al., 2014).

236 An alternative method that did not clearly measure lipase activity measured the non-
237 esterified fatty acids released from a natural and high-fat food matrix in an expectorated
238 food bolus (Kulkarni & Mattes, 2014).

239 Instead of the direct biochemical method described above, indirect evaluation of the role of

240 lipolytic activity was measured by taste sensitivity to triolein in humans (Pepino, Love-
241 Gregory, Klein, & Abumrad, 2012) or a preference for corn, soybean or triolein oil by rodents
242 (Sclafani & Ackroff, 2018); both studies conducted experiments in the presence or absence
243 of THL.

244 • *Conditions of measurement*

245 The measurement of lipolytic activity was made using the following techniques alone or in
246 combination:

247 - Measurements of the pH variations due to the release of fatty acids from triglycerides
248 by the lipolytic reaction: the pH-stat method was used with a method derived from
249 Taylor (1985), and the results were established through titrimetry.

250 - Radiometry assay of radioactively labelled fatty acids

251 - Mass and optical spectroscopy (Beisson et al., 2001; Imamura, 1989; Kurooka et al.,
252 1977).

253 • *Substrates used for evaluation of lipolytic activity*

254 The substrates used for measuring lipolytic activity were diglycerides (in 1 article only),
255 natural triglycerides from food, synthetic triglycerides, radiolabelled triglycerides or
256 synthetic free fatty acid esters. The chain length of the fatty acid substrates ranged from 4 to
257 18 carbons, and oleic acid was often used. Notably, the use of long-chain triglycerides
258 enabled better activity quantification of the lipolytic reaction mechanism.

259 In the selected publications, we did not find any information about the degree of substrate
260 emulsification that affects interface development for micelle formation, which is a
261 determinant of lipase activity (Verger, 1997).

262 Most of the reactions were carried out at pH 7, including those carried out (i) with saliva,
263 which is considered to have a pH of approximately 7 (Schipper et al., 2007), (ii) in a food
264 bolus (1 article), and (iii) fixed onto a matrix (filter disks) (2 articles).

265 The determination of the optimal pH for lipase activity enables the differentiation of the
266 lipases that act directly at oil-water interface (e.g., acid-like gastric lipases) from the lipases
267 that act on micellar structures with the required biliary salts (e.g., pancreatic lipases)
268 (Eydoux et al., 2007; Lombardo, Fauvel, & Guy, 1980). The pH at which the measurements
269 were taken shows that salivary lipases act as acidic lipases in acidic and neutral
270 environments at oil-water interfaces.

271 • **Oral lipolysis and association parameters (diet, digestion and taste) (Table 4)**

272 • *Relationships with diet*

273 Four publications were identified as describing a link between diet and oral lipolysis. Two
274 were conducted on rats with the objective of evaluating the effect of a fat-related diet on
275 the level of lingual lipase (Armand et al., 1990; Hamosh, 1978). Both papers reached the
276 same conclusion, i.e., increasing the fat content in the diet led to an increase in lingual lipase
277 activity in a dose-dependent response, suggesting an adaptive response to the level of fat in
278 the diet.

279 In addition, 2 other papers focused on the relationships between salivary lipolysis and fat
280 preference and intake in humans. These papers reached contradictory conclusions.
281 Mennella et al. (2014) observed higher lipolytic activity, fat preference and fat intake in
282 overweight subjects compared with lean subjects. The authors suggest that high salivary
283 lipolytic activity in overweight subjects could be an adaptive response to low-fat taste
284 perception due to a low level of salivary zinc. In contrast, Méjean et al. (2015) did not
285 identify relationships between salivary lipolytic activity on one hand and fat preferences and

286 intake on the other hand, regardless of BMI. These discrepancies in the results can be
287 explained by (i) the populations differing significantly between the two studies in terms of
288 age, sex and BMI, and (ii) the methodology used to evaluate salivary lipolytic activity in saliva
289 and, in particular, the controls for the specificity of the reaction, which differed between the
290 two studies, i.e., THL was used in the study by Mejean et al. and PMSF was used in the study
291 by Mennella et al., which could have led to different estimations of lipolysis activity, as
292 explained previously.

293 • *Relationships with digestion and metabolism*

294 Three papers described the role of oral lipolysis in lipid digestion and/or metabolism. Two
295 studies were conducted on rats, and only one showed direct evidence of lipid digestion in
296 the stomach, duodenum and ileum due to lingual lipase activity (Hamosh & Scow, 1973).
297 Another study found that lingual lipase is pH-dependent and remains active in the stomach
298 (Plucinski et al., 1979), which suggests that it can contribute to lipid digestion in this
299 compartment.

300 Only one study was conducted on humans (Vors et al., 2015). It described significant
301 associations between the level of stimulated salivary lipolysis and explained the post-
302 prandial lipaemia profile after fat intake depended on BMI. In particular, obese subjects
303 showed lower salivary lipolysis activity and a delay in post-prandial lipaemia compared with
304 lean subjects. The authors suggested that this lower level of salivary lipolysis in obesity can
305 impair lipid detection in the mouth and thus lead to lipaemia.

306 • *Relationships with perception and preference*

307 Ten studies were aimed at evaluating the role of oral lipolysis on taste of and preference for
308 fat. Two studies were conducted on rodents (rats or mice) *in situ* (Kawai & Fushiki, 2003;
309 Sclafani & Ackroff, 2018). In both studies, the inhibition of oral lipolysis by THL led to a

310 decrease in fat preference, indirectly indicating the role of lingual lipase in the release of
311 free fatty acids from dietary fat such that they could be detected at the oral level.
312 Eight studies were conducted with humans. Three studies were conducted *in situ* by using
313 THL for the control of oral lipolysis (Kulkarni & Mattes, 2014; Pepino et al., 2012; Voigt et al.,
314 2014). The other 5 studies evaluated oral lipolysis in saliva samples *in vitro*. A control for
315 specificity was included in 6 experiments using THL. With respect to sensory evaluation, 7
316 studies evaluated taste sensitivity to triolein (*in situ* only) or to free fatty acids (mostly
317 C18:2). One study evaluated the preference intensity ratings for fat emulsion (Neyraud et al.,
318 2012). Two of the three studies conducted *in situ* showed an inhibition of triolein sensitivity
319 in the presence of THL, which provides indirect evidence that oral lipolysis is involved in the
320 detection of dietary fat in humans. Studies conducted *in vitro* have led to contradictory
321 conclusions. Two of them showed a positive correlation between the level of lipolysis in
322 saliva and fat sensitivity (Neyraud et al., 2012; Poette et al., 2014), while two others did not
323 find a statistical correlation (Besnard et al., 2018; Mounayar et al., 2013).

324 **Discussion**

325 In this work, two aspects were considered. In the first part, we considered the methods used
326 for lipase measurements and evidence gathered by functional testing. In the second part, we
327 focused on different associations with oral lipolysis, i.e., taste sensitivity, digestion and diet.

328 • **Methodological considerations**

329 One main conclusion of this SLR is that the methods used were diverse and heterogeneous
330 for evaluating oral lipolysis, which made comparing the different papers difficult, particularly
331 the comparisons of study results that were published by different research groups.

332 This challenge to the comparisons led to the determination of a standardized protocol for
333 the evaluation of lipolytic activity with different constraints.

334 First, the measurements for lipolytic activity aimed to take into account enzymatic
335 specificity. Among the various controls used to overcome the confounding results from
336 esterase and lipase activity, the most relevant method involved measures with and without
337 THL. The robustness of inhibition by THL (Luthipeng, Marki, & Hadvary, 1992) is due to
338 covalent binding to the active site, which consists of a catalytic triad formed by the serine,
339 aspartate, and histidine that are characteristic of the lipase family, that inactivates the
340 lipases (Beer, Wohlfahrt, McCarthy, Schomburg, & Schmid, 1996); these binding sites are not
341 present in esterases (Chahinian & Sarda, 2009). This difference explains why THL is highly
342 discriminant, as has been demonstrated in the case of digestive lipases (Ransac et al., 1997).

343 Second, the choice of substrate enabled specific lipases to be targeted for study. The fatty
344 acid chain length is primordial, and medium (from C8 to C14) or long chain (>C16) fatty acid
345 glycerides are used as substrates, although the long-chain fatty acid glycerides are difficult to
346 solubilize. Foremost, researchers compromised between using natural or radiolabelled
347 triglycerides and synthetic esters, such as 4-methylumbelliferyl-oleate, which are less
348 specific but safer and faster for detecting and quantifying. Furthermore, substrates in the
349 form of micelles in aqueous medium ensure an optimal interface (Paiva, Balcão, & Malcata,
350 2000) for lipase reactions. Thus, the conditions were adapted to study weak lipase activity,
351 as is the case for salivary lipases.

352 Third, evaluation of lipolysis activity was performed at fixed pH, and some studies conducted
353 experiments at non-physiological pH levels. Additionally, no measurement method for
354 screening several pH values was used, which means that the lipases could not be
355 differentiated.

356 Finally, sample standardization is preferable in the case of salivary analysis. Clarified saliva
357 samples with a fixed protocol were described in 6 studies (Méjean et al., 2015; Mounayar et

358 al., 2013; Neyraud et al., 2012; Poette et al., 2014; Vors et al., 2015) and seemed to be
359 adapted for use in these types of analyses.

360 In summary, a literature review (Beisson et al., 2001) described the screening assays for
361 quantifying lipase activity on the principles and practical aspects of this methodological
362 consideration. It was concluded that the pH-stat method, which enabled screening over an
363 extended range of pH values due to the inclusion of several pH indicators, is suitable for pure
364 lipase assays, and a method based on natural fluorescent substrates, as described in Beisson
365 et al. 1999, is more suitable for crude biological sample assays (Beisson et al., 1999).
366 Recently, a more sensitive method than the original pH-stat has been developed (Camacho-
367 Ruiz, Mateos-Diaz, Carriere, & Rodriguez, 2015). Interestingly, both methodologies are
368 appropriate for screening a large number of biological samples.

369 • **Oral lipolysis and the association parameters**

370 • *Origin of salivary lipolysis*

371 Lingual lipase was notably involved in salivary lipolysis in rats and mice. It is secreted from
372 the serous glands found on the dorsal tongue (Hamosh, 1978; Hamosh & Scow, 1973;
373 Triantafyllou, Fletcher, & Scott, 2003) and has a high level of activity compared with gastric
374 lipase (DeNigris, Hamosh, Kasbekar, Lee, & Hamosh, 1988). Rat lingual lipase has a molecular
375 weight of 270 000-300 000, which suggests extensive self-aggregation, and it is active from
376 pH 2 to 8. Its activity is not influenced by the concentration levels of phospholipids or bile
377 salts, and therefore it differs significantly from the pancreatic lipases (Roberts, Montgomery,
378 & Carey, 1984). In contrast to that in rats, lingual lipase has never been clearly demonstrated
379 in humans, and attempts to identify its secretion at the serous gland level have always failed
380 (Spielman, D'Abundo, Field, & Schmale, 1993; Voigt et al., 2014). Hence, it is likely that
381 salivary lipolysis is due to the activity of other lipases. Indeed, the expression of putative

382 secreted lipolytic enzymes has been shown in human Von Ebner gland cells (Voigt et al.,
383 2014).

384 • *Adaptation of salivary lipolysis to diet lipid content and quality*

385 The adaptation of salivary properties to the human diet has been clearly established on
386 salivary alpha-amylase activity and carbohydrate consumption, i.e., the level of salivary
387 alpha-amylase is higher, and the consumption of complex carbohydrates is higher in the diet
388 (Squires, 1953). More recently, the number of gene copies of salivary alpha-amylase (AMY1)
389 has been associated with a starch diet in a way that aligns with the findings from the diet
390 studies (Perry et al., 2007) but it is also associated with BMI such that a low AMY1 copy
391 number is associated with a high BMI (Falchi et al., 2014). With respect to lipids in the diet
392 and lingual lipase activity, few papers have suggested salivary adaptation in rodents, but the
393 conclusions are consistent between studies. In contrast, no clear conclusions could be made
394 on salivary adaptation in humans, which is a topic that warrants further attention.

395 • *Role of salivary lipolysis in fat perception and digestion*

396 Both in rodents and humans, only indirect evidence suggests a contribution of salivary
397 lipolysis to the orosensory detection of fat. Indeed, salivary lipases hydrolyse triglyceride,
398 and the resulting free fatty acids can be detected by putative fat sensors, such as the CD36
399 fatty acid transporter, which is involved in the detection of long chain fatty acids at the taste
400 bud level in rodents (Laugerette et al., 2005). In humans, it has been shown that oronasal
401 exposure to dietary fat can influence post-prandial metabolism, particularly the stimulation
402 of lipid digestion and absorption (Mattes, 1996, 2011). With respect to taste, the oral fatty
403 acid threshold measurement of different long chain fatty acids showed that they are
404 perceived through the taste modality only (Chale-Rush, Burgess, & Mattes, 2007), but
405 whether sensors, such as CD36, are involved in long chain fatty acid detection is still

406 debated. However, both in rodents and humans, the contribution of salivary lipolysis to the
407 modulation of oral fat perception is merely speculative. Moreover, factors not involved in
408 lipolysis, namely, lipocalin or carbonic anhydrase VI, have been proposed as other putative
409 salivary components that are involved in the modulation of free fatty acid perception
410 (Besnard et al., 2018; Feron & Poette, 2013). Unravelling the mechanism by which salivary
411 lipolysis impacts fat detection at the oral level should be studied further.

412 With respect to digestion, lingual lipase participates in digesting as much as 6% of the lipids
413 during the oral phase in rats (Kawai & Fushiki, 2003). Compared with triglycerides,
414 diglycerides might be more easily digested by lingual lipase, suggesting a different substrate
415 specificity compared with other lipases of the digestive tract (Osaki et al., 2005). In contrast
416 to that in rats, the level of salivary lipolysis activity in humans is such that it cannot
417 contribute to dietary fat digestion. However, as suggested by Vors et al., 2015, a low level of
418 salivary lipolysis could indirectly contribute to lipid metabolism in humans through the
419 release of a small amount of free fatty acids that are detected in the mouth and thus
420 stimulate anticipatory digestive and metabolic responses for lipids prior to nutrient
421 absorption. Such a mechanism has been proposed for salivary alpha-amylase, as subjects
422 with a higher level of salivary alpha-amylase showed a lower level of post-prandial glucose
423 concentrations after oral intake of a starch load (Mandel & Breslin, 2012). The authors
424 suggested that the production and detection of glucose and/or maltose and/or short-chain
425 oligosaccharides through amylolytic activity in the oral cavity signals the body to prepare for
426 incoming starch and the ensuing glucose.

427 **Limitations of this SLR**

428 A bias cannot be excluded in the selection phase. First, it is possible that not all relevant
429 studies are indexed in the searched databases (ISI Web of Knowledge and PubMed). Second,

430 the search was based on a list of terms describing the potential association of oral lipolysis
431 with different parameters. The possibility that additional articles would have been identified
432 by adding other terms cannot be excluded; although the search was intended to be as
433 extensive as possible. Third, article eligibility was restrictive. We chose to include papers on
434 oral lipolysis and specific parameters associated with it. This criterion created a restraint that
435 limited our analysis and such an investigation conducted on oral lipolysis outcome was only
436 expected to substantiate and enlarge our conclusions. Fourth, in this review, only studies in
437 English were included, which could have led to biased conclusions. However, it is
438 noteworthy that only one study was excluded for language; therefore, the bias was
439 presumably low. Finally, we chose to include studies submitted to a peer review procedure,
440 which could have limited the results through publication bias. Indeed, studies with positive
441 results tend to be selected for publication.

442 **Conclusion**

443 With respect to methodological considerations, this SLR highlights the fact that a consensus
444 for a normative method to evaluate lipase activity is highly necessary. This methodology
445 must be based on considerations for both specificity (lipase versus esterase substrates) and
446 pH measurements. It will also need to be suitable for high output screening of small volume
447 biological samples. Regarding the associations studied (diet, digestion or taste), this SLR
448 highlights the small number of papers that address salivary lipolysis either in animal models
449 or in humans. In fact, most of the studies conducted in humans or animals focused on the
450 mechanisms leading to lipid and free fatty acid detection rather than on those involved in
451 upstream or peri-receptor biological events. This finding was unexpected in light of the
452 considerable controversy and debate around oral lipolysis and its role in humans.

453 In contrast to animal lingual lipase, human oral lipases could not be identified with specificity
454 associated with lipid detection, digestion or diet. Moreover, no proteomic studies have been
455 published with conclusions that confirm or dispute the presence of a human lingual lipase. It
456 is likely that in humans, different lipases such as from bacteria are involved in the overall
457 salivary lipolysis activity, rendering any relationships with physiological effects and diet
458 difficult to discern, which explains the extensive discrepancies observed in the literature on
459 this scientific subject.

460 **Acknowledgments:**

461 This work was supported by grants from the Conseil Régional Bourgogne, Franche-Comte
462 (PARI grant) and the FEDER (European Funding for Regional Economical Development).

463 **Conflicts of interest**

464 The authors state no conflicts of interest

465 **References**

- 466 Armand, M., Borel, P., Cara, L., Senft, M., Chautan, M., Lafont, H., & Lairon, D. (1990).
467 Adaptation of lingual lipase to dietary fat in rats. *Journal of Nutrition*, 120(10), 1148-
468 1156. doi:10.1093/jn/120.10.1148
- 469 Beer, H. D., Wohlfahrt, G., McCarthy, J. E. G., Schomburg, D., & Schmid, R. D. (1996). Analysis
470 of the catalytic mechanism of a fungal lipase using computer-aided design and
471 structural mutants. *Protein Engineering*, 9(6), 507-517. doi:10.1093/protein/9.6.507
- 472 Beisson, F., Aoubala, M., Marull, S., Moustacas-Gardies, A. M., Voultoury, R., Verger, R., &
473 Arondel, V. (2001). Use of the tape stripping technique for directly quantifying
474 esterase activities in human stratum corneum. *Analytical Biochemistry*, 290(2), 179-
475 185. doi: 10.1006/abio.2000.4977

476 Beisson, F., Ferte, N., Nari, J., Noat, G., Arondel, V., & Verger, R. (1999). Use of naturally
477 fluorescent triacylglycerols from *Parinari glaberrimum* to detect low lipase activities
478 from *Arabidopsis thaliana* seedlings. *Journal of Lipid Research*, *40*(12), 2313-2321.

479 Besnard, P., Christensen, J. E., Brignot, H., Bernard, A., Passilly-Degrace, P., Nicklaus, S., . . .
480 Burcelin, R. (2018). Obese subjects with specific gustatory papillae microbiota and
481 salivary cues display an impairment to sense lipids. *Scientific Reports*, *8*(1), 6742.
482 doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24619-1

483 Camacho-Ruiz, M. D., Mateos-Diaz, J. C., Carriere, F., & Rodriguez, J. A. (2015). A broad pH
484 range indicator-based spectrophotometric assay for true lipases using tributyrin and
485 tricaprylin. *Journal of Lipid Research*, *56*(5), 1057-1067. doi:10.1194/jlr.D052837

486 Carpenter, G. (2013). The secretion, components, and properties of saliva. *Annual review of*
487 *food science and technology*, *4*, 267-276. doi: 10.1146/annurev-food-030212-182700

488 Chahinian, H., & Sarda, L. (2009). Distinction between esterases and lipases: comparative
489 biochemical properties of sequence-related carboxylesterases. *Protein and Peptide*
490 *Letters*, *16*(10), 1149-1161. doi: 10.2174/092986609789071333

491 Chale-Rush, A., Burgess, J. R., & Mattes, R. D. (2007). Evidence for human orosensory
492 (taste?) sensitivity to free fatty acids. *Chemical Senses*, *32*(5), 423-431. doi:
493 10.1093/chemse/bjm007

494 Dawes, C., Pedersen, A., Villa, A., Ekström, J., Proctor, G., Vissink, A., . . . Narayana, N. (2015).
495 The functions of human saliva: a review sponsored by the world workshop on oral
496 medicine VI. *Archives of Oral Biology*, *60*(6), 863-874. doi:
497 10.1016/j.archoralbio.2015.03.004

498 DeNigris, S. J., Hamosh, M., Kasbekar, D. K., Lee, T. C., & Hamosh, P. (1988). Lingual and
499 gastric lipases: species differences in the origin of prepancreatic digestive lipases and

500 in the localization of gastric lipase. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Lipids and*
501 *Lipid Metabolism*, 959(1), 38-45. doi: 10.1016/0005-2760(88)90147-6

502 Eydoux, C., De Caro, J., Ferrato, F., Boullanger, P., Lafont, D., Laugier, R., . . . De Caro, A.
503 (2007). Further biochemical characterization of human pancreatic lipase-related
504 protein 2 expressed in yeast cells. *Journal of Lipid Research*, 48(7), 1539-1549.
505 doi:10.1194/jlr.M600486-JLR200

506 Fahrney, D. E., & Gold, A. M. (1963). Sulfonyl fluorides as inhibitors of esterases .1. Rates of
507 reaction with acetylcholinesterase, alpha-chymotrypsin, and trypsin. *Journal of the*
508 *American Chemical Society*, 85(7), 997-&. doi:10.1021/ja00890a037

509 Falchi, M., Moustafa, J. S. E.-S., Takousis, P., Pesce, F., Bonnefond, A., Andersson-Assarsson,
510 J. C., . . . Bottolo, L. (2014). Low copy number of the salivary amylase gene
511 predisposes to obesity. *Nature genetics*, 46(5), 492-497. doi: 10.1038/ng.2939

512 Feron, G. (2018). Unstimulated saliva: background noise in taste molecules. *Journal of*
513 *texture studies*. doi: 10.1111/jtxs.12369

514 Feron, G., & Poette, J. (2013). In-mouth mechanism leading to the perception of fat in
515 humans: from detection to preferences. The particular role of saliva. *Oilseeds and*
516 *fats, Crops and Lipids*, 20(2), doi: 10.1051/ocl.2012.0496

517 Hamosh, M. (1978). Rat lingual lipase: factors affecting enzyme activity and secretion.
518 *American Journal of Physiology*, 235(4), E416-421. doi:
519 10.1152/ajpendo.1978.235.4.E416

520 Hamosh, M., & Scow, R. O. (1973). Lingual lipase and its role in the digestion of dietary lipid.
521 *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 52(1), 88-95. doi:10.1172/jci107177

522 Humphrey, S. P., & Williamson, R. T. (2001). A review of saliva: Normal composition, flow,
523 and function. *The Journal of Prosthetic Dentistry*, 85(2), 162-169. doi:
524 10.1067/mpr.2001.113778

525 Imamura, S. (1989). An enzymatic method using 1,2 diglyceride for pancreatic lipase test in
526 serum. *Clinical Chemistry*, 35(1126).

527 Joubert, M., Septier, C., Brignot, H., Salles, C., Panouillé, M., Feron, G., & Tournier, C. (2017).
528 Chewing bread: impact on alpha-amylase secretion and oral digestion. *Food &*
529 *Function*, 8, 607-614. doi:10.1039/C6FO00963H

530 Kawai, T., & Fushiki, T. (2003). Importance of lipolysis in oral cavity for orosensory detection
531 of fat. *American Journal of Physiology - Regulatory Integrative and Comparative*
532 *Physiology*, 285(2), R447-454. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00729.2002

533 Kmet, L. M., Cook, L. S., & Lee, R. C. (2004). Standard quality assessment criteria for
534 evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields. Retrieved from
535 <https://era.library.ualberta.ca/items/48b9b989-c221-4df6-9e35-af782082280e>
536 website: doi: 10.7939/R37M04F16

537 Kulkarni, B. V., & Mattes, R. D. (2014). Lingual lipase activity in the orosensory detection of
538 fat by humans. *American Journal of Physiology - Regulatory Integrative and*
539 *Comparative Physiology*, 306(12), R879-885. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00352.2013

540 Kurahashi, M., & Inomata, K. (1999). Effects of dietary consistency and water content on
541 parotid amylase secretion and gastric starch digestion in rats. *Archives of Oral*
542 *Biology*, 44(12), 1013-1019. doi: 10.1016/S0003-9969(99)00099-0

543 Kurooka, S., Okamoto, S., & Hashimoto, M. (1977). A novel and simple colorimetric assay for
544 human serum lipase. *Journal of Biochemistry*, 81(2), 361-369. doi:
545 10.1093/oxfordjournals.jbchem.a131467

546 Lai, W. Y. W., Chua, J. W. M., Gill, S., & Brownlee, I. A. (2019). Analysis of the lipolytic activity
547 of whole-saliva and site-specific secretions from the oral cavity of healthy adults.
548 *Nutrients*, *11*(1), 191. doi: 10.3390/nu11010191

549 Laugerette, F., Passilly-Degrace, P., Patris, B., Niot, I., Febbraio, M., Montmayeur, J.-P., &
550 Besnard, P. (2005). CD36 involvement in orosensory detection of dietary lipids,
551 spontaneous fat preference, and digestive secretions. *Journal of Clinical*
552 *Investigation*, *115*(11), 3177-3184. doi: 10.1172/JCI25299

553 Lebenthal, E. (1987). Role of salivary amylase in gastric and intestinal digestion of starch.
554 *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*, *32*(10), 1155-1157. doi: 10.1007/BF01300204

555 Lombardo, D., Fauvel, J., & Guy, O. (1980). Studies on the substrate specificity of a carboxyl
556 ester hydrolase from human pancreatic juice. I. Action on carboxyl esters, glycerides
557 and phospholipids. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Enzymology*, *611*(1), 136-
558 146. doi: 10.1016/0005-2744(80)90049-2

559 Luthipeng, Q. Q., Marki, H. P., & Hadvary, P. (1992). Identification of the active-site serine in
560 human pancreatic lipase by chemical modification with tetrahydrolipstatin. *FEBS*
561 *Letters*, *299*(1), 111-115. doi:10.1016/0014-5793(92)80112-t

562 Mandel, A. L., & Breslin, P. A. S. (2012). High endogenous salivary amylase activity is
563 associated with improved glycemic homeostasis following starch ingestion in adults.
564 *Journal of Nutrition*, *142*(5), 853-858. doi:10.3945/jn.111.156984

565 Mattes, R. D. (1996). Oral fat exposure alters postprandial lipid metabolism in humans.
566 *Physiology & Behaviour*, *63*(6), 911-917. doi: 10.1093/ajcn/63.6.911

567 Mattes, R. D. (2011). Oral fatty acid signaling and intestinal lipid processing: Support and
568 supposition. *Physiology & Behavior*, *105*(1), 27-35.
569 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.02.016

570 Méjean, C., Morzel, M., Neyraud, E., Issanchou, S., Martin, C., Bozonnet, S., . . . Feron, G.
571 (2015). Salivary composition is associated with liking and usual nutrient intake. *PLoS*
572 *one*, *10*(9), e0137473. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0137473

573 Mennella, I., Fogliano, V., & Vitaglione, P. (2014). Salivary lipase and amylase activities are
574 higher in overweight than in normal weight subjects: Influences on dietary behavior.
575 *Food Research International*, *66*, 463-468. doi:10.1016/j.foodres.2014.10.008

576 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & Grp, P. (2009). Preferred reporting items
577 for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine*,
578 *6*(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

579 Mounayar, R., Septier, C., Chabanet, C., Feron, G., & Neyraud, E. (2013). Oral fat sensitivity in
580 humans: links to saliva composition before and after stimulation by oleic acid.
581 *Chemosensory Perception*, *6*(3), 118-126. doi:10.1007/s12078-013-9152-1

582 Neyraud, E., Palicki, O., Schwartz, C., Nicklaus, S., & Feron, G. (2012). Variability of human
583 saliva composition: possible relationships with fat perception and liking. *Archives of*
584 *Oral Biology*, *57*(5), 556-566. doi:10.1016/j.archoralbio.2011.09.016

585 Osaki, N., Meguro, S., Yajima, N., Matsuo, N., Tokimitsu, I., & Shimasaki, H. (2005).
586 Metabolites of dietary triacylglycerol and diacylglycerol during the digestion process
587 in rats. *Lipids*, *40*(3), 281-286. doi:10.1007/s11745-005-1383-3

588 Paiva, A. L., Balcão, V. M., & Malcata, F. X. (2000). Kinetics and mechanisms of reactions
589 catalyzed by immobilized lipases. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, *27*(3), 187-204.
590 doi: 10.1016/S0141-0229(00)00206-4

591 Pepino, M. Y., Love-Gregory, L., Klein, S., & Abumrad, N. A. (2012). The fatty acid translocase
592 gene CD36 and lingual lipase influence oral sensitivity to fat in obese subjects.
593 *Journal of Lipid Research*, *53*(3), 561-566. doi:10.1194/jlr.M021873

594 Perry, G. H., Dominy, N. J., Claw, K. G., Lee, A. S., Fiegler, H., Redon, R., . . . Stone, A. C.
595 (2007). Diet and the evolution of human amylase gene copy number variation.
596 *Nature genetics*, 39(10), 1256-1260. doi: 10.1038/ng2123

597 Plucinski, T. M., Hamosh, M., & Hamosh, P. (1979). Fat digestion in rat: role of lingual lipase.
598 *American Journal of Physiology*, 237(6), E541-547. doi:
599 10.1152/ajpendo.1979.237.6.E541

600 Poette, J., Mekoue, J., Neyraud, E., Berdeaux, O., Renault, A., Guichard, E., . . . Feron, G.
601 (2014). Fat sensitivity in humans: oleic acid detection threshold is linked to saliva
602 composition and oral volume. *Flavour and Fragrance Journal*, 29(1), 39-49.
603 doi:10.1002/ffj.3177

604 Ransac, S., Gargouri, Y., Marguet, F., Buono, G., Beglinger, C., Hildebrand, P., . . . Verger, R.
605 (1997). [10] Covalent inactivation of lipases. In B. Rubin, & E. A. Dennis (Eds),
606 *Methods in Enzymology* (Vol. 286, pp. 190-231). San Diego: Academic Press.

607 Robb, I. (1966). Determination of the aqueous solubility of fatty acids and alcohols.
608 *Australian Journal of Chemistry*, 19(12), 2281-2284. doi: 10.1071/CH9662281

609 Roberts, I. M., Montgomery, R. K., & Carey, M. C. (1984). Rat lingual lipase: partial
610 purification, hydrolytic properties, and comparison with pancreatic lipase. *American*
611 *Journal of Physiology-Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology*, 247(4), G385-G393. doi:
612 10.1152/ajpgi.1984.247.4.G385

613 Schipper, R. G., Silletti, E., & Vingerhoeds, M. H. (2007). Saliva as research material:
614 Biochemical, physicochemical and practical aspects. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 52(12),
615 1114-1135. doi: 10.1016/j.archoralbio.2007.06.009

616 Sclafani, A., & Ackroff, K. (2018). Role of lipolysis in postoral and oral fat preferences in mice.
617 *American Journal of Physiology - Regulatory Integrative and Comparative Physiology*,
618 *315*(3), R434-r441. doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00014.2018

619 Spielman, A. I., D'Abundo, S., Field, R. B., & Schmale, H. (1993). Protein analysis of human
620 von Ebner saliva and a method for its collection from the foliate papillae. *Journal of*
621 *dental research*, *72*(9), 1331-1335. doi: 10.1177%2F00220345930720091301

622 Squires, B. T. (1953). Human salivary amylase secretion in relation to diet. *Journal of*
623 *Physiology*, *119*, 153-156. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.1953.sp004835

624 Stewart, J. E., Feinle-Bisset, C., Golding, M., Delahunty, C., Clifton, P. M., & Keast, R. S.
625 (2010). Oral sensitivity to fatty acids, food consumption and BMI in human subjects.
626 *British Journal of Nutrition*, *104*(1), 145-152. doi:10.1017/s0007114510000267

627 Taylor, F. (1985). Flow-through pH-stat method for lipase activity. *Analytical Biochemistry*,
628 *148*(1), 149-153. doi: 10.1016/0003-2697(85)90639-6

629 Tiss, A., Lengsfeld, H., Carriere, F., & Verger, R. (2009). Inhibition of human pancreatic lipase
630 by tetrahydrolipstatin: Further kinetic studies showing its reversibility. *Journal of*
631 *Molecular Catalysis B-Enzymatic*, *58*(1-4), 41-47. doi:10.1016/j.molcatb.2008.11.003

632 Triantafyllou, A., Fletcher, D., & Scott, J. (2003). Lipolytic and esterolytic activities in
633 posterior lingual glands of rat: a histochemical study. *The Histochemical Journal*,
634 *34*(11), 529-533. doi:10.1023/a:1026037801958

635 Turini, P., Kurooka, S., Steer, M., Corbascio, A. N., & Singer, T. P. (1969). The action of
636 phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride on human acetylcholinesterase, chymotrypsin and
637 trypsin. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, *167*(1), 98-104.

638 Verger, R. (1997). 'Interfacial activation' of lipases: facts and artifacts. *Trends in*
639 *Biotechnology*, *15*(1), 32-38. doi: 10.1016/S0167-7799(96)10064-0

640 Voigt, N., Stein, J., Galindo, M. M., Dunkel, A., Raguse, J. D., Meyerhof, W., . . . Behrens, M.
641 (2014). The role of lipolysis in human orosensory fat perception. *Journal of Lipid*
642 *Research*, 55(5), 870-882. doi:10.1194/jlr.M046029

643 Vors, C., Drai, J., Gabert, L., Pineau, G., Laville, M., Vidal, H., . . . Feron, G. (2015). Salivary
644 composition in obese vs normal-weight subjects: towards a role in postprandial lipid
645 metabolism? *International Journal of Obesity*, 39(9), 1425-1428.
646 doi:10.1038/ijo.2015.71

647

648

649

650

651

652

653 **Figure caption:**

654 **Figure 1:** overview of the research strategy

655

656 **Table 1** : References of the 17 selected articles

657

Reference	N°
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to diet	
Armand, M., Borel, P., Cara, L., Senft, M., Chautan, M., Lafont, H., & Lairon, D. (1990). <i>J Nutr</i> , 120(10), 1148-1156.	1
Hamosh, M. (1978). <i>Am J Physiol</i> , 235(4), E416-421.	2
Méjean, C., Morzel, M., Neyraud, E., Issanchou, S., Martin, C., Bozonnet, S., . . . Feron, G. (2015). <i>PloS one</i> , 10(9), e0137473.	3
Mennella, I., Fogliano, V., & Vitaglione, P. (2014). <i>Food Research International</i> , 66, 463-468.	4
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid digestion and metabolism	
Hamosh, M., & Scow, R. O. (1973). <i>J Clin Invest</i> , 52(1), 88-95.	5
Plucinski, T. M., Hamosh, M., & Hamosh, P. (1979). <i>Am J Physiol</i> , 237(6), E541-547.	6
Vors, C., Draï, J., Gabert, L., Pineau, G., Laville, M., Vidal, H., . . . Feron, G. (2015). <i>Int J Obes (Lond)</i> , 39(9), 1425-1428.	7
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid taste and preferences	
Besnard, P., Christensen, J. E., Brignot, H., Bernard, A., Passilly-Degrace, P., Nicklaus, S., . . . Burcelin, R. (2018). <i>Sci Rep</i> , 8(1), 6742.	8
Kawai, T., & Fushiki, T. (2003). <i>Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol</i> , 285(2), R447-454.	9
Kulkarni, B. V., & Mattes, R. D. (2014). <i>Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol</i> , 306(12), R879-885.	10
Mounayar, R., Septier, C., Chabanet, C., Feron, G., & Neyraud, E. (2013). <i>Chemosensory Perception</i> , 6(3), 118-126.	11
Neyraud, E., Palicki, O., Schwartz, C., Nicklaus, S., & Feron, G. (2012). <i>Arch Oral Biol</i> , 57(5), 556-566.	12
Pepino, M. Y., Love-Gregory, L., Klein, S., & Abumrad, N. A. (2012). <i>J Lipid Res</i> , 53(3), 561-566.	13
Poette, J., Mekoue, J., Neyraud, E., Berdeaux, O., Renault, A., Guichard, E., . . . Feron, G. (2014). <i>Flavour and Fragrance Journal</i> , 29(1), 39-49.	14
Sclafani, A., & Ackroff, K. (2018). <i>Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol</i> , 315(3), R434-r441.	15
Stewart, J. E., Feinle-Bisset, C., Golding, M., Delahunty, C., Clifton, P. M., & Keast, R. S. (2010). <i>Br J Nutr</i> , 104(1), 145-152.	16
Voigt, N., Stein, J., Galindo, M. M., Dunkel, A., Raguse, J. D., Meyerhof, W., . . . Behrens, M. (2014). <i>J Lipid Res</i> , 55(5), 870-882.	17

658 **Table 2** : Quality assessment of the 17 selected studies

659

660

N°	Question/ objective sufficiently described?	Study design evident and appropriate?	Outcome measures(s) well defined and robust to measurement/ misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	Analytic methods described/justifi ed and appropriate?	Some estimate of variance is reported for main results?	Results reported in sufficient detail?	Conclusions supported by results?	Summary Score ^a	Reason
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to diet									
1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.9	No control for lipase vs esterase
2	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.9	No control for lipase vs esterase
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
4	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.7	Control for lipase esterase not specific enough. pH for enzymatic evaluation far from salivary pH No quantitative data from evaluation of products from lipolysis by GC methodology
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid digestion and metabolism									
5	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.8	No control for lipase vs esterase
6	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.8	No control for lipase vs esterase
7	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.9	Methodology for lipolysis measurement not detailed in the paper, only a reference was

mentioned

Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid taste and preferences										
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
9	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.9		Results for lipase activity are in abundance ratio of fatty acids without standard deviation
10	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.9		No detailed statistics on sensory values and their relations with lipolysis
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.9		Indirect relationships (through PCA analysis) between sensory data and lipolysis, no direct correlation.
13	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.9		No measure of lipolytic activity, no description of the effect of THL between the 3 groups of obese subjects (the 3 groups were polled)
14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
16	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6		No control for lipase vs esterase, no detail regarding lipolytic activity, no statistics between lipolytic activity and sensitivity to fat
17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		

661 ^aSummary score for each review was calculated by the total sum ((number of 'yes' scores x 1) + (number of 'partial' scores x 0.5) + (number of
662 'no' or 'not applicable' scores x 0)) divided by total possible score (7)

664 **Table 3:** Descriptive analysis of the objectives and the methodology used for the lipolytic activity measurements in the 17 selected articles (NR:
 665 not relevant)
 666

N°	Objectives	Lipase activity measured	Control of specificity	Biological material	Substrate	pH and T° of measurement	Methodology for lipolysis measurement	Model
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to diet								
1	To study the adaptative response of lingual lipase and pancreatic lipase to dietary fat.	Yes	No	Lingual tissue of posterior part of the tongue	Tributyryn	pH 5.4, 37°C	Titration	Rats
2	To study the subcellular localization of the lipase from the lingual serous (Von Ebner) glands of rat tongue and the factors affecting its activity (diet) and secretion.	Yes	No	Whole homogenate of lingual serous (Von Ebner) glands or subcellular fractions	Triglycerides doubly labelled [2- ³ H] glyceryl and [l- ¹⁴ C] tripalmitin	pH 5.4, 37°C	Radiometry	Rats
3	To evaluate the association of salivary flow and composition with both preferences for fat, saltiness and sweetness and the usual nutrient intake in an adult French population.	Yes	THL	Clarified unstimulated saliva	4-methyl-umbelliferyl-oleate	pH 7.5, 37°C	Fluorescence	Human
4	To verify the relationships among salivary lipase, α -amylase activities and zinc concentration with food preference and choice of people with different body mass indices.	Yes	PMSF	Whole unstimulated saliva	2,3-Dimercapto-1-propanol tributyrates, tripalmitin	(1) pH 8.5, 37°C (2) pH of saliva 37°C	Spectrophotometry and GC-FID	Human
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid digestion and metabolism								

5	To study the secretory tissues of the mouth of suckling and adult rats and examine their lipolytic activity.	Yes	No	Tissues from serous glands of the tongue, from the soft palate, oral pharynx wall including glands, clarified unstimulated saliva and stomach content	[1- ¹⁴ C] palmitic acid and trioleoyl-[2- ³ H] glycerol, corn oil triglycerides, and natural milk fats	pH 3-8, 37°C and pH 5.4, 37°C	Radiometry and titrimetry	Rats
6	To test the effect of oesophagus ligation (i.e., absence of lingual lipase) on intra-gastric triglyceride hydrolysis and in the small intestine of adults rats.	Yes	No	Whole stimulated food bolus	Bovine milk-cream mixture with 12 to 14% triglycerides	pH 5.4, 37°C	Titration and GC-FID	Rats
7	To test the hypothesis that salivary lipolysis differs according to BMI and post-prandial lipid metabolism.	Yes	THL	Clarified stimulated saliva	4-Methyl-umbelliferyl-oleate	pH 7.5, 37°C	Fluorescence	Human
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid taste and preferences								
8	To test if subjects with obesity could be characterized by an impaired fatty taste sensitivity linked to a change in the gustatory papillae in the microbial and salivary environment.	Yes	THL	Clarified unstimulated and stimulated saliva	4-Methyl-umbelliferyl-oleate	pH 7.5, 37°C	Fluorescence	Human
9	To focus on the gustatory sense and investigate the significance of the lingual lipase released in the clefts of foliate and vallate papillae, where there are many taste bud cells, to establish a link with the perception of a fat taste.	Yes	THL	Tongues	[carboxyl- ¹⁴ C] triolein on filter paper	NR	Radiometry	Rats

10	To determine the role of lingual lipase in oral fat detection as dependent on the food matrix.	Yes	THL	Saliva in food bolus	Natural high-fat food matrix: almond, almond butter, olive oil, walnut, and coconut	NR	GC-MS	Human
11	To study whether saliva composition is different in groups of subjects having low or high oral sensitivity to oleic acid. To determine whether oral stimulation with oleic acid could modify the composition of saliva.	Yes	THL	Clarified unstimulated and oleic acid stimulated saliva	4-methyl-umbelliferyl-oleate	pH 7.5, 37°C	Fluorescence	Human
12	To study intra- and inter-individual variabilities over time in the composition of molecules likely to interact with food in the mouth, with particular focus on molecules that might interact with fat.	Yes	THL	Clarified unstimulated and stimulated saliva	4-methyl-umbelliferyl-oleate	pH 7.5, 37°C	Fluorescence	Human
13	To evaluate whether a common single nucleotide polymorphism (rs1761667) in the CD36 gene that reduces CD36 expression and the addition of THL to reduce fatty acid release from triacylglycerols would attenuate fat orosensory sensitivity in obese subjects.	No	THL	In situ study	Triolein	NR	NR	Human
14	To better understand how human oral physiology may govern the sensory sensitivity to non-esterified fatty acids.	Yes	THL	Clarified unstimulated saliva	4-methyl-umbelliferyl-oleate	pH 7.5, 37°C	Fluorescence	Human

15	To determine if fat preference is influenced by the inhibition with THL of triglyceride lipolysis at both oral and post-oral levels.	No	THL	In situ study	Triolein, corn oil, soybean oil	NR	NR	Mice
16	To investigate oral fatty acid sensitivity, food selection and BMI in human subjects.	Yes	No	Clarified stimulated saliva	1,2-Diglycerides	pH 8, 35°C	Spectrophotometry	Human
17	To investigate whether triglycerides represent an adequate “fatty” stimulus <i>in vivo</i> and <i>in vitro</i> and to determine if lipolytic enzymes are present in the human oral cavity.	Yes	THL	In situ study on circumvallate papillae	Triolein	NR	HPLC-MS/MS	Human

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677 **Table 4:** Descriptive analysis of the main results about lipolytic activity and the associated parameters studied in the 17 selected articles (NR:
 678 not relevant)
 679

N°	Associated effects	Main results about lipolytic activity	Main results of the association between the parameters studied and lipolytic activity
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to diet			
1	Level of fat in the diet	NR	There is a positive adaptive response of the lingual lipase to the level of fat in the diet. The type of fat has no effect on lipolytic activity.
2	Level of fat in the diet	Lingual lipase is located in the secretory granules of the lingual serous (Von Ebner) glands. Lingual lipase secretion is stimulated by isoprenaline.	There is positive adaptive response of lipase lingual to the level of fat in the diet.
3	Lipid intake	NR	Lipolysis is not associated with the intake of lipids, mono-unsaturated or polyunsaturated and saturated fatty acids, whereas sensory preference suggests the influence of saliva characteristics in food acceptance.
4	Dietary fat consumption	NR	Salivary lipolytic activity is higher in the overweight subjects than in the normal weight subjects. High salivary lipase activity in the overweight subjects may be an adaptive response to the low-fat taste perception related to reduced zinc concentration.
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid digestion and metabolism			
5	Fat digestion	The lipase is secreted from serous gland from the posterior part of the tongue and fewly detected in the stomach. It is pH dependant.	Salivary lipase contributes significantly to the digestion of triglyceride in the stomach.

6	Fat digestion	NR	Lipolytic activity contributes significantly to the hydrolysis of fat droplets not only in the stomach but also in the duodenum and the ileum.
7	Lipaemia	NR	Lipolysis in the obese subjects is significantly lower than in the normal weight subjects and is associated with a delay in post-prandial metabolism, as observed in the obese subjects compared to the normal weight subjects.
Articles describing salivary lipolysis in relation to lipid taste and preference			
8	oleic acid detection threshold	NR	In the obese subjects, BMI is related to taste sensitivity, but no association is observed between the sensitivity to oleic acid and lipolytic activity in the obese subjects. Whatever the BMI, no link between lipolysis and BMI is observed.
9	Fat taste preference	Lingual lipase is released continuously from the papillae	The addition of THL diminished the preference for triglycerides but not for free fatty acids. Lingual lipase is involved in finding nutritive lipids in food.
10	Fat taste evaluation	NR	THL inhibits the release of non-esterified fatty acids from the food matrix in the food bolus and does not affect the sensory evaluation of almond butter.
11	oleic acid taste sensitivity	Significant decrease in lipolytic activity is observed after stimulation with oleic acid for hypersensitive subjects	No differences are found in the saliva characteristics according to sensitivity to oleic acid. The oleic acid stimulation compared to a control stimulation shows modified salivary composition in the sensitive group only. No difference in lipolytic activity is observed between the hypersensitive and hyposensitive subjects.
12	Fat taste preference	Subject salivary lipolysis is stable over time, and no sampling effect was found.	A positive relationship is found between the level of lipolysis and fattiness, and a negative relationship for the level of lipolysis and preference is observed.
13	oleic acid and triolein orosensory detection thresholds	NR	The presence of THL decreases the sensitivity to triolein in obese subjects.

14	oleic acid orosensory detection threshold	Subject salivary lipolysis is stable over time, and no sampling effect is observed during 4-month collection.	Taste sensitivity to oleic acid is explained by the oral volume and the level of lipolysis in saliva. The higher the lipolytic activity is, the higher the threshold is.
15	Fat taste preference	NR	Inhibition of oral triglyceride hydrolysis leads to a decrease in preferences for fat, but triglyceride hydrolysis is not essential for fat preferences.
16	Orosensory detection thresholds for oleic acid, linoleic and lauric acids	NR	Lipolytic level is sufficient to produce micromolar levels of fatty acids, which can stimulate oral sensors.
17	Sensory sensitivity to triolein or oleic acid	Oleic acid is liberated from triglycerides upon exposure to saliva secreted from foliate papillae. THL reduces the generation of oleic acid. The expression of different lipases at the level of the circumvallate papillae is observed. Gene coding for lingual or gastric lipase is not expressed in human lingual tissue but genes coding for other lipases are expressed.	Triglyceride perception is attenuated by concomitant THL administration. Lipolytic activities in minor salivary gland secretions directly supplying gustatory papillae are correlated to individual sensitivities for triglycerides.

680

681

682

