

Study on The Effect of Different Type of Sugar on Lipid Deposition in Goose Fatty Liver

Rongxue Wei

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Donghang Deng

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Yongqiang Teng

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Cangcang Lu

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Zhaoyun Luo

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Mariama Abdulai

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Hehe Liu

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Hongyong Xu

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Liang Li

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Shengqiang Hu

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Jiwei Hu

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Shouhai Wei

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus

Chunchun Han (✉ chunchunhai_510@163.com)

Sichuan Agricultural University - Chengdu Campus <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8692-767X>

Research

Keywords: Goose fatty liver, glucose, fructose, sucrose, lipid deposition

Posted Date: February 15th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-194490/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Poultry Science on January 1st, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2022.101729>.

Abstract

Background: Early research in our lab is indicated that the effect of glucose, fructose and sucrose on the levels of triacylglycerol and inflammatory factor was significantly different, and it is speculated that the regulatory mechanism of lipid deposition by different type of sugar in the liver is different.

Methods: In order to explore lipid deposition difference mediated by different type of sugar (glucose, fructose and sucrose) in goose fatty liver formation, this experiment was performed from cell culture, overfeeding experiment and transcriptome analysis three level.

Results: Cell culture experiment results indicated that the levels of intracellular triglyceride (**TG**), total cholesterol (**T-CHO**) and lipid content of fructose treatment and sucrose treatment were significantly higher than those of glucose treatment ($P < 0.05$). In slaughter performance, the liver weight, the ratio of liver weight to body weight, feed conversion ratio (liver weight / feed consumption) were better in sucrose overfeeding group ($P < 0.05$). In addition, the liver of the sucrose overfeeding group contained a lot of unsaturated fatty acids, especially (n-3) polyunsaturated fatty acids (**n-3 PUFA**) ($P < 0.05$). Transcriptome analysis shown that the PPAR signaling pathway is highly enriched in the fructose and sucrose overfeeding groups; cell cycle and DNA replication pathways were highly enriched in the glucose overfeeding group.

Conclusions: Due to lipids outward transportation decrease and anti-inflammation of unsaturated fatty acids (**UFA**), thereby, fructose and sucrose have better ability to induce steatosis in *foie gras* formation.

Background

The metabolic responses to different types of sugar overintake have varied from study to study. Previous studies have shown that normal people who consume fructose have higher levels of triacylglycerol (**TG**) than those who consume the same amount of glucose [1]. Studies have shown that there is a gap in acute metabolism between high fructose corn syrup and sucrose. After consuming the same amount of high fructose syrup, blood fructose concentration was higher than that of sucrose, thus resulting in a higher blood sugar value in the body. As for the reason, the explanation of this study is that the glucose component in sucrose can inhibit the activity of sucrase, affecting the hydrolysis of sucrose, and resulting in a lower fructose content [2]. Compared with the fructose and glucose treatment, the rats fed the fructose diet had higher body weight and food intake, especially during the immature period [2]. The result suggested that fructose cause a higher intake than glucose, thereby increasing the possibility of other diseases. In conclusion, there is still a great debate on the metabolic differences caused by different types of sugar excessive intake. Moreover, it is still in the preliminary stage of research and have been seldom reported.

As a powerful synthetic and catabolic organ, an important metabolic function of the liver is to maintain the steady state of plasma glucose concentration under any nutritional state of the body. When energy is excess, the excess glucose can be converted into lipids and stored in the liver through fatty acid *de novo*

synthesis. Under normal basic physiological conditions, only 5% of lipids in the liver are derived from the *de novo* synthesis pathway of endogenous lipids. However, in pathological conditions, 26% of the fat in the liver comes from fatty acid *de novo* synthesis, and 15% from food [3]. Increased liver lipids induced by high carbohydrate foods is positively correlated with *de novo* fatty acid synthesis. The substrate of fatty acid *de novo* synthesis is mainly glucose, fructose and amino acids [4]. Ingested carbohydrates are the main stimulating factor for fatty acid *de novo* synthesis in the liver, and are more likely to induce fatty liver than fat in food. In non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, excessive carbohydrates are converted into fats and the increased fatty acid *de novo* synthesis is the main cause of liver lipid deposition [5, 6]. High-sugar foods can activate liver fatty acid synthesis, and high-fat foods can inhibit this synthesis pathway. High-protein diet can reduce fat deposition induced by high-fat and high-sucrose diet in rats [7]. High-fructose foods increase fatty acid synthesis in the liver, leading to lipid deposition and IR in the liver [8]. Large amounts of carbohydrates intake in the form of fructose and sucrose can induce fatty acid *de novo* synthesis. Fatty acid synthesis increasement caused by high carbohydrate intake come from the activation of transcription factors such as SREBP1, FAS and ACC α [9, 10]. Excessive intake of sugar induces liver fat deposition and its influence on metabolism has been a hot research topic in recent years. However, the differences in liver lipid deposition induced by different types of sugars still lack systematic research.

The carbohydrate feed commonly used in livestock production, such as corn, wheat and rice, is mainly composed of starch polysaccharide, which is digested in the body and absorbed by the small intestine as glucose and other simple sugars. A large number of animal studies have been reported that high fructose diet can induce fatty liver [11]. It had also been reported that high sucrose diet can induce lipid deposition by increasing the production of TG *in vivo* and decreasing the transport of TG [12]. Unlike human fatty liver, waterfowl is more likely to show non-pathological hepatic steatosis, and the functional integrity of the hepatocytes remains intact [13]. Therefore, waterfowl is the model animals in biomedical research for fatty liver [14]. This experiment explored the difference of lipid deposition regulatory mechanism in goose liver from individual level, transcriptome level and cell level. Not only will understanding these difference between different types of sugar induced *foie gras* lipid deposition provide a method for improving *foie gras* quality, it is also conducive to improving the production efficiency. Meanwhile, it will provide not only a scientific basis to ensure animal welfare, but also an approach to the prevention and treatment of fatty liver disease in human.

Methods

Cell culture and treatment

Hepatocytes were isolated from three 14-day-old Tianfu Meat Goose from the Experimental Farm for Waterfowl Breeding at Sichuan Agricultural University (Sichuan, China) using a modification of the "two-step procedure" described by Seglen [15]. Goose primary hepatocytes were isolated and cultured in dulbecco's modified eagle medium (**DMEM**) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (**FBS**). The culture conditions were 37 °C with 5% CO₂ after 24 h. After an additional 24 h, the cells were separately

treated with serum-free media supplemented with 30mmol/L glucose or fructose or sucros and incubated for 24 h. Cell viability determination was shown in **Supplement materias S-Figure 1**. The cells were collected for follow-up study. Each experiments was performed at least in triplicate.

Concentration measurement of TG and VLDL

The extracellular VLDL concentration in the supernatant was measured using a chicken VLDL ELISA kit (GBD, USA). The concentration of VLDL in the samples was determined by comparing the optical density (OD) value at 450 nm of the samples to the standard curve. After cultured cell treatment, the culture media was collected for detecting extracellular TG concentration. Cell samples used to measure intracellular TG concentration were collected. The TG levels were quantified using a triglyceride GPO-POD assay kit (Biosinc, China). Measurements will be in accordance with the manufacturer's protocol. All assays were performed in triplicate.

Oil Red O staining

Briefly, after the treatments with goose primary hepatocytes, staining of intracellular lipids was performed using Oil Red O (Sigma) according to the manufacturer instructions. Oil Red O staining images were taken using a light microscope (Olympus Optical, Tokyo, Japan) at 200× magnification. For quantification of lipid accumulation, the Oil Red O-positive cells were extracted using 100% isopropanol for 10 min. The absorbance of the extracted dye was analyzed at a wavelength of 510 nM (BIO-RAD, USA).

Measurement of protein content in culture cells

Protein content of fatty acid synthetase (**FAS**), acetyl-CoA carboxylase (**ACC α**), carnitine palmitoyltransferase 1 (**CPT1**), microsomal triglyceride transfer protein (**MTP**) and apolipoprotein B (**APOB**) in culture cells was measured using ELISA kit (GBD, USA). Further measurements will be in accordance with the manufacturer's protocol. All assays were performed in triplicate.

Isolation of total RNA and real-time RT-PCR

Cultured cells total RNA was extracted using extraction kit (TRIzol Reagent) (Invitrogen, USA), and then RNA was transcribed into cDNA via reverse-transcription using the Primer Script TM RT system kit for real-time PCR (TaKaRa, Japan) as described by the manufacturer. The fluorescence quantitative PCR was performed on the CFX 96 instrument (Bio-Rad, USA), using a Takara ExTaq RT-PCR kit and SYBR Green as the detection dye (Takara, Japan); qRT-PCR reaction system contained the newly generated cDNA template (1.0 μ L), SYBR Premix Ex Taq TM (6.0 μ L), sterile water (4.0 μ L), upstream primers of target genes (0.5 μ L) and downstream primers of target genes (0.5 μ L). After initial denaturation at 95°C for 5 min, 40 cycles were carried out: 95°C for 10 sec, 60°C for 20 sec, 72°C for 15 sec and 72°C extension for 10 min. Fluorescence quantitative PCR Primers (BGI, Beijing, China) designed according to the goose gene sequences in current experiment were summarized in **S-Table 1**. Fold change in the expression of

target gene was analyzed using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method [16]. β -actin and 18S used as the internal reference gene. Each test include 3 biological samples and each sample was analyzed in triplicate.

Protein Analysis by western blotting

Following the incubation with the different treatments, SDS buffer was used to extract total proteins from the harvested cells which were washed twice and collected in ice-cold PBS. The untreated cells were used as control. Equal amounts of total proteins (100 μ g/lane) were separated by SDS-PAGE gel (6%) electrophoresis and transferred to a PVDF membrane. After blocking with a mixture of 5% skimmed milk/Tris-buffered saline Tween 20 (TBST), the membranes were incubated overnight at 4°C with the primary antibody rabbit against sterol regulatory element-binding proteins-1 (SREBP1) carnitine palmitoyltransferase (CPT1A), MTP antibodies (1:1,000; Beijing Biosynthesis Biotechnology, China); antibody information was listed in Supplement materials **S-Table2**. Following three consecutive washes in TBST (0.05%), the membranes were incubated with the goat anti-rabbit horseradish peroxidase-conjugated IgG at 1:2000 (Beijing Biosynthesis Biotechnology, China) for another 2 h at room temperature. The results were normalized to α -Tubulin (Beijing Biosynthesis Biotechnology, China) protein levels. Protein expression levels were finally visualized using enhanced chemiluminescence (ECL) reagents (Beyotime Institute of Biotechnology, China).

Birds and Experiment Design and Sampling

One hundred newborn male Tianfu Meat Geese were raised in Experimental Farm for Waterfowl Breeding at Sichuan Agricultural University (Ya'an, China). When 13 weeks old, the geese of each breed were randomly separated into five groups (control group, corn overfeeding group, glucose overfeeding group, fructose overfeeding group, sucrose overfeeding group), each group consisted of 20 geese, the grouping situation and overfeeding dietary component was shown in **Table 1**; the geese of control group were normally fed. The overfeeding procedure and diet regimes were performed as previously described [17]. All geese were slaughtered when 16 weeks old. After 12 hours of fasting, the body weight of geese was weighed before slaughter. After 12 hours of fasting, the body weight of geese was weighed before slaughter. Ten mL of blood were collected from wing vein, and then the geese were killed. The serum was separated by blood centrifugation at 4 °C for 4000 r/min for 10 min, then kept at -20 °C for follow-up detection. After slaughter, the liver was separated and weighed immediately. Six geese of each group were anesthetized with intraperitoneal injection of sodium pentobarbital (60 mg/kg), and then killed; the liver was collected immediately. The livers were separated into two parts respectively. A part of the liver tissue was frozen in liquid nitrogen immediately, and then kept at -80 °C for transcriptome sequencing and long-chain fatty acid determination. Other part of liver was washed in ice-cold saline (0.9% NaCl; 4 °C) and fixed in 4% formaldehyde-phosphate buffer for histomorphology determination.

Biochemical Index Examinations of serum

Ten individuals blood samples were selected randomly from each group, serum biochemical indices were quantified in whole serum. The assay kits that detected total protein (TP), total cholesterol (T-CHO),

albumin (**ALB**), very low-density lipoprotein (**VLDL**), very high-density lipoprotein (**VHDL**), TG, blood glucose, insulin, alanine aminotransferase (**ALT**), aspartate aminotransferase (**AST**), uric acid (**UA**) were provided by Nanjing Jiancheng Bioengineering Institute (Nanjing, China);

Histomorphology Examinations

According to the methods of previous study [18], the cross-sections from the middle of liver were preserved in 4% formaldehyde-phosphate buffer were prepared using standard paraffin embedding techniques, sectioned (5 μm) and stained with hematoxylin and eosin (**HE**), and sealed by neutral resin size thereafter, and then examined by microscope photography system (Olympus, Tokyo, Japan), each slice was observed and 5 visual fields were randomly selected at 40 \times magnifications.

Long -chain fatty acid of *foie gras* determination

According to the methods described as previous experiment [19], gas chromatography (**GC**) was used to detect the *foie gras* fatty acids; GC analysis conditions: HP-FFAP capillary column, 29.5 mm \times 320 μm (diameter) \times 0.25 (thickness); chromatographic column temperature programmed: 160 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ retained 1 min, up to 220 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ in 5 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ / min, then retained 8 min; carrier gas is nitrogen; total flow velocity: 70 mL/min. The detection were performed by Qingdao Sci-tech Innovation Co., Ltd (Qingdao, Shangdong, China).

Transcriptome Sequencing and analysis

A total amount of 1 μg RNA per sample was used as input material for the RNA sample preparations. Sequencing libraries were generated using NEBNext UltraTM RNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina NexSeq500 (NEB, USA) following manufacturer's recommendations and index codes were added to attribute sequences to each sample. The library fragments were purified with AMPure XP system (Beckman Coulter, Beverly, USA). PCR products were purified (AMPure XP system) and library quality was assessed on the Agilent Bioanalyzer 2100 system. The clustering of the index-coded samples was performed on a cBot Cluster Generation System using TruSeq PE Cluster Kit v4-cBot-HS (Illumina). After cluster generation, the library preparations were sequenced on an Illumina platform and paired-end reads were generated. The sequencing were performed by Baimike biological Technology Co., LTD (Beijing, China).

Raw reads of fastq format were processed through in-house perl scripts. Clean reads were obtained by removing reads containing adapter, reads containing ploy-N and low quality reads from raw reads. Hisat2 tools soft were used to map with reference genome of geese (*A. cygnoides*) reference genome (assembly Ans_Cyg_PRJNA183603_v1.0, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genome/31397?genome_assembly_id=229313). Differential expression analysis of five groups was performed using the DEseq. The resulting P values were adjusted using the Benjamini and Hochberg's approach for controlling the false discovery rate. Genes with an adjusted P-value < 0.05 found by DEseq were assigned as differentially expressed. We used KOBAS software to test the statistical enrichment of the differentially expressed genes (**DEGs**) in KEGG pathways. The sequences of the DEGs was blast to the genome of a related species (the protein protein interaction of which exists in the STRING database: [Page 7/24](http://string-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

db.org/) to get the predicted PPI of these DEGs. Transcriptome analysis was performed via Baimike biocloud platform (Baimike biological Technology Co., LTD, Beijing, China).

Statistical analysis

By using SAS 9.13 package (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC), the comparisons of multiple groups were analyzed by GLM, and the means were assessed for significant differences using the SNK-q test. All data were presented as means \pm standard deviation (SD) and showed with graphs created with GraphPad Prism 5.0 software (GraphPad Prism Software, Inc.). We considered $P < 0.05$ as statistically significant.

Results

The effect of glucose, fructose and sucrose treatment on the lipid deposition in goose primary hepatocytes

Goose primary hepatocytes were with glucose, fructose or sucrose 24h. The lipid accumulation and gene and protein involved in lipid metabolism were detected. There was no significant difference in mRNA expression of ACC α , FAS and SREBP1 between glucose group, sucrose group and fructose group ($P > 0.05$) (**Fig. 1a**). The relative mRNA expression of ACOX1, CPT1A and PPAR γ were lower in sucrose treatment ($P > 0.05$) (**Fig. 1b**). The relative gene expression of MTP, ApoB and DGAT2 were lower in sucrose treatment ($P > 0.05$) (**Fig. 1c**). The intracellular TG and T-CHO concentration was higher in sucrose and fructose group ($P < 0.05$) (**Fig. 1f and g**). As shown the intracellular lipid droplets observed from Oil red O staining (**Supplement materias S-Fig. 2**), lipid deposition increased ($P < 0.05$), and the intracellular lipid content was higher in fructose and sucrose treatment ($P < 0.05$) (**Fig. 1h**).

Comparison of different type of sugar on slaughter performance, fatty acid composition and serum parameters

As shown in **Fig. 2a**, the body weights of overfed geese were significantly higher than that of control geese ($P < 0.05$), but the four overfeeding were no difference ($P > 0.05$). The liver weight of fructose and sucrose overfeeding geese was significantly higher than glucose overfeeding geese ($P < 0.05$). While the proportion of liver weight in sucrose overfeeding group was significantly increasing the most in relative weight by 3.44-fold than that in the control overfeeding group ($P < 0.05$). The ratio of liver weight to overfeed diet consumption is highest in sucrose overfeeding group. As shown in **Fig. 2b**, the size of the liver has increased significantly after overfeeding, HE staining of liver showed that the hepatocytes are homogeneous in size and the nucleus was clearly visible in the control group, which indicated that there is a serious TG accumulation in liver, especially in the fructose and sucrose overfeeding group. The size of *foie gras* of fructose and sucrose overfeeding group largest. Fatty acid composition of liver was measured as shown in **Fig. 3a**, the content and proportion of unsaturated fatty acids significantly increased in overfeeding groups. At the same time, the content of n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA) and the ratio of n-3 PUFA to n-6 PUFA in the sugar-overfeeding group were significantly higher than those in the corn overfeeding group, which suggesting that supplementation with sugar can increase the n-3

polyunsaturated fatty acids content and ratio of n-3 PUFA to n-6PUFA in goose fatty liver formation (**Fig. 3b**).

The results of the analysis of the effects of different sugars on the serum biochemical indexes of the overfed goose are shown in **Table 2**. The TG, T-CHO, VLDL and blood glucose levels are not significantly different in glucose, fructose, and sucrose feeding groups ($P > 0.05$). The TG level of the corn overfeeding group was significantly lower than that of the glucose, fructose, and sucrose overfeeding groups ($P < 0.05$). In the blood sugar level, the control group was significantly higher than the sugar treatment group ($P < 0.05$), indicating that overfeeding caused the impaired blood sugar function of the goose, but there was no difference in the insulin level ($P > 0.05$). ALT concentration of fructose overfeeding group was significantly higher than that of control and sucrose overfeeding groups ($P < 0.05$).

Comparison analysis on the effect of supplementaion with different type of sugar on goose fatty liver formation from transcriptome analysis

In this study, 12 cDNA libraries were constructed (**Supplement materials S-Table 3 and S-Table 4**), each RNA-seq library produced more than 107 million raw reads, 53 million clean reads and the clean data of each sample reached 9.38GB. The quality scores (Q30) of all samples were above 94.28%. The percentage of total reads mapped to the anser reference genome was between 72.79% and 74.99%, the percentages of reads uniquely mapped to the reference genome were all above 71.04%. These results demonstrated that the RNA-seq data was reliable and suitable for further analysis.

We identified DEGs by DEGseq software, and FDR and log₂FC were used for screen the DEGs. The screening conditions were set at FDR < 0.05 and |log₂FC| > 1. According to the distance calculated, the clustering diagram can directly demonstrate the distance and difference between samples. Cluster Analysis of the DEGs suggested that the Control group was the most different from the G, F and S group, the G, F and S group were aggregated in another branch (**Fig. 4a**), but sample of G and F group were not in a separate branch, and the S group was separated from any groups, so we pay more attention to the DEGs of S group which were both specifically the consistency among biological replicates within groups, and to those are significantly different in fatty liver producing performance.

A total number of DEGs identified between C group and S group (Control-vs-Sucrose) was 1551, which were 827 up-regulated and 724 down-regulated genes shown in **Supplement materials S-Table 5, Fig. 4b and 4c**. And the Control group with the Glucose group (Control-vs-Glucose) was 1535 DEGs in all, it contains 833 up-regulated and 652 down-regulated DEGs, while the Control group with the Fructose group (Control-vs-Fructose) were 1659 DEGs in all, and contains 959 up-regulated and 700 down-regulated DEGs.

In order to gain a further understanding of goose fatty liver formation difference induced by glucose, fructose and sucrose, the KEGG database was used for annotate and analyze the differentially expressed gene (DEGs) pathways. As shown in **Fig. 5 and Supplement materials S-Fig. 3**, the highest enrichment

signal pathways related to DEGs in the corn overfeeding group are : fatty acid metabolism, unsaturated fatty acid synthesis (biosynthesis of unsaturated fatty acids), peroxisome, steroid biosynthesis and fatty acid elongation (**Fig. 5a**). The highest enrichment of DEGs-related signaling pathways in the glucose overfeeding group were: Cell cycle, fatty acid extension, DNA replication, and PPAR signaling pathway (**Fig. 5b**). The highest enrichment DEGs-related signaling pathways of the fructose overfeeding group are: peroxisomes, fatty acid metabolism, unsaturated fatty acid synthesis pathway, PPAR signaling pathway, and adipocytokine signaling pathway, sterol biosynthesis, fatty acid extension (**Fig. 5c**). The highest enrichment of DEGs-related signaling pathways in the sucrose overfeeding group were: fatty acid extension, fatty acid metabolism, unsaturated fatty acid synthesis, PPAR signaling pathway, and adipocyte factor signaling pathway (**Fig. 5d**).

Discussion

When the content of TG produced far exceeded the transport capacity of apolipoproteins, and the fatty acid produced far exceeded the degraded fatty acid by β -oxidation, the accumulation of lipids occurred [20], which is the mechanism of fatty liver formation. The results of this experiment shown that after the primary goose hepatocytes treated with glucose, fructose and sucrose, the content of intracellular TG increased, and the oil red O test results also showed that glucose, fructose and sucrose treatments can induce lipid deposition in goose primary hepatocytes. When the goose primary hepatocytes were treated with glucose, fructose and sucrose, respectively, the expression levels of FAS, ACC α and other genes related to fatty acid synthesis significantly increase. We also found that there was a tendency to decrease the expression levels of key genes involved in the fatty acid transportation, which indicated that fructose and sucrose treatment reduced fatty acid oxidation (**Fig. 1k**). It suggested that fructose and sucrose can decrease lipids transportation. Thereby, the fructose and sucrose treatment increased the lipids deposition in goose primary hepatocytes.

Overfed goose liver (*foie gras*) has a special hepatic steatosis process where lipid deposition accompany with cell proliferation [20]. KEGG enrichment pathways showed that the DEGs in overfeeding group were mainly enriched in fatty acid metabolism, unsaturated fatty acid synthesis, PPAR signaling pathway and cell cycle pathway. In overfeeding processes, due to the intake of carbohydrates increase, significant changes have taken place in the signaling pathways related to metabolism, especially the signaling pathways related to lipid metabolism. Transcriptome analysis shows that in corn overfeeding group, fatty acid metabolism and lipid deposition induced by sterol synthesis are the major way in the formation of goose fatty liver. Different from corn overfeeding, the PPAR signaling pathway is highly enriched in the fructose and sucrose overfeeding groups. The PPAR pathway regulates lipid metabolism, participates in fat cell differentiation [21, 22]. The liver-type fatty acid binding protein (**FABP1**) can specifically bind to fatty acids and has a transport effect on fatty acids. It is an important fatty acid carrier protein in the cell. It not only participates in the absorption, transport and metabolism of fatty acids, but also has antioxidant effects and regulates cell growth and proliferation [23, 24]. In this study, FABP1 gene expression in the sucrose overfeeding group was significantly lower than that in glucose and fructose overfeeding groups (**Supplement materialsS-Fig. 3a**), which indicated that the liver lipid transport function

of the sucrose overfeeding group was lower than that of glucose and fructose, so more lipids deposited in the goose liver. In the glucose overfeeding group, cell cycle and DNA replication pathways were highly enriched, suggesting that more cell proliferation occurred in the goose liver of glucose overfeeding group. The regeneration process of the hepatocytes is extremely complex and regulated by many factors. Cyclin Dependent Kinase (CDKs) is the core of the entire cell cycle regulatory protein. CDKs can only be activated to perform their functions after combining with the corresponding cell cycle regulatory protein to form a CDKs-cyclin complex [25]. In this experiment, the gene expression of *CDK1* was significantly increased in the overfeeding group, especially the glucose overfeeding group, indicating that glucose promoted the mitosis of hepatocytes and induced the proliferation and meristem of hepatocytes. *CDC7*, *CCNA2*, *CCNB2*, *ATR*, and *BUB1B* are also genes related to cell cycle progression [26-28]. (Pereira, et al., 2020; Yamada, et al., 2014) In this experiment, the expression levels of *CDK1*, *CDC7*, *CCNA2*, *BUB1B* in the glucose overfeeding group were the highest (**Supplement materialsS-Fig. 3**). Our other studies also showed that glucose can regulate cell growth and proliferation through cell cycle and apoptosis pathways [29, 30].

Insulin is the only hormone in the body that can lower blood sugar. Insulin resistance (**IR**) refers to the decreased sensitivity of the insulin target organs (mainly liver, skeletal muscle, and adipose tissue), that is, the biological effect of normal dose of insulin is lower than the normal one. The IR caused by different types of carbohydrate metabolism is different. Long-term high-dose fructose and sucrose intake can trigger the stress response in hepatocytes and impair insulin signals, which induced IR. Fructose may also reduce insulin sensitivity by changing the intestinal microflora or changing intestinal permeability, long-term high-dose fructose diet leads to glucose and lipid metabolism disorders, and ultimately leads to the IR [31], which in turn can aggravate the symptoms of metabolic syndrome. Fructose intake is closely related to the IR increase [32, 33]. In mammals, IR plays a role in the development of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Fatty liver caused by high fructose intake may be related to IR [34]. As demonstrated by Geng et al., overfeeding causes IR [35]. Sucrose is a disaccharide which is made up of 50% fructose and 50% glucose. Studies believe that fructose component is the reason why sucrose metabolism decreased liver insulin sensitivity [36]. In this experiment, the liver weight of fructose and sucrose overfeeding group were higher, one of reason may be IR induced by fructose intake. In addition, more and more studies believe that high fructose intake is the main cause of non-alcoholic fatty liver [9, 10]. Some studies believe that high-dose fructose and sucrose foods can significantly increase liver fat content. Fructose has a more pronounced effect than sucrose, and a monosaccharide has a more obvious effect than polysaccharide [37], which is consistent with the results of other studies [38, 39].

Blood parameters are regarded as the one of indicators of whether disease happens or not. In respect of liver inflammation assessment, traditional liver enzymes, such as AST and ALT have been applied clinically to assess hepatocyte damage and exclude NASH [40, 41]. The elevation of blood TG, TC, HDL, ALB, ALT and AST is frequently associated with fatty livers in mammalian animals. In this experiment, the ALT level of the fructose overfeeding group was significantly higher than that of the sucrose overfeeding group and the corn overfeeding group; in addition, the TP and ALB as indices reflecting the function of the liver protein synthesis and storage [42], the decrease of their contents indicated that the ability of liver to

synthesize protein was weakened [43], the ALB levels of the corn overfeeding group and the glucose overfeeding group were significantly lower than the sucrose overfeeding group. It suggested that although the chronic hepatitis occurred in sucrose overfeeding group, the hepatocyte was not seriously injured and the liver function was not affected, which showed that the inflammation inhibition mechanism existed in goose liver [44]. It has been reported that the unsaturated fatty acids (UFA) could inhibit SFA-induced elevation of ceramides and inflammation [45]. The fatty liver of goose is more common in UFA when compared to the mammalian fatty liver, with the polyunsaturated fatty acids in particular, such as omega-3 and omega-6 [46], i.e., the content of SFA is 39-47% in the fatty liver of overfed goose [47]; the content of SFA is 52-56% in the liver of human suffered from NAFLD [48]. It has also been reported that multiple fatty acid desaturase including stearoyl-CoA desaturase were induced in the liver of the overfed geese [49]. In this experiment, the liver of the sucrose overfeeding group contained a lot of unsaturated fatty acids, especially (n-3) poly-unsaturated fatty acids. It may be one of the reason that the sucrose overfeeding group had higher liver weight than the corn, glucose and fructose overfeeding group.

Conclusions

Glucose, fructose and sucrose can all induce the lipid deposition in overfed goose liver, however, the regulatory mechanism is different. The PPAR signaling pathway is highly enriched in the lipid deposition process induced by fructose and sucrose, glucose enriched cell cycle and DNA replication pathways in goose fatty liver formation. In addition, sucrose and fructose have better inducement of lipid accumulation in goose fatty liver formation. This experiment is only a preliminary exploration on the regulatory mechanism of lipid deposition by different type of sugar in goose liver, further mechanistic differences are needed further study. For example, the relationship between lipid deposition, insulin resistance and endoplasmic reticulum stress in the hepatocytic steatosis induced by different sugar type has been not clearly elucidated. Study result indicated that overfeeding dietary 10% fructose or 10% sucrose supplementation induce more lipid deposition in *foie gras*, however, whether overfeeding dietary supplementation with high concentration of fructose or sucrose in can reduce overfeeding intensity or shorten the overfeeding time need to be further research.

In *foie gras* production, the most common feed is maize flour and maize pellet. In current overfeeding experiment, the main ingredient of overfeeding feed is maize flour. Compared with maize pellet in overfeeding, the advantages of maize flour are high fluidity, fast overfeeding speed and lower mortality, etc., however, the advantages are overfeeding times increase and *foie gras* weight is lighter; therefore, maize pellet are still used in *foie gras* production mostly. Although the weight of *foie gras* produced via maize pellet overfeeding is higher, the overfeeding speed is slower and the mortality is higher than corn flour. So, how to overcome the shortcomings of overfeeding using corn flour become a problem that is necessary to be solved. In this current study, we found that fructose and sucrose have good induction for lipid deposition in goose liver, which can be a reference to improve maize flour overfeeding effect.

Abbreviations

FAS: fatty acid synthetase; SREBP-1: sterol regulatory element-binding proteins-1; ACC α : acetyl-CoA carboxylase; CPT1: carnitine palmitoyltransferase; ACOX1: acyl-CoA oxidase 1; PPAR α : peroxisome proliferators-activated receptor- α ; ApoB: apolipoprotein B; MTP: microsomal triglyceride transfer protein; DGAT1: diacylglycerol acyltransferase-1; VLDL: very low-density lipoprotein; TG: triglyceride; TP: total protein, T-CHO: total cholesterol, ALB: albumin, VLDL: very low-density lipoprotein, VHDL: very high-density lipoprotein, TG: triglyceride, insulin, ALT: alanine aminotransferase, AST: aspartate aminotransferase, UA: uric acid.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All procedures in the present study were subject to approval by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) of Sichuan Agricultural University (Permit No. DKY-B20141401), and carried out in accordance with the approved guidelines.

Consent for publication

Not applicable. The manuscript does not contain data from any individual person.

Availability of data and materials

The supplement materials and original source data of this paper were up-loaded to Figshare, the Publically available DOI for Figshare: <https://figshare.com/s/70fbe6ff915e6471c431>; Transcriptome analysis was performed via Baimike biocloud platform (<https://international.biocloud.net/zh/dashboard>; ID:15215045770; Password: deng19940227).

Competing interest

We declare that all authors have no conflict of interest about this manuscript.

Funding

The work was supported by the National Natural Science Funds of China (No. 31672413), and the National Waterfowl Industrial Technology System (No. CARS-43-6).

Author contributions

Conceptualization, C.H., and S.W.; Methodology, H.X.; Formal Analysis, S.H., and X.Z.; Investigation, C.L. and Y.T. and M.A.; Resources, L.L. and J.H; Writing—Original Draft Preparation, C.H., and S.W.; Writing—Review & Editing, R.W. and H.D.; Project Administration, H.L. and Z.L.; Funding Acquisition, C.H.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgement

Not applicable.

Author details

¹Farm Animal Genetic Resources Exploration and Innovation Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province, Sichuan Agricultural University, Chengdu, Sichuan, 611130, P.R. China

²College of Life Science, Sichuan Agricultural University, Ya'an, Sichuan, 625014, P.R. China

References

1. Kawasaki T, Igarashi K, Koeda T, Sugimoto K, Nakagawa K, Hayashi S, et al. Rats Fed Fructose-Enriched Diets Have Characteristics of Nonalcoholic Hepatic Steatosis. *Journal of Nutrition*. 2009;139(11):2067-71.
2. Le MT, Frye RF, Rivard CJ, Cheng J, McFann KK, Segal MS, et al. Effects of high-fructose corn syrup and sucrose on the pharmacokinetics of fructose and acute metabolic and hemodynamic responses in healthy subjects. *Metabolism-Clinical and Experimental*. 2012;61(5):641-51.
3. Sevastianova K, Santos A, Kotronen A, Hakkarainen A, Makkonen J, Silander K, et al. Effect of short-term carbohydrate overfeeding and long-term weight loss on liver fat in overweight humans. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2012;96(4):727-34.
4. Basaranoglu M, Basaranoglu G, Bugianesi E. Carbohydrate intake and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: fructose as a weapon of mass destruction. *Hepatobiliary Surgery and Nutrition*. 2015;4(2):109-16.
5. Ameer F, Scandiuzzi L, Hasnain S, Kalbacher H, Zaidi N. De nova lipogenesis in health and disease. *Metabolism-Clinical and Experimental*. 2014;63(7):895-902.
6. Chung M, Ma J, Patel K, Berger S, Lau J, Lichtenstein AH. Fructose, high-fructose corn syrup, sucrose, and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease or indexes of liver health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2014;100(3):833-49.
7. Ferramosca A, Conte A, Damiano F, Siculella L, Zara V. Differential effects of high-carbohydrate and high-fat diets on hepatic lipogenesis in rats. *European Journal of Nutrition*. 2014;53(4):1103-14.
8. Montgomery MK, Fiveash CE, Braude JP, Osborne B, Brown SHJ, Mitchell TW, et al. Disparate metabolic response to fructose feeding between different mouse strains. *Scientific Reports*. 2015;5.
9. Neuschwander-Tetri BA. Carbohydrate intake and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Current Opinion in Clinical Nutrition and Metabolic Care*. 2013;16(4):446-52.
10. Vos MB, Lavine JE. Dietary fructose in nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*. 2013;57(6):2525-31.
11. Todoric J, Di Caro G, Reibe S, Henstridge DC, Green CR, Vrbancic A, et al. Fructose stimulated de novo lipogenesis is promoted by inflammation. *Nature Metabolism*. 2020;2(10):1034-+.

12. Eugenia D'Alessandro M, Eugenia Oliva M, Alejandra Fortino M, Chicco A. Maternal sucrose-rich diet and fetal programming: changes in hepatic lipogenic and oxidative enzymes and glucose homeostasis in adult offspring. *Food & Function*. 2014;5(3):446-53.
13. Liu L, Zhao X, Wang Q, Sun XX, Xia LL, Wang QQ, et al. Prosteatotic and Protective Components in a Unique Model of Fatty Liver: Gut Microbiota and Suppressed Complement System. *Scientific Reports*. 2016;6.
14. Xu L, Duanmu Y, Blake GM, Zhang C, Zhang Y, Brown K, et al. Validation of goose liver fat measurement by QCT and CSE-MRI with biochemical extraction and pathology as reference. *European Radiology*. 2018;28(5):2003-12.
15. Seglen PO. Preparation of isolated rat liver cells. *Methods in cell biology*. 1976;13:29-83.
16. Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the 2⁻(Delta Delta C(T)) Method. *Methods (San Diego, Calif)*. 2001;25(4):402-8.
17. Wei RX, Song Q, Hu SQ, Xu HY, Liu HH, Kang B, et al. Overfeeding in fluence on antioxidant capacity of serum, liver, gut, and breast muscle in Gang Goose and Tianfu Meat Goose. *Journal of Applied Poultry Research*. 2020;29(2):455-64.
18. Cao W, Liu G, Fang T, Wu X, Jia G, Zhao H, et al. Effects of spermine on the morphology, digestive enzyme activities, and antioxidant status of jejunum in suckling rats. *Rsc Advances*. 2015;5(93):76607-14.
19. Su S, Wang Y, Chen C, Suh M, Azain M, Kim WK. Fatty Acid Composition and Regulatory Gene Expression in Late-Term Embryos of ACRB and COBB Broilers. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*. 2020;7.
20. Wei R, Han C, Deng D, Ye F, Gan X, Liu H, et al. Research progress into the physiological changes in metabolic pathways in waterfowl with hepatic steatosis. *Br Poult Sci*. 2020:1-7.
21. Wang L, Waltenberger B, Pferschy-Wenzig E-M, Blunder M, Liu X, Malainer C, et al. Natural product agonists of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma (PPAR-gamma): a review. *Biochemical Pharmacology*. 2014;92(1):73-89.
22. Liu Y, Wang J, Luo S, Zhan Y, Lu Q. The roles of PPAR gamma and its agonists in autoimmune diseases: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Autoimmunity*. 2020;113.
23. Xu H, Diolintzi A, Storch J. Fatty acid-binding proteins: functional understanding and diagnostic implications. *Current Opinion in Clinical Nutrition and Metabolic Care*. 2019;22(6):407-12.
24. Ho SSC, Keenan JI, Day AS. The Role of Gastrointestinal-Related Fatty Acid-Binding Proteins as Biomarkers in Gastrointestinal Diseases. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*. 2020;65(2):376-90.
25. Campbell GJ, Hands EL, Van de Pette M. The Role of CDKs and CDKIs in Murine Development. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*. 2020;21(15).
26. Winston N. Regulation of early embryo development: functional redundancy between cyclin subtypes. *Reproduction, fertility, and development*. 2001;13(1):59-67.

27. Rao CV, Yamada HY, Yao Y, Dai W. Enhanced genomic instabilities caused by deregulated microtubule dynamics and chromosome segregation: a perspective from genetic studies in mice. *Carcinogenesis*. 2009;30(9):1469-74.
28. Pereira C, Smolka MB, Weiss RS, Brieno-Enriquez MA. ATR signaling in mammalian meiosis: From upstream scaffolds to downstream signaling. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*. 2020;61(7):752-66.
29. Han C, Wei S, Song Q, He F, Xiong X, Wan H, et al. Insulin Stimulates Goose Liver Cell Growth by Activating PI3K-AKT-mTOR Signal Pathway. *Cellular Physiology and Biochemistry*. 2016;38(2):558-70.
30. Wei S, Han C, He F, Song Q, Kang B, Liu H, et al. Inhibition of PI3K-Akt-mTOR signal pathway dismissed the stimulation of glucose on goose liver cell growth. *Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition*. 2017;101(5):e133-e43.
31. Cani PD, Amar J, Iglesias MA, Poggi M, Knauf C, Bastelica D, et al. Metabolic endotoxemia initiates obesity and insulin resistance. *Diabetes*. 2007;56(7):1761-72.
32. Cecilia Castro M, Laura Massa M, Gonzalez Arbelaez L, Schinella G, Gagliardino JJ, Francini F. Fructose-induced inflammation, insulin resistance and oxidative stress: A liver pathological triad effectively disrupted by lipoic acid. *Life Sciences*. 2015;137:1-6.
33. Lin W-T, Chan T-F, Huang H-L, Lee C-Y, Tsai S, Wu P-W, et al. Fructose-Rich Beverage Intake and Central Adiposity, Uric Acid, and Pediatric Insulin Resistance. *Journal of Pediatrics*. 2016;171:90+.
34. Song G-Y, Ren L-P, Chen S-C, Wang C, Liu N, Wei L-M, et al. Similar changes in muscle lipid metabolism are induced by chronic high-fructose feeding and high-fat feeding in C57BL/J6 mice. *Clinical and Experimental Pharmacology and Physiology*. 2012;39(12):1011-8.
35. Geng T, Xia L, Li F, Xia J, Zhang Y, Wang Q, et al. The role of endoplasmic reticulum stress and insulin resistance in the occurrence of goose fatty liver. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*. 2015;465(1):83-7.
36. Wei Y, Wang D, Topczewski F, Pagliassotti MJ. Fructose-mediated stress signaling in the liver: implications for hepatic insulin resistance. *Journal of Nutritional Biochemistry*. 2007;18(1):1-9.
37. Siddiqui RA, Xu Z, Harvey KA, Pavlina TM, Becker MJ, Zaloga GP. Comparative study of the modulation of fructose/sucrose-induced hepatic steatosis by mixed lipid formulations varying in unsaturated fatty acid content. *Nutrition & Metabolism*. 2015;12.
38. Pickens MK, Ogata H, Soon RK, Grenert JP, Maher JJ. Dietary fructose exacerbates hepatocellular injury when incorporated into a methionine-choline-deficient diet. *Liver International*. 2010;30(8):1229-39.
39. Roncal-Jimenez CA, Lanaspá MA, Rivard CJ, Nakagawa T, Gabriela Sanchez-Lozada L, Jalal D, et al. Sucrose induces fatty liver and pancreatic inflammation in male breeder rats independent of excess energy intake. *Metabolism-Clinical and Experimental*. 2011;60(9):1259-70.
40. Undamatla R, Edmunds LR, Xie B, Mills A, Sipula IJ, Monga SP, et al. Reduced Hepatic Expression of the Mitochondrial Quality Control Factor PARKIN Hastens the Progression of NAFLD in Mice and Is

- Associated with NASH in Patients. *Diabetes*. 2020;69.
41. Zhou C, Wang P, Lei L, Huang Y, Wu Y. Overexpression of miR-142-5p inhibits the progression of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis by targeting TSLP and inhibiting JAK-STAT signaling pathway. *Aging-U.S.* 2020;12(10):9066-84.
 42. Durgappa M, Saraswat V, Pande G, Mohindra S, Bhadauria AS, Butala SP. Slow continuous infusion of diuretic, albumin and/or terlipressin in patients with severe alcoholic hepatitis and acute on chronic liver failure. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*. 2019;34:424-.
 43. Wang C, Jiang L, Wang S, Shi H, Wang J, Wang R, et al. The Antitumor Activity of the Novel Compound Jesridonin on Human Esophageal Carcinoma Cells. *Plos One*. 2015;10(6).
 44. Geng TY, Yang B, Li FY, Xia LL, Wang QQ, Zhao X, et al. Identification of protective components that prevent the exacerbation of goose fatty liver: Characterization, expression and regulation of adiponectin receptors. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology B-Biochemistry & Molecular Biology*. 2016;194:32-8.
 45. Schwartz EA, Zhang W-Y, Karnik SK, Borwege S, Anand VR, Laine PS, et al. Nutrient Modification of the Innate Immune Response A Novel Mechanism by Which Saturated Fatty Acids Greatly Amplify Monocyte Inflammation. *Arteriosclerosis Thrombosis and Vascular Biology*. 2010;30(4):802-U372.
 46. Tang JW, Lu MX, Fang QQ, Lu FZ, Shao RY, Shen JD, et al. Effects of hydrated sodium calcium aluminosilicate on growth performance, fatty liver, intestine morphology, and serum parameters of overfed geese. *Animal Production Science*. 2018;58(10):1876-84.
 47. Allard JP, Aghdassi E, Mohammed S, Raman M, Avand G, Arendt BM, et al. Nutritional assessment and hepatic fatty acid composition in non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD): A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Hepatology*. 2008;48(2):300-7.
 48. Molette C, Berzaghi P, Zotte AD, Remignon H, Babile R. The use of near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy in the prediction of the chemical composition of goose fatty liver. *Poultry science*. 2001;80(11):1625-9.
 49. Geng TY, Zhao X, Xia LL, Liu L, Li FY, Yang B, et al. Supplementing dietary sugar promotes endoplasmic reticulum stress-independent insulin resistance and fatty liver in goose. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*. 2016;476(4):665-9.

Tables

Table 1 Diet formula for overfeeding

	Corn group	overfeeding	Glucose overfeeding group	Fructose overfeeding group	Sucrose overfeeding group
Corn flour (%)	97		87	87	87
Glucose (%)			10		
Fructose (%)				10	
Sucrose (%)					10
Salt (%)	1.5		1.5	1.5	1.5
Muti-vitamin (%)	1.5		1.5	1.5	1.5

Table 2. The effects of different sugars on serum biochemical indexes in overfed geese

Items	Control group	Corn Overfeeding group	Glucose overfeeding group	Fructose overfeeding group	Sucrose overfeeding group
TG (mmol/L)	2.69±0.53 ^c	4.07±0.82 ^b	5.66±1.66 ^a	5.48±0.46 ^a	5.84±1.13 ^a
T-CHO (mmol/L)	11.94±3.97 ^b	27.28±6.18 ^a	31±8.38 ^a	33.58±8.61 ^a	31.74±5.96 ^a
VHDL (mmol/L)	8.42±1.57 ^b	15.4±2.25 ^a	15.68±4.84 ^a	17.2±6.43 ^a	17.82±4.32 ^a
VLDL (mmol/L)	1.53±0.66 ^b	2.72±1.15 ^{ab}	4.39±2.49 ^a	5.12±2.94 ^a	5.01±1.3 ^a
Glucose (mmol/L)	8.43±1.08 ^a	5.25±0.96 ^c	6.51±1.22 ^{bc}	6.39±0.93 ^{bc}	7.05±0.82 ^b
Insulin (μIU/L)	72.49±19.85	62.18±18.81	55.69±14.98	68.92±24.22	68.47±12.57
ALT (U/gprot)	37.87±22.81 ^b	44.95±22.03 ^{ab}	41.89±20.53 ^{ab}	70.79±27.39 ^a	35.71±7.78 ^b
AST (U/gprot)	61.27±15.65	45.9±13.41	44.43±29.07	69.56±23.47	52.88±22.04
TP (μg/ML)	2329.02 ±155.03 ^b	2216.56 ±163.84 ^b	3142.46 ±79.27 ^a	3095.03 ±118.44 ^a	2947.62 ±230.25 ^a
ALB (μg/ML)	20.57±3.79 ^b	22.22±5.86 ^b	21.67±6.64 ^b	24.86±3.57 ^{ab}	29.21±5.37 ^a
UA (μmol/L)	235.97±68.19 ^b	465.93±171.07 ^{ab}	668.18±281.09 ^a	678.67±375.96 ^a	570.8±114.43 ^a

Notes: TP = total protein, T-CHO = total cholesterol, ALB = albumin, VLDL = very low-density lipoprotein, VHDL = very high-density lipoprotein, TG = triglyceride, insulin, ALT = alanine aminotransferase, AST = aspartate aminotransferase, UA = uric acid. The data in the table is expressed as mean ± SD (n=10): the same letter between each line of data indicates that the difference is not significant ($P > 0.05$), the letter between each line of data is different, indicating that the difference is significant ($P < 0.05$).

Figures




Figure 1

Effect of different types of sugar (glucose, fructose and sucrose) on lipid metabolism in goose primary hepatocytes. a. Relative mRNA level of ACC α , SREBP-1 and FAS, which is related to lipogenesis. b. Relative mRNA level of ACOX1, PPAR α , PPAR γ and CPT1, which is related to fatty acid oxidation. c. Relative mRNA level of DGAT1, DGAT2, ApoB and MTP, which is related to lipids transportation. d. Protein content of FAS, ACC α , ApoB and CPT1 (unit of FAS is nmol/ml; unit of ACC α is ng/ml; unit of CPT1 is ng/ml; unit of ACC α is pmol/l; unit of ApoB is nmol/ml). e. intracellular and extracellular VLDL concentrations. f. Intracellular and extracellular T-CHO concentrations. g. Intracellular and extracellular TG concentrations. h. Intracellular lipid contents. Values are means \pm SD (n=3). Different lowercase letters in the same set indicate difference among treatments at P < 0.05. G30, F30 and S30 represents the goose primary hepatocytes were treated with 30mmol/L glucose, 30mmol/L fructose and 30mmol/L sucrose, respectively. The numbers "1, 2, 3, 4" under the blot indicates the treatment of control, 30mmol/L glucose, 30mmol/L fructose and 30mmol/L sucrose, respectively. VLDL = very low-density lipoprotein; TG = triglyceride; FAS = fatty acid synthetase; SREBP-1 = sterol regulatory element-binding proteins-1; ACC α = acetyl-CoA carboxylase; CPT1 = carnitine palmitoyltransferase; ACOX1 = acyl-CoA oxidase 1; PPAR α = peroxisome proliferators-activated receptor- α ; PPAR γ = peroxisome proliferators-activated receptor- γ ;

ApoB = apolipoprotein B; MTP = microsomal triglyceride transfer protein; DGAT1 = diacylglycerol acyltransferase-1; DGAT2 = diacylglycerol acyltransferase-2.




Figure 2

Effect of different types of sugar (glucose, fructose and sucrose) on foie gras performance in overfed goose. a. Comparison of slaughter performance (n=20). b. Comparison of livers and liver tissue sections. (liver tissue sections: (HE staining, 200×) (n=3). Values are means ± SD. Different lowercase letters in the same set indicate difference among treatments at P < 0.05. BW1 = Body weight before overfeeding; BW2 = Body weight after overfeeding; Liver/ Body = The ratio of liver weight to body weight after overfeeding; Liver/Feed = The ratio of liver weight to overfed diet consumption.




Figure 3

Effect of different types of sugar (glucose, fructose and sucrose) on fatty acid composition(n=6). a. Comparison of fatty acid composition. b. Statistical result of fatty acid content (unit of SFA, MUFA and PUFA is “g/100g”). Values are means \pm SD. Different lowercase letters in the same set indicate difference among treatments at $P < 0.05$. SFA = Saturated fatty acid; MUFA = monounsaturated fatty acid; PUFA = Poly-unsaturated fatty acid.




Figure 4

mRNA transcriptome analysis of differentially expressed genes (DEGs) in goose fatty liver induced by different types of sugar (glucose, fructose and sucrose). (n=3). a. Heatmap analysis of DEGs. $P < 0.05$, $\log_2(\text{fold change}) > 1$. b. Number of DEGs. c. Venn diagram of the DEGs. C1-C3: control group; G1-G3: glucose overfeeding group; F1-F3: fructose overfeeding group; S1-S3: sucrose overfeeding group.




Figure 5

Gene ontology classifications and KEGG enrichment pathways (n=3). a. control group vs corn overfeeding group. b. control group vs glucose overfeeding group. c. control group vs fructose overfeeding group. d. control group vs sucrose overfeeding group. The ordinate represents the path name and the abscissa is the enrichment factor. The higher the enrichment factor, the more significant the enrichment level of differentially expressed genes in this pathway. The color of the circle represents qvalue, and the smaller qvalue is, the more reliable the enrichment significance of differentially expressed genes in this pathway is. The size of the circle indicates the number of genes enriched in the pathway. The larger the circle, the more genes there are.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [SupplementMaterial.docx](#)