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Ghrelin Serum Concentrations Are Associated with Treatment Response During Lithium Augmentation of Antidepressants
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Abstract

Background: Lithium augmentation of antidepressants is an effective strategy in treatment-resistant depression. The proteohormone ghrelin is thought to be involved in the pathophysiology of depression. The purpose of this study was to investigate the association of treatment response with the course of ghrelin levels during lithium augmentation.
**Method:** Ghrelin serum concentrations and severity of depression were measured in 85 acute depressive patients before and after 4 weeks of lithium augmentation.

**Results:** In a linear mixed model analysis, we found a significant effect of response*time interaction ($F_{1.81} = 9.48; P = .0028$): under treatment, ghrelin levels increased in nonresponders and slightly decreased in responders to lithium augmentation. The covariate female gender had a significant positive effect ($F_{1.83} = 4.69; P = .033$), whereas time, response, appetite, and body mass index ($kg/m^2$) did not show any significant effect on ghrelin levels ($P > .05$).

**Conclusion:** This is the first study showing that the course of ghrelin levels separates responders and nonresponders to lithium augmentation. Present results support the hypothesis that ghrelin serum concentrations might be involved in response to pharmacological treatment of depression.

**Keywords:** ghrelin, lithium augmentation, response, depression, therapy resistant depression.
as a result of the linear mixed model analysis. These estimates describe the influence of the respective patient characteristics on ghrelin levels. The result of the linear mixed model analysis is the main result of the study. For \( n = 85 \) patients, 169 observations of ghrelin levels were used for linear mixed model analysis (a baseline measurement for 1 patient was missing). A significant effect on ghrelin levels was found for response*time interaction (\( F_{1.81} = 9.48; P = .0028 \)) and gender (\( F_{1.83} = 4.69; P = .033 \)). In this model, BMI (\( F_{1.91} = 0.22; P = .64 \)), response (\( F_{1.84} = 0.14; P = .71 \)), appetite (\( F_{1.113} = 0.95; P = .33 \)), and time (equal to “treatment effect of LA”; \( F_{1.83} = 1.58; P = .21 \)) did not show a significant effect on ghrelin levels. The main finding of the study (significant response*time interaction) is demonstrated in Figure 1 by the crossed regression graphs. In this analysis, the estimated ghrelin levels do not differ significantly between responders and nonresponders at baseline and after LA (overlapping 95% CI).

The estimated ghrelin levels at baseline were 4.51 ng/mL (95% CI: 2.61–6.41; \( P < .0001 \)) in nonresponders and 6.45 ng/mL (95% CI: 4.30–8.61; \( P < .0001 \)) in responders. The estimated ghrelin levels at endpoint were 6.53 ng/mL (95% CI: 4.65–8.41; \( P < .0001 \)) in nonresponders and 5.62 ng/mL (95% CI: 3.41–7.83; \( P < .0001 \)) in responders (Figure 1). The estimated ghrelin levels in men were 3.01 ng/mL lower compared with women (95% CI: -5.77 to 0.25; \( P = .033 \)).

Discussion

This is the first study investigating the course of ghrelin serum levels and the effect of treatment response on ghrelin levels during LA in patients with MDD. We found that during LA,
ghrelin levels increase in nonresponders and slightly decrease in responders.

Our findings are in line with a study that found higher ghrelin serum levels in nonresponders with MDD to antidepressant treatment when compared with responders and normal controls (Ishitobi et al., 2012). These findings strengthen evidence that ghrelin might separate subgroups of depressive patients that respond to pharmacological treatment of depression. As depression-related stress continues in nonresponders but not (or less severely) in responders, our results are in line with studies reporting a stress-dependent increase in ghrelin levels (Rouach et al., 2007) and higher ghrelin serum levels in depressed individuals compared with healthy controls (Gecici et al., 2005).

The observed gender effect in our study is in line with previous studies reporting higher ghrelin levels in females than males in both healthy subjects (Chan et al., 2004) and depressed patients (Kluge et al., 2009).

Our finding of an increase of ghrelin levels in nonresponders and a decrease in responders is in line with a preclinical study that reported an antidepressant-like effect following inhibition of ghrelin secretion after central or peripheral injection of ghrelin antisense DNA in rats (Kanehisa et al., 2006), suggesting a depressiogenic effect of ghrelin. A depressiogenic effect of ghrelin might theoretically be explained by the suppressive effect of ghrelin on serotonin release as well as its stimulatory action on HPA axis (Kluge et al., 2007). On the other hand, the majority of data, in particular from animal studies, revealed contrasting results (reviewed in Spencer et al., 2015; Wittekind and Kluge, 2015) and reported antidepressive and anxiolytic effects of ghrelin infusion (Lutter et al., 2008; Carlini et al., 2012), which might theoretically be explained by a stimulating effect of ghrelin on noradrenaline neurotransmission (Date et al., 2006) or via inhibition of glycogen-synthase-kinase 3 beta (Zhang et al., 2013). In this context, the ghrelin upregulation in nonresponders observed in our study could also be interpreted as an intrinsic or pharmacologically induced attempt to counteract depressive symptomatology. However, in a small sample, ghrelin infusion in patients with depression did not have a significant effect on depressive symptoms (Kluge et al., 2011). It is important to note that studies on the effect of ghrelin application have investigated short-term effects (15 minutes until a few days) after short-term application, whereas our study investigated long-term effects (4 weeks) after long-term application; thus, comparability of study results is limited.

Another explanation for the increase of ghrelin levels in nonresponders and the decrease in responders could be that we “only” observe secondary effects of depressive symptomatology and successful antidepressant treatment with LA: one of the main symptoms of MDD is reduced appetite and consequently reduced food intake. Starvation is known to be a strong cue for ghrelin release, which could contribute to the observed ghrelin increase in nonresponders. Responders start to eat normally because of the relief of depressive symptomatology, which consecutively results in a decrease of ghrelin levels. Noteworthy, the result of our analysis is corrected for the effect of appetite on ghrelin levels, and we did not find a significant effect of response on BMI, which therefore does not support this hypothesis. Furthermore, other studies rather report lower (Barim et al., 2009) or unchanged (Kluge et al., 2009) ghrelin serum levels in depressed subjects compared with healthy controls. However, in our study, we did not find a correlation between severity of depression and ghrelin serum levels (data not shown). In summary, the course of ghrelin levels observed in our study could be interpreted in the context of either an antidepressive or a depressiogenic effect of ghrelin or rather reflect a secondary effect of depressive symptomatology, that is, reduced appetite and food intake.

Lithium has well-known neuroprotective effects (Bauer et al., 2014) and acts as a glycogen-synthase-kinase 3 beta inhibitor (Joje and Bijur, 2002). Interestingly, preclinical studies suggest that ghrelin can function as a neuroprotective agent that inhibits apoptotic pathways (Zhang, 2013) and that inactivation of GSK-3B contributes to the antiapoptotic effects of ghrelin. In the current analysis, we found ghrelin influenced by LA. In previously published analyses, we found that serum levels of brain-derived neurotrophic factor (Ricken et al., 2013) and fibroblast growth factor 23 (Fakhri et al., 2014), both discussed in the

![Figure 1. Course of ghrelin levels in responders and nonresponders adjusted for gender and BMI: ghrelin increases in nonresponders and decreases slightly in responders to lithium augmentation. Ghrelin serum levels are presented as estimated means in ng/mL.](https://academic.oup.com/ijnp/article-abstract/20/9/692/2632170)
context of neuroprotection, increased during LA. Therefore, one might speculate that ghrelin, brain-derived neurotrophic factor, and fibroblast growth factor 23 signalling are potentially involved in the neuroprotective action of lithium.

Previous studies investigating ghrelin levels during antidepressant treatment found an increase of serum ghrelin levels during treatment with maprotiline (Pinar et al., 2008) and amitryptiline (Huang et al., 2013), while a decrease in ghrelin serum levels was reported during treatment with citalopram (Barim et al., 2009) and mirtazapine (Schmid et al., 2006), electroconvulsive therapy (Kurt et al., 2007), or various antidepressive treatment strategies (Nakashima et al., 2014). These heterogeneous findings could be due to different treatment strategies, small sample sizes, and different response rates. Limitations of these previous studies are small sample sizes and that ghrelin levels were not available together with longitudinally assessed clinical response data. The main strengths of our study are the relatively large sample size and the prospective study design. Our study extends existing data by providing (1) the first investigation of ghrelin serum levels during lithium treatment and (2) the first longitudinal investigation of the effect of treatment response on the course of ghrelin levels in patients with MDD.

Limitations of our study include the lack of a control group and a heterogeneous psychopharmacological comedication. We therefore cannot say if the observed changes in ghrelin levels are a lithium-specific effect. However, psychopharmacological comedication was stable during and before LA, and we did not find significant differences in this medication between responders and nonresponders, so that the influence of this confounding variable is limited. Also, we measured nonfasting ghrelin levels that were not taken after a standard meal and we did not obtain information on the time of the day when the blood samples were taken. Ghrelin levels strongly depend on food intake, appetite, and the anticipation of food, and its secretion has a circadian rhythm (Kiraz and Zieba, 2011) that increases variation of ghrelin levels. Nevertheless, we think that the large sample size could sufficiently compensate this confounder. Furthermore, we only have a pre- and postmeasurement of ghrelin levels, so we cannot distinguish between cause and effect (i.e., do ghrelin levels influence treatment response or does treatment response influence ghrelin levels?). To investigate this, a series of ghrelin and psychometric measurements with shorter time intervals is recommended for future studies.

In conclusion, the present results support the hypothesis that ghrelin serum concentrations might be involved in the response to pharmacological treatment of depression. Based on our data, one might speculate that an increase of the ghrelin serum concentration might be an indicator of nonresponse to LA in patients suffering from treatment-resistant depression. Further studies are needed to separate specific effects of different antidepressants on ghrelin concentration but also to address ghrelin downstream mechanisms.
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