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# Abstract

Growth differentiation factor-15 (Gdf15) is known to increase in circulation during pregnancy and has been implicated in food intake, and weight loss, complications of pregnancy, and dysmetabolism. We used a *Gdf15* knockout mouse model to assess the role of *Gdf15*  in body weight regulation and food intake during pregnancy. We found that *Gdf15-/-*dams ate a similar amount of food and gained similar amounts of weight during the course of pregnancy as their *Gdf15+/+* counterparts. Insulin sensitivity on gestational day 16.5 was also comparable between dams. In the postnatal period, pups were of similar birthweight, litter size, and has similar survival rates in both genotypes. There were also no detectable differences in milk volume production, milk fat percentage, or in offspring postnatal body weights until day 14.5 of life. These data suggest that elimination of Gdf15 is inessential for differences in food intake, weight gain, and dysmetabolism during pregnancy in a mouse model. Further research is warranted to evaluate the role of Gdf15 in pregnancy, outside of its role in body weight and food intake regulation.

# Introduction

Growth-like differentiation factor-15 (Gdf15), a Transforming Growth Factor-ß superfamily member, placental derived growth factor, and cytokine, was discovered in 1997 and dubbed macrophage-inhibiting cytokine-1 (MIC-1) (Bootcov et al., 1997). Circulating levels of Gdf15 in adults vary based on sex, age, disease status, and physiological state. In a large sample from Scotland, they found that levels of Gdf15 increase with age in both men and women and tended to be higher in those who had cardiovascular disease, cancer, or diabetes (Welsh et al., 2022). GDF15 is known to increase in response to many stressors including as cardiac injury (Kempf et al., 2006), cachexia of cancer (Suriben et al., 2020), mitochondrial stress (Ost et al., 2020), intense exercise (Klein et al., 2021), and most relevant to this work, during pregnancy (Welsh et al., 2022).

Much preclinical work with knockout models have highlighted the role of *Gdf15* in body weight regulation (Hsu et al., 2017, p. 15), appetite, and emesis (Borner et al., 2020). These models show that physiological and pharmaceutical *Gdf15* levels acts through the GFRAL receptor found in the area postrema of the brain (Patel et al., 2019). Older evidence supported, genetic ablation of *Gdf15* in mice results in reduction of body weight, fat mass, food intake, and improvement in glucose tolerance (Macia et al., 2012). However, more recently, these effects aren’t as evident (CITE A BUNCH HERE). It is more common that for GDF15 to affect body weight and insulin sensitivity, supraphysiological levels must be administer in animal studies (CITE SHIT HERE). Furthermore, Antagonism of Gdf15 by blocking GFRAL has been shown to increase fat mass and inflammation in mice (Tsai et al., 2019). As such, evaluating *Gdf15* for its capacity to weight ameliorate metabolic illness is currently being explored.

During pregnancy GDF15 increases across gestation and reaches its highest levels during the third trimester of pregnancy (Moore et al., 2000). It is heavily expressed in the placental trophoblasts, and secreted into parental circulation, and is also present in the amniotic fluid (Moore et al., 2000). In spite of these pregnancy-related increases, the functional role of *Gdf15* in pregnancy is largely unknown. Lower levels of GDF15 during early pregnancy were present in patients who later suffered a miscarriage (Tong et al., 2004). Gdf15 levels may also be play a role in gestational weight gain, as greater levels were negatively associated with cumulative gestational weight gain (Wang et al., 2020). Different levels of GDF15 are secreted in concert with complications of pregnancy. In several cases, the epidemiological data is in conflict. For example, pre-eclampsia, a life-threatening complication involving critically high blood pressure and protein loss in urine, has been found to be associated with a reduction (Chen et al., 2016), an increase (Sugulle et al., 2009), and no changes (Marjono et al., 2003) in GDF15 in serum compared to non-preeclamptic, normotensive parents. Similarly, some studies find that GDF15 is higher in pregnancies complicated by GDM, while others find it is only significantly increased in pregnancies that are complicated by T1DM (Jacobsen et al., 2022). Other studies find that GDF15 is higher in those who have T2DM and are pregnant (Sugulle et al., 2009). Recent GWAS studies have indicated that GDF15 function in pregnant humans is causally related to risk of developing hyperemesis gravidarum, an extreme form of nausea and vomiting of pregnancy (Fejzo et al., 2018, 2019). This is supported by other studies that those with higher levels of GDF15 during pregnancy were associated with greater reports of pregnancy related vomiting and diagnosis of hyperemesis gravidarum (Fejzo et al., 2019; Petry et al., 2018). Finally, Petry and colleagues found pre-pregnancy BMI was inversely related to GDF15 levels during pregnancy (Petry et al., 2018). Given the sometimes-conflicting human data, we sought to understand more about the effects of Gdf15 loss of function during the course of pregnancy, including energy metabolism, insulin sensitivity, and neonatal outcomes.

# Materials and Methods:

## Animal Husbandry and Protocol

Animals were housed in a temperature and humidity-controlled facility with a 12-hour light:dark cycle, with lights on being zeitgeber time (ZT) 0 and lights off being ZT 12. Male and female *Gdf15* null animals were described in (Frikke-Schmidt et al., 2019). Null animals were generated using CRISPR Cas-9 deletion of Exon 2 of *Gdf15*. Exon 2 (translational start site), which we ablated, is present in every known *Gdf15* transcript.

We compared serum from the Gdf15 experiment to a separate study of insulin sensitivity during pregnancy in the mouse. Virgin female C57BL/6J (RRID: ) mice were ordered from Jackson Laboratory. They were allowed to acclimatize for two weeks to the same environment described in the Gdf15 experiment. Mice were randomized into 3 groups, non-pregnant females (n=7), pregnant females (n=7), and pregnant females exposed to dexamethasone in drinking water (n=7).

## Genotyping

At 14 days of age, a small section of the tail was collected and digested in 100uL of lysis buffer (10 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM EDTA, 0.1% SDS and 1 mg/ml proteinase K) at 55°C for 4 hours. Digested DNA sample was processed with DreamTaq Green to generate PCR product (ThermoFisher Scientific, Catalog #K1081). Genotyping by PCR was conducted with 2 forward and one reverse primer sets (forward 1: 5' GAT TCC CGC CCG AAT TAG C 3', forward 2: 5' CCG AAT TAG CCT GGT CAC CC 3', Reverse: 5’ ATC CGT CCT ACT CTG GCT AAG 3'). Initiation of PCR was at 95 °C for 3 minutes, followed by 38 cycles of denaturation (95°C for 30 seconds), annealing (60°C for 40 seconds), and elongation (72°C for 1 minute), and a final amplification step at 72°C for 5 minutes. PCR product resulted in 2 visible bands, one at 200bp *Gdf15-/-* and another at 600bp *Gdf15+/+.* Mice with both bands were considered *Gdf15+/-*. Dam genotype was secondarily confirmed via maternal serum ELISA.

## Mating

*Gdf15* is highly expressed in placental tissue during mouse pregnancy (REF). We chose to study *Gdf15+/+* mated pairs compared to *Gdf15-/-* pairs because comparing littermates of *Gdf15+/-* pairs would result in placental contributions to *Gdf15* in dam serum. Therefore, we combined homozygous genotype mating pairs, resulting in homogenous genotype progeny and placentae. Adult virgin female mice (GDF15-/-n=8, GDF15+/+n=6), between 45 and 119 (mean=82.4) days old, were singly housed with *ad libitum* access to water and a standard chow diet (CD, Picolab Laboratory Rodent diet 5L0D; 5% of Calories from fat, 24% from protein, 71% from carbohydrates). Once single-housed, weekly food intake and body weight measurements began and continued throughout the experiment. After one week of food and body weight monitoring, males of like-genotype for *Gdf15* were introduced into the dam’s cage. Males were allowed to remain in the breeding cage until a copulatory plug was discovered, indicating pregnancy (E0.5). Body weight and food intake measurements continued weekly through gestation and postnatal day 14.5. Their resultant offspring and their placentae were homozygous *Gdf15+/+ Gdf15-/-* and were studied until postnatal day 14 (PND14).

Mating for the comparator c57BL/6J dams were also occurred by adding the male to the dam’s cage and allowing them to remain until gestational day 19. All protocols were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the University of Michigan.

## Insulin tolerance test

On E16.5, dams underwent insulin tolerance testing (Bridges et al., 2022). Dams were placed in clean cage without access to food but with ad libitum access to water at ZT 2. Dams were fasted for 6 hours (ZT2-ZT8). Baseline blood glucose was assessed using a tail clip and a handheld glucometer (OneTouch Ultra). After initial blood glucose measurement, an intraperitoneal injection of insulin was administered (Humulin, u-100; 0.75U/kg lean mass). Blood glucose was measured in 15-minute intervals for 2 hours. Area under the curve was calculated by taking the sum of all glucose values for each animal and averaging by genotype. We then calculated the rate of initial drop in blood glucose after insulin administration. We limited data to the first 45 minutes after injection and modeling the exponential rate of decay in glucose for each animal as a slope. This rate was then averaged by genotype.

24 hours after ITT, we collected two fed blood samples: at ZT1 and ZT13. Dams were lightly anesthetized via inhaled isoflurane and whole blood was collected by retroorbital bleed in a heparinized capillary tube. Blood was allowed to clot on ice for 20 minutes then was spun down in a cold centrifuge (4°C, Eppendorf microcentrifuge, model 5415R) for 20 minutes at 2000 g. Serum was pipetted off after centrifugation and stored at -80°C until used for analysis.

*Serum Gdf15 Quantification*

Serum Gdf15 analysis was completed using maternal serum collected 24 hours after insulin tolerance tests on E16.5 in the Gdf15 and maternal comparator C57BL/6J studies. Gdf15 levels were determined via ELISA according to manufacturer guidelines (R&D system, catalog # MGD150).

## Offspring

Pups were counted and body weights were recorded within 24 hours of birth, postnatal day (PND 0.5). Latency to copulatory plug was defined as the number of days between the introduction of the male and appearance of a copulatory plug. Gestational age was determined as difference between birth dates and dates of appearance of copulatory plug. At PND 3.5, litter sizes were culled to 2 male and 2 female pups, to standardize amount of nutrition provided to each pup. Survival of pups to PND 3.5 was assessed by comparing the number of pups present at PND 3.5 to the number present on PND 0.5 and is expressed as a percentage. Body weight was assessed for each pup on PND 0.5, 3.5, 7.5, 10.5, and 14.5. Pups were euthanized by decapitation on the 2 hours before milk collection began (PND 14.5-17.5).

## Weigh-suckle-weigh, milk volume production

On postnatal day 10.5, we assessed milk volume production by the weigh-suckle-weigh method (Boston et al., 2001; Habbal et al., 2021). Dams were weighed using an analytical scale to the nearest 10 mg and placed in a clean cage with free access to food and water. Pups were then weighed in aggregate and placed in a clean cage on top of a heating pad without access to food or water. Dam and pups remained separated for 2 hours. After 2 hours, weight measurements were repeated, and pups were reintroduced to the dam’s cage where they remained for 1 hour. After one hour, the final weights were taken for both dams and pups in aggregate. Volume of milk produced is expressed the average weight lost by each dam after 1 hour of nursing divided by the number of pups in the litter.

## Milk collection

Milk collection took place on PND 14.5-17.5. Pups were separated from dams and sacrificed 2 hours before milk collection began. Dams were allowed to *ad libitum* access to food and water in a clean cage during that time. Dams were anesthetized with intramuscular injection of Ketamine/Xylazine (0.1275g/kg body weight) into forelimb muscle. Once the dam was fully anesthetized, an oxytocin injection (2U per dam) was given in the forelimb muscle to begin let-down. Milk was collected with a pipette after manually expressing milk from nipples and stored in a 1.5 mL Eppendorf tube. Following milk collection, dams were immediately euthanized via isoflurane inhalation and cervical dislocation.

## Milk fat percentage determination

Whole milk was collected from dams at Postnatal day 14.5-17.5 and was stored at -80° C until analyzed. Whole milk was thawed on wet ice then homogenized by pipetting up and down. Milk was then diluted in PBS+EDTA in a 1:3 ratio and mixed thoroughly by pipetting up and down.

Capillary tubes were filled with the diluted milk solution and one end was double-sealed with crit-o-seal. Sample tubes were spun in 8 consecutive 120-second cycles in a mini hematocrit spinner (Iris Sample Processing, StatSpin CritSpin M961-122). In the capillary after 16 total minutes of spinning, total fat and aqueous layers were visible. These layers were measured using a 150mm dial caliper (General Tools, 6” Dial Caliper). Percentage of milk fat was determined with based on total volume of diluted milk sample. Milk samples were analyzed in duplicate, or triplicate if milk fat percentage differed by more than 25% in the first two samples.

## Statistical Analyses

Data were analyzed in R Studio version 4.2.0 (R Core Team, 2021) and are presented as mean ± standard error. Longitudinal analyses, such as food intake, body composition, and insulin tolerance testing were assessed using linear mixed effects modeling using R package lme4 (Bates et al., 2015) with random slopes and intercepts for the dam and pup with respect to time and fixed effects of genotype, age, and sex. Models of offspring body weight were assessed using ANOVA where sex was used as a covariate in a non-interacting model. Pairwise values were assessed for normality by the Shapiro-Wilk test and equivalence of variance by Levene’s test. Variables that were not normally distributed or of equivalent variance underwent non-parametric testing via Mann-Whitney U test. Those that were normally distributed and of equivalent variance were assessed via Student’s *t*-test as noted in the figure legends. For this study, p-values <0.05 were considered statistically significant.

# Results

GDF15 is elevated during pregnancy in mice

Previous work has shown that pregnancy in mice results in insulin resistance (Ladyman et al., 2018; Musial et al., 2016). We tested this by comparing age-matched pregnant and non-pregnant females. We found that non-pregnant mice had greater reductions in blood glucose when we administered an insulin tolerance test compared to pregnant females(**Figure 1A**, p=0.23). There were no differences in their fasting blood glucose (**Figure 1B**, p=0.020), or area under the curve (**Figure 1C**, p=0.70). SOMETHING ABOUT BODY WEIGHTS. Previous work from our lab has demonstrated that administering the glucocorticoid, dexamethasone, in drinking water impairs insulin sensitivity (Gunder et al., 2020; Harvey et al., 2018). We wanted to test whether administering dexamethasone to dams in their drinking water worsened pre-existing insulin resistance of pregnancy. We did this by giving dexamethasone in drinking water from day of copulatory plug until delivery and comparing them to age-matched pregnant dams. We found that dexamethasone dams did not respond to insulin compared to pregnant dams with plain drinking water (**Figure 1D**, pdex\*time=0.0204). They also had 33% lower fasting blood glucose (**Figure 1E**, pdex=0.007), but similar area under the curve (**Figure 1F**, p=0.80). We were interested to see how pregnancy and dexamethasone administration in pregnancy related to GDF15 levels in these mice. We found that GDF15 is XX% elevated in pregnant animals compared to non-pregnant mice (**Figure 1G,** p=0.XXX), but was not increased by dexamethasone administration. This led us to desire to understand the role Gdf15 plays in pregnancy on insulin sensitivity and body weight regulation in mice.

To assess the role of *Gdf15* ablation in maternal food intake and body weight accretion during mouse pregnancy, we mated *Gdf15+/+* dams with *Gdf15+/+* males and compared them to *Gdf15-/-* mated pairs. Dam body weight and food intake were measured weekly, beginning one week before mating and continued until pups reached 14 days of age (PND14.5).

As measured by ELISA, Gdf15 levels in serum was reduced by 95.9% in *Gdf15-/-*dams (Supplementary **Figure 2**, p=0.001).

## Gdf15-/- dams have normal weight gain and modestly reduced food intake during pregnancy and lactation

*Gdf15-/-*dams consumed similar calories weekly compared to *Gdf15+/+* counterparts (**Figure 3A**, pgenotype=0.23). Both genotypes had a rapid increase in food intake in the final trimester of pregnancy, with a smaller increase in the knockout mice. Knockout mice had slightly elevated food intake in the postnatal period. Overall resulted in a 75 ±SE kcal lower cumulative food intake in *Gdf15-/-*dams during the course of pregnancy (pgenotype=0.031). Despite these modest differences in cumulative food intake, *Gdf15-/*- dams had similar body weights to wild-type dams (**Figure 3B**, pgenotype=0.47). *Gdf15-/-* dams were slightly larger than *Gdf15+/+* dams in the postnatal period, but this failed to reach statistical significance (pgenotype=0.20). During the postnatal period, despite having slightly higher body weights, *Gdf15-/-* dams consumed 1.13 kcal per day fewer than *Gdf15+/+* dams (pgenotype=0.79). This resulted in *Gdf15-/-* dams having cumulative postnatal food intake that was 101.12 kcals lower than *Gdf15+/+*dams (pgenotype=0.011). This suggests that *Gdf15* is not a major determinant of either body weight or food intake during first pregnancy in the mouse.

## Gdf15-/- dams have normal insulin tolerance during pregnancy

On Gestational day 16.5, we conducted an intraperitoneal insulin tolerance test to assess the effect of *Gdf15* ablation on maternal insulin sensitivity during pregnancy (**Figure 4A**). Fasting blood glucose was slightly but insignificantly lower in *Gdf15-/-* dams compared to *Gdf15+/+* dams (**Figure 4B**, pgenotype = 0.20). Overall, linear mixed effect modeling of the experiment revealed a significant and expected effect of time on blood glucose but no moderating effect of the genotype (pgenotype = 0.71). This was confirmed by evaluating total areas under the ITT curve, again showing similar responses (**Figure 4C**, p=0.74). Often the most informative insulin response is the initial rate of drop of blood glucose. The initial rate of glucose declines was 9.3% less in *Gdf15-/-* dams compared to *Gdf15+/+* dams, but did again not reach statistical significance (**Figure 4D**, p=0.082). These data suggest that ablation of *Gdf15* is not sufficient to effect insulin sensitivity in the pregnant mouse.

## Gdf15-/- dams have normal rates of pregnancy, gestational age, post-natal survival, and birth weight

To understand the role of *Gdf15* knockout on pregnancy and early post-partum outcomes in the pups, we calculated latency to plug, gestational age and measured litter size, birth weight, and 3-day survival in all mated dams. Pups from *Gdf15-/-* dams were 3.4% smaller than those from *Gdf15-/-* dams (**Figure 5C**, p=0.05). The latency to copulatory plug a measure of xxx was similar between genotypes, averaging 3 days (**Figure 5A**, p=0.74). Gestational age was similar between genotypes, averaging 20 days (**Figure 5B**, p=0.76). The total number of pups born in a litter was 27% greater in *Gdf15-/-* dams (1.6 pups greater on average) compared to *Gdf1+/+* dams (**Figure 5D**, p=0.15). When comparing litter size, counting only pups who were born alive, that difference was only 7.8% larger (**Figure 5E**, p=0.70, 0.46 pups greater on average). The total pups who were born alive that lived to postnatal day 3 was highly variable between genotypes, resulting in 8.3% dead for *Gdf15+/+* dams and 10% for *Gdf15-/-* dams which did not reach statistical significance (**Figure 5F**, p=0.99). Together these data show that aside from modest decreases in birthweights, *Gdf15-/-* mice are similarly fertile, and carry pregnancies to a similar effectiveness as their wild-type counterparts.

## Gdf15-/- dams have no differences in milk production or milkfat percentage

To determine the effect of *Gdf15* knockout during in pregnancy on lactation in the postnatal period, we conducted a milk volume assessment at postnatal day 10. We found no differences between *Gdf15+/+and Gdf15-/-* dams in the volume of milk produced at peak lactation. The amount of weight lost by dams after nursing (**Figure 6A**, p=0.7) or and weight gained by pups after nursing (**Figure 6B**, p=0.7) were similar between genotypes. Next, we evaluated whether the major macronutrient in milk, fat, was changed by *Gdf15* knockout. To do this, we took whole milk collected between PND 14-17 and evaluated milk fat percentage. We found that milk fat percentage was similar to *Gdf15+/+*milk (**Figure 6C**, p=0.93). Despite reductions in maternal levels of *Gdf15* in the *Gdf15-/-* dams during pregnancy, mammary gland development, and lactation there is no apparent impact lactational volume milk fat content.

## Gdf15-/- pups accrete body mass at similar rates compared to Gdf15+/+ pups

To assess the effect of Gdf15 knockout during pregnancy and lactation on early pup postnatal growth, we weighed male and female offspring of *Gdf15+/+* and *Gdf15-/-*dams on PND 0.5, 3.5, 7.5, and 14.5. We used linear mixed effect modeling which detected no differences in body weight between birth and 14 days of age in *Gdf15+/+* and *Gdf15-/-*pups (**Figure 7A**, pgenotype=0.81). There was also no statistically significant effect of sex on body weight from birth to PND 14.5 (psex=0.26). Therefore consistent with similar milk production and composition, we did not detect any effects of GDF15 ablation on perinatal growth.

# Discussion

GDF15 has recently been tied to several compilations of pregnancy. Pregnancy itself is an oft-underappreciated stressor on the human body, an effect that is consistent with elevations in GDF15. The goal of this study was to understand the role of GDF15 on gestational health.

To date there are very few studies that evaluate GDF15 in human pregnancy and its effect on weight. They found contradictory evidence; one study found no differences in circulating GDF15 between mothers with obesity and mothers of normal weight (Andersson-Hall et al., 2021) and another that found that GDF15 was negatively associated with total gestational weight gain (Wang et al., 2020).

The response of Gdf15 in mice during periods of positive calorie balance and weight gain has found no differences in GDF15 during shorter term challenges in mice, but finds that after long term exposure to high fat, high sucrose diet (8 weeks) Gdf15 levels rise concomitant with an induction of the ISR in peripheral tissues such as the liver, brown adipose, and gonadal white adipose tissue depots (Patel et al., 2019).

Previous work has seen that administration of GDF15 to mice results in reductions in food intake (Mullican et al., 2017; Patel et al., 2019). Furthermore, Day and colleagues found that eliminating GDF15 in mice results in ablation of the reduction of food intake with metformin treatment (Day et al., 2019). Therefore, we hypothesized that observing pregnancy in the mouse that lacked Gdf15 at both the maternal and feto-placental level would result in unrestrained food intake. Contrary to our expectations, we saw no significant effect on food intake during the course of pregnancy or lactation. This may be related to the fact that reduction of Gdf15 isn’t the directionality where Gdf15 signaling most contributes to body weight regulation. More significant findings with Gdf15 and body weight come from studies that deliver exogenous Gdf15 (Mullican et al., 2017; Patel et al., 2019) or induce a Gdf15 stress response (such as the use of metformin (Day et al., 2019)).

The lack of gestational outcome differences, although perhaps contrary to our prediction, is something that seems to be consistent in the literature. Previous reports of *Gdf15* null models haven’t noted differences in null mice during breeding or maintenance until they are used for experimental models (Frikke-Schmidt et al., 2019; Mullican et al., 2017; Patel et al., 2019).

The most compelling evidence for the role of Gdf15 during the perinatal period is that when human studies evaluate complications of pregnancy. The most consistent are those that study excessive vomiting and emesis in pregnancy, or hyperemesis gravidarum (HG). Those patients who had HG or had higher than expected levels of vomiting during their pregnancies were more likely to have elevated Gdf15 levels (Fejzo et al., 2019; Petry et al., 2018). A later study found that SNPs near GDF15 that were associated with loss of function were protective for HG (Fejzo et al., 2019). It should be noted that as mice do not exhibit emesis, any HG related phenotypes would not be expected. Because of these relationships, we expected *Gdf15-/-*dams to have greater food intake related to reduced aversion from circulating GDF15. However, this was not apparent in these data, which is more in line with the mouse literature.

Diabetes and glucose tolerance during pregnancy and the impact of GDF15 levels in humans is less clear. Some groups find that Gdf15 levels rise in mothers whose pregnancies are complicated by type 2 diabetes (Sugulle et al., 2009). Other groups find elevated Gdf15 in association with gestational diabetes, especially in the third trimester (Tong et al., 2004; Yakut et al., 2021). Still others looking at all types of diabetes during pregnancy found that GDF15 was only associated with type 1 diabetes (Andersson-Hall et al., 2021). Our findings must be interpreted carefully, as we did not evaluate diabetes in our model, but we found no detectable differences in insulin tolerance between *Gdf15-/-* and *Gdf15+/+* dams. This again may be because the strongest evidence of effect with Gdf15 appear to be in relation to overexpression or external administration, meaning ablation may be insufficient to affect maternal insulin sensitivity.

Lactation is another period of life that is critically understudied in the context of Gdf15 production. To our knowledge, no work has been done on the effect of Gdf15 ablation on lactation before our study commenced. In fact, only two studies that mention lactation to date in relation to Gdf15. One study found that overexpression of *Gdf15* in mice resulted in impaired lactation and poor pup survival in (Binder et al., 2016). The other found simply found that the mammary gland was a prominent place of Gdf15 production in their model (Böttner et al., 1999). We found that there was no difference in survival, milk volume production, or milk fat percentage when we modulated Gdf15 in pregnant dams.

Taken together, the lack of evidence of change for food intake, body weight, insulin sensitivity, and lactation in our Gdf15 null model suggests that there may be a threshold effect for Gdf15 during pregnancy. Only those studies that overexpress, deliver exogenous, or induce long-term highly disruptive stressors to their model show differences in GDF15 in relation to food intake and body weight. Therefore, it might be that ablation of GDF15 fails to reach the threshold of stressor to elicit an effect. Gdf15 may act as a less acute stressor during pregnancy and more as a long-term indicator or feto-placental implantation. This also could mean that Gdf15 imparts effects on other systems that have been reported, but that were not evaluated in our study, such as miscarriage and maternal blood pressure (Chen et al., 2016), immunity and inflammation (Wischhusen et al., 2020), tissue injury (Hsiao et al., 2000), or macronutrient preference (Frikke-Schmidt et al., 2019).

Although the model of this work was intentional, there are several limitations to our study. Murine pregnancy is not entirely comparable to human pregnancy. In that most human pregnancies are singleton and mice carry multiple fetuses at a time, the placental structure is also slightly different when compared with human pregnancy. The approach we took eliminated feto-placental contribution of GDF15 to maternal serum during pregnancy by the use of homozygous breeding. As a result, all knockout pups had knockout dams and sires, and all wild-type pups had wild-type dams and sires. Even though we did not detect any differences in offspring growth, the genotypes of these mice are not the same. A larger sample size would have conceivably facilitated more statistical power to detect differences in the outcomes evaluated. For example, via a reverse power analysis, we cannot rule out an effect size of <0.132g on maternal body weight gain during pregnancy but such a small effect would likely be physiologically insignificant. We also followed the pups for a relatively short period of time after birth. So, any effect that would have manifested after the second week of life could not be observed.

In contrast to the mixed human findings, this study had several strengths including strong environmental, genetic and experimental consistency. While dams and sires were homozygous, they were derived from heterozygous crosses to limit genetic drift. This is the first report of the loss of GDF15 or GFRAL in pregnancy and provides strong evidence for a lack of effect on body weight, food intake, or offspring health.

# Conclusion

Despite the well-known, multi-fold rise in GDF15during mouse and human pregnancy, we found no evidence that *Gdf15* ablation during mouse pregnancy and lactation causes metabolic, body weight, appetite, or lactational differences compared to *Gdf15+/+*counterpart dams. In the neonatal period, we did not observe any differences in survival, gestational age, litter size or birth weight between genotypes. Despite monitoring growth for 14 days after birth, there were no differences in body weight accretion in *Gdf15-/-* pups of either sex; indistinguishable from age-matched *Gdf15+/+* pups. More studies with larger sample sizes are needed to confirm these findings.
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