T Cells and Natural Killer Cells, but not B Cells or Antibodies, are Affected in Overweight and Obese Saudi Females

Sawsan Hassan Mahassni

Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Science, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

http://dx.doi.org/10.13005/bbra/2769

(Received: 11 August 2019; accepted: 28 September 2019)

Saudi Arabia has one of the highest adult overweight and obesity rates, especially in females, leading to increased mortality, morbidity, infections, and risk for many diseases. This study determined the counts and percents of lymphocyte subtypes (CD3, CD4, CD8, and CD16 +CD56 cells) and serum IgG, IgA, and IgM concentrations in blood samples collected from sixty-four Saudi female university employees with an age range of 24-52 years. There is only one other study on the counts/numbers of lymphocyte subtypes in overweight and obese Saudi females.Anthropometric measurements were used to categorize the subjects of groups according to the body mass index (BMI), waist-to-hip ratio (WHR), and waist circumference (WC). Results were all compared to the controls. Antibody concentrations were not significantly different. The CD3 and CD4 counts were significantly higher for the obese BMI group and the overweight and obese BMI, respectively. The high risk WHR group had a significantly lower CD3% and a significantly higher CD16 +CD56 count. The high risk WC group had significantly higher CD3 and CD4 counts and a significantly lower CD16 +CD56%. Thus, obesity leads to changes in the cellular adaptive and innate immune systems, while not affecting thehumoral adaptive immune system.

Keywords: Adaptive immunity, Antibodies, Innate immunity, Obesity, Overweight; Saudi females.

Obesity and overweight are considered major health problems in most countries of the world with developed and rich countries being affected more than poorer or underdeveloped countries. In addition, most countries are experiencing increasing rates of both overweight and obesity, with obesity being more widespread than underweight worldwide, with the exception of some African sub-Saharan and Asian countries¹. Overweight and obesity have been increasing in the Middle East forthe last few decades, possibly due tofactors linked to changing lifestyles and modernization. Rates for overweight and obesity among adults in Saudi Arabia are among thehighest in the Middle East². In Saudi Arabia, accordingto the Saudi Arabia profile published in 2016 by the World Health Organization (WHO)³, 69.2% of females and 67.5% of males are overweight whereas39.5% of femalesand 29.5 of males are obese. Obesity and overweight lead to increased morbidity and mortality, higher infection rates, worse symptoms for some diseases, and an increased risk for many diseases, such as cardiovascular diseases, dyslipidemia, diabetes,hypertension, metabolic syndrome, liver diseases, kidney diseases,osteoarthritis,many

*Corresponding author E-mail: sawsanmahassni@hotmail.com

This is an ⁽²⁾ Open Access article licensed under a Creative Commons license: Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY). Published by Oriental Scientific Publishing Company © 2019



types of cancers, and some psychiatric illnesses. In addition, obesity and overweight are linked to many disruptions of and effects on different systems in the body including the immune system⁴⁻⁹.

The most commonly used anthropometric adiposity measures are the body mass index (BMI), the waist-to-hip ratio(WHR), and the waist circumference (WC). They are simple ways that allow measurement of the level of overweight or obesity with simple readily available tools. In addition, they help to specifythe distribution of fat in the body, and thus enabling to determine the presence of upper body obesity, which is highly associated with visceral fat, or lower body obesity. Upper or central obesity, which is more common in men than women, is highly linked to many of the ill health and obesity-related diseases that are more prevalent in people with this body shape. On the other hand, lower body obesity, more prevalent in women and leads to the pear shape that is common in adult women, leads to lower morbidity and obesity-related diseases.

The determination of counts and percents of lymphocyte subsets in overweight and obese subjects helps to ascertain the state of the immune system in these individuals and the extent to which the immune system is affected by increased weight. Additionally, specific lymphocyte types indicate the type(s) of immunity that maybe affected by increased weight. Therefore, CD3 cells, or T lymphocytes, are concerned with cellular adaptive immunity with the CD4 subtype, mainly helper T cells, being involved in enhancing or helping the adaptive (acquired) immune system, while the CD8 subtype, whichare cytotoxic/suppressor cells, having roles in killing unwanted or infected cells, or suppressing an adaptive reaction. CD19, or B cells, are the major cells of the humoral adaptive immune system and the cells from which plasma cells mature and finally produce antibodies. Finally, CD16+CD56 cells, or natural killer (NK) cells, are important in the innate immune system. Thus, these cells give a good picture of the state of the immune system and may explain the altered immune response in subjects with unhealthy weight and their high incidence of diseases and mortality.

Most research studies on obesity and overweight in Saudi Arabia are epidemiological in nature. Studies⁴⁻⁸have been done on the effects of overweight and obesity on different health related parameters and cells of the immune system in Saudi females. Worldwide, studies⁹⁻¹⁵on the effects of overweight and obesity on the immune system and on specific types of lymphocytes are few and contradictory. After an extensive search in the internet, only one study⁴was foundon counts/percentages of lymphocyte subtypes in the circulation in overweight and obese Saudi adult females. Thus, the current study aimed to fill this knowledge gap by determining the counts and percents of immune system cells and the concentrations of antibodies in overweight and obese Saudi female university workers compared to healthy weight subjects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Subjects, anthropometric measurements, sample collection, and categorizations of subjects

Sixty-four randomly chosen Saudi female university employees, ages 24-52 years, were recruited from the King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. All subjects signed a consent form for participating in this study. None of the subjects were pregnant or menstruating at the time of blood sample collection;had any chronic diseases such as diabetes, high blood pressure, and heart diseases; nor on any medications.

Blood samples were collected from the subjects into sodium heparin vacutainer tubes for the determination ofthe types of lymphocyte subsets. In addition, blood samples were collected in plain vacutainer tubes for the determination of antibody concentrations. These tubes were centrifuged after clot formation and serum was subsequently collected. In addition, anthropometric measurements (weight, height, and waist and hips circumferences) were obtained at the same time of blood collection.

TheBMI cut off values for the BMI groups were: below 18.5 kg/m² for the underweight BMIgroup, 18.5-24.9kg/m² for the healthy BMIgroup, 25-29.9kg/m² for the overweight BMIgroup, and 30-39.9kg/m² for the obese BMIgroup. None of the subjects were morbidly obese. For the WHR groups, the low risk group subjectshad WHRs below or equal to 0.8, the moderate risk group was WHRs between 0.81 and 0.85, and finally the high risk group was subjects with a WHR above 0.85. WCs below 82.5 cm were in the WC low risk group, a WC between 82.5 and 88.9 cm was in the moderate risk group, and a WC above 88.9 cm was in the high risk group.

Determination of counts and percents of lymphocyte subsets

The counts and percents of the lymphocyte subsets were determined in whole blood using a BD FACSCanto II flow cytometer (Becton DickinsonCompany, CA, USA) using the BD Multitest 6-color TBNK reagent (BD Biosciences, CA, USA) for determining the CD markers on the surface of cells.

Determination of serum IgG, IgA, and IgM concentrations

Serum concentrations of IgG, IgA, and IgM antibodies were determined on a BN II system nephelometric analyzer (Siemens, Germany) using N antisera to human immunoglobulins (IgG, IgA, and IgM) (Siemens, Germany).

Statistical analysis

Statistical and analytical analyses of the results were done using the SPSS Statistics statistical program (version 20). To test for the presence of statistically signiûcant differences between the groups, the one-way ANOVA test was used for the normally distributed parameters while the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for the non-normally distributed parameters. For the post hoc tests, the LSD test was used for the normally distributed parameters and the Dunnett T3test was used for the non-normally distributed parameters. The resulting P values indicate whether the differences between the groups is considered significant (P < 0.05), highly significant (P < 0.01), or non-significant(P = 0.05).

RESULTS

Subjects and categorizations

The subjects' ages ranged from a minimum of 24 years to a maximum of 52 years. The 64 subjects had a mean age of 32.9 years and a standard deviation of 8.5 years. The weights of the subjects had a range of 39-103 kg and a mean of 64.9 kg with a standard deviation of 15.2 kg. The heights of the subjects ranged from 145.5 cm to 171 cm with a mean and standard deviation of 159.1 \pm 5.6 cm. Categorizing the subjects intothe BMI, WHR, and WCgroups (Table 1) led to most subjects being in the healthy BMI group and the low risk WHR and WC groups.

Counts and percents of lymphocyte subsets and antibody concentrations

For the BMI categorization, the mean CD3 and CD4 counts (Table 2) and mean CD8 percents (Table 3) were significantly different between the groups. As for the WHR groups, the mean CD16

Groups	Range	N	N% of total BMI**	Minimum (kg/m2)	Maximum	Mean	± SD
Underweight	< 18.5	7	10.9	15.4	18.4	16.7	1.3
Healthy	18.5-24.9	21	32.8	18.7	24.8	21.4	1.9
Overweight	25-29.9	18	28.1	25.1	29.6	27.4	1.4
Obese	30-39.9	18	28.1	30.0	37.6	32.2	2.1
Total		64	100.0	15.4	37.6	25.6	5.5
WHR**							
Low	d" 0.80	34	54.8	0.47	0.80	0.7	0.1
Moderate	0.81-0.85	12	19.4	0.81	0.85	0.8	0.0
High	> 0.85	16	25.8	0.86	1.21	0.9	0.1
Total		62	100.0	0.47	1.21	0.8	0.1
WC* (cm)							
Low	< 82.5	28	45.2	49.5	82.0	71.5	7.3
Moderate	82.5-88.9	13	21.0	82.5	88.0	85.3	2.0
High	> 88.9	21	33.9	89.0	116.0	98.3	7.5
Total		62	100.0	49.5	116.0	83.5	13.6

Table 1. Adiposity measures categorizations for the subjects

*ANOVA one-way test, **Kruskal-Wallis testN: Number of subjects

Image: Marrie from the f													
Its Group Mean \pm SD P value Group Walue Group Mean Inderweight 1.6908 0.7853 0.0235 Low 1.9135 0.5554 0.873 Low 1.7596 Healthy 1.7195 0.4636 Moderate 1.9656 0.7557 0.873 Low 1.7596 Obese 1.7195 0.4636 Moderate 1.9656 0.7557 High 2.1696 Obese 2.0143 0.4965 Moderate 1.1673 0.3363 0.954 Low 1.0642 Underweight 0.9391 0.5071 0.015° Low 1.1673 0.4193 Moderate 1.1663 Obese 1.2999 0.2949 Moderate 1.1673 0.4193 Moderate 1.1663 Underweight 0.7207 0.214 0.058 Low 1.0643 1.3127 Obese 1.22093 0.234 High 0.7031 Moderate 1.563 Underweight 0.7121			BMI				WHR				WC		
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	nts	Group	Mean	\pm SD	P value	Group	Mean	± SD	P value	Group	Mean	± SD	P value
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Underweight	1.6908	0.7853	0.023^{S}	Low	1.9135	0.5554	0.873	Low	1.7596	0.5608	0.046^{S}
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Healthy	1.7195	0.4636		Moderate	1.9656	0.7257		Moderate	1.9911	0.3980	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Overweight	2.0434	0.4965		High	2.0042	0.5537		High	2.1696	0.6413	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Obese	2.2172	0.5665									
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Underweight	0.9391	0.5071	0.015^{S}	Low	1.1573	0.3363	0.954	Low	1.0642	0.3529	0.042^{S}
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Healthy	1.0475	0.2854		Moderate	1.1673	0.4193		Moderate	1.1563	0.2854	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Overweight	1.2666	0.2968		High	1.1900	0.3294		High	1.3127	0.3333	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Obese	1.2999	0.2949									
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Underweight	0.7207	0.2714	0.066	Low	0.7121	0.2786	0.628	Low	0.6455	0.2685	0.120
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Healthy	0.6114	0.2328		Moderate	0.7081	0.3731		Moderate	0.7673	0.2173	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Overweight	0.7122	0.2353		High	0.7514	0.2395		High	0.7944	0.3286	
Underweight 0.0478 0.0430 0.394 Low 0.0468 0.0227 0.644 Low 0.0497 Healthy 0.0526 0.0190 Moderate 0.0519 0.0213 Moderate 0.0465 Overweight 0.0447 0.0191 High 0.0477 0.0275 High 0.0467 Obese 0.0457 0.0222 High 0.0477 0.0275 High 0.0467 Obese 0.0457 0.0222 0.1924 0.686 Low 0.2920 CD56** Underweight 0.3196 0.1924 0.686 Low 0.2920 CD56** Underweight 0.2723 0.1324 0.018* Low 0.2920 CD56** Underweight 0.2713 0.1275 Moderate 0.2338 0.1628 High 0.2920 Overweight 0.2911 0.1460 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2507		Obese	0.8524	0.3388									
Healthy 0.0526 0.0190 Moderate 0.0519 0.0213 Moderate 0.0455 Overweight 0.0447 0.0191 High 0.0477 0.0275 High 0.0467 Obese 0.0457 0.0222 High 0.0477 0.0275 High 0.0467 Obese 0.0457 0.0222 0.0222 High 0.0477 0.0275 CD56** Underweight 0.3196 0.1924 0.686 Low 0.2523 0.1324 0.018° Low 0.2920 Healthy 0.2723 0.1275 Moderate 0.2113 0.0983 Moderate 0.2507 Overweight 0.2918 0.1860 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544 Ohese 0.2511 0.1462 0.2113 0.083 Moderate 0.2544		Underweight	0.0478	0.0430	0.394	Low	0.0468	0.0227	0.644	Low	0.0497	0.0253	0.883
Overweight 0.0447 0.0191 High 0.0477 0.0275 High 0.0467 Obese 0.0457 0.0222 High 0.0477 0.0275 High 0.0467 Obese 0.0457 0.0222 0.0222 0.0222 High 0.0477 0.0275 CD56** Underweight 0.3196 0.1924 0.686 Low 0.2523 0.1324 0.018 ^s Low 0.2920 Healthy 0.2723 0.1275 Moderate 0.2113 0.0983 Moderate 0.2507 Overweight 0.2918 0.1860 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544 Ohese 0.2511 0.1462 0.511 0.1462 0.2544		Healthy	0.0526	0.0190		Moderate	0.0519	0.0213		Moderate	0.0465	0.0176	
Obese 0.0457 0.0222 CD56** Underweight 0.3196 0.1924 0.686 Low 0.2323 0.1324 0.018 ^s Low 0.2920 Healthy 0.2723 0.1275 Moderate 0.2113 0.0983 Moderate 0.2507 Overweight 0.2918 0.1860 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544 Obset 0.211 0.1460 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544		Overweight	0.0447	0.0191		High	0.0477	0.0275		High	0.0467	0.0248	
CD56** Underweight 0.3196 0.1924 0.686 Low 0.2523 0.1324 0.018 ^s Low 0.2920 Healthy 0.2723 0.1275 Moderate 0.2113 0.0983 Moderate 0.2507 Overweight 0.2918 0.1860 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544 Ohese 0.2511 0.1462		Obese	0.0457	0.0222									
Healthy 0.2723 0.1275 Moderate 0.2113 0.0983 Moderate 0.2507 Overweight 0.2918 0.1860 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544 Ohese 0.2511 0.1462 0.1462 0.2544	- CD56**	Underweight	0.3196	0.1924	0.686	Low	0.2523	0.1324	0.018^{S}	Low	0.2920	0.1320	0.261
Overweight 0.2918 0.1860 High 0.3538 0.1628 High 0.2544 Ohese 0.2511 0.1462		Healthy	0.2723	0.1275		Moderate	0.2113	0.0983		Moderate	0.2507	0.1508	
Ohese 0.2511 0.1462		Overweight	0.2918	0.1860		High	0.3538	0.1628		High	0.2544	0.1549	
		Obese	0.2511	0.1462									

MAHASSNI, Biosci., Biotech. Res. Asia, Vol. 16(3), 545-553 (2019)

*ANOVA one-way test, **Kruskal-Wallis test, S: significant difference

VHR WC $Aean \pm SD$ P value Group Mean $\pm SD$ P value	78 5 0.027 ^s Low 76 5 0.401 79 5 Moderate 79 5 74 9 High 78 9	47 6 0.177 Low 46 6 0.609 47 5 Moderate 46 6 1.000 47 5 Moderate 46 6 1.000 44 7 High 48 7	29 7 0.816 Low 28 7 0.401 28 8 Moderate 31 8 28 6 High 28 7	10 4 0.522 Low 10 4 0.509 12 4 Moderate 11 4 12 7 High 12 6	11 5 0.060 Low 13 5 0.020 ^s 9 3 Moderate 10 4 13 5 High 9 5
w /alue Group M	843 Low Moderate High	146 Low Moderate High	041 ^s Low Moderate High	103 Low Moderate High	103 Low Moderate High
ı ±SD P	ν 4 % 0 Ο	1 1 6 8 0	5 5 7 9 0. 8 7 5 9	ω 4 4 0 0	5 5 5 0 5 6 5 0 0 5 5 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 5 5 5 5
BMI Group Mear	Underweight 78 Healthy 76 Overweight 78	Underweight 42 Healthy 47 Overweight 48 Obese 46	Underweight 35 Healthy 27 Overweight 27 Obese 30	Underweight 7 Healthy 11 Overweight 11 Obese 13	Underweight 14 Healthy 12 Overweight 11 Obese 9
Cell%	CD3%*	CD4%*	CD8%*	CD19%**	CD16 + CD56%*

*ANOVA one-way test, **Kruskal-Wallis test, S: significant difference

MAHASSNI, Biosci., Biotech. Res. Asia, Vol. 16(3), 545-553 (2019)

P value	0.204	0.644	0.957
\pm SD	3.06 2.65 2.63	0.75 0.54 0.81	0.55 0.59 0.48
WC Mean	7.81 7.32 6.31	1.51 1.74 1.60	$\begin{array}{c} 0.85 \\ 0.83 \\ 0.82 \end{array}$
Group	Low Aoderate High	Low Aoderate High	Low Aoderate High
P value	0.510	0.853 N	0.864
± SD	3.10 2.77 2.47	0.75 0.47 0.83	$0.54 \\ 0.63 \\ 0.43$
WHR Mean	7.43 7.59 6.50	1.55 1.58 1.67	0.87 0.85 0.75
Group	Low Moderate High	Low Moderate High	Low Moderate High
P value	0.477	0.385	0.193
± SD	2.97 2.83 3.15 2.69	0.75 0.78 0.75 0.58	0.48 0.34 0.64 0.57
BMI Mean	7.79 7.37 6.71 7.26	1.72 1.43 1.49 1.81	$\begin{array}{c} 1.12 \\ 0.72 \\ 0.83 \\ 0.86 \end{array}$
Group	Underweight Healthy Overweight Obese	Underweight Healthy Overweight Obese	Underweight Healthy Overweight Obese
Concentration g/L	IgG*	IgA*	IgM**
	$\begin{array}{cccc} BMI & WHR & WC \\ Concentration & Group & Mean & \pm SD & P value & Group & Mean & \pm SD & P value & Mean & \pm SD & P value \\ g/L & & & & \\ \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c cccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	$ \begin{array}{ccccc} Concentration \\ g/L \\ Concentration \\ g/L \\ IgG^{\ast} \\ Healthy \\ T37 \\ Overweight \\ IgA^{\ast} \\ Healthy \\ IgA^{\ast} \\ Overweight \\ IgA^{\ast} \\ Overweight \\ IgA^{\ast} \\ Overweight \\ IgA^{\ast} \\ Overweight \\ IA $

*ANOVA one-way test, **Kruskal-Wallis test

+CD56 counts (Table 2) and CD3 percents (Table 3) were significantly differentbetween the groups. Finally, for the WC groups, the mean CD3 and CD4 counts (Table 2) and mean CD16 +CD56 percents(Table 3) were significantly different between the groups. The remaining cell counts and percents for each obesity measure were not significantly different between the respective groups. Finally, the mean IgG, IgA, and IgM concentrations (Table 4) were not significantly different between each of the BMI, WHR, and WC groups.

The post hoc analyses were done for the significantly different cell counts and percents (Table 5). The mean CD3 count for the obese BMI group and the mean CD4 counts for the overweight and obese BMI groups were significantly higher than the mean counts for the respective healthy BMI groups (controls). The mean CD8 percent was significantly higherfor the underweight BMI group compared to the mean percent for the control group.

As for the post hoc analyses for the WHR groups (Table 5), the mean CD16 +CD56 counts werenot significantly different for both the moderate and high risk groups compared to the low risk group (control), while the count for the high risk group was significantly higher compared to the count for the moderate risk group. The mean CD3 percent was significantly lower for the high risk WHR group compared to the mean percent for the control. Finally, for the post hoc comparisons for the WC groups, the mean CD3 and CD4 counts for the high risk group were both significantly higher than the respectivemean counts for the control group. The mean CD16 +CD56 percent for the WC high risk group was significantly lower than the mean percent for the control group. The remaining group comparisons for the three adiposity measures were not significantly different compared to the respective control groups.

Parameter	Test	G1	G2	Mean Difference (G1-G2)	± SE	P value
			BMI			
CD3 count	LSD	Healthy	Underweight	0.0288	0.2367	0.904
		2	Overweight	-0.3238	0.1742	0.068
			Obese	-0.4977	0.1742	0.006 ^s
CD4 count	LSD	Healthy	Healthy	0.1085	0.1397	0.441
			Overweight	-0.2191	0.1028	0.037 ^s
			Obese	-0.2524	0.1028	0.017 ^s
CD8%	LSD	Healthy	Underweight	-8	3	0.007^{s}
			Overweight	-1	2	0.776
			Obese	-3	2	0.181
WHR						
CD16 +CD56 count	Dunnett T3	Low	Moderate	0.0410	0.0363	0.600
			High	-0.1015	0.0466	0.110
		Moderate	High	-0.1426	0.0496	0.024^{s}
CD3%	LSD	Low	Moderate	-1	2	0.655
			High	5	2	0.016 ^s
WC						
CD3 count	LSD	Low	Moderate	-0.2314	0.1885	0.225
			High	-0.4099	0.1622	0.014 ^s
CD4 count	LSD	Low	Moderate	-0.0921	0.1119	0.414
			High	-0.2485	0.0963	0.012 ^s
CD16 +CD56%	LSD	Low	Moderate	3	2	0.052
			High	4	1	0.009 ^s

Table 5. Post hoc statistical analysis for the significantly different parameters for the BMI, WHR, and WC

G1: group 1, G2: group 2

S: significant difference

DISCUSSION

This research study aimed to determine the status of immune system cells and antibodies in Saudi female university workers in Saudi Arabia and to determine the best measure of adiposity to use for this cohort. Studies on immunological parameters in obese and overweight individuals from the local community are important to help determine the effects of overweight and obesity on the immune system to better educate the local population about these effects in the hope of giving more incentives for weight loss and to be able to give better guidelines on healthy weights.

For the BMI groups, the mean CD3 cell (T lymphocyte) counts were significantly higher (P = 0.006) for the obese BMI group compared to the healthy (control) group. The mean CD4 cell (T helper lymphocyte) counts were significantly higher for both the overweight (P = 0.037) and obese BMI subjects (P = 0.017) compared to the mean count for thehealthy BMI group. Finally, themean CD8 cell (T suppressor or T regulatory lymphocyte) percent forthe underweight BMI was significantly higher (P = 0.007) compared to the mean percent for the control. The remaining cells were not significantly different(P > 0.050) for the BMI groups compared to the control.

These findings agree with the previous finding⁴ of a significantly higher mean CD4 count for highly obese BMI Saudi female university students compared to healthy weight subjects. In addition, the findings of this previousstudy⁴ agree with the current findings of no significant differences between themean CD8 counts, CD4 percents, and CD19 and CD16 +CD56 cell counts and percents for theBMI groupsand the control. On the other hand, the current findings disagree with the findings of the above mentioned study⁴ of no significant differences for the mean CD3 counts and CD8 percents for the BMI groups compared to the control.

As for the WHR groups, only the mean CD16 +CD56 cell counts and CD3 percents showed significant differences compared to the controls. The mean CD16 +CD56 cell (natural killer lymphocyte) count for the high risk group was significantly higher (P = 0.024) compared to the mean count for the moderate risk group. On the other hand, both mean counts for the moderate and

high risk groups were not significantly different (P > 0.050) from the mean count for the low risk (control) group. The mean CD3 percent for the high risk group was significantly lower (P = 0.016) compared to the mean count for the control.

The current findings agree with those of the above mentioned study on Saudi female university students⁴ which found no significant differences for the WHR groups for the mean CD8 and CD19 counts and percents, and CD16 +CD56 percents compared to the control. On the other hand, the current findings disagree with the previous findings⁴ of significantly higher CD3 count and CD4 count and percent for the moderate risk group, and none significantly different CD16 +CD56 counts for both WHR groups compared to the control.

For the WCgroups, both the mean CD3 and CD4 cell counts were significantly higher (P = 0.014 and 0.012, respectively) for the high risk group compared to the mean counts for the respective controls. The mean CD16 +CD56 cell percent for the high risk group was significantly lower (P = 0.009) compared to the mean percent for the control group. The remaining cell counts and percents were not significantly different from the controls.

The mean IgG, IgA, and IgM concentrations were not significantly different between each of the BMI, WHR, and WC groups. This agrees with previous studies⁵ that also showed no significant differences in the concentrations of these antibodies in adolescent Saudi females.

The cohort of the study is considered highly educated since most of the subjects had a college degree or a higher degree. Therefore, the subjects were probably more aware than other cohorts about health and a healthy lifestyle and probably attempted to follow health and diet recommendations. This may explain the minimal differences between the overweight and obese subjects compared to the healthy weight ones.

CONCLUSIONS

All adiposity measures showed significant changes in CD3 cell (T cells) counts/percents with the highest BMI and WC being associated with significantly higher counts while the highest WHR was associated with a significantly lower percent. CD4 counts were significantly higher for the overweight and obese BMIs and high risk WHR. On the other hand, CD16+CD56 cell percents were significantly lower for the high WC compared to the control while not being significantly different from the controls using the BMI and WHR. Thus, higher obesity, measured by BMI and WC, is associated with higher CD3 and CD4 counts, and lower CD16+CD56 cell percents compared to the controls. Thus, cellular adaptive immunity and innate immunity are both affected in the obese while humoral adaptive immunity is not.

REFERENCES

- 1. World Health Organization, Obesity and overweight Fact Sheet, 2018. http://www.who. int/newsroom/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-andoverweight
- World Health Organization, Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean, Obesity Fact Sheet, 2019. http://www.emro.who.int/health-topics/ obesity/Page-1.html
- World Health Organization Diabetes country profiles, 2016.https://www.who.int/diabetes/ country-profiles/sau_en.pdf
- Al-Sufyani A. A., Mahassni S. H. Obesity and Immune Cells in Saudi Females.*Innate Immun.* 2011; 17(5): 439-450.
- Mahassni S. H., Sebaa R. B. Obesity and the Immune System in Saudi Arabian Adolescent Females.*Int. J. Biochem. Biotech. Sci.* 2012; 1(2):1-16.
- Mahassni S. H., Sebaa R. B. Obesity and CRP, Adiponectin, Leptin, and Lipid Profile in Saudi Arabian Adolescent Females. *J. Basic Appl. Sci.* 2013; 9: 500-509.
- 7. Mahassni S. H., Bashanfar N. O. Waist Circumference a Predictor of Hypertension and Dyslipidemia in Young Saudi Females.*Int. J. Chem. and Biomol. Sci.* 2016; **2**(1):15-24.

- Mahassni S. H., Bashanfar N. O. High Levels of Inflammatory Adipokines and C-reactive protein, and Minimal Changes in Immune Cells in Overweight and Obese Saudi Female University Students.*Int. J. Pharm. Res. Allied Sci.* 2019; 8(1):171-183.
- Martí A., Marcos A., Martínez J. A. Obesity and immune function relationships. *Obes. Rev.* 2001; 2(2): 131-140.
- Tanaka S., Isoda F., Ishihara Y., Kimura M., Yamakawa T. T lymphopaenia in relation to body mass index and TNF-alpha in human obesity: adequate weight reduction can be corrective. *Clin. Endocrinol. (Oxf).* 2001; 54(3): 347–354.
- O'Rourke R. W., Kay T., Scholz M. H., Diggs B., Jobe B. A., Lewinsohn D. M., Bakke A. C. Alterations in T-cell subset frequency in peripheral blood in obesity. *Obes Surg.* 2005; 15(10):1463–1468.
- Womack J., Tien P. C., Feldman J., Shin J. H., Fennie K., Anastos K., Cohen M. H., Bacon M. C., Minkoff H. Obesity and immune cell counts in women.*Metabolism.* 2007; 56(7):998–1004.
- Ilavská S., Horváthová M., Szabová M., Nemessányi T., Jahnová E., Tulinská J., Líšková A., Wsolová L., Staruchová M., Volkovová K. Association between the human immune response and body mass index. *Hum. Immunol.* 2012; 73(5):480-485.
- Marzullo P., Minocci A., Giarda P., Marconi C., Tagliaferri A., Walker G. E., Scacchi M., Aimaretti G., Liuzzi A.Lymphocytes and immunoglobulin patterns across the threshold of severe obesity.*Endocrine*. 2014; 45(3): 392-400.
- Song K., Du H., Zhang Q., Wang C., Guo Y., Wu H., Liu L., Jia Q., Wang X., Shi H., Sun S., Niu K.Serum Immunoglobulin M Concentration Is Positively Related to Metabolic Syndrome in an Adult Population: Tianjin Chronic Low-Grade Systemic Inflammation and Health (TCLSIH) Cohort Study.*PLOS ONE*. 2014; 9(2): e88701:1-9.