

Table (1): Effect of control and HFD on feed intake:

Groups	Means of feed intake (gm/day/rat)
Control	216.9 ± 12.25 ^a
HFD	327.5 ± 22.00 ^b

Each value is the mean ± SEM. Means have different superscript letters indicate significant variation at ($P \leq 0.05$), while the same letters indicate non significant variation.

Table (2): Effect of HFD, Zenical and herbal mix on feed intake:

Groups	Weeks	Means of feed intake (gm/day/rat)
Control	18 th	266.3 ± 2.394^a
HFD	18 th	358.8 ± 3.146^b
Zenical	18 th	345.0 ± 5.000^b
Herbal mix	18 th	330.0 ± 5.401^{bc}
Control	20	290.0 ± 6.124^{ac}
HFD	20	386.3 ± 6.250^d
Zenical	20	335.0 ± 3.536^b
Herbal mix	20	326.8 ± 4.535^b
Control	22	321.3 ± 3.146^b
HFD	22	413.8 ± 4.732^e
Zenical	22	312.5 ± 6.614^{bc}
Herbal mix	22	308.0 ± 6.311^{bc}

Each value is the mean ± SEM. Means have different superscript letters indicate significant variation at ($P \leq 0.05$), while the same letters indicate non significant variation.

Table (3): Effect of diet induced obesity and treatment on body weight:

Groups	Weeks	Body weight (gm)
Control	Initial Bwt	86.58 ± 2.407^a
HFD	Initial Bwt	87.85 ± 2.407^a
Control	16 th	121.9 ± 5.325^b
HFD	16 th	141.2 ± 4.026^b
Control	22	139.6 ± 4.114^b
HFD	22	157.8 ± 6.852^d
Zenical	22	135.4 ± 11.37^b
Herbal mix	22	123.2 ± 6.108^b

Each value is the mean ± SEM. Means have different superscript letters indicate significant variation at ($P \leq 0.05$), while the same letters indicate non significant variation.

Table (4): Effect of diet induced obesity and treatment on body mass index (BMI):

Groups	Weeks	Body mass index (BMI) g/ cm²
Control	Initial BMI	5.807 ± 0.6272^a
HFD	Initial BMI	7.808 ± 0.4491^a
Control	16 th	12.55 ± 0.3442^b
HFD	16 th	17.81 ± 0.8156^b
Control	22	22.85 ± 1.084^c
HFD	22	29.09 ± 1.045^d
Zenical	22	20.20 ± 0.7348^c
Herbal mix	22	21.50 ± 0.6455^c

Each value is the mean ± SEM. Means have different superscript letters indicate significant variation at ($P \leq 0.05$), while the same letters indicate non significant variation.

Table (5): Effect of HFD, Zenical and herbal treatment on serum cholesterol, TG, LDL and HDL in rats:

Groups	TG (mg%)	Cholesterol (mg%)	LDL (mg%)	HDL (mg%)
Control	54.60±6.42 ^a	70.30±2.75 ^a	16.71±2.27 ^a	40.97 ± 2.35 ^a
HFD	80.00±0.65 ^b	118.1±6.35 ^b	55.78±4.40 ^b	44.39±6.75 ^a
Zenical	60.22±6.09 ^a	82.78±6.75 ^a	23.34±3.48 ^a	63.90±4.26 ^b
Herbal Mix	59.56±4.55 ^a	94.56±5.49 ^c	29.66±3.95 ^a	60.69±7.15 ^b

Data expressed as mean ± SE and number of animal in each group is twelve.

(a-a), (b-b) and (c-c) this mean non significant increase or decrease between groups, while (a-b-c) found significant between them at $p < 0.05$ when compare high fat diet to control values and treatment groups with high fat diet.

Table (6): Effect of HFD, Zenical and herbal treatment on kidney function tests:

Groups	Urea (mg%)	Creatinine (mg%)	Uric acid (mg%)
Control	24.53±1.02 ^a	0.54±0.04 ^a	1.96±0.25 ^a
HFD	26.22±1.55 ^a	0.68±0.03 ^b	3.11±0.16 ^b
Zenical	23.19±1.58 ^a	0.57±0.01 ^a	2.86±0.23 ^b
Herbal Mix	23.81±1.25 ^a	0.56±0.02 ^a	2.86±0.15 ^b

Data expressed as mean ± SE and number of animal in each group is twelve.

(a-a) and (b-b) this mean non-significant increase or decrease between groups, while (a-b) found significant between them at $p < 0.05$ when compare high fat diet to control values and treatment groups with high fat diet.

Table (7): Effect of HFD, Zenical and herbal treatment on renal oxidative stress:

Groups	Renal GSH (mg/dl)	Renal MDA (nmol/ml)	Renal SOD (u/gm)
Control	9.31±0.21 ^a	35.48 ± 3.520 ^a	548.6±24.16 ^a
HFD	7.74±0.25 ^b	63.03 ± 1.489 ^b	375.6±29.75 ^b
Zenical	9.37±0.23 ^a	50.33 ± 1.602 ^c	499.8 ±27.69 ^a
Herbal Mix	10.42±0.52 ^a	60.17 ± 0.028 ^b	462.0±30.74 ^a

Data expressed as mean ± SE and number of animal in each group is twelve.

(a-a), (b-b) and (c-c) this mean non significant increase or decrease between groups, while (a-b-c) found significant between them at $p < 0.05$ when compare high fat diet to control values and treatment groups with high fat diet.