Macronutrient mass intake explains deferential weight and fat loss in isocaloric diets

Francisco Arencibia-Albite[1] Anssi H. Manninen[2]

[1]Universidad del Sagrado Corazón, Natural Sciences Department, PO BOX 12383, San Juan PR 00914-0383, Puerto Rico. Email: franciscom.arencibia@sagrado.edu

[2]Dominus Nutrition Oy, Ylipääntie 438, 92220 Raahe, Finland. Email: anssi@dominusnutrition.fi

Corresponding author: **Anssi H. Manninen**

Summary

Currently, obesity treatment rests on the "calories-in, calories-out" rule, formally named the energy balance theory (EBT). It maintains that body weight increases as food calories are greater than expended calories but decreases when the opposite occurs; hence, weight stability is expected at energy balance meaning that over time energy-in equals energy-out.[1] It follows that dietary regimens with identical energy content should evoke similar amounts of weight and fat loss with only minor differences that emerge from diet's macronutrient composition[7], e.g., diet-induced glycogen depletion and water excretion. A vast collection of evidence shows, however, that low-carbohydrate diets typically result in much greater weight and fat loss than isocaloric low-fat diets.[7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] Furthermore, our recent mathematical analysis demonstrated that weight stability coincides with a persistent energy imbalance and not otherwise.[4] As an alternative, the mass balance model (MBM) was proposed that fitted weight loss data and explained the often superior weight loss evoked by low-carbohydrate diets versus low-fat diets.[4] Here, we expand on these observations by computationally contrasting the predictions of both models in two scenarios described in the literature[3, 16]: altering the diet's macronutrient composition while energy intake is kept at weight maintenance level; and the weight loss response as diet composition is changed under untreated type 1 diabetes. Our results indicate that MBM predictions are remarkably accurate while those of the EBT are clearly erroneous. These findings may represent the beginning of a paradigm shift in obesity research.

Keywords: obesity, weight loss, energy balance theory, mass balance model, macronutrients

List of abbreviations

MBM = mass balance model; MB = mass balance; EB = energy balance; EBT = energy balance theory; CIM = carbohydrate-insulin model; FFM = fat-free mass; FM = fat mass; EPM = energy-providing mass; VLCD = very-low-carbohydrate diet; KD = ketogenic diet; HCD = high-carbohydrate diet; ND = "normal diet"; BW = body weight; BF = body fat; EI = energy intake; EE = energy expenditure; T1D = type 1 diabetes; ECF = extra cellular fluid; Gly = glycogen; nEPM = non-energy-providing mass; AT = adaptive thermogenesis; PAL = physical activity level; RQ = respiratory quotient; GNG = gluconeogenesis; DNL = *de novo* lipogenesis; TG = triglycerides; HDL = high-density lipoprotein; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin; total-C = total cholesterol; MRI = magnetic resonance imaging; CT = computed tomography.

Introduction

"Four stages of acceptance: 1) this is worthless nonsense; 2) this is an interesting, but perverse, point of view; 3) this is true, but quite unimportant; 4) I always said so." -- JBS Haldane

Macronutrients – proteins, fats and carbohydrates – are an important part of a diet, and as such, have been the subject of a great deal of discussion and controversy, especially among obesity researchers. According to the energy balance theory (EBT), "[a] fundamental principle of nutrition and metabolism is that body weight change is associated with an imbalance between the energy content of food eaten and energy expended by the body to maintain life and to perform physical work."[1] Many current approaches to obesity

treatment are based on the EBT; however, neither behavioral prevention nor behavioral treatment is generally successful in practice. Furthermore, this theory has major limitations for explaining obesity, as reviewed by Wells and Siervo.[2] Weight stable obese individuals, for example, may experience substantial changes in body weight as a reaction to isocaloric modifications in diet. In many instances these body mass alterations are far greater than those expected from the macronutrient-induced changes in total body water.[3] Thus, the EBT is rendered inadequate in these circumstances.

Arencibia-Albite[4] has recently used mathematical methods to investigate EBT's central claim:

As energy balance approaches zero body weight becomes stable.

The conclusion of this paper is highly polemical – to put it mildly – and possibly represents the beginning of a paradigm shift:

Body weight stability coincides with a persistent energy imbalance which is negative under low-fat diets but positive under low-carbohydrate diets.

This signifies, then, that the EBT is an incorrect theory, and also explains why in numerous well-controlled studies negative energy balance measurements are frequently observed under a "normal diet" in weight stable populations.[5, 6] These findings do not represent a violation of the First Law of Thermodynamics, as it allows for any open system to express a positive or negative energy balance under a null mass change (**For further details, see Supplementary File 2**).

As an alternative to the EBT, the mass balance model (MBM) of obesity was proposed. It maintains in qualitative terms that *body weight fluctuations are ultimately dependent on the difference between daily nutrient mass intake and daily mass excretion* (e.g., elimination of macronutrient oxidation products) and NOT on energy imbalance. In its mathematical form the MBM fitted weight loss data from dietary interventions of low-carbohydrate diets (LCDs) versus isocaloric low-fat diets (LFDs) leading to a simple and convincing explanation for the often superior weight loss evoked by LCDs over LFDs (Figure 1).[4] This work compares the MBM predictions against those derived from the EBT; and it is convincingly demonstrated that in the experimental settings where the EBT makes erroneous forecasts the MBM results in remarkably accurate predictions.



Figure 1. MBM simulation: LCD *vs.* LFD

A. Two hypothetical overweight 90kg adult males with identical body composition and weight maintenance energy intakes (2 750 kcal/day; 35% fat (F), 50% carbohydrate (C), 15% protein (P)) initiate two distinct isocaloric diets (2 000 kcal/day): low-fat diet (LFD; 20% F, 65% C, 15% P) *vs.* low-carbohydrate diet (LFD; 20% F, 65% C, 15% P). Consistent with published feeding data[7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12], the MBM predicts that the LCD results in greater weight loss in contrast to the LFD. Model parameters are as follows: BW_0 = 90kg, FM_0 = 22.5kg, nEPM = 1.41kg, F_{loss}= 0.030833, PAL = 1.5, VO_2 = 4.32 L/[kg x day]. **B.** The figure depicts the body fat (BF) percentage changes that correspond to panel A. **C.** As shown, the LCD mass intake (m_{in}) is small relative to the eliminated mass (m_{out}) and so the net daily mass loss is large (i.e., $|m_{in} - m_{out}|$). In the LFD the net daily mass loss is, however, not as efficient since m_{in} cancels out a substantial fraction of m_{out} decelerating weight loss. LCDs are thus more effective in maximizing the net daily mass loss relative to LFDs and consequently the former manifest a substantially larger cumulative weight loss than the latter. **D.** Daily energy expenditure (EE) data from panel A. The horizontal line represents the daily energy intake. According to the EBT, this graph suggests that the subject in the LFD should lose more weight than the one

in the LCD, which is not the case as illustrated in panel A. Energy imbalance is, therefore, not predicting the weight loss outcome in this intervention.

Materials and Methods

As noted above, this study compares the MBM predictions against those derived from the EBT.

Mass Balance Model (MBM):

For model derivation and details consult Arencibia-Albite[4] but, briefly, daily body weight (BW, in kg) fluctuations are given by:

$$BW(t) = M/R + (BW_0 - M/R)(1 - R)^t$$
$$M = EPM + nEPM$$
$$R = F_{loss} - \rho_{O_2} \cdot PAL \cdot VO_2$$

where *t* is time in days; M is the average daily mass intake defined as the sum of the energy-providing mass (EPM; e.g., F, C and P) plus the non-energy-providing mass (nEPM; i.e., water, insoluble fiber, vitamins and minerals); R is the average relative daily rate of mass excretion free of total daily O_2 uptake; BW_0 is the initial body weight; F_{loss} is the average relative daily rate of mass excretion that includes of total daily O_2 uptake; $\rho_{O_2} = 1/770$ is O_2 density in kg/L at 27^0 C and 1 ATM; PAL is a dimensionless number that represents the physical activity level computed as the ratio of total daily O_2 uptake over the total daily resting O_2 consumption; and VO_2 is the specific daily resting O_2 uptake in L/(kg x day).

The EMP parameter is adjusted according to:

$$EPM = EI\left(x_C/\rho_C + x_F/\rho_F + x_P/\rho_P\right)$$

where EI is the energy intake; $0 \le x_i \le 1$ is the energy fraction from i = C, F , P; and ρ_i is the energy density of i with $\rho_C = 4.2 kcal/g,\ \rho_F = 9.4 kcal/g,\ \rho_C = 4.7 kcal/g$. To simulate pancreatic β-cell death $x_C = 0$ as the bulk of ingested glucose is lost through urination.

Fat mass (FM) and fat free mass (FFM) alterations are given by:

$$FM(t) = 10.4W\left\{\frac{FM_0}{10.4}\exp\left[\frac{(M/R - BW_0)\left[1-(1-R)^t\right] + FM_0}{10.4}\right]\right\}$$
$$FFM(t) = BW(t) - FM(t)$$

where FM_0 is the initial fat mass and W is the lambert W function.

In MBM simulations daily energy expenditure (EE) can be estimated by

$$EE = (\text{kcal per } O_2\text{L}) \cdot PAL \cdot VO_2 \cdot BW$$

The first term at the right-hand side can approximated with the diet's macronutrient composition and the following Weir formula[13]

$$\text{kcal per } O_2\text{L} = 5.047x_C + 4.463x_P + 4.735x_F.$$

Energy Balance Theory (EBT):

The quantitative form of the EBT use in this study is that of the United States National Institute of Health (NIH) *Body Weight Planner* developed by Hall *et al.*[14] A succinct model description is given below.

Glycogen (G), extracellular fluid (ECF), body fat (F_b), lean tissue (L) and adaptive thermogenesis (AT) are modeled by following system of equations:

$$\frac{dG}{dt} = \left(CI - CI_b\left(G/G_0\right)^2\right)/\rho_G$$

$$\frac{dECF}{dt} = \frac{1}{[Na]}\left(\Delta Na_{diet} - \xi_{Na}\left(ECF - ECF_0\right) - \xi_{CI}\left(1 - CI/CI_b\right)\right)$$

$$\frac{dF_b}{dt} = \left[\frac{F_b/\rho_F}{10.4\rho_L/\rho_F + F_b}\right]\left(EI - EE - CI + CI_b\left(G/G_0\right)^2\right)$$

$$\frac{dL}{dt} = \left[\frac{10.4/\rho_F}{10.4\rho_L/\rho_F + F_b}\right]\left(EI - EE - CI + CI_b\left(G/G_0\right)^2\right)$$

$$\frac{dAT}{dt} = \left(\beta_{AT}\Delta EI - AT\right)/\tau_{AT}$$

where CI_b is the carbohydrate energy intake (CI) at energy balance; G_0 is the initial body glycogen amount; ρ_G is the glycogen energy density (4.2 kcal/g); [Na] is the extracellular Na concentration (3.22 mg/ml); ξ_{Na} is a ECF Na excretion constant (3 000 mg/[ml x day]); ξ_{CI} CI dependent Na excretion constant (4 000 mg/[ml x day]); ρ_L Is the energy density of lean tissue (1.815kcal/g); τ_{AT} is the AT time constant (14 days); and $\beta_{AT} = 0.14$ is the AT coefficient.

EE is defined as

$$EE = \frac{\left[\begin{array}{l} K + \gamma_{F_b}F_b + \gamma_L L + \left[\left(1 - \beta_{TEF}\right)\cdot PAL - 1\right]RMR + \beta_{TEF}\Delta EI + AT \\ + \left(EI - CI + CI_b\left(G/G_0\right)^2\right)\left(\dfrac{10.4\eta_L/\rho_F}{10.4\rho_L/\rho_F + F_b} + \dfrac{\eta_{F_b}F_b/\rho_F}{10.4\rho_L/\rho_F + F_b}\right) \end{array}\right]}{1 + \dfrac{10.4\eta_L/\rho_F}{10.4\rho_L/\rho_F + F_b} + \dfrac{\eta_{F_b}F_b/\rho_F}{10.4\rho_L/\rho_F + F_b}}$$

where K is arbitrary constant determined to achieved energy balance at BW_0; $\gamma_{F_b} = 3.1 kcal/[kg \cdot day]$ is the specific body fat metabolic rate coefficient; $\gamma_L = 21.99 kcal/[kg \cdot day]$ is the specific lean tissue metabolic rate coefficient; $\beta_{TEF} = 0.1$ is the thermic effect of feeding coefficient; $RMR = 19.7(BW - F_b) + 413$ is Mifflin *et al.*[15] resting metabolic rate formula; $\eta_L = 229.446 kcal/kg$ is the lean tissue synthesis efficacy; and $\eta_{F_b} = 179.254 kcal/kg$ is the fat tissue synthesis efficacy.

Body weight at time *t* is obtained by the following sum

$$BW(t) = F_b(t) + L(t) + 1.0027G(t) + ECF(t)$$

To simulate pancreatic β-cell death CI = 0, as majority of the ingested glucose is lost through urination. The system of differential equations was solved using the fourth order Runge-Kutta method with a time step of 1 day.

Results

The Figure 2 A uses the MBM to simulate the effect of exchanging a high-carbohydrate diet (HCD) for an isocaloric very-low-carbohydrate diet (VLCD) in a weight-stable 70kg individual. Under the HCD (day 150-400), body weight gradually increases to 73kg. However, after beginning the isocaloric VLCD (day 400), body weight decreases towards a steady value of 67.5kg. Figure 2 B repeats the simulation in panel A, but with Hall *et al*.[14] model of the EBT. The latter indicates, in general, that isocaloric perturbations only elicit non-significant alterations in body weight that are mostly a consequence of changes in extracellular fluid (ECF) and stored glycogen (Gly, Figure 2 C1). In such cases, therefore, changes in body composition are expected to be nearly undetectable (Figure 2 C2). For further details, see the figure legend.

An interesting aspect of the MBM is its capacity to account for the degree of weight loss observed at the onset of type 1 diabetes (T1D). Before the discovery of insulin, a common dietary treatment of T1D was a very-low-carbohydrate diet/high-fat diet which slowed down and reduced the excessive weight loss while alleviating the classical symptoms of polyuria, polyphagia and polydipsia [16]. The Figure 2 D1 shows that the MBM explains the weight loss associated with the onset of T1D and also makes predictions consistent with the diabetes treatment during the pre-insulin era. The EBT, however, predicts a substantial weight loss at T1D onset even if the pre-onset diet is a VLCD (Figure 2 D2). For further details, see the figure legend.



FIGURE 2 Predictions under isocaloric perturbations: EBT *vs.* MBM

A. MBM response to exchanging a HCD for an isocaloric VLCD. BW is stable at 70 kg with EI = 2 000 kcal during 150 days (control: 50% F, 35% C, 15% P). The daily carbohydrate mass intake (CMI) is 167g. At day 150 EI = 2 000 kcal but CMI has increased by 143g as the control diet is exchange for a HCD (20% F, 65% C, 15% P). On day 400, EI = 2 000 kcal but the diet is exchange again for a VLCD (75% F, 10% C, 15% P). Here CMI decreases by 262g. Model parameters are as follows: BW_0 = 70kg, FM_0 = 14kg, nEPM = 1.5kg, F_{loss} =

0.034942857, PAL = 1.5, VO_2 = 4.464 L/[kg x day]. **B.** EBT response to the same perturbations as in panel A. Initial conditions are as follows: K = 547.2925, BW(0) = 70kg, $F_b(0)$ = 14kg, L(0) = 36.012kg, ECF(0)=19.486kg, AT(0) = 0, G(0) = 0.5kg, PAL =1.5 **C1.** According to the EBT, majority of the weight change under an isocaloric perturbations result from changes in extracellular fluid (ECF) and stored glycogen (Gly) that stabilize within few days. **C2.** MBM predicts that BF evolves in parallel to the weight change direction. In contrast, the EBT predicts that, under isocaloric perturbations, BF evolves according to the amount of fat intake (FI). **D1.** MBM predicts that the weight loss magnitude evoked by pancreatic β-cell death is dependent on the diet's macronutrient composition. Model parameters are as in A. **D2.** The EBT predicts that changes in the diet's macronutrient distribution will elicit measurable changes in the rate and magnitude of weight loss after β-cell death but not as potent as those predicted by the MBM. Initial conditions are as in B.

Kong *et al.*[3] have recently published a well-controlled feeding study that allows to test the validity of the predictions made by the MBM and EBT. Their young female subjects (age: 21± standard deviation [SD]: 3.7 years, weight: 65.5 ± SD: 7.7 kg, body mass index: 24.9 ± SD: 2.7 kg/m^2) were weight-stable for 4 weeks under a normal diet (ND: 1 967kacl ± SD: 362kcal ; F 44% ± SD: 7.6%, C 39.6% ± SD: 5.8%, 15.4%± SD: 3.3%) and then switched to an isocaloric ketogenic diet (KD 1 817kacl ± SD: 285kcal; F 69% ± SD: 5.4%, C 9.2% ± SD: 4.8%, 21.9%± SD: 3.4%) for another 4 weeks leading to a substantially reduced body weight (– 2.9 kg) and body fat percentage (– 2.0%).

Figure 3 A1, A2 and A3 simulate Kong *et al.*[3] data using the Hall *et al.*[14] model of the EBT. Here the KD decreases body weight by 1.71Kg (Figure 3 A1) which is mainly a result of changes in ECF and stored glycogen (Figure 3 A2). In such case, the EBT predicts a slight increase in body fat percentage (Figure 3 A2). Figure 3 B1 simulates Kong *et al.*[3] data using the MBM. As illustrated, this model predicts a much larger drop in body weight (–3.05kg) under KD than the EBT. Contrary to the EBT, however, the MBM predicts a drop in body fat percentage of about 1.6%. This signifies, therefore, that at the MBM leads to more accurate predictions in than those made by the EBT.



FIGURE 3. The simulation of Kong *et al*. data: EBT *vs.* MBM

A1. The figure utilizes the EBT to simulate Kong *et al.*[3] data. During the ND period (days 0-30) energy balance (EB, red curve) is zero. After day 30 EB becomes negative under the KD resulting in a cumulative weight loss of 1.71kg at day 60. Initial conditions are as follows: K = 892.7146, BW(0) = 65.5kg, $F_b(0)$ = 22.925kg, L(0) = 25.698kg, ECF(0) = 16.375kg, AT(0) = 0, G(0) = 0.5kg, PAL =1.5. **A2.** The EBT predicts that – although the KD results in *weight* loss – BF increases since FI has been augmented by 41g. **A3.** During the ND total glycogen is 500g but after the KD this amount has dropped by 280.25g. ECF has also decreased by 1.076kg. These quantities add to 1.35525kg = 0.28025kg + 1.076kg. Consequently, of the 1.71kg weight loss in A1, 0.35475kg = 1.71kg – 1.35525kg are from other mass sources (0.2436 kg fat mass + 0.11115 kg fat-free mass = 0.35475kg). According to the EBT, fat mass has in fact decreased; however, only by slight

amount since FI has been augmented during the KD. Consequently, as the decline in fat-free mass is much larger than that of fat mass, BF increases as in A2. **B1.** The figure utilizes the MBM to simulate Kong *et al.*[3] data. During the ND period (days 0-30) mass balance (MB, red curve) is zero. After day 30 MB becomes negative under the KD resulting in a cumulative weight loss of 3.05kg at day 60. Model parameters are as follows: BW_0 = 65.5kg, FM_0 = 22.925kg, $nEPM_{ND}$ = 1kg, $nEPM_{KD}$ =0.96kg, F_{loss}= 0.029078, PAL = 1.5, VO_2 = 4.32 L/[kg x day] **B2.** According to the MBM, of the 3.05kg of weight loss 2.07kg came from fat and 0.98kg from fat-free mass. Even though FI has increased the decline in fat-free mass is much smaller than that of fat mass and thus BF decreases as shown.

Discussion

According to the EBT, at energy balance, changes in macronutrient composition elicit non-substantial changes in body weight. These alterations are assumed to be secondary to changes in ECF and glycogen that follow from adjustments in the diet's sodium content and carbohydrate intake.[1, 7] The EBT also claims that body composition alterations, under these circumstances, are expected to be small but to occur in parallel to the amount of dietary fat intake (see Figure 2 C2). Consequently, from the EBT perspective, the MBM simulations (see Figure 2 A and C2) are unrealistic, as body weight and body fat alterations are much greater than those predicted when energy balance is assumed to be present. If such an argument is definitive, then the accuracy of EBT predictions should always exceed those made by the MBM. Figure 3 illustrates, however, that this is clearly not the case.

Moreover, the EBT implicitly asserts that blood leptin concentration should be minimally affected when arbitrary subject switches from a weight-maintenance standard diet to an isocaloric ketogenic diet since, as argued by this theory, under such conditions fat mass decline is insignificant (see Figure 3 A2). In contrast, the MBM predicts a substantial drop in leptin levels since this model indicates that this type of isocaloric exchange results in a substantial drop in fat mass. Indeed, a recent well-controlled feeding trial by Kong *et al.*[3] showed that the interchange of a weight-preserving normal diet for an isocaloric ketogenic diet evokes a significant reduction in leptin levels.

In addition, the MBM simulations on pancreatic β-cell death are consistent with a review of case histories from the pre-insulin era illustrating that VLCDs could result in some weight gain after the onset of T1D.[16] Elliot Proctor Joslin, for example, was the first United States medical doctor that specialized in diabetes treatment during this era. Although anecdotal, one of his diabetic patients, Mary H., reportedly gained nearly 3kg of body weight while consuming a diet containing solely protein and fat. The EBT simulations, in contrast, do not predict such therapeutic effect.

Numerous examples in the weight management literature show that the amount of weight loss is far greater in low-carbohydrate diets (LCDs) compared to isocaloric low-fat diets (LFDs). [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] According to the EBT, this can only occur if the energy expenditure under LCDs is larger than that in LFDs. However, in many of these dietary interventions non-significant differences are found between the energy expenditures of these diets.[7, 12, 17, 18, 19] Researchers that subscribe to the EBT, therefore, argue that in such cases the most likely explanation of the observed superior weight loss is the result of energy intake underreporting by low-fat dieters.[12] This claim has encountered minimal opposition since it is widely accepted that the majority of the energy intake recording devices (e.g., self-reported food records) are biased toward underestimation.[5, 6] (**For further discussion, see Supplementary File 1**). Two alternative models, however, may explain the apparent weight loss advantage of LCDs over isocaloric LFDs: the carbohydrate-insulin model (CIM) of obesity[20] and the MBM[4] (**See also Supplementary File 3**).

The CIM postulates that high-carbohydrate intake elevates insulin levels leading to the activation of complex neuroendocrine responses that drive body fat deposition, increase appetite and decrease energy expenditure[17]; which, according to the EBT, explains the persistent weight gain over time observed in obese subjects. Conversely, LCDs, by significantly decreasing circulating insulin levels, should increase energy expenditure by augmenting fat oxidation, which – as argued by CIM advocates – accounts for the greater and faster weight loss observed in feeding trails of LCDs *vs.* isocaloric LFDs. The above claims are open to discussion, however, as evidence shows that obese individuals manifest a highly elevated energy expenditure relative to normal weight subjects[21], plus, as already mentioned, the predominant evidence indicates that no significant energy expenditures differences exist between diets. [7, 12, 17, 18, 19] A recent meta-analysis by Ludwig *et al.*[22] suggests that an adaptation period of at least 14 days may be required in order to LCDs to elevate energy expenditure. If this is the case, then one would expect a slow decay of the respiratory quotient (RQ) toward 0.71 since this would reflect the gradual metabolic dependence on fat as the main energy fuel. In ketogenic diets, however, the RQ reaches a steady state within the first week and continuous to be stable for at least three more weeks.[17] Taken together, it seems that the LCD-enhanced weight loss is unlikely to be a consequence of an augmented energy expenditure as proposed by the CIM.

In contrast, the MBM describes body weight fluctuations as a ***mass imbalance problem***. Specifically, when macronutrient mass intake exceeds the excretion of macronutrient oxidation products body weight increases and *vice versa*. Body weight stability is, hence, expected as over time the average consumed mass equals the average eliminated mass. Our model arrives from the following long-standing observations:

1. The physiological/biochemical activity that decreases body weight is the excretion of oxidation products and not energy expenditure.[23] This is exemplified in the oxidation of a "general" triglyceride molecule:

$$C_{55}H_{104}O_6 + 78O_2 \longrightarrow 55CO_2 \;+\; 52H_2O \;+\; Heat\,(\sim 8{,}084\,kcal/mol)$$

The mass entering this reaction is (in g/mol)

$$\begin{aligned} C_{55}H_{104}O_6 &: \quad 860g \\ 78O_2 &: 2496g \\ \textbf{Total} &\textbf{: 3356g} \end{aligned}$$

whereas mass exiting the reaction is only present in the reaction products

$$\begin{aligned} 55CO_2 &: 2420g \\ 52H_2O &: \;\; 936g \\ \textbf{Total} &\textbf{: 3356g} \end{aligned}$$

and not in the dissipated heat (i.e., Calories). Therefore, body mass decreases as the body excretes or eliminates oxidation products but not as consequence of the heat content in the energy expenditure.

2. The food property that has the capacity to increases body weight is its macronutrient mass and not its potential nutritional energy. For instance, the absorption and retention within body cells of 1 gram of fat, carbohydrate or protein will increase body mass by exactly 1 gram. This observation is independent of the potential caloric content ascribe to the macronutrient; according to the Law of Conservation of Mass, the absorbed macronutrient mass cannot be destroyed and, thus, it will contribute to total body mass as long as it remains within the body. Such contribution ends, however, when the macronutrient is eliminated from the body either as products of metabolic oxidation (e.g., H_2O and CO_2) or in other forms (e.g., shedding of dead skin cells fill with keratin protein).

3. *From points 1 and 2 it follows that body weight fluctuations can be described by the difference between daily mass intake and daily mass excretion*. Although at first sight this statement may seem not to have far-reaching consequences, Arencibia-Albite[4] has shown that when translated into mathematical form it fits body weight and fat mass data from isocaloric diet trails of LCDs *vs*. LFDs, and also results in predictions that are not evident from the qualitative inspection of points 1, 2 and 3. This work further substantiates such predictions and demonstrates that MBM-based simulations result in highly realistic forecasts in settings where the EBT-based simulations collapse.

The energy picture of body weight dynamics explains body fat fluctuations as the balance between fat intake and fat oxidation. The EBT cannot foresee, therefore, that a LCD may lead to more fat loss than an isocaloric LFD since the fat balance in the latter appears to be more negative than in the former.[7] A multitude of feeding studies[3, 9,11,12] suggest, however, this is not the case as the contrary is a more frequent observation. In the mass picture, in contrast, body fat fluctuations are not only dependent on fat intake and oxidation but other routes contribute as well to fat loss. In LCDs, for instance, the elevated fatty acid oxidation leads, in hepatocytes, to high cytoplasmic HMG-CoA levels which are rapidly reduced to mevalonic acid for cholesterol production. The characteristic excess cholesterol of LCDs[24], in turn, is then eliminated in in feces as bile acids. Additionally, in LCDs, carbon atoms from fatty acid breakdown circulate in the blood stream as high acetoacetate levels which can exit the body either in the urine or through breathing when spontaneously decarboxylated to acetone. The afore mentioned processes may thus be responsible for the greater fat loss in LCDs *vs*. isocaloric LFD even if fat oxidation is greater in LFDs as suggested by short-term (e.g., 6 days) studies.7 Consequently, in the light of this theoretical study, the above argument suggests that the variable that better accounts for body fat fluctuations is mass and not energy.

Conclusions

Implicit in the EBT discourse is that body fat accumulates only if fat intake exceeds fat oxidation, even under dietary energy restriction, which explains why this theory argues in favor of LFDs as the optimal fat loss dietary treatment.[7] Such point of view is clearly captured in Figure 2 C2 and Figure 3 A2; however, numerous examples in experimental literature indicates the opposite. The MBM, on the other hand, is highly consistent with these data suggesting that the relevant variable for weight fluctuation is mass and not energy. Our model by its *razor-sharp* yet *simple* logic, seems to be perfectly able to account for the deferential weight loss among isocaloric diets. The obesity community is trying to explain such "mysterious" findings by invoking complex signaling pathways that completely ignore the *fundamental rule* in science: the Occam's razor (*novacula Occami*), i.e., the simplest explanation is usually the right one. More specifically, "entities should not be multiplied without necessity", a notion attributed to English Franciscan friar William of Ockham. Nevertheless, we are certainly not claiming that our model is definitive, or downplaying the emergent and promising therapeutic value of LCDs, but rather to stimulate researchers around the world to acknowledge that the widely accepted EBT is incorrect.

The daily intake of macronutrient mass is, obviously, influenced by the ever-present interplay between the environment and genes; thus, it is important to realize that the MBM makes no claims regarding the *behavioral* aspects of obesity. Certainly, food processing, distribution, marketing, education, etc. plays a big role in current obesity epidemics.

Authors contribution

Study concept and designing: Manninen, Arencibia-Albite

Acquisition of data: Manninen, Arencibia-Albite

Statistical analysis and interpretation of data: Manninen, Arencibia-Albite

Drafting the manuscript: Manninen, Arencibia-Albite

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Manninen, Arencibia-Albite

Administrative, technical or material support: Manninen, Arencibia-Albite.

Study supervision: N/A.

Acknowledgements

This has been a time-consuming and cliff-hanging research project with both brains working in overdrive almost around a clock. Fortunately, we are now about to close the 1st chapter of our MBM research project.

We would like to thank our families for support and care; our numerous colleagues for stimulating discussions; and *medRxiv* for providing excellent customer service.

Funding sources

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

NOTE

Please visit our not-for-profit MBM Research Group page: https://www.facebook.com/MBM-Research-Group-101242115189178

References

1. Hall K.D. Heymsfield S.B. Kemnitz J.W. Klein S. Schoeller D.A. Speakman J.R. Energy balance and its components: implications for body weight regulation. Am J Clin Nutr. 2012; 95: 989-994.

2. Wells J.C.K. Siervo M. Obesity and energy balance: is the tail wagging the dog? Eur J Clin Nutr. 2011; 65: 1173–1189.

3. Kong Z, Sun S, Shi Q, Zhang H, Tong TK, Nie J. Short-Term Ketogenic Diet Improves Abdominal Obesity in Overweight/Obese Chinese Young Females. Front Physiol. 2020; 11:856.

4. Arencibia-Albite F. Serious analytical inconsistencies challenge the validity of the energy balance theory. Heliyon. 2020; 6(7):e04204.

5. Winkler JT. The fundamental flaw in obesity research. Obesity Reviews. 2005; 6:199–202.

6. Dhurandhar NV, Schoeller DA, Brown AW, Heymsfield SB, Thomas D, Sørensen TIA, et al. Energy balance measurement: when something is not better than nothing. International Journal of Obesity. 2014; 39: 1109–1113.

7. Hall KD, Bemis T, Brychta TR, Chen KY, Courville A, Crayner EJ, et al. Calorie for Calorie, Dietary Fat Restriction Results in More Body Fat Loss than Carbohydrate Restriction in People with Obesity. Cell Metabolism. 2015; 22: 531.

8. Lean M, Han T, Prvan T, Richmond P, Avenell A. Weight loss with high and low carbohydrate 1200 kcal diets in free living women. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 1997; **51**: 243–248.

9. Bazzano LA, Tian H, Reynolds K, Yao L, Bunol C, Liu Y, et al. Effects of Low-Carbohydrate and Low-Fat Diets: a randomized trail. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2014; 161: 309.

10. Samaha FF, Iqbal N, Seshadri P, Chicano KL, Daily DA, McGrory J, et al.

A Low-Carbohydrate as Compared with a Low-Fat Diet in Severe Obesity

New England Journal of Medicine. 2003; 348: 2074–2081.

11. Brehm BJ, Seeley RJ, Daniels SR, D'Alessio DA. A Randomized Trial Comparing a Very Low Carbohydrate Diet and a Calorie-Restricted Low Fat Diet on Body Weight and Cardiovascular Risk Factors in Healthy Women. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2003; 88: 1617–1623.

12. Brehm BJ, Spang SE, Lattin BL, Seeley RJ, Daniels RS, D'Alessio DA. The Role of Energy Expenditure in the Differential Weight Loss in Obese Women on Low-Fat and Low-Carbohydrate Diets. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2005; 90: 1475–1482.

13. WEIR JB. New methods for calculating metabolic rate with special reference to protein metabolism. J Physiol. 1949;109(1-2):1-9.

14. Hall KD, Sacks G, Chandramohan D, Chow CC, Wang YC, Gortmaker SL, Swinburn BA. Quantification of the effect of energy imbalance on bodyweight. Lancet. 2011;378(9793):826-37.

15. Mifflin MD, St Jeor ST, Hill LA, Scott BJ, Daugherty SA, Koh YO. A new predictive equation for resting energy expenditure in healthy individuals. Am J Clin Nutr. 1990; 51(2):241-7.

16. Westman E.C. Yancy W.S. Humphreys M. Dietary treatment of diabetes mellitus in the pre-insulin era (1914-1922). Perspect Biol Med. 2006; **49**: 77-83.

17. Hall KD, Chen KY, Guo J, Lam YY, Leibel RL, Mayer LE, Reitman ML, Rosenbaum M, Smith SR, Walsh BT, Ravussin E. Energy expenditure and body composition changes after an isocaloric ketogenic diet in overweight and obese men. Am J Clin Nutr. 2016;104(2):324-33.

18. Hall KD, Guo J. Obesity Energetics: Body Weight Regulation and the Effects of Diet Composition.

Gastroenterology. 2017; 152(7):1718-1727.e3.

19. Hall KD, Guo J, Speakman JR. Do low-carbohydrate diets increase energy expenditure? Int J Obes (Lond). 2019; 43(12):2350-2354.

20. Ludwig DS, Ebbeling CB. The Carbohydrate-Insulin Model of Obesity: Beyond "Calories In, Calories Out".

JAMA Intern Med. 2018; 178(8):1098-1103.

21. Das SK, Saltzman E, McCrory MA, Hsu LK, Shikora SA, Dolnikowski G, Kehayias JJ, Roberts SB. Energy expenditure is very high in extremely obese women. J Nutr. 2004;134(6):1412-6.

22. Ludwig DS, Dickinson SL, Henschel B, Ebbeling CB, Allison DB. Do Lower-Carbohydrate Diets Increase Total Energy Expenditure? An Updated and Reanalyzed Meta-Analysis of 29 Controlled-Feeding Studies. J Nutr. 2020:nxaa350.

23. Meerman R, Brown AJ. When somebody loses weight, where does the fat go? BMJ. 2014;349:g7257.

24. Retterstøl K, Svendsen M, Narverud I, Holven KB. Effect of low carbohydrate high fat diet on LDL cholesterol and gene expression in normal-weight, young adults: A randomized controlled study. Atherosclerosis. 2018; 279:52-61.

“Macronutrient mass intake explains deferential weight and fat loss in isocaloric diets”

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1

Additional discussion regarding free-living human feeding studies with special reference to Kong *et al*.

As recently discussed by Hall [1], feeding trials have their own challenges, including – but certainly not limited to – the impracticality and difficulty of randomizing large numbers of free-living subjects to eat different diets for a long period time while ensuring very-high levels of adherence throughout. Although so-called domiciled feeding studies [1] can certainly provide important insights, their “artificial” environment may seriously limit generalizability and applications to free-living individuals, not to mention the fact that this type of studies have become prohibitively expensive to conduct in the United States since the National Institutes of Health (NIH) ceased directly funding Clinical Research Centers [1]. Consequently, well-controlled randomized free-living feeding studies remain the gold standard when it comes to proving causality in the areas of nutrition and metabolism.

There are always potential problems with any kind of dietary records; although we know that these records have relatively high error rates, they can be very meaningful – in terms of causality – if *1)* the differences in the study arms are large enough; and *2)* there are indicators of very good adherence (e.g., the presence of ketone bodies*). A Very-low-carbohydrate diet always win in a well-controlled face-off with an isocaloric high-carbohydrate diet* (**see the Supplementary File 1 Figure 1**). *If such a response is not observed, then it is simply not a well-controlled study, as alternative results would indicate a violation of the Law of Conversation of Mass* (**see Supplementary File 2**).

Researchers guided by the erroneous EBT, however, tend to automatically assume that the subjects on the very-low-carb arm must have overreported what they actually ate, or the people of the high-carb arm must have underreported what they ate, or both. *How likely is that the very-low-carb arms, time after time, substantially overreport dietary records, whereas the high-carb arms consistently underreport dietary records?* [2]

To test the predictive power of both the MBM and the EBT, we decided to utilize the recent free-living feeding data by Kong *et al.* (**see Figures A1, A2, A3, B1, and B2 in the main body of the manuscript**). Their young female subjects were weight-stable for 4 weeks under a “normal diet” and then switched to an isocaloric ketogenic diet for another 4 weeks leading to a substantially reduced body weight (– 2.9 kg) and body fat percentage (– 2.0%), consistent with the MBM.

To assure subjects’ adherence to ketogenic diet (KD), Kong *et al*. required that:

- The subjects measure urinary ketones every day (early morning or after dinner) and record 3-day food diaries (2 weekdays and 1 weekend day) during the experimental period.

- 3-day food diaries were kept by all subjects for 8 weeks.
- All subjects were given in advance "thorough instructions" on how to estimate portion sizes and record food/beverages intake on food composition tables.
- Subjects were asked to report to the laboratory every week to assess changes in body weight and hand in the logbook with dietary records.
- Energy and macronutrient distribution were calculated by the same dietician using the nutrition analysis and management system; diet compliance was evaluated based on the results of the urinary ketones and food diaries, and subjects received follow-up dietary advice and counseling individually from the dietician.

In summary, we believe it is safe to conclude that the energy intake values in a report by Kong et al. are about as reliable as it gets. Of course, one can claim – and some certainly do – that such free-living feeding studies are not well-controlled. If we follow such criteria, how many "well-controlled" studies we have on dietary supplements, or pharmaceuticals, or other interventions lasting longer than few weeks? Zero.

Already in 1971, Young *et al.* [3] compared 3 diets that contained the same amount of calories (1800 kcal/d) and protein (115g/d) but that differed in carbohydrate content. After 9 weeks on the 30g, 60g, and 104g carbohydrate diets, weight loss was 16.2kg, 12.8kg, and 11.9kg and fat accounted for 95%, 84%, and 75% of the weight loss, respectively. Thus, the authors concluded, "[w]eight loss, fat loss, and percent of weight loss as fat appeared to be inversely related to the level of carbohydrate in the isocaloric, isoprotein diets", consistent with the MBM (When the energy fraction from dietary fat *increases*, while energy intake is clamped, mass intake *decreases* due to the significantly higher energy density of fat in contrast to other substrates). And since these authors were also guided by the erroneous EBT, "[n]o adequate explanation can be given for weight loss differences." To our knowledge, no one has found flaws in the trial by Young *et al*. It is worth noting that they utilized underwater weighing (i.e., hydrodensitometry) to determine body composition, which is more accurate than other widely available methods of body composition testing. When performed properly, underwater weighing can be accurate to 1.8 to 2.8% compared to the state-of-the-art methods (e.g., magnetic resonance imaging [MRI], computed tomography [CT]).

Since it is widely – and mistakenly – assumed that the fundamental cause of obesity is an energy imbalance between calories consumed and calories expended, it was logical to recommend a low-fat diet for weight management and obesity treatment. However, data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES) indicate a large increase in carbohydrate intake as a major contributor to "caloric excess" (in reality, macronutrient mass excess) in the United States from 1974 to 2000, whereas the absolute amount of fat decreased for men during this period and showed only a slight increase for women (**See Supplementary File 1 Figure 2**]. And it was during this very period when the incidence of obesity raised to its current epidemic proportions, consistent with the mass balance model (MBM) predictions.

References

1. Hall KD. Challenges of human nutrition research. Science 2020 Mar 20;367(6484):1298-1300. doi: 10.1126/science.aba3807.

2. Public Health Collaboration. Randomised [sic] Controlled Trials Comparing Low-Carb Diets Of Less Than 130g Carbohydrate Per Day To Low-Fat Diets Of Less Than 35% Fat Of Total Calories. https://phcuk.org/rcts/?fbclid=IwAR0ZPiJs_Bo4dO6ipt3u1QKmxYcjzazQNtuZPc0bopBzMS9BWnENcAy6Z5A (accessed 11/01/2021)

3. Young CM, Scanlan SS, Im HS, Lutwak L. Effect of body composition and other parameters in obese young men of carbohydrate level of reduction diet. Am J Clin Nutr 1971;24:290–6.

4. Feinman RD, Pogozelski WK, Astrup A et al. Dietary carbohydrate restriction as the first approach in diabetes management: critical review and evidence base. Nutrition 2015 Jan;31(1):1-13.

[DEAR EDITORS, PLEASE NOTE THAT THE REFERENCES IN THIS SUPPLEMENTARY FILE ARE SEPARATE FROM THE REFERENCES IN THE MAINBODY OF THE MANUSCRIPT. THUS, THEY DO NOT FOLLOW THE SAME REFERENCE NUMBERING OR REFERENCE STYLE.]



[FIGURE LEGEND STARTS] Supplementary File 1 Figure 1. Randomized controlled trials comparing low-carbohydrate diets of less than 130g carbohydrate per day to low-fat diets of less than 35% fat of total calories. For further details, see [2]. How likely is that the very-low-carb arms, time after time, substantially overreport dietary records, whereas the high-carb arms consistently underreport dietary records? Figure adapted from [2]. [**FIGURE LEGEND ENDS**]



[FIGURE LEGEND STARTS] Supplementary File 1 Figure 2. Estimated macronutrient consumption during the epidemic of obesity and type 2 diabetes. Data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) by year, and from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Inset: Incidence of diabetes (millions of people with diabetes by indicated year). NHANES suggest a large increase in carbohydrate intake as a major contributor to "caloric excess" (in reality, *macronutrient mass* excess) in the United States from 1974 to 2000, whereas the absolute amount of fat decreased for men during this period and showed only a slight increase for women. It was during this *very* period when the incidence of obesity raised to its current epidemic proportions, consistent with the mass balance model (MBM) predictions. CHO = carbohydrate; Prot = protein. Reproduced, with permission, from [4]. [**FIGURE LEGEND ENDS**]

NOTE:

As Corresponding Author, I confirm that this SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1 has been read and approved for submission by all the named authors.

Sincerely,

Anssi H. Manninen 12/01/2021

“Macronutrient mass intake explains deferential weight and fat loss in isocaloric diets”

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1

Mass balance model (MBM) does not violate any laws of physics

In the “Introduction” section of the main body of the manuscript, it is briefly clarified that the mass balance model (MBM) does not violate the First Law of Thermodynamics. In this SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 2, we further discuss this topic to clear some confusion.

As explained by Arencibia-Albite [1], it is possible for an open system, such as the human body, to be at mass balance while the system experiences a persistent energy imbalance; that is, energy balance may be positive ($\Delta E > 0$) or negative ($\Delta E < 0$) yet the **mass change** that may occur during energy flux is not required by the First Law of Thermodynamics (i.e., the Law of Conservation of Energy) to mirror the energy balance **direction**.

Thus, it is clear that the MBM does not violate the First Law of Thermodynamics.

The energy balance theory (EBT), in contrast, ignores the Law of Conservation of Mass [2]. This Law dates from Antoine Lavoisier’s 1789 discovery that mass is neither created nor destroyed in any chemical reaction; hence, the O_2 mass that enters cellular respiration plus the mass of macronutrients that served as energy fuel will equal the mass of the excreted oxidation products. Daily weight loss is, therefore, the result of daily the elimination of oxidation products (CO_2, H_2O, urea, etc.) and not a consequence of the heat release upon nutrient combustion (i.e., daily energy expenditure).

The **Supplementary File Figure 1** illustrates an example of how weight stability happens concomitant to a persistent and significant energy imbalance. The reader may wonder how we are certain that is not possible to obtain a set of mass-in/mass-out values that result in the expected coincidence of mass balance with energy balance? Arencibia-Albite [1], using linear algebra, analyzed under what conditions mass balance concur with energy balance and found that both ONLY coexist if the following three conditions are simultaneously satisfied:

average absorbed fat mass = average oxidized fat mass

average absorbed carbohydrate mass = average oxidized carbohydrate mass

average absorbed protein mass = average oxidized protein mass

For example, if

65g = average absorbed fat mass = average oxidized fat mass = 65g

250g = average absorbed carbohydrate mass = average oxidized carbohydrate mass = 250g

85g = average absorbed protein mass = average oxidized protein mass = 85g

Then,

Average mass in = 65g + 250g + 85g = Average mass out

And, hence

Average EI = (4.7kcal/g) x 65g + (4.2kcal/g) x 250 + (9.4kcal/g) x 85g = Average EE = 2 154.5kcal

The reason why this is the only way in which weight stability and energy balance coincide lies outside biochemistry and physiology. In mathematics and physics any well-defined problem, such as the coincidence of weight stability and energy balance, has one and only one possibility:

1. The problem is unsolvable.
2. The problem has one and only one solution.
3. The problem has many solutions.

Thus, not all well-defined problems can be solved and if they do it may be true that it has exactly one solution. A classic example is the famous Königsberg bridge problem that in 1736 the Swiss mathematician Leonard Euler was able to demonstrate, without any doubt, that the problem solution did not exist leading to the birth of graph theory, a branch of mathematics with many important applications. Consequently, as demonstrated by Arencibia-Albite [1], the simultaneous satisfaction of these three requirements is what guarantees that weight stability happens together with energy balance and NO OTHER WAY IS POSSIBLE. Consequently, body weight stability must coincide with a persistent energy imbalance, since, as exemplified in the Supplementary File 2 Figure 1, the constitutive processes of gluconeogenesis and *de novo* lipogenesis impede the simultaneous satisfaction of afore mentioned conditions.



[FIGURE LEGEND STARTS] Supplementary File 2 Figure 1. Mass balance can occur in energy imbalance. Here were illustrate hypothetical macronutrient mass input *vs.* output pattern that achieves *weight stability without energy balance*. Circles represent macronutrient (protein [P], carbohydrate [C], fat [F])

body reserves. The left dashed box contains the daily average input mass, whereas the right box encloses the daily average output mass. Energy densities are as follows: ρF = 9.4 kcal/g, ρC = 4.2 kcal/g , ρP = 4.7 kcal/g. While mass balance is achieved, energy balance is NOT since some of the absorbed or stored protein (amino acids) may be transformed into glucose (gluconeogenesis, GNG) or lost through energy expenditure-independent routs DNL = *de novo* lipogenesis. [**FIGURE LEGEND ENDS**].

References

1 Arencibia-Albite F. Serious analytical inconsistencies challenge the validity of the energy balance theory. Heliyon. 2020 Jul 10;6(7):e04204. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04204. eCollection 2020 Jul.

2. Sterner RW, Small GE, Hood JM. (2011) The Conservation of Mass. Nature Education Knowledge 3(10):20.

[DEAR EDITORS, PLEASE NOTE THAT THE REFERENCES IN THIS SUPPLEMENTARY FILE ARE SEPARATE FROM THE REFERENCES IN THE MAINBODY OF THE MANUSCRIPT. THUS, THEY DO NOT FOLLOW THE SAME REFERENCE NUMBERING OR REFERENCE STYLE.]

NOTE:

As Corresponding Author, I confirm that this SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 2 has been read and approved for submission by all the named authors.

Sincerely,

Anssi H. Manninen 12/01/2021

"Macronutrient mass intake explains deferential weight and fat loss in isocaloric diets"

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 3

Energy efficiency in weight loss diets

Contrary what the late Dr. Atkins taught, numerous prominent obesity experts have strictly, if not fanatically, maintained that a isocaloric very-low-carbohydrate/high-fat diet cannot lead to a greater weight loss than a isocaloric high-carbohydrate/low-fat diet – except for the small changes in body fluids – because it would somehow violate the laws of thermodynamics. This is, of course, *not* the case (**See Supplementary File 2**).

Where does the greater weight loss (**See Supplementary File 1**) comes from? Some claim that it is mostly water weight, but this is only true initially. Water loss occurs due to glycogen depletion [1]; however, in the long term, fat loss is a substantial portion (**See the mainbody of the paper**). Others have claimed that a

very-low-carbohydrate diet leads to progressive loss of muscle mass, but this assumption is clearly fallacious [e.g., 2,3].

Regarding the main topic of this **Supplementary File 3**, It has been suggested that "[t]he greater weight [and fat] loss on carbohydrate restricted diets, popularly referred to as metabolic advantage can thus be understood in terms of the principles of nonequilibrium thermodynamics and is a consequence of the dynamic nature of bioenergetics where it is important to consider kinetic as well as thermodynamic variables." [4] (See also [5]). In his latest paper [6], Feinman states that "[e]nergetic inefficiency, substrate cycling and demands of gluconeogenesis support observed advantages for weight [and fat] loss."

In our humble opinion, Feinman and Fine [4,5, 6] fail to recognize that efficacy is NOT a matter of incomplete oxidation of substrates; rather it is about the way the body uses the available fuel resources. Let say you start to run 5km every day and you will soon realize that you can complete the same distance in same time (let say 0.5 h) but with a smaller amount of heartbeats. Now the body has adapted to this cardiovascular stress physiologically, biochemically and – in the long run – anatomically – and thus has become *more efficient fuel utilizer*. That is, your body can achieve the same running average speed (5km/0.5 h=10km/h) utilizing less fuel. However, every time the body oxidizes 1 g of glucose while running the heat released by the body continues to be ~4kcals, which will not change as you age or as a function of your genome, epigenome, or proteome.

Body chemistry – and thus body mass – is all about detailed mass balances, not about energy conservation. Mass balance model (MBM) maintains that a low-carbohydrate (LCD) is more effective in minimizing the daily macronutrient mass intake relative to a high-carbohydrate diet (HCD), and – consequently – a LCD manifests a substantially larger daily weight and fat loss than a HCD. *According to the MBM, weight loss advantage of a LCD over HCD is independent of the differences in the physiological effects of the* diets (e.g., dietary carbohydrate-induced insulin secretion). Rather, deferential weight loss simply emerges from dissimilar macronutrient mass intakes.

Answer the question: what do you measure when you stand on the bathroom scale, your body mass or your energy?

On the other hand, we agree with Feinman's [5] recent conclusion that the control of the glucose-insulin axis, via drastic carbohydrate restriction, allows improvement in all of the markers of metabolic syndrome and provides methods for remission and reversal of type 2 diabetes [**See Supplementary File Figure** 1].

To be fair, one of us (AHM) must admit being "guilty" of suggesting similar ideas about the "metabolic advantage" of LCDs as Feinman and Fine [7]. Sometimes it just happens that the whole knowledge structure turns out to be flawed and - thus – has to be abandoned. *The whole game needs to be changed*. However, correcting a mistake always requires sacrifice. If the mistake has been great, so must be the sacrifice. And if the truth has been denied for a very long time, a dangerous amount of sacrificial debt may have been accumulated.

The take-home message of this **Supplementary File 3** is that the most "cost-effective" way to gain body weight/body fat is to ingest pure carbohydrate-based energy-providing mass (EPM), i.e., sugars, syrup and/or starch. It does not really matter which one in terms of body weight/body fat.

References

1. Fernández-Elías VE, Ortega JF, Nelson RK et al. Ricardo Mora-Rodriguez. Relationship between muscle water and glycogen recovery after prolonged exercise in the heat in humans. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2015 Sep;115(9):1919-26. doi: 10.1007/s00421-015-3175-z. Epub 2015 Apr 25.

2. Manninen AH. Very-low-carbohydrate diets and preservation of muscle mass. Nutr Metab (Lond). 2006 Jan 31;3:9. doi: 10.1186/1743-7075-3-9.

3. Casanueva FF, Castellana M 3 Bellido D et al. Ketogenic diets as treatment of obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus. Rev Endocr Metab Disord. 2020 Sep;21(3):381-397. doi: 10.1007/s11154-020-09580-7.

4. Feinman RD. Fine EJ. Nonequilibrium thermodynamics and energy efficiency in weight loss diets. Theor Biol Med Model. 2007; 4: 27. Published online 2007 Jul 30. doi: 10.1186/1742-4682-4-27.

5. Feinman RD. Beyond "a Calorie is a Calorie": An Introduction to Thermodynamics. In: *Nutrition in Crisis: Flawed Studies, Misleading Advice, and the Real Science of Human Metabolism*. Chelsea Green Publishing, 2019.

6. Feinman RD. The biochemistry of low-carbohydrate and ketogenic diets. Curr Opin Endocrinol Diabetes Obes. 2020 Oct;27(5):261-268. doi: 10.1097/MED.0000000000000575.

7. Antonio J. Manninen AH. Eating to Improve Body Composition. In: *Essentials of Sports Nutrition and Supplements*. Humana Press, 2008.



Low carbohydrate diets are better than low-GI diets or high cereal diets for weight loss, HbA1c, triglycerides and HDL. Data from Westman, *et al* (2008) *Nutr Metab (Lond)*, 5 (36). and Jenkins, *et al* (2008), *JAMA* **300**: 2742-2753.

[**FIGURE LEGEND STARTS**] **Supplementary File 3 Figure 1**. Low-carbohydrate diets are more effective for weight loss, glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), triglycerides (TG) and high-density lipoprotein than low-glycemic

or high cereal diets, all of which are consistent with the MBM. Total-C = total cholesterol; LDL = low-density lipoprotein. Preproduced, with permission, from [6]. [**FIGURE LEGEND ENDS**] (

[DEAR EDITORS, PLEASE NOTE THAT THE REFERENCES IN THIS SUPPLEMENTARY FILE ARE SEPARATE FROM THE REFERENCES IN THE MAINBODY OF THE MANUSCRIPT. THUS, THEY DO NOT FOLLOW THE SAME REFERENCE NUMBERING OR REFERENCE STYLE.]

NOTE:

As Corresponding Author, I confirm that this SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 3 has been read and approved for submission by all the named authors.

Sincerely,

Anssi H. Manninen 18/01/2021

NOTE: The earlier title of this paper was "The mass balance model of obesity explains the weight loss advantage of a low-carbohydrate diet over a isocaloric low-fat diet".