

Menno and Eric



DANNY LENNON:

Thank you for doing the podcast.

ERIC HELMS:

My pleasure.

MENNO HENSELMANS:

My pleasure.

DANNY LENNON:

And for Menno for hosting us. I suppose, just before we get into anything else, maybe to get us warmed up, I will do a brief update on what you guys have been up to. Eric, I'll probably start with you, given that you're one week out for your next competition and you've been deep into your contest season so far; and since the last time we've talked, maybe give me an update on where you are and what's been going on.

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Let's see. Last time we talked, you were visiting me in February or March?

DANNY LENNON:

I believe you were like five weeks out from your first show.

MENNO HENSELMANS:

First show, so yeah, that would have been either – we had just presented in...

DANNY LENNON:

In February I think or March.

MENNO HENSELMANS:

So we presented in Australia and then I think you came and visited New Zealand, and this is

Menno and Eric

when I was still pretty sane, I would say. I was still doing...

ERIC HELMS:

That was long ago.

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Things have changed, yeah. I was still doing much more qualitative cues. Somewhere around, I think, man, it's three to six weeks out, somewhere in that range, I started tracking and the show went very well. I placed second to one of our 3DMJ clients, but more importantly it was the best I've ever looked on stage, and I was really pleased. But I would say, I was in certainly acceptable condition, like, I had a the main glute striations, maybe one or two, and a couple of dents, but certainly could have improved my condition and that's basically what I focused on. But right after, and this is a big win for me, right after the show, I went to Italy, for a week with my wife. We did a cool contest prep seminar there with a group who is translating the pyramids into Italian which is just the great, great folks, the WMBF affiliate there, and some folks who worked on Brad Seanfields book in Italian, so it's a really good group of people, and so we had a full week in Italy after a weekend seminar.

If I was to tell you as a coach, how many times people going on a vacation post show results in shame, pain, weight gain, and other things that end in AIN, and not really enjoying the sights and time, and really just kind of feeling this push-pull love-hate, I can't vacation-I should vacation, I need to reverse dieting-to recover dieting, I need to stay on the diet, whatever, it's never a good thing, but I crushed it. I just did so well, and I was very pleased with myself, I kind was an athlete to be in that position to eat at moderation and to have like a qualitative diet break post show. And when I got back and the water weight had dissipated just from the flight, not even the food, I was half a kilo up from where I was the previous week when I was in Hawaii. And yeah, slid back into the diet after a two-week diet break. And if when you were with me you saw difficulty of like say 3 out

of 10, on like the contest prep scale, which is awesome for getting into that kind of shape I was really pleased, it got to the point where I had to push it all the way to like an 8 out of 10 going from like 1980s conditioning standard to fully striated glutes, cross-striated quads, striated triceps and being potentially as competitive as you can be for your body there was a monumental level of effort that had to occur and it definitely got a lot harder.

And it's just very interesting to me from a researcher perspective, I want to know more about that because I think the data we have and some of the stuff we'll be talking about here at UVC, and my presentation, is all related to what you have to do to get shredded but not the actual conditioning you reach, there's not a whole lot of data on what is it just like to be 4% body fat as a male or 8% body fat as a female. But there's a whole lot on low energy availability or large deficits or being glycogen depleted or things like that. But we know body fat signals leptin, we know there's got to be all kind of – the effects of just being lean, but we haven't well quantified it because sane athletes just get as lean as is beneficial for performance; while insane athletes aka not really athletes aka physique athletes like myself are essentially getting to the point where they are not conducive to anything except looking the way you look. And I just don't think we have a lot of data on that.

So anyway, I'm expanding a lot, but basically I've been living the life of dieting but it's been good, I've been able to stay up with podcasts and it's affected my work and cognitive function a little bit but I only really had a really deep hard two-week period where I was crushing myself and I was under 9 kcals per pound for the whole week on average for a couple of weeks to get to the place I needed to be. And now the food's coming up, on the week out, and three weeks out, and seven weeks out, and then I'm done.

Menno and Eric

ERIC HELMS: You got three more shows.

MENNO HENSELMANS: Yes sir. And the beauty of it is, so I'm here at UBC, and I'm one week out; and then when I'll be onstage in my next show, I'll be two weeks out; and then I will go home and I'll fly out to the EPC, European [inaudible 00:10:01] conference in the UK, and I'll be one week out from my last show.

DANNY LENNON: That's hardcore.

MENNO HENSELMANS: So the joys of traveling, while being in the fun stage of prep, has also been a really cool challenge. So this has been a really cool year just to prove to myself that I can pivot shift and do the whole bodybuilding prep thing regardless of what's going on in my life. And don't get me wrong, it does create more stress in my life; it is harder, but it's cool to see that I can rise to meet it, prove to myself I know how to do it, and that gives me flexibility rather than taking away from the options in my life.

DANNY LENNON: Yeah, it's not essentially stopping any of the stuff you would have been doing anyway. It just makes stuff harder.

MENNO HENSELMANS: Exactly.

DANNY LENNON: Yeah. So speaking of traveling, Menno, maybe update us on what you've been doing the last few months and has it been hopefully not as miserable a time as it's been [inaudible 00:10:53].

MENNO HENSELMANS: Let's not get started on where I've been, that would be a long list. I'm still doing the digital nomad life, but business-wise one of the main things I'm focusing on is expanding my PT course into Norwegian and German. And we have a couple of research projects going on; one really cool study with Andy Galpin on intermittent fasting. Basically, I think this will be the first study, if we can get subject compliance, which we're devoting a lot of attention to, to really see what the effect of

Menno and Eric

intermittent fasting on muscle growth is. So basically, we're going to do, like, four square meals a day, basically, Stuart Phillips recommendations versus original Martin Burkins' lean gains protocol with early morning workout actually fasted, 16-8. I think the timing is 16-8, yeah. I think that will be a really cool study. And then afterwards with Bill Campbell, we're going to do the replication of the matador study on basically diet breaks, but we're going to be doing a bit more realistic program. We have a bit fewer diet breaks because they were doing every other week, if I recall correctly. That's still like probably a year or six months out before we do this, but it's all underway, funding and everything. So I think that's going to be really cool as well.

ERIC HELMS:

That's awesome because Jackson is, he's going to be two months left in collecting diet break study in athletes, the three to one that he's doing out in Perth, that I'm a part of. So it'll be really good to have a plethora of research coming out on diet breaks and athletic training population.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, both those kind of study designs you mentioned were kind of two things that actually I think we could get into in this conversation or at least similar things, and I definitely want to get back to the diet breaks, because, as you mentioned, a study that Jackson is kind of finishing up now, I think the last 10 people are actually...

ERIC HELMS:

Yeah, he's got 10 subjects left.

DANNY LENNON:

And they are selecting that right now. But there are some questions I want to ask both of you on that general topic. The other one around intermittent fasting, before we get into that specifically, it kind of reminded me of something that I think each of you may have a slightly different position on from what I've seen from the outside. So you can feel free to correct me if any of this is wrong. But it relates to, if someone has, let's say, an alternating

Menno and Eric

intake across a week that would kind of create a deficit, at least from what I've known from talking to you Eric, you would be quite wary of how much on any given day those low days should go with the idea of what it's going to do to muscle protein balance for example.

ERIC HELMS:

Sure.

DANNY LENNON:

Whereas, as far as I'm aware, and you can correct me, Menno, you don't see that as much of an issue on certain days to push a bit more aggressively on low days and maybe that could even extend to complete fasting or prolonged periods of fasting, I'm not too sure. So first of all, do I have that position correct?

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Pretty much. I would never recommend complete fasting. So as long as I go, it's like a protein sparing modified fast, which means protein intake remains high and all essential nutrient intakes are covered. So that in itself, with some practical leeway of your main dieting and sustainability, basically, puts the low end – I've actually done a lot of experimentation with this, on protein intake times 9.7 calories per day, so about 10 times protein intake. So if your protein intake is like 150 grams, then my estimate of minimum sustainable energy intake on rest days, like, not really rest days, but way outside the anabolic window, so when I think there is no more elevation in protein synthesis, it's like 1500 calories.

ERIC HELMS:

I can theoretically disagree with them, but I was on lower than that for my protein intake just to get to where I've been. So I think there's – so first, I would say, you probably have characterized our opinions accurately, but the devil is in the details. If Menno had said something like, yeah, 1.6 grams per kg of protein and nothing else for the day, I might have pushed back a little bit, but he didn't say that. And that is low calories, but it's not insane, and like, he's covering nutrient basis. So yeah, I think it all depends on where those

goalposts are. So if you look at some of the actual every other day fasting protocols out there, you're on like 500 calories or nothing on some of those days, which I don't think that I would be surprised if that was optimal for sparing lean tissue. But that's not really the goal in those studies, they're just looking at achieving a deficit.

So I don't disagree with Menno when it comes down to what it actually looks like, because I think, when you're at the point where you'd be using a protein modified fast essentially on your dieting days, with your refeeds, I don't think that's just – I wouldn't just put someone on that. But if I had to, that's kind of just the nature of physique sport, if we're talking in that context, is that you do what you have to do to get someone into a good position. Like, I saw, our good friend, Alex Thomas, he's promoting evidence-based practice in the sports nutrition space, Sports Nutrition Australia is doing good things; he's getting people talking about energy availability, and he had a nice little infographic of good energy availability, okay for non athletes, and then you don't want to go there. And I'm looking at, and it's like under 30 kcals per kg energy [inaudible 00:16:35] like, that's just, like, very people are going to get in shape without being at times below that if they're in for bodybuilding, but that's just the reality of the sport. Just like I tell someone, are you going to play American Football, make sure you don't get concussions; but it's not like the guy across the lines is going to go, I'm going to not hit you very hard. If you're going to be a boxer, you're going to get punched in the face; if you're going to be a bodybuilder, you're going to be starving at a certain point relative to you. You eat as much as you can to get lean, but I do think – so, for example, my kcal intake for an entire week was around 20 kcals per kilogram for two weeks straight, that's with high days and low day. You can imagine, my low days were actually below what Menno was talking about – just to do what I had to do in a timeframe I had, looking at the rate of weight

Menno and Eric

loss and the progress I was seeing in my physique.

MENNO HENSELMANS: So work on [inaudible 00:17:28] calorie intakes on training [inaudible 00:17:29].

ERIC HELMS: So I had five days at 1200 calories, which was just basically veggies and protein for me.

MENNO HENSELMANS: So like basically protein [inaudible 00:17:39] modified fast.

ERIC HELMS: Exactly, yeah. And then I had two days at 2500 in a row. So I had a five and two setup, and I just adjusted my training so that the highest [inaudible 00:17:49] RPs were occurring on my refeed days, that's going to be individual, what we consider hard and what rep range combinations and all that. And that's not ideal, that's not recommended, and I would not do that unless I had to do that. But I think it's very easy to play kind of backseat quarterback and look at someone's numbers and go, that's crazy, it shouldn't be that low, and it's, like... But if you're a coach and someone is not dropping body fat, and you have skin fold data and you have body weight data, it sort of doesn't matter, like, okay, do you want to get striated glutes. Yes, I do. Well, then we have to do something. We've had a diet break. We've had a 4-3 setup, like, I was dieting on four low days, three high days, three 2700 calorie days. So we tried trying to eat up and get the metabolism revved up "metabolism". We took a diet break. We got to a very lean condition. But to get from like that, perhaps 6% body fat down to the 4% body fat, for me to be as competitive as I can be, we had to rob Peter to pay Paul, and I've had to do that with many clients. I've had to, yes, read my JISSN paper on what my recommendations for bodybuilding are; and yes, I have clients right now who are below those calorie ranges, below those fat ranges, and sometimes even below the protein ranges, just got to figure out a way in what works best for you in that individual space. So I don't think Menno and I actually disagree when it comes down to what you need

Menno and Eric

to do. I don't think that's just the way you should set up a diet though. I wouldn't start with someone on 10 times their protein intake for total calories for the day. I would start them on the highest calorie intake I could across the week, and it would probably be a little less extreme between high and low days.

DANNY LENNON:

Sure. Let me put it different way then. So if we're taking someone that doesn't get to a point where that's necessary to go that low, but instead, for one reason or other their preference is to have a super-low day like this, or just says why can't I do this, I could put it to you, why would it be such a problem and is that decreased, let's say, their muscle protein balance overall you're saying is maybe more suboptimal if they're going super low, is that really actually much of a problem at all? And if so, why?

ERIC HELMS:

I am most confident in saying, we don't know. I think, right now, my opinion is that we are banking too much longitudinal assumptions on reductionist perspectives of what happens in muscle on how hypertrophy occurs. To avoid going on a total tie right here, I'm going to kind of just talk through what I think we do know. So basically, we know people lose muscle if they go on extended calorie deficits and get lean, if they are not novices on weight training pretty consistently. Mechanistically, how that happens, we know a couple of things. For one, when you take someone who is with obesity or who is not lean and you put them on a calorie deficit, we see a blunting in muscle protein synthesis. When someone is actually lean, we've seen this in Atherton and one other study, I think Posiaco's, not only is muscle protein synthesis blunted in response to protein feeding and training, but there is also an elevated muscle protein breakdown. So those are gross categorizations though. The actual recovery process from muscle damage and the remodeling process when you look at the complexity of skeletal muscle and how we're learning new things about it all the time

and the signaling pathways, I don't think it's accurate to just pretend that muscle protein, or rather that hypertrophy or atrophy occurs as an isolated ongoing event. I think it does, but there are other aspects that are going on there that I would be – I think it would be arrogant to try to be that reductionist with it, because that's the only measures we have. I don't think we don't – we don't know, we don't know yet; but we do know that a dieting lean person has getting hit on both ends of that equation.

So therefore what should we do? Well, we probably want to make sure that we can resist and strain; we probably want to make sure that we can get the most bang for our buck out of our protein in this case. We're also now moving away from some of the disparity between lab based outcomes in protein synthesis research and real world. So, for example, again, tirade is happening, there's no way around that I'm sorry. If you look data on Peri-workout feeding, nighttime feeding or protein distribution, you get very clear trends when you look at studies that are on short term, you see most muscle protein balance is better and you distribute things. But when you start to look at systematic reviews, meta-analyses and randomized controlled trials, all of a sudden, the protein distribution spread theory, nighttime feeding if protein is matched, or meta-analytics around Peri-workout nutrition, the effect sizes drop a lot; often it's non-significant or it's very clear there's no difference. That makes sense to me because we don't, in the real world, fast for eight hours, only eat whey protein and have an isolated training session and then do nothing else. You don't you don't just eat 80 grams of protein over a 12-hour period. There's a study on a lean steak, only 25 grams of protein, you eat it, and there's a six-hour study and muscle protein synthesis was elevated for the entire study. So that means at least six hours for a lean steak, that's not a way. Now, imagine having a reasonable-sized steak, where that's 50 to 60 grams, and you had it with a baked potato and some butter, and you've got lipids

Menno and Eric

and fiber and vegetables and you ate four hours prior, and you might have a snack before you go to bed, you've got a Conga line of amino acids going through your body all the time and you're not going to have these peaks and valleys, you're going to have one dip in your first meal and that's it, for most of the way that most people eat and unless they're doing intermittent fasting on a calorie deficit or if they're only eating 1400 calories.

So to bring it full circle, the time where you might really want to think about these peaks and valleys is when your total nutrient intake is so low that only what you're eating is protein because now you're starting to look like an actual study, and these are lean proteins too, because you don't have the calories to have proteins with fats. So if you're only eating 10 calories per gram of protein, your body is going to be looking a lot more like those studies where they bring in an athlete fasted and have them only eat protein for the day. So maybe we do want to think about those peaks and valleys. But then again, in those scenarios, like you're talking about, only do that if you have to is my opinion.

DANNY LENNON:

Menno, I want to get your perspective on that, if any of that differs from Eric, or just that original question answered, how you would have approached that subject of why is it an issue if you think...

MENNO HENSELMANS:

I do think there are some potential benefits to gain from calorie recycling, which is why the reason I do it. In terms of the likelihood of muscle loss, we definitely don't have like super solid data on this. So my main perspective is if you can take calories away, outside the anabolic window, and we think there is no harm in that, that means we can shift them towards the anabolic window where there is greater likelihood of them having benefits. So that's basically my perspective, so it's not training rest days, it's anabolic window versus non-anabolic window, and that can be a big

difference, because sometimes it means someone doesn't have periods outside the anabolic window, especially for a novice trainee. So pretty much for a novice trainee, I don't have the [inaudible 00:25:44] modified fast days. If we have, say, an advanced trainee that's training only three times a week, then my programs would be quite alternating in energy intakes. But it depends on how big their workouts are and when they do their workouts, when the actual calorie peaks are down. So if they're training first thing in the morning, then training the rest days would differ substantially. But if they are training late at night, I would continue high calorie intakes at least at breakfast and probably lunch the next day. And of course, it also depends on the complexity you want with a client.

But anyway, I think the benefits are that if you look at calories cycling versus alternate day fasting, it's one of the things types of calorie cycling we have the most research on, compared to continuous energy restriction as they usually call it, so same energy intake throughout the entire week. Then the research is generally saying fat loss body composition change is the same, but some studies – I think there are two studies that find greater fat loss which may be adherence, but still, they find greater fat loss with the alternate day fasting type setups. There's also a review by Verati and, I think, a meta-analysis on super low, like, super, super low energy intake, not sure how relevant it is, but it found a transfer greater fat free mass per reservation with the alternate day fasting type setups. And so, the research is actually, if anything in favor of, like, alternate day fasting compared to continuous energy intakes, that's mostly in sedentary individuals. But I think the difference is, it's likely going to be similar if you're keeping calories high around and especially after the workouts, which is key for strength training. And there are also two studies, finding improved adherence, so people actually prefer the alternate day fasting type setups, and that's

also what I've experienced with clients. Many people think they don't prefer it, and if you just ask people, then probably the majority will say, no, that sucks. But if you actually have them do it, then many people will actually like calorie cycling compared to non-cycling. And conversely, there is to, my knowledge, no study finding significant detrimental effects in terms of adherence compared to continuous calorie intake which is like, intuitively what everyone says. You present any evidence for calorie cycling and they're like, for like, a protein sparing modified fast twice a week which is what I could do with a client. And they're like, yeah, that's insane, people can't do that. But actually, people can. The research is quite clear that the worst case scenario is pretty much, it's still the same energy deficit across the week, and that's what usually gets you in the end. That's the most important thing, and the distribution is secondary, but it may even help to have high and low days throughout the week.

So it's like the opposite of the refeeds where the benefits of refeeds, there's also a form of calorie cycling. So at some point where you're like, whatever [inaudible 00:28:40] two high days, five low days, it's a continuum, whether you shift that until you're saying like, I have refeed days versus at some point you're saying I've PSMF days, but somewhere in between we actually have the same calorie distribution across the week. So, in that sense, I'd say, I probably seek them a little bit more than Eric, the low intakes outside the anabolic window. But yeah, the overall, yes, I definitely agree with. In terms of muscle loss, I'm not too fussed, because if you look at research, even on complete fasting, we know that at 15 hours we have the first indications that anabolic signaling like mTOR, and the like, start actually decreasing. And then 15 to 20 hours, we have indications of dropping leucine balance, and I think it's only after past 20 hours and into the 30-hour realms where you really get consistently actual decreases in protein

Menno and Eric

balance, like whole body protein balance, so it takes a surprisingly long time before you actually get to that point. That's with zero calorie intake, zero protein intake, with just nothing. So I think that, especially if you were talking about 24 hours, still getting your protein in, calorie intake not being absolutely minimal, the risk of actual muscle loss is very minimal. In general, protein breakdown rates don't decrease much, like there's Posiaco's [inaudible 00:30:08] also two studies by Stuart Phillips showing that they were not super lean; but in 20 and 40% deficit, there was zero, or at least not a significant decrease in protein breakdown with energy intakes dropping, again, 20 to 40%, compared to maintenance. Protein synthesis though does take the main hit, so in the end, it doesn't really matter, it's still protein balance, it goes way down. But at least, in terms of like muscle loss, direct muscle loss, I think there's very little cause for concern.

DANNY LENNON:

Right, yeah. And then one of the things that kind of gets talked about when people are looking at the actual degree of the calorie deficit and aggressive dieting protocols is that you could probably make a strong case, and that both of the things that I think both of you mentioned already is on the presumption someone is doing resistance training and has a high protein intake and has distributed that appropriately across the day, that's probably going to mitigate most of that. The second kind of question then that sometimes can sound a bit like a stupid question to people is, for a lot of people who are not in a contest prep, does some degree of muscle loss, even if it happens, does that matter that much, in that, after their diet is over, how readily or what position are they in to gain that back relatively easily?

ERIC HELMS:

A couple of things, I think, one, and I don't want it to turn into a debate, because I think you're asking really important questions, but I will say that when we're dealing with the kind of literature that Menno and I are talking

about, there is going to be reasonable different interpretations of it based on how comfortable you are extrapolating from what exists. I think there's nothing wrong with Menno and I being at different comfort levels, like, I'm aware of Verity in 2011 showing superior lean mass loss, I'm aware of the studies showing superior fat loss, but I'm also aware that there have been meta-analyses published in the last three years since Verity that include all their studies that came to a null conclusion. So it's at least null or positive. I would definitely agree with that. Another thing related to the mechanisms involved and the time course before you see muscle loss is that it is almost completely based on people who are overweight, and we do know there are substantial differences in lean people and overweight people. So I just want to put that out there too, we shouldn't assume transference of non-training overweight individuals to a lean bodybuilder, let's say that.

Now with that said, I don't think his position is unreasonable at all. But I am not comfortable enough to say, yeah, like he's not advocating for a lean body [inaudible 00:32:57] 30 hours without eating either. He's saying, hey, the research on what we have says it's probably not a problem. So I think eating 10 times your protein and lifting weights is probably going to be enough to sustain muscle retention. And I'd say, it probably is. Could it be not perfect for retaining muscle retention? Sure. But to your question, one thing I've had to struggle with in writing up recommendation based papers on bodybuilding is how much do we emphasize muscle retention – is there, especially in natural bodybuilding, an obligatory loss of muscle to reach essential levels of body fat in the majority of people? And there may very well be, but it's also difficult to measure true muscle loss. There's, I think, somewhere around 13% of adipose tissue is lean mass. So depending on how you're measuring it, and the vast majority of studies on bodybuilders, and actual body composition change in athletes in general, are two compartment models. So when

we see lean body mass, are we seeing lean muscle mass? Sometimes, yes. Sometimes, no. That's probably the answer to that. To what degree? How much is this related to their training? How much can you – does being an experienced competitor for longer, given what we're learning about muscle memory, make you less likely to lose muscle as you get more experienced? Something I've anecdotally observed is that the first time someone diets for bodybuilding show, they lose a shit-ton of muscle as a natural athlete. And then the second, third, fourth, fifth, 18th time is very different.

I've been pleasantly surprised at how little muscle I've lost, given the degrees I pushed myself previously, but even more so now. And some of that is knowing what you can do in the gym and pushing yourself, some of that is psychological, some of it is figuring out what works best for your body, etc., but there also comes – to your point, let's say, there is an obligatory amount of muscle loss that is required in most athletes to get them the kind of condition they need to be to be their most successful, basically, saying that yes, you at 90% of your current muscle mass, but 2% body fat leaner would beat you if you were 10% more muscle but not in a good kind of shape. That's true in most cases if we're talking about the bodybuilding division, it may not be in men's physique. But even better than that, in my opinion, is getting ready early, because certainly I've seen that while I'm not an advocate for the worst representation of reverse dieting, like, adding 100 calories per week and still staying in a deficit after a show or after a season, in the middle of a season, for example, in what my game plan has been, where two weeks ago I achieved peak condition, and now my calories have been coming up, I have been gaining performance in the gym, seeing more fullness, I don't know if I'm putting the lost muscle mass back on but I'm very certainly putting glycogen back on and performing better and seeing – I've actually hit

Menno and Eric

PRs in a few things in the last couple of weeks. Getting ready early and eating up into a show is probably the best ideal. That way, yes, we do what we have to do and you lose some muscle but now we have an opportunity to try to correct that without putting on body fat. So I think it comes down to, all right, if we're probably going to lose muscle, whether you use a continuous or intermittent strategy then some other strategy needs to come in to try to correct that to see if we can get the most [inaudible 00:36:28].

DANNY LENNON:

I guess, just to clarify, because in that case, for sure, I think with a contest prep it obviously matters how much muscle is retained or, as much as we can, there probably will be some. But I guess, what I'm wondering is, for someone not in that particular situation who just trains and eats for general aesthetics, let's say, or maybe competes in some other sport and is offseason, could you make the case that, again, let's accept that, even though we don't have to, this person may lose a bit more muscle by dieting super aggressively just because they want to and how much of that is a problem in that those few weeks they save from dieting they can gain that muscle back or potentially even more, of that.

ERIC HELMS:

I would be concerned about the weight regain. There's some decent data that suggests that hyperphagia is going to be predicted by lean body mass losses. So if someone loses a bunch of muscle on a cut, their hunger levels and their leptin ghrelin balance and their hormone levels are not going to normalize until they regain that lean body mass. So that's a big component of it. So maintaining lean body mass I think is important for the maintenance of that lost tissue. So if we're not talking about a bodybuilder, we're talking about an athlete, or someone who just wants to, like, I want to get in there, get done, get the diet finished, then I can back to normal life. Normal life may be struggling with weight regain if there's a substantial amount of lean body mass lost. If

Menno and Eric

we are talking in small amounts, I don't think it's going to be huge, but that might be offset by the benefit of intermittent diet and giving you chances to practice maintenance which there's good data on, like, the Byrne diet break study, showing better retention of fat loss down the line. And if you look back at Wing, 2002, the accidental diet [inaudible 00:38:21] the accidental diet break study, I think that indicated that probably not just adherence during the diet, probably more importantly for non-bodybuilders and athletes, the psychological and behavioral aspect of intermittent diet and giving you the opportunity to go what is it like to live on a diet because you're presumably typically going to maintenance or they were in Byrne. And I think it's difficult to plan for the period after the diet when you're eating 1500 calories, because I can't live like this, I don't know what it's like, it's a huge alteration to your behavior. And if that's like your continuous approach, you'll get there real quick. But then if you have a 2700 calorie day that's a maintenance, that's going to be actually a few hundred calories less than when you get your body fully revved up back to normal TDEE. That's your opportunity to go, you know, this ain't half-bad, I can actually have breakfast at a cafe. It gives you the opportunity to practice maintenance which I think is an invaluable and undervalued tool.

DANNY LENNON:

Menno, any thoughts on the muscle loss being an issue and any of the things that I threw out there?

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Is it a concern for bodybuilders, 100%, I'd say. I know that there is actually one paper that has investigated the impact of body composition on judging, scoring on bodybuilders, and they found that by far the most significant predictor was body fat percentage which I think Eric and I can anecdotally very much agree with. There's one thing that's really important if you want to get your client to a pro level is that their conditioning, and then muscle mass is definitely secondary to that. So, for example,

you're limited in time, you have to get them down like, this is a worst case scenario because I fully agree with Eric, getting in shape on time is one of the most important things; one of the biggest difference between contest prep now and like during the 80s, that six-week contest prep, that eight-week contest prep, that's like maybe if you were shredded as hell beforehand, but otherwise it's more six months than six weeks. So that's one thing. On the other hand, I'd myself probably lose more muscle than I need to with dieting because I eat two meals a day. So I'm pretty sure that's [inaudible 00:40:31] but I also think I'm pretty much at my natural max in terms of muscle mass, so I should have so much muscle retention and I've also been bigger and also fatter and bigger. That is probably not a big concern, I'll probably easily regain that. So for my personal scenario, it's not a concern. With clients, I am very concerned with it, because, for one of the concerns Eric raised, but also there's one [inaudible 00:40:58] that found that I think it was 20 versus 30% deficit or thereabout, and the 20% deficit group actually lost more fat because they were recomping while the other group was losing muscle mass.

So the problem with muscle loss is that that energy that comes from the body is now no longer coming from the fat because your body is, there's a given amount of body energy that the body is losing, so that energy is no longer coming from fat, but it's coming from muscle mass. So to that extent, it's hurting fat loss. Any muscle loss will directly be fat loss, plus you're no longer – to the extent that it decreases protein synthesis, as Eric talked about, it will hurt fat loss even further, because muscle protein synthesis is an energy intensive process. So the muscle loss in itself is a direct deterrent to fat loss. It's literally a zero-sum game in terms of energy loss from a body. Plus the reduction energy expenditure, so it's even worse than that. So it's pretty much a worst case scenario or like, in my case, the adherence is so much more important or someone has

Menno and Eric

major muscle retention or muscle memory on their side, otherwise I would almost always, especially for untrained individuals and probably most scenario where this applies to women where they think it's not that important for them to have muscle mass, whereas in reality it probably is, and it will help them lose fat. So in practice, yeah, definitely, I think muscle retention is very important.

DANNY LENNON:

Just on the side note, is the two meals a day for a personal preference or some other health-based reasons or what is that meal frequency for you?

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Yeah, I think it might have health benefits, but most importantly, I don't like meal prepping, I don't like spending time eating food. I enjoy really big meals, so it's just really convenient for me, and we go out a lot these days to restaurants and stuff and trying with that with like six meals a day and feeding a restaurant meal with 500 calories, that's not going to happen, because if I eat sushi, I'm looking at 2000 calories minimum probably, that's like implementing every strategy I can to mitigate the damage.

DANNY LENNON:

Do you, typically, where you place those, start of the day, end of the day, or is it both bookended at the end of the day or what... ?

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Yeah, I'm quite meticulous with the timing because I respond very well to morning intermittent fasting. So my first meal will be at like 2:00, and then I make sure to do the workouts relatively shortly afterwards, so I don't train fasted, and I'm well nourished during the workout. And then the second meal is by far the bigger meal, like 50% bigger, so the timing in terms of stimulating protein balance is actually really good, and the fast occurs mostly in the time when protein synthesis levels also probably aren't as high. So at least I have like the minor benefits of carb backloading, anabolic window nutrient timing, and those things on my site, they probably

Menno and Eric

don't weigh up against the loss of one to two meals compared to a perfect setup; but at least within the constraints of really wanting to limit it to two meals, I think I'm doing it very meticulously.

DANNY LENNON:

Super interesting. I did want to come back to the diet break thing before we wrap that particular topic up. And in the types of populations we're talking of, we don't really have much protocols that would match up to what is anecdotally done by a lot of coaches. And I know both of you have probably used diet breaks to some degree, maybe in different ways or in different frequencies with clients, I guess, so we could get into a whole slide of it being related to psychological benefits. But if we're purely sticking with the hypothesis around some sort of physiological benefits for diet breaks, would you classify yourself as more optimistic or pessimistic on what these studies may show?

MENNO HENSELMANS:

I'm actually pretty pessimistic in terms of potential benefits and neglected downsides, so I think a diet break can definitely be very strategically implemented. And I know a lot of coaches have success with them, Eric, and I've also talked with quite a lot of coaches that have good anecdotal success with them. I don't have that good success with them, I have to say, and I think that the benefits – or the downside is mostly the lack of routine that, if you want to do a diet break, I think it's really important to stick to routines and really implement it, not like – I don't like the word diet break itself basically. So I don't like the idea of actually taking a break from the dieting. You're taking a break from the deficit maybe, so that I can see some sense in, but the changing of lifestyle habits is actually in the first diet break study which has been heralded as the vindication of diet breaks because the offers hypothesized it with harm adherence, and it didn't. And that sort of got turned into the herald of diet breaks are great. There was also no positive effect and there were some indications that adherence

was a bit poor, especially in the week right after the diet break, and subjects report it, which is definitely also what I have seen that people got into different lifestyle habits, they were eating foods that they still probably shouldn't be. When you're on a diet and you're learning how to eat high-protein cheesecake and you go on a diet break, you eat real cheesecake, and then you go back to the high protein cheesecake, you're like, okay, so actually it's not that great, okay; whereas, when you're just dieting for a long time and you're just eating that, you're like, oh my god, this is so awesome, I can actually eat this and it still has high protein, I could fit it into my calories easily.

So I think those are dangers that you really have to be aware of, and I think people, especially people that don't do diet breaks with a coach, but they just have their perspective like, okay, now the breaks are off for a week and then I go back. That's the reason diets fail for most people, like, the yo-yo diet, they don't make sustainable lifestyle changes. So I like the perspective a lot more of like, Eric mentions, the idea of practicing maintenance, something like that a lot more than the name diet break, because I think there are a lot of dangers with that. And also the matador study, which is the only study that's reasonably controlled and found that true benefits, like, in terms of retention of energy expenditure, I'm very, very skeptical of that based on the other literature, which is part of the reason I want to replicate it in strength trainees, because it wasn't significant in absolute terms, it was only relative to fat free mass, it was borderline significant if I recall correctly. And it was, if you look at that other literature, it sounds quite in stark contrast with that, it generally shows no effects of how you distribute calories across very wide array of context in terms of the adaptive form of genesis that occurs, it's all body composition; like, it doesn't matter how you time it, how you distribute calories, how fast you diet, it just matters what body composition you enter; like, other research

even finds that even if you crash diet, as long as you get to the same body composition, your energy expenditure will be the same at that point. I've done a very comprehensive review on metabolic damage which also basically found that it doesn't matter what the diet is, all that matters is the body composition you get to in terms of adaptive form of genesis at least.

So I think actual metabolic advantages, going in the direction of metabolic damage and the like are highly unlikely. You're talking about maybe, probably the same benefits that I think may exist with aggressive calorie cycling that maybe you're sort of not tricking but, yeah, somewhat taking advantage of delays in metabolic adaptation with the aggressive calorie cycling or maintenance versus deficit days or whether it's a week or a day, that maybe there is some advantage in that, you're sort of staying ahead of the metabolic adaptation because we know that some adaptive form of genesis adaptations take three days to manifest, they're not super instant. So maybe there is something, but in terms of actual physiological benefits of a diet break, I think they will never be worth the time it takes, because even if you look at a study like eight weeks of dieting with a week diet break in between versus eight weeks of continuous cutting, you have eight more weeks with the diet break study, you're talking about double the time investment, and that's the main thing, you could be spending that time bulking. So if you're, especially that's an extreme protocol, I think, not really any [inaudible 00:49:28] chooses, but if you do a diet break every other week, then yeah, you're going to get better results probably, but it's taking you twice as long. And if you factor in the fact that the other group could have started their lean bulk way earlier, and then you match the results based on that in a strength training, I think the results will be definitely in favor of the non-diet break group.

Menno and Eric

DANNY LENNON:

Okay, and I'll kick the same thing over to you, Eric, pessimistic or optimistic?

ERIC HELMS:

I would say, I am optimistic, but it depends on the context, and it's really important to, instead of looking at diet breaks and intermittent dieting as is this good or bad, I think that's a really not useful paradigm to look at it, and I know it's the trap we all fall in. But this is definitely, I would say, this isn't a hammer, this is like a specific type of turning wrench; and you can tell I've never fixed anything in my life – a turning wrench, so this is a type of wrench you turn.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, I suppose we don't.

ERIC HELMS:

Yeah, you know, those non-turning wrenches. I really only know how to do one thing, and that's to prep bodybuilders and be a bodybuilder. So I can't ride a bike nor can I use wrenches. But anyway, so it's really important to think of what is the utility of a diet break, and to understand that we have to think about not only behavior but physiology, and I know you asked physiology, the first thing Menno talked about was kind of the behavioral aspects, it's just so intrinsically linked to it, and to understand the kind of underlying mechanisms here. So I'm going to start with saying that behaviorally, diet breaks exists on a continuum, and I'll tell a story, we'll go back to Wing was this herald of diet breaks being good is because the way we looked at diet breaks before is they are literally the break of the diet, something being broken down. And when I talk to people about the utility of diet breaks, the analogy I use is, hey, do you get your oil changed in advance or do you wait until your car breaks down to get the oil changed. People chuckle and it makes sense, and that was basically the research perspective. Diet breaks are clearly bad. They are the whole reason the nutrition industry has been largely ineffective, because we know how to lose weight, but we can't keep it off. So just the fact that people stopped dieting but didn't regain weight was in

stark contrast to what existed, but in very true quantitative terms that's not better, like Menno said, it's just not bad.

So then as you continue this kind of behavioral paradigm of thinking what's the differences here, why is it better or sometimes worse or sometimes really bad or sometimes potentially beneficial? The difference is the contrast between the two and their purpose. So the extent to which you will deviate from the behavior you had on the diet is dictated by how much diet fatigue you had on the diet. So the extreme end of that is I push myself to the nth degree, broke the diet, and went out and binged. The binge eating behavior is starkly contrasting to the diet, and that's what we see, people regain weight and sometimes even get fatter than they started – a big problem, that's why we're studying it. In the Wing study, we just saw they went back to normal, like, whoa, that's a big deal and maybe this could result in maintenance. But there were indications that it was a little tough for that first week, and that's because the contrast was less. And then in Byrne, we actually see overall beneficial adaptations, maybe a little overstated on the metabolic side of it. But they were intentionally given maintenance diets, had their RE measured, actually tested in a pretty well-controlled study as best you can in kind of outpatient model, and we saw benefits. So the degree to which there is a behavioral contrast between a diet break and the diet, can be a threat to its benefit, and I totally agree with Menno on that. And if you read my blog article that I wrote called the Default Diet on 3DMJ, where I basically said, hey, the skeleton of your diet should be the same in-season, off-season, prep, reverse diet, recovery diet, whatever, and it's what are you add on top of that. I think you just can't forget that behavioral component. So for them to work, it needs to be that there is behavioral similarities, even if there's quantitative differences in energy intake, which is really what we're talking about here is then,

Menno and Eric

okay, well, in what cases would and why I would use that.

So I also agree with Menno, even when you get the best body composition advantage out of intermittent dieting, it's still not going to overwhelm just being in a deficit longer. So yeah, you might spend, like the example of Garth, which is a tough one because they weren't all dieting the same length of time, they're individualized, but even then, you did see a smaller deficit resulting in a much better ratio of body comp. But still, if you compared the individuals on a 20 versus 30% deficit who dieted for the same length of time, there was still an advantage to a larger deficit in total fat lost. And there's just no way around that. But then the question is, well, as everyone, the example Menno gave of a physique athlete that isn't going to go lean bulk, no, and I would say the two situations that are very much polar opposites of where diet breaks might be useful is at the end of your dieting period you have to get on stage and you're judged by your body composition or you don't plan on necessarily doing a lean bulk, you're someone who's trying to adopt a new lifestyle change. So let's say, you have a client who's 140 kilos at 5'6", they definitely don't want just a diet from being 140 kilos down to 70 straight through, because then they're going to have no idea what life looks like not dieting and that diet break becomes important. However, much more for the behavioral side of it. I think where there's potential physiological benefits is the leaner you get and that's where there is probably a greater rationale, because the leaner you get, the harder you have the diet, and what you have to do to get there, the more there is a potential for benefit, and we just don't have enough data in intermittent dieting in lean individuals, which is why I think Menno's study and Jackson's study are so important; because, if anything, the rationale would be increased for someone who is in a dieted state because they are receiving more pushback from their body if you will.

So that's kind of how I see. It's also important to a lot of the, I would say, the counter-arguments to refeeding or diet breaks, people bring up over feeding studies. Like, for example, Dirlwanger, where – I'm probably mispronouncing that, but they're like, there's only a 7% increase in, I think total energy expenditure and leptin barely moved, and it didn't make much of a difference. But that was people going from maintenance to an over feeding period for three days, not, I've dieted for eight weeks and now I've done three days. And it's important to remember that refeeds aren't distinct from diet breaks, it's all just how much of a surplus are you in or are you in maintenance and for how long, and it exists on a continuum. So the potential benefits of a four-hour refeed versus a 12-hour refeed versus a 24-hour refeed versus a 48-hour refeed versus a 72-hour refeed is that a diet break now, at what point does it become a diet break. I would agree with Menno that it's going to be kind of this continuum nebulous, and eventually when it's long enough, it is a registered behavior change, not just like, okay, I'm doing this for the weekend and I'm getting back to it, and it's going to affect how you act differently. So we can't really separate the physiology from the behavior unfortunately. I do think if there is potential for benefit, it's in those two scenarios where you need to maximize the optimal body composition and a time restricted period, and therefore you want to try to have that endpoint to be your best, not, okay, and now the diet's over, I can lean bulk and regain whatever I lost, because, no, you're going to get on stage, or you're not necessarily worried about lean bulking but you benefit from that behavioral practice of being out of the deficit periodically, and might also get some small physiological benefits.

It's also important just to think about it's not all just what happens in aggregate at the end of a diet, and one way I can point that out is if you think about people who have bulimic like

tendencies. When you look at people who weight cycle, and they might end up being the same body weight, but you've seen some really negative effects on their body from overfeeding and going back to a diet where it's not a net deficit, but they were at points in a deficit and then in a surplus and it's not the same as being at maintenance the whole time. We see a lot of negative outcomes from that, and you can see, you know, that's basically relative energy deficient science sport. But like, there's a case study of a, I believe it starts with an H, but I can't number, it's a female figure competitor who gained weight out of her show but didn't get her menstrual cycle back for a year and a half. So what I think you're seeing there is that she was probably, and it's specifically said in the discussion, she took a measured approach and exerted restraint to try not to gain weight too quickly, because she didn't want to gain too much body fat. And I know what that looks like in practice, it means not eating enough post-show, but then binging, and then correcting for it, binging and correcting for it, and still having a linear trajectory. And when you step back far enough, and you look at it year and a half, you're like, oh, she's 10 kilos up from stage weight, why doesn't she have her period. It's because she hasn't been in actual surplus for any more than three days in a row for a year and a half, if I had to speculate. So it's important to think on the flip side, if that can have a negative physiological consequence, then it probably can on the reverse.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah. I know, it's not the same, but it kind of reminded me of, I believe, this is something you said to me before about what you had noticed anecdotally yourself when dieting, that, as opposed to thinking of what your deficit was across the week, the way when things got really difficult that you needed to have certain days that were extremely low with some high days as opposed to just all the days being relatively low; that on paper may look like the same net deficit but just wasn't going to be on, I guess, a

Menno and Eric

certain threshold to allow you to make the progress in that week you needed to.

ERIC HELMS:

Yeah, and there are, if you look at some of the mechanisms of that, to give credit, to some of the stuff that's come before, like, while UD2, Lyle McDonald's model of that nonlinear diet, it's very theoretical and it's based on a lot of layered assumption on physiology without the studies. I do agree that if you create a huge calorie sink, and you're dieting and you're dieting and you refeed on specific macronutrients in a specific time course and to a specific degree, there is going to be a period where you're not gaining body fat despite being in a surplus. And likewise, going the other way, there is going to be points in a diet where the body is so resistant to fat loss that you have to deplete glycogen way past what you think is reasonable and create a large energy gap to what would be ideal from like an energy availability perspective to effectively lose fat when all that remains is very "stubborn fat". And the risk of losing muscle mass is directly fighting that. So there are points where it's not just math, but it's rather the stubborn and sticky parts of the math, that don't want to be computed, and you can either overwhelm it or you can use time-based strategies like we're talking about; and then if you do just overwhelm it by numbers, like, if you take a guy who's a 180 pounds on stage like me and you beat 1200 calories for five days, I guarantee you, that's not best for muscle retention. But if I am training five days per week, full body, spread apart nicely, two high days, and then I eat up in my show, like, there's a strategy to account for that. But it allows me to actually burn through body fat that really doesn't want to go, like, the top of my glutes, you're supposed to be able to see it, but not a line. And so, yeah, circumventing those defense mechanisms, if you will, of getting incredibly lean, does sometimes require very different strategies than what would be required to get someone from obese to overweight or overweight to a more "normal body fat" level.

Menno and Eric

DANNY LENNON:

Right. Maybe I'll start wrapping up, because I'm mindful of both your time. One question for you, Menno, to finish off here on diet breaks, from a more practical perspective, what you may do with people, if we are, again, you're kind of leaning in the direction of physiologically it's likely or at least you wouldn't be sold on being inherent benefits, so if there are benefits, you could probably put them down to either behavioral or psychological that may or may not influence someone's compliance with a diet. So if we're going on that presumption, in practice, for, let's say, just a general population person that's dieting, do you actively go out and say, well, let's plan to put in diet breaks to help with their compliance, or is it a case of, I suppose, reverse engineering and thinking, well, if they're going to need a diet break at a certain point, is there anything we can do to mitigate that, if it's for a psychological reason?

MENNO HENSELMANS:

How do you minimize the harm of a diet break?

DANNY LENNON:

Right, or even the need to use it in the first place, I guess, right? Is there something we're doing with the dieting strategy that's causing us to frequently need to do this or that they can't stick to...

MENNO HENSELMANS:

We need to break all the time, is the diet really that good.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, essentially.

MENNO HENSELMANS:

Right. So in an ideal world, what I do with robotic clients is I cut and I bulk, cut-book, cut-bulk, zero breaks. But I will very occasionally do a diet break when I think the diet is not going in the right direction behaviorally. And by that, I mean, I focus greatly on sustainability, which is one of the reasons I'm generally, well, I'm known as an opponent of cardio, not that I'm really, I employ it as a last resort as needed, but that's general how I'm a characterized, and it's for these kind of reasons

and many things that I don't advocate where I may dislike in general, because I'm really focused on sustainability when it's almost not a competitor and they're dieting, and anything they do with their food choices, anything, if they're like, also my sometimes, which you could say beef with, if it fits your macros, it's at least the way some people interpret it, is yes you can fit ice cream into your macros, but is that really going to make you happier, and is that the best thing for your lifestyle change or does that person really just need to hear yes you should eat more vegetables, yes you really do need to learn that. So I'm really focused on that, but if I see that someone's diet is really not going in a direction, like I say, psychologically, when I think what will happen, basically, like Eric says, I think they will binge after diet, then I may basically pull on the breaks and try – I'll probably call it a mini-lean bulk then, because physiologically, I can justify the diet break, but I will basically use a mini-lean bulk to pull on the breaks and basically try to see what happens if I increase calories and we try to put it in the context of not as a break or now we're going to bulk, but to, yeah, see that they are not going to an hinge and try to maintain these habits and then resume the deficits. So in that sense, you could say, I very occasionally use diet breaks, but again in ideal worlds I rarely employ them. So it really depends on the clients.

ERIC HELMS:

It's just so important how you implement diet breaks and refeeds and all these strategies. If you see someone, I wish there was a way that you could just know this, but like, typically, when someone does a refeed or a diet break, you'll see the energy density of their diet goes way up, because they start seeking out foods that they can fit in that previously didn't fit, and they'll end up eating – I've actually seen the eating pattern change so much that the actual total food mass that someone consumes on a refeed day is less than a normal day, and then they're hungrier on a refeed day. I think looking at volumetrics and energy density,

which, just for the listeners, if you haven't listened to the Danny's interview with Barbara Rolls, that's a really great one, that's just such a – we've lost that whole trail of research so much now that we've been arguing about whether carbs and fats and proteins and macronutrients are the most satiating, when vegetables kills all of it. When you look at having a – this is something Menno turned me onto, and that I've been pursuing and really interested in – when you keep your energy density really low and you have a high food bulk that is actually low in calories, man, ad libitum dieting becomes really obvious, and the refeed day, it makes you feel like, oh wow, I can live like this, and it also encourages that you're still eating the foods that are quite healthy and full of micronutrients, and it's a very stark contrast to refeeds, oh I get to eat like cake and candy and diet foods and things that are quite calorie dense because you're only going to be able to diet on that while you're dieting, you have to exert restraint to not eat in a surplus when you're eating those foods. But when you have a refeed day and you go out to a cafe and you order sautéed mushrooms, sautéed spinach, a couple of poached eggs, two pieces of sourdough bread, and you look at that, and you're like, that's only 450 calories, like, what the hell, like, oh my god, I can do that five times a day and I'm less than maintenance, all of a sudden it changes your perspective on what's sustainable. So I think you can't throw higher calories at a client on a refeed day or a diet break without any kind of pastoral care and what the actual eating process looks like.

And just as an aside, and then I'll shut up because I'm off topic, when you see nutrition interventions where they've actually included a dietitian who actually sits down with clients and teaches them how to eat versus when they just simply give someone liquid diets or the kind of researcher based, I'm focused on the quantitative calorie intake and numbers, you see very different outcomes in terms of adherence, because people don't think like

Menno and Eric

researchers, they think about food, they only get taught to count calories when they diet. That's why you see these evidence based/pro science arguments where someone will be like, my coach has me eating more food and I'm losing weight; and they go, no, you're on less calories; and they go, no, I'm eating way more food; they probably are eating way more food, they probably are eating four pounds of food now from two-and-a-half, but it's mostly fruits and vegetables and they've learned to like those things, they've been taught how to cook it, they've gotten a lot of pastoral care; and yeah, maybe the coach doesn't have great science skills, but they're getting long-term results with their clients and you're focusing on stuff that doesn't matter, and they are actually driving the wrong way because you're telling them to eat high energy dense foods that taste good but count your macros and you'll be free forever "free" as in, you better bring a food scale with you everywhere you go.

DANNY LENNON:

Yeah, that's actually something I've seen, that's one of the counterproductive things that you allude to with the diet breaks, because, I guess, it's a hot topic in fitness industry now. There's almost a feeling, I guess, some coaches may have of, oh I should be doing this. I know 3DMJ do this with their athletes, I should be doing this. But if they don't have the understanding reasoning, well, why are you doing on this week for this person in this manner, if you can't answer that, it's probably going to do more harm than good, because, yeah, you're neglecting those basic fundamentals of nutrition we typically talk about.

ERIC HELMS:

100%.

DANNY LENNON:

Guys, I'll start to wrap it up here, because we're already more than I would have hoped to keep you this evening. And so before we go, let people know where they can find you on the internet, social media, that type of stuff if they want to keep up. Menno, I'll start with you.

Menno and Eric

MENNO HENSELMANS: Sure. [mennohenselmans.com](http://mennohenselmans.com) should have pretty much everything. I'm also active on Instagram [menno.henselmans](https://www.instagram.com/menno.henselmans) and facebook/[mennohenselmans](https://www.facebook.com/mennohenselmans).

DANNY LENNON: And Mr. Helms?

ERIC HELMS: So the reason why he's no longer Bayesian bodybuilding is I actually jacked it and I was only offered to sell it back for \$2 million. So unfortunately I think I set it too high because I haven't gotten the money yet, but no, I would just like to say, I miss string theory and I miss Bayesian bodybuilding...

DANNY LENNON: Those are the good old days.

ERIC HELMS: Right. So anyway you can find me on all our bodybuilding craziness on [3dmusclejourney.com](http://3dmusclejourney.com), that's the number three, the letter D, [musclejourney.com](http://musclejourney.com).

MENNO HENSELMANS: Soon to be [erichelms.com](http://erichelms.com).

ERIC HELMS: Soon, yeah.

MENNO HENSELMANS: [erichelmsphd.com](http://erichelmsphd.com).

ERIC HELMS: Yes, once I go with a full band leader route and just shit on all other people who built me up and got me here, yeah. You heard of Jeff Berdo, Brad, Andrea and everyone else, I'm the front man, it's going to be [erichelms.com](http://erichelms.com). No, no, definitely not true. So [3dmusclejourney.com](http://3dmusclejourney.com), and for more daily content, hot takes, and fun memes, that's not true actually, I have a pretty bland Instagram, check me out at Helms 3DMJ.

DANNY LENNON: Awesome. Guys, thank you for doing this and for talking to me.

ERIC HELMS: My pleasure.

MENNO HENSELMANS: Thank you.

Menno and Eric

**FOLLOW ON INSTAGRAM: @dannylennon\_sigma**

**SUPPORT THE PODCAST: [patreon.com/sigmanutrition](https://patreon.com/sigmanutrition)**