Nutrition and Eating Behavior

Steady Practice Applied Science Series — SP-8

Steady Practice Research · 2026

Abstract

Nutrition is simultaneously the most studied and most contested domain in personal health science. This survey separates robust findings from dietary noise, covering the evidence on dietary patterns, macronutrient roles, meal timing, the food environment, and behavioral strategies for dietary change. Key findings: dietary patterns (Mediterranean, DASH) have stronger and more consistent evidence than any individual nutrient; ultra-processed foods drive excess caloric intake independently of nutritional composition; food environment and default choices predict dietary behavior better than nutritional knowledge; self-monitoring of food intake reliably improves diet quality in the short term; intermittent fasting produces similar weight outcomes to continuous caloric restriction for most people; and dietary behavior is among the most habit- dependent of all health behaviors, making the habit science (SP-1) directly applicable. We cover the landmark dietary trials, the macronutrient debate, meal timing evidence, behavioral economics applied to eating, self-monitoring efficacy, and design principles for a platform that uses nutrition as a behavioral variable.

Contents

1. Introduction

Humans make approximately 200–225 food decisions per day, the majority of which occur below conscious awareness (Wansink & Sobal, 2007). These decisions are shaped by: the food environment (what is visible, accessible, and the default option), social context (what others around us eat), habitual patterns (what we always eat at this time, in this place), cognitive load (decisions made when mentally depleted default to familiar options), and explicit nutritional knowledge (the least powerful predictor).

The nutrition science literature is unusually noisy for a domain with such high public interest. Much of the popular discourse is based on observational studies with significant confounding (healthy-user bias, recall bias), or on mechanistic studies in non-human models. The signal-to-noise ratio is substantially better for dietary patterns than for individual nutrients, and better for behavioral strategies than for nutrient-specific claims.

This survey takes a calibrated view: strong where the evidence is strong (dietary patterns, food environment, self-monitoring), skeptical where it is not (most individual nutrient claims,

precise macronutrient prescriptions).

---

2. Dietary Patterns: The Strongest Evidence

2.1 The Mediterranean Diet

The most robust evidence in nutritional epidemiology is for the Mediterranean dietary pattern: high in vegetables, fruits, legumes, whole grains, fish, and olive oil; moderate in wine; low in red meat and processed foods.

PREDIMED trial (Estruch et al., 2013; N=7,447, RCT): Mediterranean diet supplemented with extra-virgin olive oil or nuts significantly reduced cardiovascular events by approximately 30% vs. control diet (low-fat) at 4.8-year follow-up. This is the largest RCT of a dietary pattern for cardiovascular outcomes.

PREDIMED-Plus (Salas-Salvadó et al., 2020): Mediterranean diet combined with caloric restriction and physical activity produced superior cardiovascular risk factor improvement vs. Mediterranean diet alone.

Observational support: Multiple large prospective cohort studies (Nurses' Health Study, EPIC, ATTICA) converge on 20–30% lower all-cause mortality in high-adherence Mediterranean diet groups.

Mechanisms: Anti-inflammatory properties (polyphenols in olive oil, omega-3 in fish), favorable effects on gut microbiome composition, and improved insulin sensitivity.

2.2 The DASH Diet

The Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) diet: high in fruits, vegetables, low-fat dairy; reduced saturated fat, cholesterol, sodium.

DASH trial (Sacks et al., 2001; N=459, RCT): DASH reduced systolic blood pressure by 5.5 mmHg vs. control diet, and by 11.4 mmHg in hypertensive participants. Combined with sodium reduction: 8.9 mmHg reduction vs. DASH alone.

DASH is guideline-recommended for hypertension management and is consistently associated with lower cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and depression risk in prospective studies.

2.3 Common Elements and Dietary Pattern Overlap

The Mediterranean and DASH diets overlap substantially: both emphasize whole foods, plants, lean protein, and de-emphasize ultra-processed foods. Willett et al. (2019) — the EAT-Lancet Commission — identified a "planetary health diet" consistent with these patterns that is also environmentally sustainable.

The consistent message across dietary pattern research: eat mostly whole, minimally processed foods, with abundant vegetables and fruits, adequate protein, and minimal added sugar and refined grains. The precise macronutrient split within this pattern is less important than the pattern itself.

---

3. Ultra-Processed Foods

3.1 The NOVA Classification

Monteiro et al. (2019) developed the NOVA classification of food processing: - **Group 1**: Unprocessed or minimally processed foods (vegetables, fruits, meat, eggs, milk) - **Group 2**: Processed culinary ingredients (oils, butter, sugar, salt) - **Group 3**: Processed foods (canned vegetables, smoked meat, cheese) - **Group 4**: Ultra-processed foods (UPF): "formulations of ingredients, mostly of exclusive industrial use, that result from a series of industrial processes"

Ultra-processed foods include: packaged snacks, sugary beverages, breakfast cereals, fast food, processed meats, ready-to-eat meals, and most products with long ingredient lists of additives.

3.2 The Hall RCT and the Mechanisms of UPF Overconsumption

Hall et al. (2019) conducted the first RCT directly comparing ultra-processed vs. unprocessed diets matched for calories, sugar, fat, and fiber offered (N=20, crossover design). Participants consumed each diet for 2 weeks ad libitum. Key findings: - Ultra-processed diet: participants ate 500 kcal/day more - Ultra-processed diet: 2 lb weight gain; unprocessed diet: 2 lb weight

loss (net 4 lb difference) - Eating rate was faster on the ultra-processed diet (2.5 vs. 2.0 kcal/minute) - No difference in subjective appetite between diets

The finding that appetite did not differ despite 500 kcal/day excess intake is the central puzzle. UPFs drove overconsumption without producing greater hunger — meaning the mechanism was not increased appetite but impaired satiety signaling. Understanding why requires examining four converging mechanisms.

Mechanism 1 — Texture and Chewing Reduction

UPFs are systematically engineered for minimal oral processing resistance. Industrial processes (extrusion, homogenization, emulsification) eliminate fibrous food structure, requiring substantially less chewing than whole foods with equivalent caloric density. Fardet (2016) proposed the "food matrix" concept: the physical structure of food — cellular integrity, particle size, water binding — determines the rate at which calories are delivered for absorption, independent of nutritional composition.

Chewing has two satiety-relevant consequences: it mechanically distends the stomach gradually (extending the satiation window), and it delays caloric absorption, allowing satiety peptides (PYY, GLP-1) to accumulate before excess calories are consumed. Rolls et al. (2000) showed that chewing count per bite predicted meal size independently of hunger — higher chewing count $\rightarrow$ earlier meal termination. UPF texture engineering systematically removes this natural brake.

Mechanism 2 — Eating Rate and the 20-Minute Delay

Satiety signaling operates on a time delay: peripheral satiety hormones (CCK, PYY, GLP-1) require 15–20 minutes after food consumption begins to produce central satiety signals (Cummings & Overduin, 2007). Eating rate determines how many calories are consumed before this signal arrives.

At the Hall RCT eating rate difference (2.5 vs. 2.0 kcal/minute), a 20-minute meal window produces a 100 kcal intake difference from rate alone. Accumulated across 3 meals and snacks, this is directionally consistent with the 500 kcal/day excess intake observed. Eating rate reduction — slower bites, longer meals — is a behavioral intervention acting directly on this mechanism, without requiring dietary composition changes.

Mechanism 3 — Sensory-Specific Satiety Bypass

Sensory-specific satiety (SSS) is the natural reduction in pleasure experienced from a specific food as it is consumed, while appetite for other foods remains intact. It is a within-meal satiety brake: eating enough of one food triggers local hedonic reduction, limiting overconsumption before caloric satiety signals arrive (Rolls, 1986).

UPFs are engineered to minimize SSS. The "bliss point" concept (Moss, 2013) — the optimal combination of salt, sugar, and fat that maximizes palatability while minimizing sensory fatigue — represents systematic effort to keep hedonic reward high across extended consumption. Multi-sensory complexity (varied texture, flavor layers, contrasting temperatures) further delays SSS. The result: UPFs maintain near-constant hedonic reward until caloric satiety arrives, which — given the chewing and eating rate effects — arrives late.

Mechanism 4 — Protein Leverage

Simpson and Raubenheimer (2005) proposed the protein leverage hypothesis: humans prioritize meeting protein targets and continue eating until protein requirements are satisfied, regardless of caloric intake. UPFs are systematically lower in protein density than minimally processed foods. A diet that underprovides protein relative to calories drives total caloric excess as the organism attempts to reach protein satiety.

Gosby et al. (2011) experimental test: reducing dietary protein from 15% to 10% of energy (mimicking high-UPF dietary composition) increased total caloric intake by 12%. The mechanism is biological protein sensing, not conscious preference.

Practical Implication

The 500 kcal/day excess from UPFs is not primarily driven by palatability preference — participants in the Hall RCT did not rate the UPF diet as more enjoyable. It is driven by four mechanisms operating below conscious awareness. This means interventions targeting willpower or dietary knowledge are acting on the wrong mechanism. The effective behavioral levers address the mechanisms directly: slower eating practices, higher protein density to satisfy protein leverage, and reduced household UPF availability to remove the mechanical triggers before they activate.

A platform that tracks UPF exposure (proportion of calories from NOVA Group 4 foods) captures more behavioral signal than one tracking macronutrients, because it indexes the upstream driver of downstream caloric excess.

3.3 Observational Evidence

Multiple large prospective cohorts show consistent associations between UPF consumption and all-cause mortality, cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, depression, and colorectal cancer. Rico-Campà et al. (2019; N=19,899, 10-year follow-up) showed each 10% increment in UPF consumption was associated with a 14% increase in all-cause mortality.

Practical implication: The proportion of calories from ultra-processed foods is a better predictor of diet quality and health outcomes than most individual nutrient measures. A platform that tracks UPF exposure (even at a rough categorization level) captures more signal than one that tracks macronutrients precisely.

---

4. The Macronutrient Debate

4.1 What the Evidence Actually Shows

Decades of dietary guidelines focused on macronutrient ratios (% fat, carbohydrate, protein) have produced little clear benefit. The key findings from comparative macronutrient trials:

Fat: Multiple meta-analyses have failed to show that reducing dietary fat (without replacing with specific substitutes) reduces cardiovascular events. Replacing saturated fat with polyunsaturated fat reduces risk; replacing with refined carbohydrates does not (Mozaffarian et al., 2010).

Carbohydrates: Low-carbohydrate diets produce faster initial weight loss (primarily water from glycogen depletion) but converge with low-fat diets at 12–24 months (Tobias et al., 2015, meta-analysis). No consistent superiority for long-term outcomes.

Protein: Higher protein intake ($\geq$1.6 g/kg/day) is associated with greater satiety, better preservation of lean mass during caloric restriction, and improved body composition outcomes (Morton et al., 2018, meta-analysis of 49 RCTs).

Summary: Protein adequacy and food quality (whole vs. processed) matter more than fat-carbohydrate ratios for most health outcomes. Individual macronutrient prescriptions without addressing food quality and eating behavior are largely ineffective.

4.2 Dietary Fiber

Fiber is the macronutrient component with the most consistent evidence across multiple outcome domains. Reynolds et al. (2019, Lancet meta-analysis of 185 prospective studies and 58 clinical trials): every 8g/day increment in dietary fiber intake was associated with 5–27% reduction in all-cause mortality, cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, and colorectal cancer.

Fiber-rich foods (vegetables, fruits, legumes, whole grains) are consistently in the protective dietary patterns identified across literatures. Fiber supplementation without food source change shows weaker effects.

---

5. Meal Timing and Intermittent Fasting

5.1 Circadian Rhythm and Eating

The circadian clock governs metabolic efficiency: insulin sensitivity, glucose clearance, and fat oxidation follow circadian rhythms, peaking in the morning and declining through the day. St-Onge et al. (2017) review: front-loading caloric intake earlier in the day improves insulin sensitivity, reduces appetite, and is associated with better body weight outcomes.

Eating late at night — particularly after 8–9 PM — is associated with elevated triglycerides, impaired glucose tolerance, and increased energy intake the following day (Kaplan et al., 2018). The mechanism is circadian desynchrony between food intake and metabolic readiness.

5.2 Intermittent Fasting

Intermittent fasting (IF) approaches include: - **16:8**: 16-hour daily fast, 8-hour eating window (time-restricted eating, TRE) - **5:2**: normal eating 5 days/week, ~500 kcal on 2 non-consecutive days - **Alternate day fasting**: alternating ad libitum and very-low-calorie days

Effectiveness vs. continuous restriction: Harris et al. (2018) systematic review (N=279, 6 RCTs): no significant difference in weight loss between IF protocols and daily caloric restriction at 24 weeks. Adherence rates similar. IF may offer an adherence advantage for users who find daily restriction difficult.

Wilkinson et al. (2020) pilot RCT of 10-hour TRE in metabolic syndrome patients (N=19, 12 weeks, no caloric restriction): significant reductions in body weight (-3.3%), BMI, blood pressure, LDL cholesterol, and glucose. Benefits achieved without dietary composition changes.

Practical guidance: IF is a valid dietary strategy for users who find it easier to restrict eating window than to count calories. It is not metabolically superior to equivalent caloric restriction. Eating window timing matters: early TRE (7 AM–3 PM) outperforms late TRE (noon–8 PM) for most metabolic outcomes.

---

6. The Food Environment

6.1 Default Effects and Nudges

Thaler and Sunstein's (2008) nudge framework applies directly to dietary behavior: the architecture of the choice environment predicts dietary choices more strongly than nutritional knowledge.

Wansink et al. (2006) showed that people eat 73% more from a bowl with a hidden refill tube vs. a normal bowl, without noticing the difference. The environment, not deliberate decision-making, drove consumption.

Salience and visibility: placing healthy foods at eye level in cafeterias or refrigerators increases their selection by 15–30% (Just & Wansink, 2009). The healthiest option should be the most visible, most convenient, and the default.

Plate size: Wansink and Van Ittersum (2013) showed that larger plates cause people to serve themselves 9–31% more food. Portion size is primarily cued by environmental containers, not internal hunger signals.

Package size: unit portions reduce consumption by 25% compared to large packages, regardless of the food type or the user's stated dietary goals (Rolls et al., 2004).

6.2 Social Influence on Eating

Herman et al. (2003): the social facilitation of eating is among the most robust findings in food behavior research. People eat 35–72% more in groups than alone. The mechanism: social norms and prolonged meal duration.

Social modeling: people match their food intake to the quantities eaten by social companions. Higgs and Thomas (2016): prior meal was larger after seeing a confederate eat a large portion, even without social interaction — the mere information that someone else ate more increased intake.

6.3 Cognitive Load and Dietary Decision-Making

Baumeister et al. (1998) ego-depletion framework: self-regulation is a limited resource. After cognitively demanding tasks, dietary self-control decreases. Hagger et al. (2010) meta-analysis confirmed: decision fatigue increases unhealthy food choices.

Practical implication: dietary behavior on high-stress, high-cognitive-demand days is systematically worse. A platform that contextualizes dietary data with stress or cognitive load data captures this variation. Planning meals in advance (reducing the decision at the moment of eating) is the most effective cognitive-load mitigation.

---

7. Self-Monitoring of Diet

7.1 Evidence for Food Tracking

Burke et al. (2011) systematic review of 22 studies: dietary self-monitoring was consistently associated with better dietary outcomes. Studies that measured self-monitoring frequency showed dose-response: more frequent monitoring $\rightarrow$ better outcomes.

Tate et al. (2006) RCT: internet-based dietary tracking with feedback produced 3$\times$ greater weight loss than tracking without feedback (5.5 kg vs. 1.5 kg at 1 year). The feedback loop, not just the tracking, is what produces the behavior change.

7.2 The Burden-Accuracy Tradeoff

Manual food logging requires significant effort and is subject to systematic underreporting. Dhurandhar et al. (2015) showed that self-reported dietary intake data is unreliable for precise caloric estimation across populations. Systematic underreporting ranges from 12% (dietitians) to 60% (obese populations).

Practical resolution: the goal of food tracking for a behavior change platform is not precise caloric accounting but pattern awareness. "I notice I eat significantly less on days after I exercise" is a useful behavioral insight. Caloric precision to ± 50 kcal is not.

Photo-based food logging: smartphone camera + ML food recognition (Snap Nutrition, Google Lens) reduces logging burden to seconds and is approximately 80–85% accurate for common foods. Error is systematic (same foods misidentified similarly) and acceptable for behavioral pattern detection.

7.3 Sustaining Dietary Self-Monitoring

Food diary adherence drops steeply over time. Harvey-Berino et al. (2010) showed online food tracking adherence fell from 85% at week 1 to 42% at week 12 in a weight loss program. Predictors of sustained tracking: higher baseline self-efficacy, perceived accuracy of the tracking tool, and positive feedback based on data.

---

8. Eating Behavior Patterns and Psychological Factors

8.1 Emotional Eating

Emotional eating — eating in response to negative emotions rather than hunger — is a significant predictor of overeating and dietary quality in observational studies. Van Strien et al. (2016) showed emotional eating mediates the relationship between stress and unhealthy eating independent of dietary intentions.

The mechanism: negative affect activates reward-seeking behavior; highly palatable foods (high sugar, fat, salt) provide immediate hedonic reward. This is the same reward mechanism that

drives other habit-based behaviors (SP-1).

Interventions for emotional eating: mindfulness-based approaches (SP-5) reduce emotional eating in RCTs (Katterman et al., 2014 meta-analysis, d = 0.49). CBT-based approaches targeting the cognitive appraisals driving negative affect are similarly effective.

8.2 Dietary Restriction and the Rebound Effect

Restrained eating — chronically monitoring and restricting food intake — is associated with paradoxical increases in food intake when restraint fails. Polivy and Herman (1985) "what the hell effect": after a perceived dietary transgression, restrained eaters eat significantly more than unrestrained eaters, because the perceived goal has already failed.

This is the dietary analog of streak psychology (SP-6): all-or-nothing thinking produces worse long-term outcomes than flexible consistency approaches. Nutritional prescriptions that label foods as "forbidden" or "cheating" create the psychological conditions for rebound eating.

8.3 Food Addiction and Hyperpalatable Foods

The "food addiction" construct — applying addiction criteria to eating behavior — remains scientifically contested but captures a real phenomenon: some users experience loss of control over eating hyperpalatable foods (high sugar + fat combinations) that is not explained by hunger. Gearhardt et al. (2011) Yale Food Addiction Scale: approximately 15–20% of adults score positive for food addiction criteria on hyperpalatable foods.

Practical implication: for users who describe loss of control around specific foods, restriction-based approaches (willpower) are less effective than environmental redesign (remove trigger foods from the home, substitute with less hyperpalatable alternatives).

---

9. Nutrition and Other Health Behaviors

9.1 Diet and Sleep (→ SP-3)

Sleep deprivation raises ghrelin (hunger) and reduces leptin (satiety), increasing appetite by 24% (Spiegel et al., 2004). Short sleep consistently predicts weight gain in longitudinal studies. Chronically poor sleep impairs dietary self-regulation independently of motivation.

Practical link: a platform that improves sleep quality will see secondary dietary behavior improvements without direct dietary intervention. Framing sleep improvement as a dietary behavior strategy (not just a performance or mood strategy) increases motivation for sleep investment.

9.2 Diet and Exercise (→ SP-4)

Exercise increases caloric expenditure but also increases appetite, partially offsetting the caloric deficit. The "compensatory eating" effect is real but varies substantially by individual and exercise intensity (Donnelly & Smith, 2005).

The more reliable nutrition-exercise link: exercise protects lean mass during caloric restriction (Morton et al., 2018) and improves insulin sensitivity, making the same dietary intake produce better metabolic outcomes.

9.3 Diet and Mental Health

Jacka et al. (2017) — the SMILES trial (N=67, RCT): dietary improvement intervention significantly reduced depression scores compared to social support control at 12 weeks (MADRS reduction: 11.0 vs. 4.7). The first RCT showing diet can improve clinical depression outcomes.

Firth et al. (2020) meta-analysis (16 RCTs): dietary interventions significantly reduced depression symptoms (d = 0.36) and anxiety (d = 0.25) across clinical and non-clinical populations. Effect sizes are comparable to other psychological interventions for subclinical presentations.

---

10. Design Principles for Steady Practice

Track dietary patterns, not macronutrients. The question "how many ultra-processed foods did I eat this week?" is more predictive of health outcomes than "how many grams of fat?" Design for pattern awareness over nutritional precision.

Surface environmental cues. "You ate more calories on evenings when you worked late" is an actionable insight. Environmental awareness is more useful than nutritional knowledge for most users.

Reduce eating decision burden. Meal planning features (what am I eating tomorrow?) reduce the decision at the moment of eating, when cognitive load and willpower are lowest.

Don't frame food as forbidden. Any "clean eating" or "no X foods" framing creates conditions for the rebound effect. Use frequency and proportion language: "eating X most of the time" is durable; "never eating X" is not.

Connect dietary behavior to the whole system. "On days after you slept less than 6 hours, your caloric intake averages 15% higher" is a systems insight that motivates sleep improvement more than a nutrition lecture. The dietary-sleep-exercise triangle is the highest-value connection a platform can surface.

Apply habit science directly. Dietary behavior is among the most habit-driven of all health behaviors. Use the implementation intentions (SP-1 cross-reference): "After I pour my morning coffee, I will prep vegetables for the day" is a food habit stack. Eating at consistent times in consistent contexts is a dietary habit design choice.

Individual Variation

Nutrition science has produced some of the most compelling recent evidence that population averages conceal enormous individual-level heterogeneity. The practical consequence is that the dietary advice generated from cohort studies and meta-analyses — even well-conducted ones — may be literally wrong for a specific individual, not because the science is flawed but because the individual is a genuine outlier relative to the mean response.

Glycemic response. The Weizmann Institute study (Zeevi et al. 2015, N=800) measured

postprandial glucose responses to identical standardized meals across 800 individuals wearing continuous glucose monitors. The same foods produced responses ranging from minimal elevation to diabetic-range spikes in different individuals. Bread — a food with a well-characterized population glycemic index — produced wildly different responses: some individuals experienced minimal glucose elevation; others showed peaks typical of high-glycemic foods. Gut microbiome composition was the strongest single predictor of individual response, stronger than food composition alone. This finding means that population glycemic index tables have limited predictive validity for any specific individual's actual glucose response.

Fat metabolism. APOE genotype is one of the clearest pharmacogenomic examples in nutrition. APOE4 carriers show approximately twice the LDL elevation per gram of saturated fat compared to APOE2 carriers. The standard dietary guidance to reduce saturated fat for cardiovascular risk management applies with substantially different force depending on which APOE alleles an individual carries. APOE4 individuals — approximately 25% of the population — show measurable LDL increases from saturated fat at levels that are neutral or even beneficial for APOE2 carriers. The standard advice is correct on average and wrong at the individual level in a predictable, genetically determined way.

Caffeine metabolism. CYP1A2*1F genotype cleanly divides the population into fast and slow caffeine metabolizers. Fast metabolizers (1A/1A genotype) clear caffeine rapidly; slow metabolizers (1F allele carriers) maintain elevated plasma caffeine for substantially longer periods. Cornelis et al. (2006) showed that fast metabolizers in a large cohort showed cardiovascular benefit from moderate coffee consumption (3–4 cups/day); slow metabolizers showed increased myocardial infarction risk at the same dose. The cardiovascular recommendation for coffee is literally opposite depending on CYP1A2 genotype — a clean example of a population-level recommendation that is directionally wrong for a substantial subgroup.

Intermittent fasting response. Women show substantially more variable hormonal responses to extended fasting than men, particularly in cortisol, thyroid, and reproductive hormone dynamics. Women in the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle show different fasting responses than those in the follicular phase. Response to intermittent fasting also varies with baseline metabolic health and chronic stress load: individuals with elevated cortisol at baseline show greater HPA axis disruption from fasting stress. These interactions mean that fasting protocols derived from male subjects or metabolically healthy populations have uncertain applicability to women with stress-related hormonal dysregulation.

Practical implication. Population nutrition trials produce mean effects that may be meaningless for any specific individual. The most accessible individual nutrition experiment currently available is continuous glucose monitoring combined with food logging for 2–4 weeks: this reveals personal glycemic response patterns, identifies individual high-glycemic foods (which may not match standard tables), and generates a personalized response profile. This single experiment provides more individually actionable data than any population dietary guideline.

N=1 Experiment Protocols

The following protocols provide specific, runnable personal experiments for understanding your individual nutritional responses. Each includes measurement specifications, durations, and decision criteria.

CGM Glucose Response Experiment (14 days)

Equipment: Continuous glucose monitor (CGM; Abbott FreeStyle Libre or equivalent) worn for 14 days.

Protocol: 1. Log all meals with estimated portion size using photo documentation (photo-based logging apps reduce friction to seconds) 2. At the end of 14 days, download glucose data and match meal timestamps to glucose response curves 3. Compute area under the curve (AUC) for each major meal type using the CGM app's export feature or manual calculation (sum of glucose values above fasting baseline $\times$ time interval, over 2 hours post-meal) 4. Rank meal types by AUC. Identify your top 3 glucose-spiking meals and top 3 glucose-stable meals. 5. In week 3: select your single highest-spike meal and reformulate it — reduce refined carbohydrate content, add protein, or add fiber — and re-measure AUC. Continue reformulating one high-spike meal per week based on personal CGM data.

Decision criterion: Individual glucose responses to identical foods vary by 2–3$\times$ across people. A food that generates minimal glucose elevation in one individual may produce near-diabetic peaks in another. Your personal CGM data replaces population glycemic index tables, which have limited predictive validity for individual responses, with direct measurement. Use

the output to identify your personal high-risk meals rather than applying generic tables.

Food-Mood-Energy Tracking Protocol

Objective: Detect personal associations between dietary choices and energy, focus, and mood — relationships that are not visible in daily experience but emerge over 2 weeks of systematic measurement.

Measurement procedure: - Three ratings per day (within 30 minutes after waking, at midday, at end of workday): Energy (1–10), Focus (1–10), Mood (1–10) - Photo log of all main meals (main course minimum; beverages optional) - Classify meals post hoc into categories (high-protein, high-carbohydrate, ultra-processed, vegetable-dense, etc.) — do not classify in advance, to avoid influencing choices

Analysis (after 14 days minimum): - Lag the food data by one time period: compute correlations between previous-meal category and the subsequent rating period's Energy, Focus, and Mood scores - Run Pearson r for each meal category against each outcome variable - Flag any correlation with $|r| > 0.3$ for follow-up crossover experiment

Decision criterion: Any correlation with $|r| > 0.3$ is large enough to warrant a follow-up 2-week crossover (one week eating more of that food category, one week avoiding it) to distinguish correlation from causation. Most people will find 1–2 meaningful patterns; pursuing all of them simultaneously is not necessary.

Elimination N=1 Crossover Experiment

Objective: Test whether a suspected problem food produces measurable physiological or psychological effects for you specifically, using a controlled crossover design.

Protocol: - **Weeks 1–3 (elimination phase)**: Remove the target food completely. Measure weekly: morning HRV (5-minute resting measurement using a validated app), daily energy rating (1–10, assessed within 30 minutes of waking), and nightly sleep score (from wearable if available) - **Week 4 (reintroduction)**: Resume eating the food at roughly your previous frequency. Continue the same weekly measurements for the full week.

Analysis: Compare late elimination (week 3) vs. reintroduction (week 4) on all three outcomes.

Week 1 serves as baseline; week 3 represents stable elimination effects.

Decision criterion: A difference of ≥ 0.5 standard deviations on any outcome measure between late elimination and reintroduction is sufficient to identify the food as a personal performance variable. This is not a diagnostic test — it is behavioral optimization data. Use it to inform dietary choices based on your individual response, not population averages.

---

11. Conclusion

Nutrition science is characterized by a paradox: the population-level evidence for dietary patterns (Mediterranean, DASH, minimally processed whole foods) is robust and broadly consistent, while the individual-level evidence for specific dietary strategies is far weaker and far more contested. Most dietary debates — low-carb vs. low-fat, breakfast timing, optimal meal frequency — are largely resolved at the individual level by the fact that adherence to any reasonable dietary pattern predicts outcomes better than adherence to the optimal pattern theoretically.

The behavioral science of eating is clearer and more actionable than the nutritional science. Food environment design, reduction of ultra-processed food availability, self-monitoring with feedback, and meal timing routines all produce reliable improvements without requiring dietary optimization debates. The best dietary program is one the user will actually maintain — and maintenance is a behavioral design problem more than a nutritional content problem.

For a personal science platform, nutrition is best approached as a behavioral variable (how often, how much, in what contexts) rather than a content optimization problem (what macronutrient ratio). The most valuable experiments are not "is low-carb better for me?" but "does meal timing affect my energy levels?" and "how does food environment change my intake patterns?" — questions the user can actually answer with N=1 methodology.

References

Burke, L. E., Wang, J., & Sevick, M. A. (2011). Self-monitoring in weight loss: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 111(1), 92–102.

Donnelly, J. E., & Smith, B. K. (2005). Is exercise effective for weight loss with ad libitum diet? Energy balance, compensation, and gender differences. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 33(4), 169–174.

Dhurandhar, N. V., Schoeller, D., Brown, A. W., Heymsfield, S. B., Thomas, D., Sørensen, T. I. A., … & Allison, D. B. (2015). Energy balance measurement: When something is not better than nothing. *International Journal of Obesity*, 39(7), 1109–1113.

Estruch, R., Ros, E., Salas-Salvadó, J., Covas, M.-I., Corella, D., Arós, F., … & Martínez-González, M. A. (2013). Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with a Mediterranean diet. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 368(14), 1279–1290.

Firth, J., Marx, W., Dash, S., Carney, R., Teasdale, S. B., Solmi, M., … & Sarris, J. (2020). The effects of dietary improvement on symptoms of depression and anxiety: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 81(3), 265–280.

Gearhardt, A. N., Corbin, W. R., & Brownell, K. D. (2011). Preliminary validation of the Yale Food Addiction Scale. *Appetite*, 52(2), 430–436.

Hagger, M. S., Wood, C., Stiff, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2010). Ego depletion and the strength model of self-control: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(4), 495–525.

Hall, K. D., Ayuketah, A., Brychta, R., Cai, H., Cassimatis, T., Chen, K. Y., … & Zhou, M. (2019). Ultra-processed diets cause excess calorie intake and weight gain: An inpatient randomized controlled trial of ad libitum food intake. *Cell Metabolism*, 30(1), 67–77.

Harris, L., Hamilton, S., Azevedo, L. B., Olajide, J., De Brún, C., Waller, G., … & Ells, L. (2018). Intermittent fasting interventions for treatment of overweight and obesity in adults. *JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports*, 16(2), 507–547.

Harvey-Berino, J., West, D., Krukowski, R., Prewitt, E., VanBiervliet, A., Ashikaga, T., & Skelly, J. (2010). Internet delivered behavioral obesity treatment. *Preventive Medicine*, 51(2), 123–128.

Herman, C. P., Roth, D. A., & Polivy, J. (2003). Effects of the presence of others on food intake: A normative interpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(6), 873–886.

Higgs, S., & Thomas, J. (2016). Social influences on eating. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1–6.

Jacka, F. N., O'Neil, A., Opie, R., Itsiopoulos, C., Cotton, S., Mohebbi, M., … & Berk, M. (2017). A randomised controlled trial of dietary improvement for adults with major depression (the "SMILES" trial). *BMC Medicine*, 15(1), 23.

Just, D. R., & Wansink, B. (2009). Smarter lunchrooms: Using behavioral economics to improve meal selection. *Choices*, 24(3), 1–7.

Katterman, S. N., Kleinman, B. M., Hood, M. M., Nackers, L. M., & Corsica, J. A. (2014). Mindfulness meditation as an intervention for binge eating, emotional eating, and weight loss: A systematic review. *Eating Behaviors*, 15(2), 197–204.

Morton, R. W., Murphy, K. T., McKellar, S. R., Schoenfeld, B. J., Henselmans, M., Helms, E., … & Phillips, S. M. (2018). A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of the effect of protein supplementation on resistance training-induced gains in muscle mass and strength in healthy adults. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 52(6), 376–384.

Monteiro, C. A., Cannon, G., Levy, R. B., Moubarac, J.-C., Louzada, M. L. C., Rauber, F., … & Jaime, P. C. (2019). Ultra-processed foods: What they are and how to identify them. *Public Health Nutrition*, 22(5), 936–941.

Mozaffarian, D., Micha, R., & Wallace, S. (2010). Effects on coronary heart disease of increasing polyunsaturated fat in place of saturated fat: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLOS Medicine*, 7(3), e1000252.

Polivy, J., & Herman, C. P. (1985). Dieting and binging: A causal analysis. *American Psychologist*, 40(2), 193–201.

Reynolds, A., Mann, J., Cummings, J., Winter, N., Mete, E., & Te Morenga, L. (2019). Carbohydrate quality and human health: A series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *The Lancet*, 393(10170), 434–445.

Rico-Campà, A., Martínez-González, M. A., Alvarez-Alvarez, I., de Deus Mendonça, R., de la Fuente-Arrillaga, C., Gómez-Donoso, C., & Bes-Rastrollo, M. (2019). Association between

consumption of ultra-processed foods and all cause mortality: SUN prospective cohort study. *BMJ*, 365, l1949.

Rolls, B. J., Roe, L. S., & Meengs, J. S. (2004). Salad and satiety: Energy density and portion size of a first-course salad affect energy intake at lunch. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 104(10), 1570–1576.

Sacks, F. M., Svetkey, L. P., Vollmer, W. M., Appel, L. J., Bray, G. A., Harsha, D., … & Cutler, J. A. (2001). Effects on blood pressure of reduced dietary sodium and the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) diet. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 344(1), 3–10.

Salas-Salvadó, J., Díaz-López, A., Ruiz-Canela, M., Basora, J., Fitó, M., Corella, D., … & Bulló, M. (2020). Effect of a lifestyle intervention program with energy-restricted Mediterranean diet and exercise on weight loss and cardiovascular risk factors. *Clinical Nutrition*, 38(6), 2716–2724.

Spiegel, K., Tasali, E., Penev, P., & Van Cauter, E. (2004). Brief communication: Sleep curtailment in healthy young men is associated with decreased leptin levels, elevated ghrelin levels, and increased hunger and appetite. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 141(11), 846–850.

St-Onge, M.-P., Ard, J., Baskin, M. L., Chiuve, S. E., Johnson, H. M., Kris-Etherton, P., & Varady, K. (2017). Meal timing and frequency: Implications for cardiovascular disease prevention. *Circulation*, 135(9), e96–e121.

Tate, D. F., Jackvony, E. H., & Wing, R. R. (2006). A randomized trial comparing human e-mail counseling, computer-automated tailored counseling, and no counseling in an internet weight loss program. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 166(15), 1620–1625.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.

Tobias, D. K., Chen, M., Manson, J. E., Ludwig, D. S., Willett, W., & Hu, F. B. (2015). Effect of low-fat diet interventions versus other diet interventions on long-term weight change in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*, 3(12), 968–979.

Van Strien, T., Roelofs, K., & De Wied, M. (2016). Emotional eating, negative affect, and the effects of appetite-related hormones. *Appetite*, 103, 79–87.

Wansink, B., & Sobal, J. (2007). Mindless eating: The 200 daily food decisions we overlook. *Environment and Behavior*, 39(1), 106–123.

Wansink, B., & Van Ittersum, K. (2013). Portion size me: Plate-size induced consumption norms and win-win solutions for reducing food intake and waste. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 19(4), 320–332.

Wansink, B., Painter, J. E., & North, J. (2005). Bottomless bowls: Why visual cues of portion size may influence intake. *Obesity Research*, 13(1), 93–100.

Wilkinson, M. J., Manoogian, E. N. C., Zadourian, A., Lo, H., Fakhouri, S., Shoghi, A., … & Taub, P. R. (2020). Ten-hour time-restricted eating reduces weight, blood pressure, and atherogenic lipids in patients with metabolic syndrome. *Cell Metabolism*, 31(1), 92–104.

Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., … & Murray, C. J. L. (2019). Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet*, 393(10170), 447–492.

Cummings, D. E., & Overduin, J. (2007). Gastrointestinal regulation of food intake. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 117(1), 13–23.

Fardet, A. (2016). Minimally processed foods are more satiating and less hyperglycemic than ultra-processed foods: A preliminary study with 98 ready-to-eat foods. *Food & Function*, 7(5), 2338–2346.

Gosby, A. K., Conigrave, A. D., Lau, N. S., Iglesias, M. A., Hall, R. M., Jebb, S. A., … & Raubenheimer, D. (2011). Testing protein leverage in lean humans: A randomised controlled experimental study. *PLOS ONE*, 6(10), e25929.

Moss, M. (2013). *Salt Sugar Fat: How the Food Giants Hooked Us*. Random House.

Rolls, B. J. (1986). Sensory-specific satiety. *Nutrition Reviews*, 44(3), 93–101.

Simpson, S. J., & Raubenheimer, D. (2005). Obesity: The protein leverage hypothesis. *Obesity Reviews*, 6(2), 133–142.