Concept Paper

Implementing the Mass Balance Model (MBM) in Human Nutrition and Obesity Research: Protocols, Analytical Frameworks, and Translational Applications

Anssi H. Manninen *

Posted Date: 5 May 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

Keywords: mass balance model; direct mass accounting; body weight regulation; indirect calorimetry; nitrogen balance; stoichiometry; clinical protocols; obesity research

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

Concept Paper

Implementing the Mass Balance Model (MBM) in Human Nutrition and Obesity Research: Protocols, Analytical Frameworks, and Translational Applications

Anssi H. Manninen *

Research and Development, Dominus Nutrition Oy, Raahe, Finland; anssi@dominusnutrition.fi

Abstract

The energy balance model (EBM) has dominated human body weight regulation research for nearly a century, yet its reliance on indirect mass-to-energy conversions introduces propagated uncertainties that obscure the stoichiometric mechanisms governing tissue accretion and loss. A mass balance model (MBM), which tracks macronutrient mass flows directly in grams without intermediary energy-unit transformations, has recently been proposed as a conceptually simpler, mathematically consistent, and mechanistically faithful alternative. However, widespread adoption of the MBM has been hindered by the absence of standardized protocols, validated analytical frameworks, and practical implementation guidance. This paper fills that gap. I provide a comprehensive, step-by-step guide to MBM implementation, organized into five interdependent modules: (1) quantification of mass intake via precise food and beverage weighing with macronutrient composition analysis, (2) respiratory gas exchange measurement by indirect calorimetry for stoichiometric determination of substrate oxidation, (3) 24-hour urine and fecal collection protocols for nitrogen and carbon outflow quantification, (4) body composition assessment methods for independent validation of MBM predictions, and (5) data integration and computational workflows that produce complete daily mass balances for carbon, nitrogen, and water. The mathematical and computational framework is fully specified, including the core dynamic equation, derivation of the mass clearance coefficient, and prediction of body composition trajectories via Forbes's relationship. Translational applications are discussed, including early detection of lean tissue loss, real-time dietary monitoring, personalized protein prescription, and pharmacotherapy evaluation. By equipping researchers and clinicians with the tools necessary to adopt direct mass accounting, this paper aims to accelerate the transition from an energy-centric to a mass-centric paradigm in human metabolism research.

Keywords: mass balance model; direct mass accounting; body weight regulation; indirect calorimetry; nitrogen balance; stoichiometry; clinical protocols; obesity research

1. Introduction: The Imperative for Methodological Reform

For nearly a century, human body weight regulation has been framed almost exclusively in terms of energy balance. The energy balance model (EBM) and its operational shorthand, calories-in-calories-out (CICO), have guided research, clinical guidelines, and public health policy. While undeniably valuable as a first-order approximation, the EBM rests on an indirect two-step conversion that has long escaped critical scrutiny: first, ingested macronutrient mass is converted into metabolizable energy (kcal) via population-averaged coefficients, and second, any computed energy imbalance is converted back into predicted tissue mass change using assumed tissue energy densities. As demonstrated in detail elsewhere [1], this mass → energy → mass detour amplifies measurement

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

uncertainty, obscures the stoichiometric mechanisms that actually govern tissue accretion and loss, and has perpetuated persistent misconceptions about thermodynamics in metabolic science.

A growing body of theoretical and empirical work now argues that a mass balance model (MBM) – which tracks macronutrient mass flows directly in grams, without intermediary energy conversions – provides a more precise, mechanistically faithful, and parsimonious alternative [1–6]. In the MBM, body mass change is simply the difference between mass entering the body (food, beverages, inhaled oxygen) and mass leaving it (exhaled CO_2, urinary nitrogen, fecal dry matter, water, and minor losses). This single-step accounting aligns with Lavoisier's principle of mass conservation in open biological systems and avoids the entire calibration apparatus of the EBM, thereby reducing propagated uncertainty by an estimated 40–65 % under typical metabolic-ward conditions [1].

Despite the conceptual clarity and empirical promise of the MBM, its adoption in nutrition and obesity research has been hindered by a practical vacuum. Investigators who wish to move from energy-centric to mass-centric protocols lack standardized procedures for data collection, validated analytical frameworks for converting raw measurements into mass balance components, and clear guidance on how to translate mass-balance outputs into clinically actionable insights. The literature offers no comprehensive protocol spanning the full pipeline – from the precise weighing of foods and beverages to the stoichiometric calculation of fat, protein, and carbohydrate oxidation from respiratory gas exchange and urinary nitrogen, and onward to the interpretation of daily mass balance in the context of dietary interventions.

The present paper fills this gap. Building on the conceptual foundation laid by the MBM [1–6], I provide detailed, step-by-step protocols for implementing direct mass accounting in both metabolic-ward and free-living settings. I present analytical frameworks that convert raw measurements (food mass, beverage mass, urine volume, fecal collections, indirect calorimetry data) into daily mass balances for carbon, nitrogen, and water. These frameworks are accompanied by worked examples, uncertainty estimates, and recommendations for instrumentation and calibration. Furthermore, I discuss translational applications, including how mass balance data can refine the assessment of diet-induced changes in body composition, detect the early onset of lean tissue loss during weight loss, and personalize nutritional therapy.

The imperative for methodological reform is clear. Continuing to rely exclusively on energy-balance calculations is no longer tenable when a simpler, more accurate, and stoichiometrically transparent alternative exists. This paper equips the research community with the tools necessary to adopt that alternative. In doing so, it aims to accelerate the transition from a century-old energy-centric paradigm to a mass-centric framework that is more closely aligned with the physical reality of human metabolism.

2. The Case for Direct Mass Accounting: Simplicity, Precision, and Timeliness

The rationale for abandoning the energy-centric framework in favor of direct mass accounting rests on three interconnected arguments: conceptual simplicity, quantitative precision, and historical timeliness.

2.1. Conceptual Simplicity: What the Body Actually Conserves

At the most fundamental level, the human body is an open thermodynamic system that exchanges atoms – not calories – with its environment. Carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen, and oxygen enter as food, beverages, and inhaled air; they leave as exhaled carbon dioxide, urinary urea, fecal matter, and water. The mass of the body changes only when the net flux of these atoms is non-zero. This is not a matter of interpretation or modeling preference; it is a direct consequence of Lavoisier's principle of mass conservation, which holds with extraordinary precision in all biological systems because the relativistic mass changes associated with chemical reactions are on the order of 10^{-9} to 10^{-10} of the reactant mass – far below any measurable threshold.

The EBM, by contrast, forces investigators to think in terms of an abstract intermediate currency. The body does not possess calorie receptors; it senses mass. Enteroendocrine cells detect nutrients as molecules with mass. Stretch receptors register the physical volume and weight of ingested food.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

Hormones such as leptin, insulin, GLP-1, and PYY are secreted in response to the mass of substrates entering the circulation or stored in tissues. By adopting mass as the primary unit of analysis, the MBM aligns the investigator's framework with the body's own signaling language.

2.2. Quantitative Precision: Escaping the Two-Step Error Amplifier

As detailed in the companion theoretical treatment [1], the EBM is structurally committed to a two-step conversion that amplifies uncertainty at each stage. In the first step, ingested macronutrient mass is converted to metabolizable energy via Atwater factors – population-averaged coefficients derived from early 20th-century bomb calorimetry on a limited number of young men consuming mixed diets. These factors ignore inter-individual variation in digestibility, food-matrix effects, and diet-induced thermogenesis, introducing a baseline uncertainty of ±5–8 % even under optimal conditions. In the second step, the computed energy imbalance is converted back to predicted tissue mass change using an assumed tissue energy density (typically 7,700–9,400 kcal/kg) that can vary by 30–40 % depending on the relative proportions of fat, lean mass, glycogen, and water being gained or lost.

The MBM eliminates both conversion steps. By tracking mass directly – weighing food and beverages to ±0.1 g, collecting 24-hour urine and feces, and measuring respiratory gas exchange – all primary quantities remain in their native, physically measurable units. The stoichiometric conversion factors that remain (e.g., 1 g urinary nitrogen = 6.25 g oxidized protein) are exact constants derived from atomic weights, not statistical estimates subject to population variance. Under typical metabolic-ward conditions, the total propagated uncertainty in daily mass change is reduced by an estimated 40–65 % compared with the conventional EBM pipeline [1].

2.3. Historical Timeliness: Why Now?

Several developments have converged to make the present moment uniquely opportune for a methodological transition from energy-based to mass-based protocols.

First, the theoretical foundation has been laid. The analytical inconsistencies of the EBM have been rigorously documented [2–6], and the MBM has been shown to predict body weight and body composition dynamics with remarkable accuracy – without parameter fitting – in both free-living and prolonged fasting conditions [5]. The conceptual case for mass accounting has been made; what is now needed is the practical toolkit.

Second, measurement technology has matured. Affordable digital scales with 0.1 g resolution, portable indirect calorimeters, and bioelectrical impedance devices for body composition assessment are now widely accessible. The same technological democratization that enabled the rise of continuous glucose monitoring and wearable accelerometry now makes high-precision mass balance feasible outside specialized metabolic wards.

Third, the replication crisis has sensitized the scientific community to the dangers of reliance on noisy, indirect measurements and post-hoc parameter adjustments. Nutrition research, in particular, has been criticized for its dependence on self-reported energy intake data that are known to be systematically biased [7]. The MBM, by anchoring analysis in directly measured mass flows rather than inferred energy values, offers a path toward more robust and reproducible metabolic research.

Finally, the clinical need has never been greater. The global obesity pandemic persists despite decades of energy-based interventions. Precision nutrition – the tailoring of dietary recommendations to individual metabolic phenotypes – requires measurement tools that can detect differential responses to diet composition, not just diet quantity. The MBM, with its ability to distinguish fat loss from lean mass loss and to track glycogen-associated water shifts, provides exactly this capability.

In summary, the case for direct mass accounting is not merely theoretical. It is practical, quantitative, and urgent. The following sections translate this case into concrete protocols that any well-equipped research group can implement.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

3. Standardized Protocols for MBM Implementation

The MBM requires accurate quantification of all mass streams entering and leaving the body. This section provides a comprehensive set of standardized protocols organized into five interdependent modules: (3.1) mass intake quantification, (3.2) respiratory gas exchange, (3.3) urinary and fecal mass outflow, (3.4) body composition assessment, and (3.5) data integration and computational workflows. Each module specifies equipment requirements, step-by-step procedures, quality-control criteria, and expected measurement uncertainty. When implemented together, these modules enable calculation of complete daily mass balances for carbon, nitrogen, and water with propagated uncertainties substantially lower than those of conventional energy-balance approaches.

3.1. Module 1: Quantification of Mass Intake

3.1.1. Food Mass Measurement

All solid foods and semi-solid items (sauces, spreads, condiments) must be weighed to ±0.1 g using a calibrated digital balance before being presented to the participant. For metabolic ward studies, each food component is weighed separately in its prepared, ready-to-eat form. After the meal, any uneaten portions (plate waste) are re-weighed to the same precision, and net intake is computed as:

$$\text{Net intake (g)} = \text{Mass}_{\text{served}} - \text{Mass}_{\text{uneaten}}$$

For multi-component meals, this procedure is applied separately to each food item. Composite meals (e.g., casseroles, soups) should be prepared from individually weighed ingredients, and the final cooked mass recorded to permit back-calculation of ingredient-specific intake from plate-waste masses.

Foods that change mass during preparation (e.g., cooked grains, meats) require both pre- and post-cooking weights to establish a mass retention factor. This factor is applied to correct for water loss or gain during cooking and to express intake in terms of raw ingredient masses for subsequent macronutrient analysis.

3.1.2. Beverage Mass Measurement

All beverages, including water, are weighed to ±0.1 g. Beverages provided in sealed containers are weighed before and after consumption; the difference represents intake. For beverages consumed from open containers (cups, glasses), the container is tared empty, filled, weighed before consumption, and re-weighed with any remaining liquid after consumption.

3.1.3. Macronutrient Composition Analysis

For each food and beverage item, macronutrient composition (grams of fat, carbohydrate, protein, fiber, and alcohol per 100 g of edible portion) must be determined. Three approaches are acceptable, in descending order of accuracy:

- Direct laboratory analysis: Homogenized aliquots of the actual foods served are analyzed by standardized methods (e.g., Soxhlet extraction for fat, Kjeldahl or Dumas combustion for nitrogen/protein, enzymatic assay for available carbohydrate). This is the gold-standard approach for metabolic ward studies.
- Verified food-composition databases: National databases (e.g., USDA FoodData Central, EuroFIR) may be used when the specific brand, cultivar, and preparation method are matched to the database entry. Database values should be cross-validated against manufacturer specifications where available.
- Manufacturer label data: Acceptable for commercially packaged foods with standardized formulations. Label values for fat and carbohydrate carry uncertainties of ±10–20 % owing to rounding rules and allowable deviations.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

The protein conversion factor (grams of protein per gram of nitrogen) must be specified. The standard factor of 6.25 is appropriate for mixed diets; food-specific factors (e.g., 5.70 for wheat, 6.38 for dairy) may improve accuracy when dietary composition is known in detail.

3.1.4. Water Content Determination

For precise mass balance calculations, the water content of foods must be known. This is obtained by oven-drying homogenized aliquots to constant mass (typically 105 °C for 24 h) or from validated database values. The total water intake is the sum of beverage water and food water.

3.1.5. Free-Living Adaptations

Under free-living conditions, where direct weighing of all foods by research staff is impractical, the following adaptations maintain acceptable accuracy:

- Participants are trained in the use of a portable digital balance (±1 g) and instructed to weigh all foods and beverages immediately before consumption, including plate waste.
- A photographic food record (smartphone application) serves as backup documentation. Images must include a fiducial marker (e.g., a standard-sized card) to permit estimation of portion size if weighing is incomplete.
- Participants record brand names, preparation methods, and recipes for composite dishes.
- Research staff conduct daily review of records with the participant to resolve ambiguities.

The estimated uncertainty of free-living mass-intake data is ±5–8 % after training and daily review, compared with ±1–3 % for metabolic ward protocols.

3.2. Module 2: Respiratory Gas Exchange

3.2.1. Measurement Principle

Indirect calorimetry quantifies the mass of carbon exhaled as CO_2 and the mass of oxygen consumed. These measurements, combined with urinary nitrogen excretion (Module 3), enable stoichiometric calculation of fat, carbohydrate, and protein oxidation rates.

3.2.2. Equipment and Calibration

A validated metabolic cart or whole-room indirect calorimeter is required. Before each measurement session, the following calibration procedures must be completed:

- **Gas analyzer calibration:** Span gases of known O_2 and CO_2 concentration (certified to ±0.01 %) are used to calibrate the analyzers. For metabolic carts, two-point calibration (zero gas and span gas) is performed before each test.
- **Flowmeter calibration:** A calibrated 3-L syringe is used to verify volume measurements across the expected flow range. The measured volume must agree with the syringe volume within ±2 %.
- **System leak test:** The system is pressurized and monitored for pressure decay; any leak exceeding 0.5 % of flow is unacceptable.

3.2.3. Measurement Protocols

Two protocols are specified, depending on study design:
Protocol A – Resting metabolic rate (RMR) measurement:

- Participant fasts for ≥8 h (water permitted), abstains from caffeine, nicotine, and vigorous exercise for ≥12 h before measurement.
- After 30 min of supine rest in a thermoneutral environment (22–24 °C), a ventilated canopy or facemask is positioned.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

- VO_2 and VCO_2 are recorded continuously for ≥30 min. The first 5–10 min are discarded (acclimation period). Data from a steady-state period (defined as ≥5 consecutive minutes during which the coefficient of variation for VO_2 and VCO_2 is ≤10 %) are averaged.

Protocol B – 24-hour measurement in a whole-room calorimeter:

- Participant resides in the calorimeter for ≥23 h. Meals are provided through an air-lock. Physical activity is standardized or monitored by motion sensors.
- VO_2 and VCO_2 are measured at intervals of ≤1 min throughout the stay.
- Sleep, resting, and activity periods are identified by motion-sensor data and diary records, permitting calculation of sleeping metabolic rate, diet-induced thermogenesis, and activity energy expenditure.

3.2.4. Derived Variables

From measured VO_2 (L/min) and VCO_2 (L/min), the respiratory quotient (RQ) is calculated as:

$$\mathrm{RQ} = \frac{\mathrm{VCO_2}}{\mathrm{VO_2}}$$

The mass of carbon exhaled per unit time is:

$$\dot{m}_{\mathrm{C,CO_2}}\ (\mathrm{g\ C/min}) = \frac{\mathrm{VCO_2}\ (\mathrm{L/min}) \times 12.011\ (\mathrm{g/mol})}{22.4\ (\mathrm{L/mol})}$$

where 12.011 is the atomic mass of carbon and 22.4 is the molar volume of an ideal gas at standard temperature and pressure. Corrections for ambient temperature, barometric pressure, and water vapor pressure are applied per instrument specifications.

3.2.5. Quality Control

- RQ values outside the physiological range of 0.67–1.30 indicate measurement error, air leak, or non-steady-state conditions.
- Repeated RMR measurements on the same individual under identical conditions should agree within ±5 %.
- Whole-room calorimeter recoveries should be validated periodically by alcohol combustion tests (target recovery: 98–102 %).

3.3. Module 3: Urinary and Fecal Mass Outflow

3.3.1 24-Hour Urine Collection

All urine voided during a 24-h period (typically 07:00 to 07:00) is collected. The protocol:

1. On day 1 at 07:00, participant voids and discards this first specimen (bladder emptied, starting the collection period).
2. All subsequent urine is collected in a pre-weighed container, including the final void at 07:00 on day 2.
3. No preservative is added. The container is stored at 4 °C during collection.
4. Total 24-h urine mass is measured to ±1 g. After thorough mixing, a 10-mL aliquot is transferred to a labeled polypropylene tube for laboratory analysis. The aliquot may be frozen at –20 °C for up to 3 years without significant degradation.

3.3.2. Urinary Nitrogen Analysis

Total urinary nitrogen is determined by the Dumas combustion method. Results are reported as grams of nitrogen per 24 h. The stoichiometric relationship:

$$\text{Oxidized protein (g/day)} = \text{Urinary N (g/day)} \times 6.25$$

assumes that all urinary nitrogen derives from amino acid catabolism and that protein is 16 % nitrogen by mass. For studies requiring greater precision, corrections for non-urea nitrogen losses

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

(creatinine, uric acid, ammonia) may be applied; these typically amount to 2–3 g of non-protein nitrogen per day.

3.3.3. Fecal Collection

For complete mass balance determination, a 72-h fecal collection is recommended to average day-to-day variability in bowel habit. Shorter collections (24–48 h) may be acceptable when a non-absorbable marker is administered to demarcate the collection period.

Protocol:

- Participants are instructed to collect all stool passed during the collection period.
- Stool is collected into pre-weighed, sealable containers and stored at 4 °C during the collection period.
- Total fecal mass is determined to ±1 g.
- After homogenization, aliquots are analyzed for total fat, nitrogen, and energy content using NMR spectroscopy or standard chemical methods.
- Fecal macronutrient content is subtracted from dietary macronutrient intake to determine absorbed (net) macronutrient mass.

3.3.4. Minor Mass Loss Pathways

Insensible water loss (respiratory water vapor, transepidermal water loss), desquamated skin, hair, nail growth, and sweat mineral losses together account for approximately 2–3 % of total daily mass flux. For most MBM applications, these minor losses can be estimated with sufficient accuracy:

- Respiratory water loss ≈ 0.25–0.35 kg/day (derived from expired air water content and ventilation rate).
- Transepidermal water loss ≈ 0.30–0.45 kg/day (dependent on ambient temperature, humidity, and skin area).
- Sweat losses are measured by weighing clothing and towels before and after exercise sessions.

For studies requiring maximal precision (e.g., long-term energy balance validation), more elaborate measurement of minor losses may be warranted.

3.4. Module 4: Body Composition Assessment

Body composition must be tracked longitudinally to interpret mass balance data. The MBM predicts changes in fat mass (FM) and fat-free mass (FFM) from mass flow data, and these predictions should be validated against independent measurements.

3.4.1. Measurement Methods

Accepted methods, in descending order of accuracy:

- **Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA):** Provides three-compartment assessment (FM, lean mass, bone mineral). Measurement precision is ±0.5–1.0 % for total body mass. DXA is considered the reference method for most MBM validation studies.
- **Air-displacement plethysmography (BodPod):** Two-compartment model (FM, FFM). Precision ±1–2 % under standardized conditions.
- **Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA):** Suitable for frequent monitoring. Multi-frequency, segmental BIA devices provide estimates of total body water, which can be converted to FFM using validated hydration factors. Precision is operator- and hydration-status-dependent; measurements must be made under strictly standardized conditions (fasting, post-void, rested).
- **Anthropometry (skinfolds, circumferences):** Least precise but suitable for field settings; requires trained personnel and population-specific prediction equations.

3.4.2. Measurement Schedule

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

For metabolic ward studies: body composition is assessed at baseline, at the midpoint, and at the end of the intervention period. For free-living studies: weekly or biweekly measurements are recommended, with BIA for frequent monitoring and DXA for pre- and post-intervention reference assessments.

3.4.3. Stoichiometric Validation

The MBM predicts daily FM and FFM changes from mass flow data. These predictions should be cross-validated against measured body composition changes at the end of each study phase. Agreement within ±5 % of the measured change is considered acceptable; systematic deviations indicate measurement error or incomplete accounting for a mass stream.

3.5. Module 5: Data Integration and Computational Workflows

3.5.1. Core Mass Balance Equation

The MBM computes the daily rate of body mass change (dM/dt, g/day) from the difference between total mass inflow and total mass outflow:

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = (M_{\text{food}} + M_{\text{beverages}} + M_{O_2}) - (M_{CO_2} + M_{\text{urine}} + M_{\text{feces}} + M_{\text{minor}})$$

where all terms are in grams per day. This single equation replaces the two-step conversion process (mass → energy → mass) that characterizes the EBM.

3.5.2. Stoichiometric Calculation of Substrate Oxidation

Using measured VO_2, VCO_2, and urinary nitrogen (UN), the masses of fat, carbohydrate, and protein oxidized per day are calculated from the stoichiometric relationships:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Protein oxidized (g/day)} &= 6.25 \times \text{UN (g/day)} \\ \text{Fat oxidized (g/day)} &= 1.67 \times VCO_2 - 1.67 \times VO_2 - 1.92 \times \text{UN} \\ \text{Carbohydrate oxidized (g/day)} &= 4.55 \times VCO_2 - 3.21 \times VO_2 - 2.90 \times \text{UN} \end{aligned}$$

where VO_2 and VCO_2 are in liters per day and UN is in grams of nitrogen per day. These equations, derived from the stoichiometry of complete substrate oxidation, are exact physical relationships, not statistical approximations.

3.5.3. Carbon, Nitrogen, and Water Balances

Carbon balance: The carbon content of dietary macronutrients (fat ≈ 0.77 g C/g, carbohydrate ≈ 0.44 g C/g, protein ≈ 0.53 g C/g) is compared with carbon excreted as CO_2 and fecal carbon. Net carbon balance (g C/day) is directly proportional to changes in body energy stores.

Nitrogen balance: Nitrogen intake (protein intake in g/day ÷ 6.25) is compared with urinary nitrogen, fecal nitrogen, and minor nitrogen losses (sweat, skin, nails ≈ 0.5 g N/day). Positive nitrogen balance indicates net protein accretion; negative balance indicates net protein loss.

Water balance: Water intake (beverages + food water + metabolic water) is compared with water output (urine + fecal water + respiratory water + sweat). Daily water balance should average near zero over periods of ≥3 days. Systematic deviations indicate errors in food water estimation or unmeasured losses.

3.5.4. Software Implementation

An open-source computational pipeline is provided as Supplementary Material. The pipeline:

1. Imports raw data from each module (food diaries, indirect calorimetry output files, urine/fecal analysis reports, body composition records).
2. Performs unit conversions and stoichiometric calculations.
3. Generates daily mass balance reports (carbon, nitrogen, water) with propagated uncertainty estimates.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

4. Plots cumulative mass balance against measured body weight change for visual quality control.

The pipeline is implemented in Python 3.x and R, with detailed documentation and worked examples.

3.5.5. Quality Assurance and Troubleshooting

Daily quality checks:

- Total mass inflow and outflow should balance within ±2 % of daily body mass fluctuation for weight-stable participants.
- RQ values outside 0.67–1.30 indicate measurement error.
- Urinary nitrogen excretion outside 4–20 g/24 h in adults signals collection error or extreme dietary protein intake.
- Measured body weight change (ΔBW) is compared with computed dM/dt; systematic divergence >5 g/day sustained over ≥3 days indicates incomplete mass accounting.

Table 1. Troubleshooting guide for mass balance model (MBM) data quality assurance.

Observation	Likely cause	Remedial action
RQ > 1.0 sustained	Overfeeding, de novo lipogenesis, or gas analyzer calibration error	Verify gas analyzer calibration with span gases; confirm dietary intake records; check for protocol violations (e.g., recent meal before RMR measurement)
RQ < 0.67	Ketosis, incomplete respiratory gas collection, or analyzer drift	Test urine for ketones; recalibrate gas analyzers; verify collection mask or canopy seal; confirm fasting duration
dM/dt > ΔBW	Unmeasured mass intake (e.g., unreported snacks, beverages)	Review participant diary; conduct dietary recall interview; check for water consumed during showering or teeth brushing
dM/dt < ΔBW	Unmeasured mass loss (e.g., heavy sweating, respiratory water loss underestimation)	Quantify sweat loss by weighing clothing and towels pre- and post-exercise; verify calorimetry-derived respiratory water estimates; check ambient temperature and humidity logs
Urinary N outside 4–20 g/24 h	Incomplete 24-h urine collection or extreme dietary protein intake	Verify collection start and end times with participant; check urine volume against expected range (0.8–2.5 L/24 h); review dietary protein records
Divergence >5 g/day sustained ≥3 days	Systematic measurement error in one or more modules	Re-calibrate all balances and gas analyzers; verify food database entries; cross-check body weight scale against certified calibration mass
VO_2 or VCO_2 drift during measurement	Analyzer warm-up incomplete or sensor aging	Allow ≥30 min warm-up before calibration; replace electrochemical sensors if >12 months in service; repeat calibration

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

Observation	Likely cause	Remedial action
Fecal collection incomplete	Participant non-compliance or short collection period	Extend collection to 72 h; administer non-absorbable marker (e.g., brilliant blue) to demarcate collection period; reinforce protocol with participant

4. Mathematical and Computational Framework

The preceding section provided protocols for quantifying daily mass fluxes – the raw inputs to the mass balance model (MBM). This section describes how those fluxes are integrated into a dynamic model that predicts body weight and body composition trajectories over time, without any intermediate energy-unit conversions.

4.1. The Core Dynamic Equation

The MBM expresses the rate of change of body mass (dM/dt) as the difference between the net mass inflow (NMI) and net mass outflow (NMO):

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = \text{NMI} - \text{NMO} \qquad (1)$$

where NMI = solid food mass + beverage mass – water mass output (urine + insensible water), and NMO = water-free mass outflow – O_2 uptake. All terms are in grams per day.

As demonstrated empirically and analytically [5], NMO under free-living and fasting conditions is well described by a relationship analogous to Torricelli's Law:

$$\text{NMO} = k \cdot M^{1/2} \qquad (2)$$

where k is the mass clearance coefficient ($kg^{0.5}$/day). Thus, the full dynamic equation becomes:

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = \text{NMI} - k \cdot M^{1/2} \qquad (3)$$

Equation (3) is the core of the MBM. It contains no energy terms, no Atwater coefficients, and no tissue energy density assumptions. The only parameter, k, is directly measurable from baseline data (see Section 4.2) and, under stable dietary conditions, remains constant even during moderate intake restriction.

4.2. The Mass Clearance Coefficient k

The coefficient k quantifies the body's efficiency in eliminating mass and is calculated directly from baseline (weight-stable) measurements:

$$k = \frac{\text{NMI}_{\text{baseline}}}{\sqrt{M_{\text{baseline}}}} \qquad (4)$$

For example, using data from a single-subject longitudinal study [5]: NMI at baseline = 1.691 kg/day, body mass = 86.6 kg, yielding k ≈ 0.1817 $kg^{0.5}$/day. During a 337-day intake restriction phase, k remained unchanged at 0.1817 $kg^{0.5}$/day, demonstrating that moderate reduction in food mass does not alter the body's mass elimination machinery when dietary composition remains similar.

However, when the dietary context changes radically – as in prolonged fasting – k is not constant. It decays toward a lower steady-state value, reflecting the body's physiological down-regulation of mass clearance [5]. This decay is captured by:

$$k(t) = k_{SS} + (k_0 - k_{SS})\exp(-t/\tau) \qquad (5)$$

where k_0 is the initial clearance coefficient, k_{ss} is the steady-state value reached after adaptation, and τ is the characteristic adaptation time constant. This time-dependent k produces the progressive decline in mass loss rate observed during fasting – the phenomenon conventionally termed adaptive

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

thermogenesis. In the MBM, adaptive thermogenesis is not an added correction term; it is an emergent property of the clearance coefficient's dynamics.

4.3. Predicting Body Composition Changes

To predict fat mass (FM) and fat-free mass (FFM) changes during weight loss, the MBM integrates the dynamic mass equation with Forbes's empirically validated relationship between FM and FFM [8,9]:

$$\mathrm{FFM} = \alpha \ln(\mathrm{FM}) + \beta \qquad (6)$$

where α and β are determined from baseline body composition data. From this, the trajectory of FM during weight change can be computed as:

$$\mathrm{FM}(t) = \alpha \cdot W\left(\frac{\mathrm{FM}_0}{\alpha}\exp\left(\frac{M(t) - M_0 + \mathrm{FM}_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) \qquad (7)$$

where W is the Lambert W function, M_0 is initial body mass, and FM_0 is initial fat mass.

The procedure is straightforward:

- Compute M(t) by solving Equation (3) – analytically (see Supplementary Material for closed-form solutions) or numerically (e.g., 4th-order Runge-Kutta with time step 0.2 days).
- Insert M(t) into Equation (7) to obtain FM(t).
- Compute FFM(t) = M(t) – FM(t).

This approach requires only baseline mass, NMI, and a single body composition assessment to determine α. No energy intake data, no diet-induced thermogenesis estimates, and no physical activity coefficients are needed.

4.4. Numerical Simulation: A Worked Example

Consider a 70-kg individual with baseline FM_0 = 14 kg and FFM_0 = 56 kg (α determined from body composition assessment). Baseline NMI is 1.70 kg/day, yielding k = 1.70 / √70 ≈ 0.2032 $\mathrm{kg}^{0.5}$/day. The individual reduces NMI by 10 % to 1.53 kg/day.

Equation (3) is integrated numerically:

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = 1.53 - 0.2032 \cdot M^{1/2}$$

The model predicts:

- A new steady-state mass M_SS = $(1.53 / 0.2032)^2$ ≈ 56.7 kg, reached asymptotically.
- At day 30: M ≈ 67.8 kg, FM ≈ 12.1 kg, FFM ≈ 55.7 kg.
- At day 120: M ≈ 58.2 kg, FM ≈ 5.2 kg, FFM ≈ 53.0 kg.

Critically, the MBM prediction distinguishes between early-phase weight loss (dominated by glycogen and water) and later-phase loss (dominated by fat), automatically adjusting the effective tissue composition of weight change without any tunable tissue energy density parameter.

4.5. Computational Implementation

The MBM is implemented as an open-source Python package (MBM-sim, provided in Supplementary Material). The package:

- Accepts daily NMI, baseline body mass, baseline body composition, and optional time-dependent k parameters.
- Solves Equation (3) using scipy.integrate.solve_ivp with the 'RK45' method.
- Computes FM(t) and FFM(t) via Equation (7) with the lambertw function from scipy.special.
- Generates publication-quality plots of mass, FM, and FFM trajectories.
- Exports results as CSV for downstream analysis.

A Jupyter notebook with the worked example and full documentation is included.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

5. Translational Applications

The ultimate value of any physiological model lies in its capacity to inform and improve clinical practice. The mass balance model (MBM) offers several concrete advantages over conventional energy-balance approaches in translational settings, spanning clinical obesity management, personalized nutrition, pharmacotherapy monitoring, and sports medicine. This section outlines the principal applications and identifies areas where the MBM can immediately enhance decision-making.

5.1. Early Detection of Lean Tissue Loss During Weight Reduction

A persistent clinical challenge in obesity management is ensuring that weight loss derives predominantly from fat mass rather than lean tissue. Conventional energy-balance methods infer body composition changes retrospectively, often requiring weeks of data and expensive imaging (DXA, MRI) before a trend becomes apparent. The MBM, by contrast, can detect the onset of lean tissue loss within 24–48 hours.

The mechanism is straightforward. Urinary nitrogen excretion, measured from 24-hour urine collections, provides a direct, real-time window into net protein catabolism. A sustained increase in urinary nitrogen above baseline, when expressed as grams of oxidized protein per day, signals that the body is drawing on its own lean tissue for fuel. This information is available long before any change in total body weight or appearance becomes evident on body composition scans. For the clinician, this means that a dietary or pharmacological intervention can be adjusted – for example, by increasing protein intake or modifying the energy deficit – before significant lean mass has been lost.

5.2. Monitoring Dietary Interventions in Real Time

The MBM enables near-real-time assessment of whether a prescribed dietary intervention is achieving its intended metabolic goals. By integrating daily mass intake data (Module 1) with respiratory gas exchange (Module 2) and urinary nitrogen (Module 3), the clinician can determine within 24 hours:

- Whether the patient is in negative fat balance (via RQ and stoichiometric fat oxidation calculations).
- Whether protein balance is being maintained (via nitrogen balance).
- Whether weight loss is dominated by water and glycogen or by actual tissue catabolism.

This contrasts sharply with the energy-balance approach, which typically relies on weekly or biweekly weigh-ins and cannot distinguish between water shifts and tissue loss without additional, often costly, assessments. In the MBM framework, every day produces a complete mass ledger, allowing the clinician to titrate the intervention with much finer temporal resolution.

5.3. Personalizing Protein Prescriptions

Current protein recommendations for weight loss are largely population-based and do not account for individual variability in nitrogen handling. The MBM, through its nitrogen balance component, provides a direct, individualized metric: 24-hour urinary nitrogen excretion, compared against dietary nitrogen intake. This metric allows the clinician to determine, for a specific patient on a specific diet, precisely how much protein is required to maintain nitrogen equilibrium.

This application is particularly relevant for populations at high risk of sarcopenia – older adults, post-bariatric surgery patients, and individuals on very-low-calorie diets. Instead of relying on generic guidelines (e.g., 1.2–1.6 g protein per kg body weight), the clinician can titrate protein intake until urinary nitrogen stabilizes at a level indicating net protein balance, thereby personalizing the prescription to the patient's actual metabolic response.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

5.4. Evaluating Pharmacotherapies and Combination Treatments

The MBM framework is agnostic to the mechanism of action of any given intervention. Whether a drug acts by reducing appetite, increasing energy expenditure, altering substrate partitioning, or modifying nutrient absorption, its net effect is always registered in the mass streams: less carbon entering (reduced intake), more carbon leaving (increased oxidation), or altered nitrogen partitioning (changes in lean mass). The MBM can therefore serve as a standardized platform for evaluating the physiological effects of novel anti-obesity agents.

In a clinical trial setting, an MBM-based endpoint – daily net carbon balance, for example – could serve as an early biomarker of efficacy, complementing traditional endpoints such as total body weight change at 12 or 24 weeks. This could shorten dose-finding studies and reduce the cost of drug development by providing actionable metabolic data within days rather than months.

5.5. Applications in Sports Medicine and Body Recomposition

Athletes and bodybuilders pursuing body recomposition – simultaneous fat loss and lean mass gain – operate in a physiological space where energy-balance calculations are particularly unreliable. The MBM, by tracking carbon and nitrogen independently, can distinguish between periods of net fat oxidation and net protein accretion, even when total body weight is stable. This provides the athlete and coach with objective feedback on whether the current nutritional and training regimen is achieving the desired tissue-level effects.

Moreover, the MBM's ability to account for glycogen-associated water shifts (approximately 3–4 g of water per gram of glycogen) clarifies a common source of confusion in athlete monitoring: rapid weight changes during carbohydrate manipulation that reflect water flux rather than tissue change. Energy balance models either ignore these shifts or require post-hoc adjustments; the MBM handles them transparently as part of the water balance.

5.6. Toward an Appetite-Regulated MBM

A logical next step in translational development is the integration of the MBM with behavioral appetite regulation. Arencibia-Albite has proposed an appetite-regulated mass balance model (ARMBM) in which appetite control mechanisms modulate mass intake while the underlying stoichiometric mass flows remain governed by the same conservation principles [5]. In this framework, hunger and satiety signals are conceptualized as the body's way of regulating mass inflow to match the clearance capacity determined by k.

This synthesis opens the door to integrated digital health applications. A smartphone application that combines food mass logging (via integrated scale), real-time respiratory gas analysis (via portable indirect calorimetry), and periodic urinary nitrogen self-testing could deliver daily, actionable feedback – not in calories, but in the body's native currency: grams of mass gained or lost, and from which tissues.

5.7. Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

The translational strengths of the MBM are its conceptual simplicity, its reliance on directly measurable physical quantities, its freedom from the two-step mass → energy → mass conversion, and its capacity to deliver actionable data within 24–48 hours. In metabolic ward settings, where all mass streams can be measured with high precision, the MBM is already ready for clinical deployment.

The principal limitation is the practical challenge of comprehensive mass flow measurement in free-living conditions. While I have proposed adaptations in Module 1 (Section 3.1), complete 24-hour urine and fecal collections remain burdensome for patients outside a controlled facility. The development of validated surrogates – for example, spot-urine nitrogen-to-creatinine ratios as proxies for 24-hour nitrogen excretion, or smart-toilet technology for automated fecal analysis – will be critical for scaling MBM-based interventions to routine clinical practice.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

Future work should also validate the MBM against gold-standard body composition methods in diverse populations, including older adults, adolescents, and individuals with metabolic diseases. The ARMBM framework deserves empirical testing in behavioral weight-loss trials. And the open-source computational pipeline provided here should be extended into user-friendly clinical decision-support tools.

5.8. Summary of Translational Applications

Application	Key MBM Metric	Time to Actionable Data
Lean tissue loss detection	Urinary nitrogen (g/24 h)	24–48 h
Real-time dietary monitoring	Daily carbon and nitrogen balance	24 h
Personalized protein prescription	Nitrogen balance vs. intake	48–72 h (steady state)
Pharmacotherapy evaluation	Net carbon balance	24 h
Body recomposition feedback	Independent C and N balances	24 h
Glycogen/water shift clarification	Water balance component	24 h

6. Conclusion and Future Directions

The MBM represents more than a technical refinement of energy-balance methodology. It is a return to first principles. By tracking macronutrient mass flows directly in grams – without intermediate conversions to and from energy units – the MBM aligns physiological analysis with the physical reality that the body actually obeys: the conservation of mass in an open biological system.

This paper has provided the practical scaffolding that has been missing from the MBM literature. I have specified standardized protocols for quantifying every major mass stream entering and leaving the body, from the weighing of foods and beverages to the stoichiometric calculation of substrate oxidation from respiratory gas exchange and urinary nitrogen. I have presented a mathematical and computational framework that integrates these measurements into dynamic predictions of body weight and body composition trajectories, without tunable parameters or post-hoc corrections. And I have outlined the translational applications that make the MBM immediately useful in clinical obesity management, personalized nutrition, pharmacotherapy evaluation, and sports medicine.

The advantages of the MBM over the conventional energy balance model are both conceptual and practical. Conceptually, the MBM eliminates the two-step mass → energy → mass conversion that propagates uncertainty and obscures mechanism. Practically, it delivers actionable metabolic data – such as the onset of lean tissue loss – within 24 to 48 hours, rather than the weeks required by traditional body composition assessments. The MBM handles glycogen-associated water shifts transparently, distinguishes fat loss from protein loss, and remains agnostic to the mechanism of any dietary or pharmacological intervention, reporting only what the mass streams reveal.

Several priorities demand attention in the coming years. First, the protocols described here require validation in larger, more diverse populations – older adults, adolescents, individuals with type 2 diabetes, and post-bariatric surgery patients – to establish normative ranges for key MBM metrics such as the mass clearance coefficient k and daily nitrogen balance variability. Second, the translational pipeline must be simplified for free-living settings. The development of validated surrogates for 24-hour urine collections (e.g., spot-urine nitrogen-to-creatinine ratios) and the integration of smart-toilet or wearable technologies for automated mass outflow measurement will be critical for scaling MBM-based interventions beyond the metabolic ward. Third, the appetite-regulated MBM (ARMBM) proposed by Arencibia-Albite [5] merits empirical testing in behavioral weight-loss trials, as it offers a principled bridge between the stoichiometric rigor of mass balance and the behavioral complexity of human eating.

Finally, the MBM paradigm invites a broader cultural shift in how nutrition scientists, clinicians, and educators communicate about body weight. Moving from "eat fewer calories" to "reduce the mass

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

of energy-dense foods while preserving protein- and fiber-rich foods" is not merely a linguistic change. It is a translation of physiological reality into practical guidance – guidance that patients can understand, measure, and act upon.

The tools are now on the table. The protocols are specified. The computational pipeline is available. The invitation to the research community is clear: adopt direct mass accounting, test it rigorously, refine it collaboratively, and help build a more precise, mechanistically faithful science of human body weight regulation.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at the website of this paper posted on Preprints.org.

Author Contributions: This is a single-authored paper.

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

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank my family for their support and care as well as my colleagues for stimulating discussions.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest related to this work.

Data and Code Availability: All protocols, statistical code, example datasets, and the complete MBM Toolkit will be made public upon manuscript acceptance.

References

1. Manninen AH. Mass Balance over Energy Balance: Why Direct Mass Accounting Offers a More Precise and Mechanistically Faithful Framework for Human Body Weight Regulation. *Preprints* 2026, 2026040690. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202604.0690.v1
2. Arencibia-Albite F. Serious analytical inconsistencies challenge the validity of the energy balance theory. *Heliyon*. 2020 Jul 10;6(7):e04204. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04204. Erratum in: *Heliyon*. 2020 Sep 14;6(9):e04609. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04609. PMID: 32685707; PMCID: PMC7355950.
3. Arencibia-Albite F. The energy balance theory is an inconsistent paradigm. *J Theor Biol*. 2022 Oct 7;550:111240. doi: 10.1016/j.jtbi.2022.111240. Epub 2022 Aug 6. PMID: 35944592.
4. Manninen AH. Chronic positive mass balance is the actual etiology of obesity: A living review. *Global Transl Med*. 2023, 2(1), 222. https://doi.org/10.36922/gtm.222
5. Arencibia-Albite F. Empirical Evaluation of the Mass Balance Model in Human Bodyweight Regulation, 13 January 2026, PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8576437/v1
6. Arencibia-Albite F. Quantitative Foundations of Energy Balance Are Not Empirically Reliable Under Ideal Conditions, 16 January 2026, PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8595271/v1
7. Bajunaid R, Niu C, Hambly C, Liu Z, Yamada Y, Aleman-Mateo H, Anderson LJ, Arab L, Baddou I, Bandini L, Bedu-Addo K, Blaak EE, Bouten CVC, Brage S, Buchowski MS, Butte NF, Camps SGJA, Casper R, Close GL, Cooper JA, Cooper R, Das SK, Davies PSW, Dabare P, Dugas LR, Eaton S, Ekelund U, Entringer S, Forrester T, Fudge BW, Gillingham M, Goris AH, Gurven M, El Hamdouchi A, Haisma HH, Hoffman D, Hoos MB, Hu S, Joonas N, Joosen AM, Katzmarzyk P, Kimura M, Kraus WE, Kriengsinyos W, Kuriyan R, Kushner RF, Lambert EV, Lanerolle P, Larsson CL, Leonard WR, Lessan N, Löf M, Martin CK, Matsiko E, Medin AC, Morehen JC, Morton JP, Must A, Neuhouser ML, Nicklas TA, Nyström CD, Ojiambo RM, Pietiläinen KH, Pitsiladis YP, Plange-Rhule J, Plasqui G, Prentice RL, Racette SB, Raichlen DA, Ravussin E,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202604.1641.v2

Redman LM, Reilly JJ, Reynolds R, Roberts SB, Samaranayakem D, Sardinha LB, Silva AM, Sjödin AM, Stamatiou M, Stice E, Urlacher SS, Van Etten LM, van Mil EGAH, Wilson G, Yanovski JA, Yoshida T, Zhang X, Murphy-Alford AJ, Sinha S, Loechl CU, Luke AH, Pontzer H, Rood J, Sagayama H, Schoeller DA, Westerterp KR, Wong WW, Speakman JR. Predictive equation derived from 6,497 doubly labelled water measurements enables the detection of erroneous self-reported energy intake. *Nat Food*. 2025 Jan;6(1):58-71. doi: 10.1038/s43016-024-01089-5. Epub 2025 Jan 13. Erratum in: *Nat Food*. 2025 May;6(5):523-524. doi: 10.1038/s43016-025-01175-2. PMID: 39806218; PMCID: PMC11772230.

8. Forbes GB. Lean body mass-body fat interrelationships in humans. *Nutr Rev*. 1987 Aug;45(8):225-31. doi: 10.1111/j.1753-4887.1987.tb02684.x. PMID: 3306482.
9. Hall KD. Body fat and fat-free mass inter-relationships: Forbes's theory revisited. *Br J Nutr*. 2007 Jun;97(6):1059-63. doi: 10.1017/S0007114507691946. Epub 2007 Mar 19. PMID: 17367567; PMCID: PMC2376748.