

**TITLE**

Energy Balance During a Self-Sufficient, Multistage Ultramarathon

**AUTHOR**

Hough, Paul and Earle, James

**JOURNAL**

Journal of Human Performance in Extreme Environments

**DATE DEPOSITED**

26 September 2017

**This version available at**

<http://research.stmarys.ac.uk/id/eprint/1788/>

---

**COPYRIGHT AND REUSE**

Open Research Archive makes this work available, in accordance with publisher policies, for research purposes.

**VERSIONS**

The version presented here may differ from the published version. For citation purposes, please consult the published version for pagination, volume/issue and date of publication.

Published online: 9-6-2017

## Energy Balance During a Self-Sufficient, Multistage Ultramarathon

Paul A. Hough

*St. Mary's University*, paul.hough@stmarys.ac.uk

James Earle

*St. Mary's University*, james.earle@stmarys.ac.uk

---

### Recommended Citation

Hough, Paul A. and Earle, James (2017) "Energy Balance During a Self-Sufficient, Multistage Ultramarathon," *Journal of Human Performance in Extreme Environments*: Vol. 13 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.

DOI: 10.7771/2327-2937.1103

Available at: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/jhpee/vol13/iss1/5>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

**Title:** Energy balance during a self-sufficient, multistage ultramarathon

**Submission type:** Case study

**Authors:** Paul A. Hough and James Earle: School of Sport Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University, Twickenham, UK

**Corresponding Author:** Paul Hough, School of Sport, Health and Applied Science, St Mary's University, Waldegrave Road, Twickenham, TW1 4SX

Email: [paul.hough@stmarys.ac.uk](mailto:paul.hough@stmarys.ac.uk)

Telephone: (Office) 020 8240 2338 (Mobile) 07845 824108

**Preferred running head:** Energy balance, multistage ultramarathon

**Abstract word count:** 245

**Text-only word count:** 3221

**Number of figures and tables:** 8

## Abstract

Endurance athletes are recommended to maintain energy balance and ensure adequate energy availability (EA) so that endurance performance is not compromised. **PURPOSE:** Describe and evaluate the energy balance of an athlete competing in a self-sufficient, multistage ultra-marathon (MSU). **METHODS:** A male endurance athlete (Age 35 yrs; Ht 183.0 cm; BM 78.4 kg;  $VO_{2max}$  66 ml/kg/min) volunteered to take part in this observational case study prior to competing in the Marathon des Sables (MdS) 2016. The subject self-reported energy intake (EI) by reviewing his dietary plan following each stage. Basal metabolic rate (BMR) was estimated prior to the MdS based on fat free mass. Distance and moving speed were recorded using a GPS device throughout the race. Exercise energy expenditure (EEE) was calculated using the GPS device algorithm. Total energy expenditure (TEE) was calculated by adding athlete's RMR to the recorded EEE. Energy balance was calculated by subtracting EI from TEE. **RESULTS:** Mean daily EI was  $2946 \pm 358$  kcal and daily EEE was  $3006 \pm 1030$  kcal. This resulted in a total energy deficit of 9609 kcal with a daily energy deficit of  $1922 \pm 952$  kcal/day. The athlete did not report any subjective feelings of hunger at any point during the event. **CONCLUSIONS:** The athlete did not consume enough calories to meet estimated energy requirements, resulting in a negative energy balance and low EA throughout the event. Relying on subjective perception of hunger to modulate energy intake is an ineffective strategy during a MSU.

**Key words:** nutrition, ultra, endurance, Marathon des Sables, performance

## **Introduction**

The Marathon des Sables (MdS) is a multistage ultramarathon (MSU) that takes place in the Sahara Desert of Morocco, with temperatures achieving over 50°C, it has been described as ‘the toughest footrace on earth’<sup>[1]</sup>. Over six days, competitors cover ~156 miles, with one rest day following the longest stage (~55 miles). Although daily water rations are provided, a unique aspect of MdS is that competitors must be self-sufficient throughout the race, which entails carrying all food, clothing and equipment for the entire event. In addition to thorough training preparation, optimal performance in the MdS requires appropriate nutrition and hydration strategies to be implemented. Athletes are required to ingest sufficient energy to compensate for the high energy expenditure of prolonged running in hot conditions, whilst also maintaining adequate levels of hydration<sup>[2]</sup>.

The average speed maintained during a multiday ultramarathon has been proposed to correspond to maintaining a sufficient energy intake<sup>[3]</sup>. Therefore, an inadequate energy intake, resulting in a large energy deficit, could compromise performance<sup>[4]</sup>. Previous research indicates that it is possible to maintain energy balance over the course of a five day (960 km) ultramarathon<sup>[3]</sup>. However, the self-sufficient nature of the MdS means that athletes are faced with a complex challenge of carrying a sufficient quantity of food to maintain energy balance without carrying an excessively heavy pack, which would reduce comfort and performance. Despite thirty previous editions, there are few studies which have evaluated energy balance during MdS or similar MSUs<sup>[5,6,7]</sup>. The aim of the current observational study was to describe and evaluate the energy balance of an athlete competing in a self-sufficient MSU in relation to the current nutrition recommendations for endurance athletes.

## **Method**

### *Subject*

One subject agreed to volunteer in this observational case study. The subject was an experienced male, amateur endurance athlete (Age 35 yrs; Height 183.0 cm; Body mass 78.4 kg;  $VO_{2max}$  66 ml/kg/min) who regularly competes in endurance running: five previous marathons, three Ironman triathlons, two ultramarathons (Nov 2015 [33miles] and Feb 2016 [50miles]). The subject’s marathon personal best was 03 hrs: 26 min in a mixed terrain marathon. The subject had no prior experience of a MSU. Prior to the study, the subject provided written informed consent and completed a pre-activity readiness questionnaire. The study was approved by the St Mary’s University Ethics Committee.

### *Design*

This was an observational case study, whereby the subject’s MdS race pace and nutritional intake data was recorded during the six-day event. A subjective journal was also completed. The data from the rest day (day 5) and 17 km charity stage (day 7) did not count towards the overall race classification and was omitted from analysis.

### *Preliminary Exercise Assessment*

Five days prior to the first day of the MdS the subject reported to the laboratory to undergo a physiological evaluation, following a 24-hour rest period. This consisted of a body composition assessment, a sub-maximal and maximal running protocol on a motorised treadmill (Woodway, ELG 70, Weil am Rhein, Germany). The sub-maximal protocol

consisted of six, four minute stages whereby the treadmill speed was increased by 1 km/h at the start of each stage. Expired, breath-by-breath, gas measurements were recorded throughout the test using an open spirometric system (Oxycon Pro, Jaeger, Hoechburg, Germany). At the end of each stage a capillary blood sample was drawn and analysed using a blood lactate/glucose analyser (Biosen C\_Line, EKF Diagnostics, Barleben, Germany). There was a five-minute period of passive recovery after the sub-maximal assessment before a step-wise incremental  $\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$  test was performed.

### *Body Composition Assessment*

Skinfold measures were taken before the preliminary exercise assessment and five days after the MdS at the same time of day. The skinfolds were measured using skinfold callipers (Harpenden, Baly International, West Sussex, UK) according to International Society of the Advancement of Kinanthropometry (ISAK) guidelines. The skinfolds were taken by an ISAK certified practitioner at seven sites (biceps, triceps, subscapular, iliac crest, abdominal, medial-thigh, medial-calf). Technical error was less than 5% for all skinfold measurements. Body fat and fat free mass were calculated using Durnin and Womersley equations [8].

### *Nutrition Plan*

As the subject had no prior experience of a MSU, he followed the nutritional guidelines recommended by the MdS organisers [1]. This consisted of 3000-4000 kcal/day composed of 15% protein, 30% fats and 55% carbohydrates. The authors did not suggest a specific macronutrient breakdown, other than suggesting protein intake should be slightly higher than the recommended 15% in order to aid recovery [9]. Subjective advice relating to palatability and food enjoyment was provided. For example, the subject was advised not to include a large volume of artificial sweet foods (energy gels, sports drinks) as these are can be unpalatable in hot conditions and often have a low nutrient density. An example of a daily food plan is presented in Table 1.

\*\*\*Table 1 about here\*\*\*

### *Energy balance*

The subject self-reported his actual energy intake (EI) by reviewing the dietary plan in the evening after each stage, noting if any additional food/drink was consumed and where items were not or only partly consumed. The dietary record was used to calculate energy and macronutrient intake using dietary analysis software (Dietplan v6.60, Forestfield Software, Horsham, West Sussex, UK).

Basal metabolic rate (BMR) was estimated prior to the MdS based on fat free mass [10]. Distance and moving speed were recorded using a GPS device (Garmin Forerunner 920XT) throughout the race. Exercise energy expenditure (EEE) was calculated using the Garmin Firstbeat algorithm, which incorporates distance, heart rate and the user profile. Total energy expenditure (TEE) was calculated by adding the subject's RMR to the recorded EEE. Energy balance was calculated by subtracting EI from TEE. Energy availability (EA) was calculated using the following equation [11]:

$$\text{Energy Availability} = \frac{\text{Energy Intake} - \text{Exercise Energy Expenditure}}{\text{Fat Free Body Mass}}$$

### *Pacing and Performance*

Average moving speed was calculated in 5 km splits retrospectively using GPS data. Overall mean moving speed was calculated from the moving time taken to cover the stage distance for each day. The variation in pace was therefore described as the percentage variation between each 5 km split and the overall mean moving speed <sup>[12]</sup>.

## **Results**

### *Race preparation*

In the 12 weeks leading up to the MdS, mean running based training volume was 65 km/wk. To prepare for the terrain challenges, the subject also performed a weekly stair climbing training session (n=4) consisting of climbing 20 flights of stairs for 1.5-3 hours whilst wearing a 30 kg weighted vest. The running volume peaked (74 km/wk) three weeks before the MdS. In addition to training outdoors (mean temperature 9°C) the subject performed heat acclimation sessions (35-40°C) on three consecutive weeks before the MdS (see Table 2).

\*\*\*Table 2 about here\*\*\*

### *Energy Intake and Expenditure*

Mean daily EI was  $2946 \pm 358$  kcal and daily EEE was  $3006 \pm 1030$  kcal. This resulted in a total energy deficit of 9609 kcal with a daily energy deficit of  $1922 \pm 952$  kcal/day. Total EA was  $-0.97 \pm 15.4$  kcal/kgFFM/day. The daily EI, EEE and macronutrient profile during each competitive race day are presented in Table 3 and 4. A Pearson correlation shows a strong relationship between stage distance and energy intake ( $r = 0.61$ ), indicating the participant consumed more calories on the longer distance stages. Planned EI for the five race days was 14,591 kcal, of which 14,732 kcal was consumed. Therefore, the participant consumed marginally (0.1%) more energy than planned due to the consumption of ad hoc items donated from other competitors.

\*\*\*Table 3 about here\*\*\*

\*\*\*Table 4 about here\*\*\*

### *Fluid Intake*

The mean ( $\pm$  SD) fluid intake during the five competitive days was  $1.84 \pm 0.57$  L/hr. Daily fluid intake was  $11.35 \pm 1.24$  L.

### *Body composition*

Body mass decreased by 2% from 78.04 to 76.8 kg. The sum of seven skinfolds decreased by 11% from 92.7 mm to 82.5 mm following the MdS.

### *Pacing and Performance*

The participant completed the race in 10 h: 51 min with an average moving speed of 7.4 km/h (range 6.22 – 8.51 km/h) finishing within the second quartile of 264 finishers. Daily performance data is presented in Table 5. We are only able to comment on observations in pacing strategy from GPS data and acknowledge confounding variables, such as heat and elevation, will likely have influenced this.

\*\*\*Table 5 about here\*\*\*

Overall, we observe the fastest speeds within the first 10km throughout the MdS and apart from stage 1, there was an increase in speed for the final 5km of each stage (see Figure 1).

\*\*\*Figure 1 about here\*\*\*

Stage 1 had the greatest average elevation which coincided with the slowest running speed (Figure 2). Noticeably the greatest variation in speed occurred during the longest stage, which also had the largest variation in elevation and highest calorie deficit (Figure 3).

\*\*\* Figure 2 about here\*\*\*

\*\*\* Figure 3 about here\*\*\*

## Discussion

A low EA can impair health and performance [13]; therefore, athletes are advised to maintain energy balance and adequate EA to prevent a decline in endurance performance. However, the maintenance of energy balance and adequate EA during ultra-endurance events is problematic due to the long durations of exercise and high levels of EEE involved. The subject in this case study experienced a large negative energy balance and a deficit in EA throughout the self-sufficient MSU. The daily EI in the present study was  $2946 \pm 358$  kcal ( $38$  kcal/kgBM/day), which is less than the relative value ( $49 \pm 11$  kcal/kgBM/day) previously reported during a five day, 225 km ultra-marathon [6]. This meant the subject experienced a mean energy deficit of  $1992 \pm 952$  kcal/day (range: 846 – 3396 kcal) during the five competitive race days. Previous studies have also demonstrated that athletes were unable to consume enough food/fluid to meet estimated energy requirements during an Ironman triathlon [14] and 1230 km bike marathon [15]. Despite the large negative energy deficit in the present study, the subject reported '*at no time did I feel hungry, I probably took too much food*'. Interestingly, a lack of hunger was also reported in previous MdS competitors [16], which suggests the long durations of exercise may suppress appetite, possibly through altering circulating levels of appetite related hormones, such as leptin and acylated ghrelin [17]. This is an important consideration for athletes competing in MSUs, as it seems relying on subjective feelings of hunger to guide EI is not an effective strategy and will likely result in large energy deficit and low EA, which may compromise performance. Indeed, a higher calorie intake has explained over 60% variation in performance during an ultramarathon [4]. Therefore, athletes unaccustomed to a MSU event are likely to benefit from a strategic diet plan to minimise energy deficit and maximise performance.

During prolonged exercise adequate dietary protein intake in the range of 1.2 to 2.0 g/kg/day is required to support metabolic adaptation, repair and remodelling [13]. This is particularly important during a MSU as aerobic exercise increases protein oxidation and skeletal muscle protein turnover [18]. As indicated in table 4, the subject was able to achieve the recommended protein intake during the event (1.7 g/kg/d).

Fat is an important energy substrate during prolonged submaximal exercise [19]. Fat intake was 1.4 g/kg/day which was below the macronutrient profile advised by the MdS. However, this is unlikely to have had a large impact on the subject's performance when compared to a reduced carbohydrate availability.

Carbohydrate (CHO) is an important fuel for skeletal muscle, particularly during moderate-high intensity exercise. A significant depletion of liver and muscle glycogen stores is associated with fatigue and a reduction in the exercise intensity during sustained exercise [13]. When food content is aimed to maximise CHO content there is an observed increase in success during ultra-endurance events [20]. Therefore, endurance athletes are typically advised



to ensure pre-exercise CHO intake enables glycogen stores to equal the estimated energy cost of the exercise; hence the recommended CHO intake for an endurance event lasting 4-5 hours is 8-12g/kg/d<sup>[13]</sup>. This requirement may be even greater during an event like the MdS, as the additional thermal stress likely increases CHO metabolism<sup>[21]</sup>. The subject's mean CHO intake was 4.5 g/kg/day, which corresponds to previous findings that athletes competing in ultra-endurance events consistently fail to meet recommendations for CHO intake<sup>[6,20]</sup>. This is likely due to practicality issues in applying the general CHO intake recommendations during MSUs or similar ultra-endurance events. The maximum quantity of CHO that can be absorbed during exercise is 60 - 90 g/hr<sup>[22]</sup>, which limits EI to approximately 240 – 360 kcal/hr. Consequently, an energy deficit is inevitable if the athlete is using CHO alone during exercise and the EEE is greater than ~360 Kcal/hr. Additionally, achieving this upper range of carbohydrate intake (90 g/hr) would be problematic during self-sufficient, multi-stage ultra-endurance events, as the required food/drink could substantially increase pack mass. Furthermore, consuming the upper range of CHO during competition increases the potential for gastrointestinal discomfort<sup>[23]</sup>. A possible solution to overcome this later issue is the implementation of a low carbohydrate, high fat (LCHF) diet before and during multi-stage ultra-endurance events.

The implementation of LCHF diets for endurance athletes has recently been the subject of renewed interest, as lipid stores have been demonstrated to provide a majority of the energy necessary to fuel low-moderate intensity exercise<sup>[19]</sup>. Due to the abundance of lipid stores within the human body, a LCHF diet may enable prolonged, moderate intensity exercise to be maintained without the need for CHO ingestion<sup>[19]</sup>. Theoretically, if an athlete has adapted to a LCHF diet prior to the event they may not need to consume any foods during exercise. However, this could exasperate the energy deficit experienced during ultra-endurance events. One possible solution is to ingest foods high in medium-chain triglycerides (MCT), although ingesting >30g of MCT during exercise is associated with severe gastrointestinal distress<sup>[24]</sup>. Whilst there is a conceptual basis for ultra-endurance athletes to adopt a LCHF diet, the strategy currently lacks empirical evidence. Consequently, ultra-endurance athletes wishing to experiment with a LCHF diet should proceed with caution, particularly if the event involves periods of high ( $\geq 75\%$   $VO_{2max}$ ) intensity exercise (e.g. hill climbing), as a chronic LCHF diet can potentially lead to a reduction in exercise performance<sup>[25]</sup> and potentially impair metabolic flexibility (i.e. the capacity to oxidise carbohydrates)<sup>[26]</sup>.

The participant did not experience any issues with food, such as unpalatability or excessive hunger. The choice of what and when to eat the planned meals is challenging for competitors, as a number of factors such as the environmental temperature, sleep deprivation, hunger and fatigue influence food and fluid intake. For example, the participant decided to consume his main meal in the morning for breakfast, as his palatability for this type of 'real' food was higher at this time.

The race organisers provide 12 litres of water each day in 1.5 litre bottles. These are provided in the morning, at checkpoints during the stage and at the finish. Competitors are also provided with salt tablets (0.1 g sodium each) at the beginning of the race which they take ad libitum. The subject's sweat rate was recorded during heat acclimation sessions (see Table 1). This data was used to recommend a minimum water intake of 1.7 L/hr to avoid significant dehydration (<2.5% loss in body mass). This drinking strategy was practiced during the final three heat acclimation sessions and well tolerated. The subject was able to achieve this minimum fluid intake guideline (average fluid intake = 1.8 L/hr). Nonetheless, the subject reported feeling dehydrated in the evening following stage one, but did not consume any

additional fluids. This likely led to the symptoms of severe dehydration (dizziness) he experienced during stage two, when he needed to rest for 30 minutes after reaching the first checkpoint. This highlights the importance of hydrating adequately after each stage to prevent starting the next stage in a state of dehydration <sup>[21]</sup>. Following this experience, the subject did not report any complications, which supports the notion that, provided an athlete begins a race in a euhydrated state, an ad libitum drinking strategy can be effective during ultra-endurance events <sup>[7]</sup>.

The subject achieved an average speed of 7.4 km/h over the course of the MdS finishing within the second quartile of 264 finishers. We are only able to comment on observations in pacing strategy from GPS data (Table 4), and acknowledge confounding variables (i.e. heat and elevation) will likely have influenced performance. The subject's fastest speeds were recorded within the first 10km throughout the MdS and, with the exception of stage one, there was an increase in speed for the final 5km (shown in Figure 1) of each stage. Stage 1 had the greatest average elevation which could explain the slowest running speeds (Figure 2), additionally it is likely the subject used it as a 'pace setting and trial stage'. Noticeably the greatest variation in speed occurred during the longest stage, which had the highest variation in elevation and simultaneously the greatest calorie deficit (Figure 3), which may have influenced the average speed.

Although the subject self-reported 'struggling for speed' on stage five, this was actually the fastest stage with an average speed of 8.8 km/h and the lowest variation in speed, despite having the greatest variation in elevation. This was likely due to a combination of factors such as the previous rest day, a reduced pack mass, improved knowledge of endpoint <sup>[27]</sup> and an intentional increase in intensity for the final stage. However, reductions in exercise performance are associated with sub-optimal nutritional status and it is probable that nutritional factors may have also contributed to the improved performance on day five, as the negative energy balance was less (-713 kcal) than any of the previous days and average fluid intake was highest (2.3 L/hour). Overall, speed progressively increased throughout the week, suggesting an overall negative pacing strategy.

Body mass and fat mass decreased by 2% and 5.6%, respectively. This finding is similar to the reductions in body mass (2 kg) and fat mass (0.79 kg) reported in a cyclist following a five day (2,272 km) race <sup>[28]</sup>. The sum of seven skinfolds decreased by 11% (-10.2 mm) indicating a marked reduction in subcutaneous body fat similar to reductions in body fat reported following another ultra-endurance event <sup>[29]</sup>. Fat-free mass increased by 1.1 %, which is in contrast to previous studies which have reported reductions following multiple day cycling <sup>[28]</sup> and running <sup>[30]</sup> events. The maintenance of FFM was likely achieved due to ingesting an adequate amount of protein (1.7 g/kg) throughout the event. However, as with the changes in total body and fat mass, these results must be interpreted with caution due to the methodological limitations associated with the skinfold method. For example, an increase in total body water caused by fluid shifts may have influenced the skinfold measures <sup>[31]</sup>.

## **Conclusions and Practical applications**

This study characterised the energy and fluid intake, as well as the estimated energy balance/availability, of a male athlete competing in the MdS. Despite encountering a large energy deficit, similar to values previously reported during multistage, ultra-endurance events, the subject did not report any subjective feelings of hunger. This indicates relying on sensations of hunger to regulate EI is ineffective in preventing a large energy deficit and low EA during a MSU. A large energy deficit may compromise endurance performance;

therefore, athletes competing in MSUs should adopt a dietary strategy that involves consuming foods with a high calorie density at appropriate points in their events.

## References

1. Marathon des Sables. <http://marathondessables.co.uk>. Last accessed 20<sup>th</sup> June 2016.
2. Rehrer NJ. Fluid and electrolyte balance in ultra-endurance sport. *Sports Med.* 2001; 31:701–715.
3. Rontoyannis GP, Skoulis T, Pavlou KN. Energy balance in ultramarathon running. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1989; 49:976-979.
4. Mahon E, Hackett A, Stott T, George K, Davies I. Macronutrient consumption prior to, and during, a mountain marathon. *Am J Sport Sci.* 2014; 2:5-12.
5. Toner E, Wardle K, Mews T, Costa R. Nutritional and fluid intakes during a 243km multi-stage self-sufficient ultra-marathon in a hot desert environment: A case study approach. *J Sports Sci.* 2011; 29:S101-102.
6. Costa R, Swancott A, Gill S, Hankey J, Scheer V, Murray A, Thake C. Compromised energy and macronutrient intake of Ultra-endurance runners during a multi-stage Ultra-marathon conducted in a hot ambient environment. *Int J Sports Sci.* 2013; 3:51-62.
7. Costa R, Teixeira A, Rama L, Swancott A, Hardy L, Lee B, Camões-Costa V, Gill S, Waterman J, Freeth E, Barrett E, Hankey J, Marczak S, Valero-Burgos E, Scheer V, Murray A, Thake C. Water and sodium intake habits and status of ultra-endurance runners during a multi-stage ultra-marathon conducted in a hot ambient environment: an observational field based study. *Nutr J.* 2013; 12:13
8. Durnin JV, Womersley J. Body fat assessed from total body density and its estimation from skinfold thickness: measurements on 481 men and women aged from 16 to 72 years. *Br J Nutr.* 1976; 32:77-97.
9. Koopman R, Pannemans DL, Jeukendrup AE, Gijsen AP, Senden JM, Halliday D, Saris WH, van Loon LJ, Wagenmakers AJ. Combined ingestion of protein and carbohydrate improves protein balance during ultra-endurance exercise. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab.* 2004; 287:712–720.
10. Cunningham JJ. A reanalysis of the factors influencing basal metabolic rate in normal adults. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 1980; 33:2372-2374.
11. Loucks AB. Energy balance and energy availability. In: Maughan RJ, ed. *Sports Nutrition, The Encyclopaedia of Sports Medicine, an IOC Medical Commission Publication.* West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd; 2013:72–87.
12. Santos-Lozano A, Collado P, Foster C, Lucia A, Garatachea N. Influence of sex and level on marathon pacing strategy. Insights from the New York City race. *Int J Sports Med.* 2014; 35:1-6.
13. Thomas DT, Erdman KA, Burke LM. American College of Sports Medicine Joint Position Statement. Nutrition and Athletic Performance. *Med Sci Sports.* 2016; 48:543-568.
14. Kimber N, Ross J, Mason S, Speedy D. Energy balance during an ironman triathlon in male and female triathletes. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab.* 2002; 12:47–62.
15. Geesmann B, Mester J, Koehler K. Energy balance, macronutrient intake, and hydration status during a 1230km ultra-endurance bike marathon. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab.* 2014; 24:497-506.
16. McCubbin AJ, Cox GR, Broad EM. Case Study: Nutrition planning and intake for Marathon des Sables – A series of five runners. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab.* 2016; 26:581-587.

17. Vatansever-Ozen S, Tiryaki-Sonmez G, Bugdayci G, Ozen G. The effects of exercise on food intake and hunger: Relationship with acylated ghrelin and leptin. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2011; 10:283–291.
18. Rodriguez NR, Vislocky LM, Gaine PC. Dietary protein, endurance exercise, and human skeletal-muscle protein turnover. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care.* 2007; 10:40-45.
19. Volek JS, Freidenreich DJ, Saenz C, Kunces LJ, Creighton BC, Bartley JM, Davitt PM, Munoz CX, Anderson JM, Maresh CM, Lee EC, Schuenke MD, Aerni G, Kraemer WJ, Phinney SD. Metabolic characteristics of keto-adapted ultra-endurance runners. *Metabolism.* 2016; 65:100-110.
20. Stuempfle KJ, Hoffman MD, Weschler LB, Rogers IR, Hew-Butler T. Race diet of finishers and non-finishers in a 100 mile (161 km) mountain footrace. *J Am Coll Nutr.* 2011; 30:529–535.
21. Febbraio MA. Alterations in energy metabolism during exercise and heat stress. *Sports Med.* 2001; 31:47-59.
22. Jeukendrup A. A step towards personalized sports nutrition: carbohydrate intake during exercise. *Sports Med.* 2014; 44:25-33.
23. Jeukendrup AE, Vet-Joop K, Sturk A, Stegen JH, Senden J, Saris WH, Wagenmakers AJ. Relationship between gastro-intestinal complaints and endotoxaemia, cytokine release and the acute-phase reaction during and after a long-distance triathlon in highly trained men. *Clin Sci (Lond).* 2000; 98:47–55.
24. Jeukendrup AE, Saris W, Schrauwen HM, Brouns F, Wagenmakers AJ. Metabolic availability of medium-chain triglycerides co-ingested with carbohydrate during prolonged exercise. *J Appl Physiol.* 1995; 79:756-762.
25. Zajac A, Poprzecki S, Maszczyk A, Czuba M, Michalczyk M, Zydek G. The effects of a ketogenic diet on exercise metabolism and physical performance in off-road cyclists. *Nutrients.* 2014; 6:2493-508.
26. Burke LM, Kiens B. “Fat adaptation” for athletic performance: The nail in the coffin? *J Appl Physiol.* 2006; 100:7–8.
27. St Clair Gibson A, Noakes T. Evidence for complex system integration and dynamic neural regulation of skeletal muscle recruitment during exercise in humans. *Br J Sports Med.* 2004; 38:797-806.
28. Bircher S, Enggist A, Jehle T, Knechtle B. Effects of an extreme endurance race on energy balance and body composition - a case study. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2006; 5:154–162.
29. Karstoft K, Solomon TP, Laye MJ, Pedersen BK. Daily marathon running for a week—the biomechanical and body composition effects of participation. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2013; 27:2927-2933.
30. Knechtle B, Kohler G. Running 338 kilometres within five days has no effect on body mass and body fat but reduces skeletal muscle mass – the Isarrun 2006. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2007; 6:401-407.
31. Knechtle B, Duff B, Schulze I, Kohler G. A multi-stage ultra-endurance run over 1,200km leads to a continuous accumulation of total body water. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2008; 7:357-364.

**Table 1.** Example daily food plan

| <b>Day2<br/>(41.43km)</b> | <b>Food</b>                  | <b>Energy<br/>(kcal)</b> | <b>Carbohydrate<br/>(g)</b> | <b>Protein<br/>(g)</b> | <b>Fat<br/>(g)</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Breakfast</i>          | Thai Green Curry with Rice   | 587                      | 42                          | 23                     | 32                 |
| <i>Snack</i>              | Wiggle Energy Bar            | 235                      | 40                          | 3.2                    | 3.5                |
| <i>Snack</i>              | Bounce Energy Ball           | 178                      | 46                          | 9                      | 2.6                |
| <i>Snack</i>              | Cliff Energy Bloks           | 192                      | 48                          | 0                      | 0                  |
| <i>Snack</i>              | Pepperoni                    | 268                      | 0.6                         | 6                      | 11                 |
| <i>Snack</i>              | Ultra-Fuel Energy 4.1        | 192                      | 38.4                        | 10                     | 0                  |
| <i>Recovery</i>           | SiS Recovery Rapid           | 368                      | 23                          | 20                     | 1.3                |
| <i>Dinner</i>             | Potato, Salmon in Dill Sauce | 1115                     | 41                          | 16                     | 36                 |
|                           | <b>Total</b>                 | <b>3135</b>              | <b>279</b>                  | <b>87</b>              | <b>86</b>          |

**Table 2.** Heat acclimation training data from eight sessions performed prior to MdS. Data presented as mean  $\pm$  SD.

| <b>Duration<br/>(min)</b> | <b>Speed<br/>(km/h)</b> | <b>Gradient<br/>(%)</b> | <b>Heart rate<br/>(B/min)</b> | <b>RPE<br/>(6 -20)</b> | <b>TS<br/>(0-8)</b> | <b>Fluid deficit<br/>(ml)</b> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 55                        | 9 $\pm$ 1               | 1.1 $\pm$ 2             | 156 $\pm$ 21                  | 11.5 $\pm$ 1           | 4                   | 2943 $\pm$ 872                |

Abbreviations: RPE, Rating of perceived exertion; TS, Thermal sensation

**Table 3.** Daily energy intake and expenditure during the MdS

| <b>Stage</b> | <b>Exercise EE<br/>(kcal)</b> | <b>Total EE<br/>(kcal/d)</b> | <b>Energy Intake<br/>(Kcal/d)</b> | <b>Energy<br/>Availability<br/>(kcal/kg-<br/>FFM/d)</b> | <b>Energy<br/>balance<br/>(kcal/d)</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| (1) 33.8 km  | 2850                          | 4712                         | 2522                              | -5.30   | -2190                                  |
| (2) 41.4 km  | 2680                          | 4542                         | 2929                              | 4.02  | -1613                                  |
| (3) 36.5 km  | 2376                          | 4238                         | 2674                              | 4.81  | -1564                                  |
| (4) 82.8 km  | 4806                          | 6668                         | 3272                              | -24.78  | -3396                                  |
| (5) Rest     | 500                           | 2362                         | 2305                              | 29.17   | -57                                    |
| (6) 40.4 km  | 2319                          | 4181                         | 3335                              | 16.41   | -846                                   |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | 15031                         | 24341                        | 14732                             |   | -9609                                  |
| Ave          | 3006.20                       | 4868.                        | 2946                              | -0.97   | -1922                                  |
| SD           | 1030                          | 1030                         | 358                               | 15  | 952                                    |

Abbreviations: EE, energy expenditure; FFM, fat free mass

**Table 4.** Macronutrient intake


| <b>Stage</b> | <b>Carbohydrate (%)</b> | <b>Protein (%)</b> | <b>Fat (%)</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| (1) 33.8 km  | 49                      | 29                 | 22             |
| (2) 41.4 km  | 54                      | 22                 | 24             |
| (3) 36.5 km  | 54                      | 24                 | 23             |
| (4) 82.8 km  | 69                      | 22                 | 9              |
| (5) Rest     | 59                      | 28                 | 13             |
| (6) 40.4 km  | 63                      | 18                 | 19             |
| Ave          | 58                      | 24                 | 18             |
| SD           | 7                       | 4                  | 5              |




**Table 5.** Observations in speed and elevation in relation to energy deficit.

| <b>Stage</b>  | <b>Average Moving<br/>Speed (km/h)</b> | <b>Speed CV (%)</b> | <b>Elevation CV<br/>(%)</b> | <b>Daily Energy<br/>Deficit (kcal)</b> |
|---------------|--|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Stage1_33.8km | 6.3                                    | 14.8                | 1.9                         | -2190                                  |
| Stage2_41.4km | 7.9                                    | 16.4                | 2.2                         | -1613                                  |
| Stage3_36.5km | 7.6                                    | 19.1                | 2.4                         | -1564                                  |
| Stage4_82.8km | 7.7                                    | 19.7                | 5.4                         | -3396                                  |
| Stage5_40.4km | 8.8                                    | 12.3                | 5.5                         | -846                                   |


Abbreviations: CV, coefficient of variation



**Figure 1.** Percentage difference from average speed for each stage.



**Figure 2.** Representation of average elevation and average running speed. Shaded area shows variation in elevation between each 5km split.



**Figure 3.** Representation of average running speed and day to day calorie deficit. Shaded area shows variation in speed between each 5km split.