

Calorie Restriction, Cortisol and Abdominal Fat

Implications for sustainable body-composition goals and the EPK framework

Billy Craig | Independent Researcher

Version 1.0 | 2 October 2026

Working paper - not peer reviewed

Central conclusion. The burden of a diet matters alongside its effect on body composition. Cortisol evidence supports investigating this burden, but does not establish that calorie restriction prevents abdominal fat loss or that increasing intake selectively removes abdominal fat.

Abstract

This targeted narrative review examines the proposed chain linking calorie restriction, increased stress or cortisol exposure, and abdominal fat accumulation. Selected human experiments show that restriction can increase cortisol, but other interventions report little change. Observational studies link cortisol measures with central adiposity, while remission of pathological cortisol excess reduces visceral fat. These findings do not establish that ordinary diet-induced cortisol changes cause abdominal fat retention. Randomised trials directly demonstrate that calorie restriction can reduce visceral and subcutaneous abdominal fat. Aesthetic abdominal definition, regional adiposity and metabolic health are distinct outcomes. We propose that Energy Per Kilogram (EPK) should evaluate hunger, recovery, performance, adherence and body composition together, without claiming a proven cortisol-mediated advantage. A prospective study design separates the practical effectiveness of an energy-balance pathway from the narrower question of cortisol mediation. No new participant data or pooled effect estimates are reported.

Keywords: energy restriction; cortisol; visceral adipose tissue; subcutaneous fat; dietary adherence; energy availability; EPK.

Licence: CC BY-ND 4.0 for original author-owned text. Third-party research remains subject to its own rights. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23101380.

1. The question and the evidence selected

The practical question is whether a reduced-calorie diet that increases stress exposure is poorly suited to a goal such as a leaner abdomen or visible abdominal muscles. The answer requires separating an intervention's ability to reduce fat from its tolerability and its effects on other outcomes. A diet can reduce abdominal fat while imposing costs that make it unacceptable to an individual. Conversely, an approach that improves well-being has not necessarily been shown to reduce abdominal fat.

1.1 Scope and search approach

A targeted search of PubMed-indexed records, PubMed Central and linked primary research was conducted through 2 October 2026. Search themes included calorie restriction and salivary cortisol; stress reactivity and waist-to-hip ratio; hair cortisol and adiposity; Cushing's remission and MRI fat distribution; randomised restriction trials with abdominal imaging; and low energy availability, hunger and performance. Eleven primary studies were selected for their relevance to one or more links in the proposed pathway.

This is a narrative review, not a systematic review. There was no registered protocol, exhaustive database search, duplicate screening, formal risk-of-bias scoring or meta-analysis. Findings were checked against original publication records and abstracts, with accessible full text used where available. Records differ in detail and completeness. The selection intentionally includes findings that challenge a simple restriction-to-cortisol-to-abdominal-fat explanation; it cannot establish the absence of every possible effect.

1.2 Four outcomes that must remain separate

Abdominal subcutaneous fat lies beneath the skin. **Visceral fat** lies within the abdominal cavity around organs. **Muscular development and definition** concern the abdominal musculature and its visible contour. **Function** includes strength, endurance, recovery and the ability to sustain daily activity. Imaging-based studies can distinguish fat depots; a waist measurement cannot reliably separate them. [5,6,7]

A visible six-pack is not a validated proxy for visceral fat, cortisol regulation or general health. Appearance is not the same endpoint as a measured reduction in an abdominal depot. For this review, cosmetic goals are treated as personal preferences, not medical outcomes or evidence of physiological adequacy.

Proposed causal chain: dietary restriction -> increased cortisol exposure -> altered abdominal fat storage.

Each link requires evidence. An association at the final link does not establish that the whole chain operates during an ordinary diet.

2. Does restriction increase cortisol?

Short-term restriction. Tomiyama et al. randomised 121 women to calorie monitoring, restriction, both, or neither for three weeks. The restriction target was 1,200 kcal/day. Restriction increased total salivary cortisol output; monitoring increased perceived stress. The experiment separated two behaviours often combined in dieting. It did not measure later cortisol-mediated abdominal fat gain. A fixed intake also represents different deficit sizes for different people. [1]

A contrasting intervention. A six-month CALERIE investigation reported little effect of sustained restriction, with or without exercise, on salivary cortisol. This weakens a universal claim that calorie deficits necessarily raise cortisol. Exposure duration, deficit severity, participants and sampling protocols differ between studies; these differences cannot be resolved by choosing only the result that supports a preferred model. [2]

Low energy availability in athletes. Jeppesen et al. studied 12 female endurance athletes in a randomised crossover experiment. Fourteen days at approximately 22 rather than 52 kcal/kg fat-free mass/day of energy availability increased systemic cortisol by 22% and impaired exercise performance. Time-trial impairment persisted after three days of refuelling. The small, specialised sample limits generalisation. Energy availability subtracts exercise expenditure from intake before dividing by fat-free mass; it is not intake per kilogram of total body mass. [3]

2.1 Stress exposure and cortisol are not interchangeable

A dietary target is an exposure; perceived stress is a reported experience; cortisol is a biological measurement. Their relationships are empirical questions. The separation of monitoring-related perceived stress and restriction-related cortisol in the short trial is particularly instructive. [1] An assessment that records only one of these quantities should not be described as measuring all three.

For a future EPK study, sampling time, sleep and waking schedule, recent exercise, medication and the cortisol assay should be prespecified. Repeated measurements would help distinguish reproducible changes from noise. Salivary profiles, blood concentrations and hair measures address different aspects and periods of exposure; their numerical results should not be pooled as if they were interchangeable tests.

Supported: some restriction protocols increase cortisol.

Not established: every deficit raises cortisol, an increase is necessarily pathological, or cortisol prevents fat loss.

3. Cortisol and abdominal fat: what is linked?

Stress responsiveness. Epel et al. examined 59 healthy premenopausal women over repeated laboratory stress sessions. Higher waist-to-hip ratio was associated with greater cortisol reactivity; lean women with central fat showed less habituation to repeated challenges. Because body shape was not experimentally assigned and fat change was not followed prospectively, direction of causation remains unresolved. Waist-to-hip ratio was a distribution marker, not an MRI measurement of visceral fat. [4]

Longer-term exposure marker. Jackson et al. analysed hair cortisol in 2,527 adults aged 54-87. Hair cortisol correlated with waist circumference, but the association was small ($r = 0.082$). It was also associated with persistent obesity assessed retrospectively over four years. Cortisol was not measured before that entire weight history, so the analysis does not establish cortisol as the initiating cause. The predominantly white British sample also limits population transfer. [5]

Pathological excess. Geer et al. followed 14 patients with Cushing's disease before surgery and after remission. Whole-body MRI showed reductions in visceral and other fat depots, including a reduced visceral-to-total-fat ratio. This provides clinically relevant evidence about fat distribution during sustained cortisol excess and its treatment. It was not a randomised cortisol-lowering experiment in ordinary dieters. Surgical treatment, recovery and other endocrine changes prevent attributing every change to a single pathway. [6]

3.1 A plausible link is not proof of a dietary mechanism

These studies differ in population, exposure and outcome. An association between stress reactivity and waist-to-hip ratio cannot be substituted for evidence that reducing dietary intake increased visceral fat. Likewise, a treatment response in Cushing's disease cannot supply the expected effect size of a modest restriction-related cortisol change.

The missing bridge is a study that measures a dietary intervention, subsequent cortisol change and later depot-specific fat change, with an analysis capable of addressing competing explanations. Diet, activity, sleep, adiposity and stress can change together. A plausible mechanism deserves testing; it is not a reason to ignore direct body-composition outcomes.

Interpretation for EPK. Cortisol regulation is a candidate modifier or mediator to investigate. It is not an established explanation for why an individual retains abdominal fat, and abdominal appearance cannot diagnose cortisol excess.

4. What happens to abdominal fat during restriction?

Six-month randomised evidence. Redman et al. compared weight maintenance, a 25% dietary restriction prescription, and a combined diet/exercise deficit in a trial with 35 completers. Both deficit groups lost about 10% of body weight and 27% of abdominal visceral fat. Multislice CT assessed abdominal distribution. Relative fat distribution did not change despite reductions in absolute fat. This is direct evidence that restriction can reduce visceral fat, not proof that it preferentially targets that depot. [7]

One-year evidence. Racette et al. randomised 48 adults to restriction, exercise intended to produce a comparable deficit, or a healthy-lifestyle control. MRI showed reductions in both visceral and subcutaneous abdominal fat in the restriction and exercise groups. The restriction group achieved an average 11.5% restriction rather than the prescribed 20%, highlighting the distinction between assigned and achieved exposure. Participants were not selected for a demonstrated cortisol increase, so the study does not quantify fat loss specifically in that subgroup. [8]

4.1 Visible abs are a different endpoint

Vispute et al. randomised 24 sedentary adults to abdominal exercise or control for six weeks with an isocaloric diet. Abdominal muscular endurance improved, but abdominal-fat and body-composition measures did not significantly change. This small trial shows that better local muscular endurance need not coincide with less covering fat. It does not establish that every possible local-training programme has no regional effect. [9]

For a physique-focused EPK study, abdominal subcutaneous thickness or volume and muscle measurements would be more informative than a cortisol result alone. Photographs could be a supplementary, standardised outcome, but differences in lighting, posture and presentation would need control. No body-fat percentage or cortisol threshold for visible abs is established here.

4.2 What the combined evidence permits

Restriction can reduce abdominal fat. Some restriction protocols also increase cortisol. These observations are compatible: a possible effect on fat distribution does not imply that net fat loss is impossible. The reviewed trials do not demonstrate that most people would lose more abdominal fat at maintenance intake, nor that increasing intake selectively removes abdominal fat. Equally, a reduction in waist size alone does not establish that the diet preserved function or was sustainable.

5. Sustainability and the EPK proposition

The strongest EPK proposition arising from this literature is to evaluate body-composition goals alongside adequate fuelling, hunger, recovery and performance. This is a proposed research priority, not evidence that the programme already outperforms established interventions. A participant may reasonably value a tolerable eating pattern and better function more than maximising short-term weight loss.

Persistent appetite pressure. Sumithran et al. enrolled 50 adults in a ten-week very-low-energy weight-loss programme. At a year after initial weight loss, hunger and several appetite-regulating hormones remained different from baseline. This supports biological pressure towards regain, not a universal failure rate, and it concerns appetite signals rather than demonstrating cortisol-mediated abdominal fat retention. Follow-up findings should not be interpreted as outcomes from every person who begins a diet. [10]

Function can diverge from scale change. The athlete experiment described earlier demonstrates that low energy availability can impair performance. [3] A proposed EPK evaluation should therefore avoid declaring success from lower mass alone. Whether restoring sufficiency improves adherence or body composition in non-athletes remains a separate question.

5.1 Dietary fat type remains a separate exposure

LIPOGAIN randomly compared saturated-fat-rich and polyunsaturated-fat-rich overfeeding in 39 young, normal-weight adults. Despite similar weight gain, the saturated-fat intervention produced more liver fat and a larger visceral-fat increase. The short trial shows why dietary composition and depot-specific outcomes deserve measurement. It does not establish a cortisol mechanism, a benefit of low total fat during restriction, or preferential abdominal fat loss from increasing carbohydrate. [11]

5.2 Relation to the working papers

For EPK-001, this review supports including tolerability and function when evaluating intake per kilogram. For EPK-002, it supports investigating whether persistent hunger and stress affect adherence. For EPK-003, depot-specific outcomes and dietary composition should accompany substrate-use measures. For EPK-004 and EPK-005, performance and recovery should be assessed separately from fat loss. These are proposed extensions, not revisions to the existing published PDFs.

Recommended formulation. A sustainable body-composition approach should assess the physiological and psychological burden of restriction as well as fat loss. Cortisol may contribute to individual responses, but a cortisol-mediated advantage of EPK has not been demonstrated.

6. A study that could test the proposition

Pragmatic question. Among adults with a history of restrictive dieting and persistent hunger or reduced function, does an EPK pathway intended to meet estimated energy needs improve well-being and performance compared with a clearly specified, supported restriction programme? If abdominal fat reduction is also a goal, does the pathway improve, maintain or compromise that outcome? These are questions, not predicted results.

A parallel-group randomised trial could use a prespecified intervention period with longer follow-up, comparable support, and documented protein intake and training. The sample size should be calculated for the chosen primary outcome using pilot variability and a clinically meaningful difference. Severe undernutrition and medical causes of cortisol excess require separate assessment rather than inclusion in an ordinary consumer comparison.

The pragmatic trial would test the complete programme. If its diets differ in energy and macronutrient composition, it cannot isolate the contribution of each. A separate matched-diet or factorial comparison would be needed to identify an independent effect of carbohydrate-fat balance. An estimated maintenance target also does not prove that actual energy balance was achieved.

6.1 Prespecified measurements

Body composition: abdominal visceral and subcutaneous fat measured separately by a standardised imaging protocol; whole-body fat and lean tissue; waist circumference and mass. Imaging can be restricted to a validation subgroup when costs require it, with clear limits on generalisation.

Experience and function: validated hunger and perceived-stress measures, sleep, training performance, recovery, adherence, withdrawals and adverse outcomes. Report reasons for discontinuation rather than treating missing participants as successful maintainers.

Exposure and mechanism: dietary records, activity and expenditure estimates, device completeness, and repeated cortisol measurements with fixed collection procedures. A mechanistic substudy could use objective expenditure assessment; routine users need not individually undergo laboratory testing.

6.2 Mediation must be demonstrated

Randomisation to diet does not randomise the cortisol response. To investigate mediation, cortisol should be assessed after intervention begins and before later fat outcomes, with baseline levels and plausible mediator-outcome confounders specified. Even then, causal mediation requires assumptions and sensitivity analyses. Correlated changes in cortisol and waist size are insufficient on their own.

Conclusion. Available human evidence supports attention to the burden of restriction, but not the claim that dieting generally defeats abdominal fat reduction through cortisol. EPK's contribution should be tested through sustained function, tolerability and directly measured body composition, with no guaranteed six-pack or cortisol-lowering claim.

References

1. Tomiyama AJ et al. (2010). Low calorie dieting increases cortisol. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 72:357-364.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20368473/>
2. Tam CS et al. (2014). No effect of caloric restriction on salivary cortisol levels in overweight men and women. Full-text record PMC3946997.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3946997/>
3. Jeppesen JS et al. (2024). Low energy availability increases immune cell formation of reactive oxygen species and impairs exercise performance in female endurance athletes. *Redox Biology* 75:103250.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38936255/>
4. Epel ES et al. (2000). Stress and body shape: stress-induced cortisol secretion is consistently greater among women with central fat. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 62:623-632.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11020091/>
5. Jackson SE, Kirschbaum C, Steptoe A. (2017). Hair cortisol and adiposity in a population-based sample of 2,527 men and women aged 54 to 87 years. *Obesity* 25:539-544.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28229550/>
6. Geer EB et al. (2012). Body composition and cardiovascular risk markers after remission of Cushing's disease: a prospective study using whole-body MRI. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 97:1702-1711.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22419708/>

References and declarations

7. Redman LM et al. (2007). Effect of calorie restriction with or without exercise on body composition and fat distribution. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 92:865-872.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17200169/>
8. Racette SB et al. (2006). One year of caloric restriction in humans: feasibility and effects on body composition and abdominal adipose tissue. *Journal of Gerontology A* 61:943-950.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16960025/>
9. Vispute SS et al. (2011). The effect of abdominal exercise on abdominal fat. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research* 25:2559-2564.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21804427/>
10. Sumithran P et al. (2011). Long-term persistence of hormonal adaptations to weight loss. *New England Journal of Medicine* 365:1597-1604.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22029981/>
11. Rosqvist F et al. (2014). Overfeeding polyunsaturated and saturated fat causes distinct effects on liver and visceral fat accumulation in humans. *Diabetes* 63:2356-2368.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24550191/>

Declarations

This author-developed working paper presents a narrative synthesis and proposed research design. It reports no new experiment or participant data and has not undergone external peer review. The author develops the EPK framework discussed here; that intellectual interest should be considered when interpreting the proposed applications. No claim of independent programme validation is made.

AI-assisted drafting and source checking were used in preparation. Review limitations are described in Section 1. The paper does not present a medical diagnostic test, an individual dietary prescription or an established treatment for cortisol excess.

Copyright 2026 Billy Craig. Original author-owned text is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. Third-party material and cited publications are excluded unless separately licensed. PDF distribution does not prevent copying or editing.

Licence: creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/