Artin Entezarjou, MD
Simplifying Science & Interpreting Research

SIGMA NUTRITION RADIO

Episode 245

Danny Lennon:	Artin welcome to the podcast. Thank you so much for joining me today.
Artin Entezarjou:	Thank you very much Danny. It's a pleasure to be here. A longtime listener of the show and I am happy to be on.
Danny Lennon:	Yes. This is a conversation just like mentioned before we started recording to you that I think is going to be extremely, extremely useful to a lot of listeners. That I don't think we've directly approached at least – definitely in some indirect manner it's probably been talked about, but trying to get into this idea of how we can best make sure of science, and before we get into any of that stuff maybe just for people listening and are coming across you in your work for the first time, can you give some background on yourself that kind of type of work you're doing and fields that you're involved with?
Artin Entezarjou:	Absolutely. So, my name is Artin Entezarjou. I am a medical doctor practicing my internship in Sweden at the moment. Well, I can say that I've been involved in the fitness industry since 2015 when I started EBT, which stands for Evidence Based Training. But I started out really as a teenager like anyone else wanting to build muscle, trying to burn fat, look better all this line of superficial stuff and I did what any reasonable teenager does. I went onto bodybuilding.com and went onto YouTube and tried to find out the best way to get the best results, and you know I ended up with the classic six meals per day, gainer, maltodextrin supplements, doing some cardio to burn fat while bulking, clean

eating all the stuff. Got some results, but it was hard to know what was really working, and as I started studying medicine we learnt about different types of studies and evidence based medicine is central to how we work. So, I started thinking like I should probably start applying this to my training and my nutrition and there was a lot of work done, but Instagram and Facebook weren't super big and the stuff that was on it was like FIT-P and there were all these random supplements that I was kind of unsure about what was working and what wasn't. So, I decided to start looking up studies, start looking up sources which were reliable trying to apply research to fitness and that's how EBT got started simply and Instagram page providing content.

Danny Lennon: So, you have EBT running and putting out content at the moment, and then like you say you're also a medical doctor. So, what is a typical day-to-day work look like for you right now if there is such a thing?

Artin Entezarjou: Well, right now I'm actually on holiday. So, right now I'm actually spending a lot of time just reading research. I have like every time I come across something that sounds interesting I do a little Google Keep notes and I have a long list of stuff that I'm like, "Hah this I really want to learn more about this aspect of fitness, this aspect of nutrition," so I look up.

The good thing of being affiliated with a university which I didn't mention is that I am also a Ph.D. student doing research within primary care. So, I have access to lot of research from different journals, so I can read pretty much any research that I want, read full articles.

So, that's what my days would look like now, but otherwise my general day will look like I get up maybe 6:00 in the morning, have breakfast and get on the train to commute to work. It starts around 8:00 in the morning. On the train I usually do some reading and write some blog posts for EBT. We have different rotations, so I've been in internal medicine. I've just finished my surgery rotation and I have actually the two best rotations left which is psychiatry and primary care. And personally I want to become a primary care physician, so I can apply what I have learnt through EBT with my patients.

Danny Lennon: That's awesome and that seems like a fantastic way to go and exciting times for sure. So, to get into today's discussion the kind

of term that you'd use when we were discussing some of this over email was this idea of simplifying science. So, maybe a good place to jump in is what exactly we are talking about here, what is that concept of simplifying science?

Artin Entezarjou: Yes. So, in Sweden they teach us Ph.D. students that a researcher has three duties or [Foreign Language 00:11:27] in Swedish. The first duty is to conduct research, the second duty is to teach, and then the third duty or [Foreign Language 00:11:37] in Swedish is public outreach, communicating your research to the public. As researchers we can get very snort into or we can get very focused on our little fields, but we need to remember that the long-term goal is to make society a better place cliché as it might sound.

And to accomplish that goal my personal belief is that we need to make science digestible for the public. Many people aren't as educated in understanding different types of research and understanding what good information is, so we need to help them. It's part of our duties I would say as researchers.

So, simplifying science really – it doesn't mean changing the conclusions. It really means using simple terminology, using similes when possible, trying to be accurate as much as we can but also being somewhat flexible so that people more easily can understand what we're saying.

Danny Lennon: Right. So, from a perspective of people of how we should do this I think the difficult thing is towing that balance of on one hand wanting to simplify it for people, but on the other not simplifying it so much it actually loses its context, because that's one of the things we know about accurate information is that a lot of the time it depends on a number of different things. There's certain specific context or background understanding we may need to fully articulate what we're trying to say. So, how do we strike a balance in your opinion of being able to simplify enough that a broad number of people can understand without losing the true essence of what we're trying to say?

Artin Entezarjou: That's a very good question and it's not an easy one to answer. I can tell you that this balance between context and digestibility is very difficult. It's not easy at all, I mean what I personally find is instead of just saying it depends and leaving in at that or saying that we need more research when we present a study or a piece of advice is to explain just simply how we look at one study for

example, this study compared one type of resistance training to another and we found these differences. What conclusions can we draw from this?

Well for example, maybe if you've heard of this study Prestes et al that looked at rest-pause training it found there is larger thigh hypertrophy in the group that did rest-pause training. At the first glance we might see that okay rest-pause training it looks like it's peer for hypertrophy, but if we look further into it we see that for example, diet wasn't controlled in this study. The group that did rest-pause training might have actually been eating more protein rich diets. So, is it really the rest-pause training or is it something else? We need more research which is better controlled.

So, it takes time I guess. We need to give small pieces of information that can help people question research, but still try to interpret it by themselves.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. I think this is something that certainly at many times over the past number of years I think that I've struggled with trying to give information that I know is accurate, but also in a way that people can actually go and use. And I think one of the big problems that, at least I've found and I love to hear your experience on is, when I say something being so aware of how people who have a deep breadth of knowledge or maybe involved in academic field could potentially point to a certain thing and say, "Well, that's not technically correct. It's an oversimplification and worrying too much about trying to layout the scenario for every possible scenario I could think of as opposed to saying a statement that's short and simple and is going to help someone. Certainly I think that's been my issue for sure or maybe over worrying about really people who are aren't really the target of that information I guess if that makes any sense?

Artin Entezarjou: That makes perfect sense and I know exactly what you mean. I think what can happen is – you've probably heard about the Dunning-Kruger effect where you start – Dunning-Kruger effect for your listeners I can just simply say that it's the amount of confidence you have in your field without much research you've read. So, you might have recognizers in yourself after watching a documentary on plant based diets or global warming all of a sudden we feel like we have a very good idea of what is wrong with the field or what is to be recommended. Classic example, is also looking at a documentary on sugar and all of a sudden we

think sugar might be this very dangerous thing, but after awhile we might be proven wrong someone might present us with contradicting research and overtime we realize there is so much more that we don't know. And what that ends up happening is – what happened for me was that I made a mistake once. I posted a post about plant based diets and claimed that there was no difference between a plant based protein and animal based protein because I found a study where they had given rice supplement versus weight supplement to two groups and they'd built as much muscle. But of course my followers who are very critical, which I love which is the reason why I have EBT directly pointed out that well there's more to it than that. It's the dose of leucine etc, etc.

The point I'm trying to make here is I became overwhelmed with there's a lot more to it than I thought and we can end up in this place where we don't want to give recommendations because we are scared that we've missed out something.

I think the best solution to that problem is to be transparent. To admit that I am a person I am doing the best way I can, I'm interpreting the research as best as I can, and I am just openly happy for people to give me more research so I can improve that message.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. And I think it also goes the other way of once we're in this kind of evidence based world I think sometimes we can be a bit hypercritical of certain people who put out certain messages and maybe miss that sometimes if somebody is talking in generalities. That's okay to be a bit vague and general with more of a sweeping statement as long as someone is putting a caveat that well in general for most people this will be true instead of jumping on that and saying, "Well, what about this scenarios, what about this type of person." We can never make one statement that's going to do for all people in all scenarios, right? So, I think it cuts both ways. One thing that I did want to ask about is – and again I think we chatted about this before of when this kind of growing evidence based scene within the fitness industry is obviously very encouraging and it's great to see so many coaches and fitness professionals and trainers want to have evidence based practice as core part of their philosophy. However, many of them may not have the academic training or a degree in science and the exposure to reading research that some academics have. So, number 1 for people in that situation are there any maybe

common mistake you might see people making who are trying to be evidence based in their approach, but are not necessarily doing it correctly or are making some mistakes in how they are using evidence?

Artin Entezarjou: Common thing I see is – and you've probably heard yourself, is understanding the difference between a correlation and a causation already in correlation. So, the basic foundation here I think that I try to teach with EBT is understanding that all studies are not created equal. Just because you've cited 10 studies or 10 sources doesn't mean that your info is 10 times as valid as mine where I have one source.

There are three general levels I think you can roughly divide evidence into. Most valid would be an experimental study or in science as we call interventional study. The next level would be an observational study, and the third level would be an expert opinion where expert gives opinion in the lack of a scientific evidence and people tend to confuse observational research results with experimental research results.

A common example that I use is if you imagine the correlation between wearing a large t-shirt and being tall. So, tall people generally wear larger t-shirts i.e. there's a correlation between being tall and wearing large t-shirts. Now does this mean that if we give someone a large t-shirt that they will become tall. No. So, there is a link as much as media usually puts it between large t-shirts and being tall but there is not causation. There is no causal relationship. The relationship there is that someone is tall and therefore is forced to buy a large t-shirt not the other way around.

Danny Lennon: So, with something like observational research one thing that maybe a potential pitfall that some people may fall into when they hear something like that is to become overly dismissive of any observational research or any associational research. So, obviously that's not the case and it can have some good value. So, what is the best way to think of observational and associational research and how we should use that and think about it?

Artin Entezarjou: That's a good question. Exactly, there is definitely a place for observational research. We can say simply that observational research has the advantage that it can include a large number of subjects. We can have observational research on thousands and millions of people and follow them over very long periods of time.

So, basically you can see trends in activity following very, very long periods of time which you probably wouldn't be able to do in an experimental research.

And a case would be for example, looking at the link or correlation between sugar and diabetes or obesity. You can follow people for many, many years and ask them about their sugar consumption and see that maybe people who tend to eat more added sugars in their diet tend to gain more weight overtime.

Doing that in an experimental scenario might work, but you get to see more conclusions if you'd have long-term research. For example, development of diabetes or other diseases like cancer and such these take years to develop and you won't be able to see those effects in a 12-week experimental study.

Danny Lennon: Right. So, we can basically take observational work and use it for its strengths, and then combine those findings with work that we see done in more of an experimental setting and get this kind of bigger picture of what's likely to be going on with that interference?

Artin Entezarjou: Absolutely that will be a fair summary. Generally I think the important thing here is to understand that there are many different types of research. One type that we haven't mentioned is the mechanistical research or as I call it test tube research to simplify science once again, to be research where we're looking at one cell and seeing how effects happen in a test tube or in a lab. Obviously a cell isn't the same thing as an entire living human body, but test tube research can definitely help us make speculations.

So, if you have a test tube study that seems to indicate that high sugar levels might contribute to diabetes. At the same time as you have observational studies going on for several years that show link between sugar intake and diabetes. And at the same time you have experimental studies for 12 weeks showing that insulin sensitivity or such is affected by sugar consumption. If all these things are in agreement that might help us draw a conclusion.

So, you need to look at each type of research and see is there agreement or is there disagreement and with a caveat here that this is not my field, so the link between sugar and diabetes it's a complement and I am just using it an example in this case.

Danny Lennon:	Sure. I think one of the things that can really become apparent is that we're never looking at one particular study and using that to draw a definite conclusion. Particularly, when it comes to something as complex as human nutrition or human health, and I think this is probably a big issue with a lot of mainstream media articles that we can see that have this big headline of how science has shown X causes Y and really that's not really the way science works or what science is. It's more about this building up of not only research that is then replicable but various different types of research, and combining what we see in mechanistic work and observational work, and then randomized controlled trials, and then seeing where does most of that lean to, to get a best idea as opposed to this one study proves this one thing?
Artin Entezarjou:	Exactly. You can see each study as a piece of the puzzle, and then observational studies tend to have more conflicting results and this can be due to several reasons. Many observational studies on diet in particular are based on reported data, so people are writing about how much they're eating. They're reporting how much exercise they're doing and this can sometimes depending on the reliability lead to conflicting results and that's why you said Danny that we need to combine those findings with the experimental or interventional research.

It's also helpful to look at the observational studies which use a sound way of measuring their outcomes as opposed to looking at all observational research and equating all observational research. |
| Danny Lennon: | So, one thing that might be useful is for maybe people who are starting down this path of wanting to read more primary research for themselves, and try and get more information that way by directly going to journals and reading papers. What are some maybe tips you give for when they're going to read studies what are certain things to be on the lookout for that might be useful of how to best make use of that time of reading an actual study? |
| Artin Entezarjou: | That's a good question. Reading a study can be very difficult, especially if you haven't read it within the field. So, I think the first thing to do is to find a so called Systematic Review or Meta Analysis of the field that you want to learn about and start reading there, because you'll find lots of references to different articles. |

And to clarify a systematic review is summary of all existing research to answer a certain question. So, they're taking results from many studies and pooling it in a so called Meta Analysis, so I would start there. After you've read that review or the systematic review you should then aim to go into looking at different studies, and when you have one specific study which you're trying to read start by reading the introduction because that one often provides a background to the entire context of the research question.

And then, if you are not used to interpreting results and the methods I would actually skip the methods and results section and jump straight to the discussion, because the discussion usually summarizes the results in a somewhat understandable way, and then starts brining up other research.

And you'll quickly see that the researchers will often bring up a contradicting research and explain why their findings are different to findings of other research and this way overtime you will build up a mental arsenal of research that you've reflected upon, and compared, etc, etc. That'll be my advice to start outs.

Danny Lennon: Excellent. And I think that's a great starting point for people who are looking to get into reading more studies, particularly if you don't have a background in that. One thing Artin, for people who maybe do have some scientific training or have done degree in some sort of science related field or who maybe have just been reading research themselves for quite a period of time and have build up some competency. I think one area that can still be quite daunting is when it comes to looking at results, and results tables, and looking at some of the statistics used. So, maybe it might be useful to highlight some of the things people might see there like a P-value or a mean, standard deviation, effect size what are some of those key things that might be typically seen in some results. And can you give just a brief summary of a couple of the main ones?

Artin Entezarjou: Absolutely. So, there are several indicators, statistical tools that we use when we conduct research to see if – for example, a difference between two groups is it a true difference or is it a fluke, is it a lucky finding. One of those tools that we use is the P-value, so to simplify very much because there is more to it than this. The P-value is essentially the probability that your finding is a fluke or not, and so generally arbitrarily we've decided that a P-value of less than 0.05 is a significant finding. What this means is

that the difference between two groups is not a fluke it's probably a real difference, and if you were to repeat that experiments you would probably find a difference again, so P-values are important to understand.

What I think is even more useful than the P-value is the confidence interval or usually abbreviated CI in the studies. And this confidence interval tells us that if we were to repeat the experiment within what range would we expect to find the results. So, a very broad confidence interval would indicate that the result is very uncertain. While a narrower confidence interval would indicate that okay we are more certain of our results. Yeah.

To go on I guess I could say that confidence intervals and P-values are one tool, and I think the best way to illustrate this is using an example. So, if I would do a study on measuring bicep size after doing curls. I would take maybe 20 men, and tell half of them to do bicep curls and tell other half of them at random to not do bicep curls and just I use them as a control group. After say 12 weeks of training I would measure the size of their biceps in both groups, and I might find that the group which did their biceps training had on average 20% larger cross sectional area of their bicep muscles compared to the control group. Now, was this a lucky finding or not? We can conduct several types of tests and the test will eventually give us a P-value. If that P-value is less than 0.5 or 0.05 sorry that's an indication of that there is a significant difference between the groups.

But we also need to look at the confidence interval, so there was an average of 20% difference between the biceps training group and the control group but if the confidence interval is 1% to 40% what that is saying is that this average result is very uncertain, and it could be that the biceps training in fact has 40% benefit compared to control or as little as 1% benefit compared to control.

And that's why the third variable which is important to consider is study size. How big is the population we're measuring because generally the bigger the population is the narrower the confidence interval becomes the more certain we become that this finding is within an accurate range.

Danny Lennon: One thing that I think we did want to get onto that is related to this is once people have build up a certain level of understanding

and they want to get involved in discussions about certain ideas which I think is always a good idea and typically is very fruitful. The actual art of going and having a good fruitful discussion versus one that just becomes a pointless argument where people are shouting each other down, so how would you approach that question of advice the people of how to have a discussion over anything evidence based and how to kind of communicate that in a discussion form?

Artin Entezarjou: Wow! This is probably one of the most important points in the podcast I think, because having a discussion versus just screaming at each other is a key to – actually the difference between not developing and becoming a better researcher as opposed to actually learning and becoming better. So, I would say step one; when you meet someone who seems to disagree with what you have to say I would say make sure that both parties are open to changing their minds. So, if you notice that the other party has no situation in which he or she will change their mind and same goes for yourself then there's no point in having a discussion because then it's not a discussion. So, once both parties have agreed okay there are these things I would think I would need to see before changing my mind then I am prepared to have a discussion.

The second point before actually getting into the discussion is both of us need to agree what the central point of the discussion is. Are we discussing the affects of insulin on obesity or we discussing the affects of low carb high fat diet on obesity, because those two points are very different even though at first glance they might seem to be the same thing.

Once you've agreed on what the central point is I would say that the whole argument should circle around discussing evidence that centers around the central point. You might have heard of Graham's Levels of Agreements ([Hierarchy of Disagreement](#)). This is a six level ladder, if you Google it you'll find a pyramid, which explains things you should bring up in a discussion to make it a fruitful discussion. So, the Graham's Levels of <mark>Agreement</mark> Level-6 is the ideal level where we're discussing the refuting the central point of an argument. But there are nuances to this hierarchy and it's very easy to fall into other discussions which aren't about the central point. Level-5 for example, is the situation where the opposing party will start talking about things that aren't about the central point. Instead of talking about affects of insulin per se on fat loss they might start talking about low carb high fat diets and

fat loss. And they'll quote you and say well you said this about low carb high fat diets but the discussion isn't about low carb high fat diets it's in fact about insulin.

If we move down another level it could be that the party presents seemingly opposing evidence, which is very good I think the discussion should generally revolve around making claims and presenting supporting evidence. But if that evidence is indicating something or is referring to something that isn't the central point of the argument then that argument will once again spiral into something that isn't a fruitful discussion.

Further down the Graham's Level of Agreement we have Level-3, which is when someone simply states the opposite without any evidence, and I think this Level-3, 2 and 1 are simply unconvincing arguments. So, if you say that insulin doesn't directly contribute to obesity because of this study that looked at this question specifically, and someone says no that's not true then it's not really a discussion because you aren't learning anything new.

Level-2 there is if someone starts talking about how they don't like your tone. They don't like what you're saying, because you're saying it in a mean way or disrespectful way this is besides the point of the argument. So, try to avoid talking about responding to each other's tone.

And of course, the classic one you see in the instagram comments often is the ad hominem or Level-1 in the Graham's rank is when you attack the person instead of attacking the arguments. So, if you're talking about insulin and obesity and someone say but you're not qualified to answer this question because you are not a doctor how can you know this. This is not addressing the central point and it can get even worse to Level-0 in Graham's ranking which is just name calling where you just say you know what you're an idiot, you don't have anything to say in this statement.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. You don't need to go far on the internet to find something like that unfortunately. Yeah, I mean it's such an important point that so often when you see these arguments that you can just see are going nowhere it's typically because either people are just not willing to change their opinion on something, which is what you first outlined, but also they could become dismissive of someone who is on the other side of the argument just because going into that they have this biased view that this person has a different

ideology to me, and therefore they must be wrong, right, nothing they bring up can be useful as opposed to maybe listening and saying well maybe some of the stuff they're going to say can be interesting and I might be able to change on some of those ideas. So, I think yeah understanding why we want to have a discussion is probably the key there?

Artin Entezarjou: Exactly. We're both trying to learn. So, once you've brought up discussions and discussed the central point, and you've agreed on what the nuances are on the central point then you should both leave the discussion thinking that yeah I learned something new today. I think I got a more nuanced understanding of this point before discussion and after discussion. If you reflect back on the discussion and you feel like you didn't learn anything new, if neither party learned anything new then it probably wasn't a very fruitful discussion.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. For sure and like I say unfortunately that tends to happen quite a bit, but I think for people listening just number one to keep yourselves sane. Avoid some of those pitfalls if you see yourself getting into those types of discussion. But number two for your own learning being better at discussing these matter and being open, and I think we can have this false idea that just because we want to be "Evidence Based" means that we can never be committing any of these pitfalls or we're never in the wrong, whereas often times that's exactly some of the people I see doing this that because they're talking to someone who they think is not evidence based. They can either become dismissive or not actually provide any evidence to support their own claims or just not want to have an open dialog and trying to really get to the bottom of something. Instead it becomes this thing of trying to demonstrate how much more they know, which is quite unfortunate.

Artin Entezarjou: Exactly. People done want to learn more. People just want to be right in some situations and that's unfortunately a problem. And I wanted to touch on the points you mentioned about people with different ideologies, because I think that's also very important one to bring up. People need to separate ideology versus fact, good example is the idea that we should tax sugar sweetened drinks. There might be very convincing evidence that attacks sugar sweetened drinks reduces consumption of sugar sweetened drinks in a society. We can all agree on the facts, but there might still be some people that despite this fact believe that we

shouldn't intervene in people's lives in such a way. But this is an ideological discussion and not a factual discussion.

Danny Lennon: Yeah. And that tends to I think crop up quite a lot when we're talking about policy changes, because then it goes away from the question of does consumption of sugar sweetened beverages impact health or not and becomes a new question of even if it does should we do something about it and that becomes more of this kind of political or policy change question which again there tends to be much more debate around as opposed to a fact over if something influences health or not I guess. Yeah, so we've come close to time here already and this conversation has gone extremely quickly. We could probably talk about some of these ideas for a lot longer, but before we do run out of time where can people find more of your work online or where can they contact you on social media and all that type of stuff?

Artin Entezarjou: Yeah. So, my page EBT – Evidence Based Training is most active on Instagram, so if you type in the @ebtoffical one word you'll find us on Instagram. You'll also find us on ebtofficial.com we have a blog and more content to read. We also have a book coming out I think it should be coming out very soon when this podcast airs. It's called Vegan Gains. It's a result of me realizing I was wrong about plant based diet, so what I did was I went onto Pub Med and search the whole Pub Med for systematic reviews on plant based diets and I ended up writing a short book on it, so you'll find that there as well. Otherwise you can find me on LinkedIn as well if you want to send me a message, but the best place to get in touch with me is probably just ping me on Instagram.

Danny Lennon: Awesome! So, for everyone listening I will link up to all of that in the show notes to this episode and you can click through and check out all of that stuff there. So, Artin before I get to the final question if we were to leave people with some kind of main summary points or the big key takeaway points that you would like them to really take away from this particular episode what would those main points be?

Artin Entezarjou: I would say the main point is if you're a researcher listening to this and you have interesting research you want to teach society I think you should try to as much as you can simplify your terminology so that more people can understand what you're trying to say. If you're not a researcher and you are a personal trainer I think their main takeaway should be that you should

always try to improve, and learn, and see every discussion as an opportunity to learn. So, always be open to changing your mind but also understand that not all opinions or studies are counted equal. The main difference between an experimental study that can prove cause, and observational study that can find correlations long-term, and a test tube study that can find hits about what might be going on and try to find information on all these three study types and draw conclusions from them.

Danny Lennon: Perfect. So, with our final question of the episode it's simply if you could advice people to do one thing each day that would have a positive impact on any area of their life what would that one thing be.

Artin Entezarjou: That's a very good question. And I've been thinking about how I will answer this one, because I've been listening through your podcasts for such a long time and I think I want to leave it with a saying from Stephen Covey's book The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, "Seek first to understand than to be understood." This is a principle that I live by which has helped me a lot. So, you tend to jump to conclusions when you meet someone who you are in disagreement with or having different ideology from. Don't let your mind jump to those conclusions. Give time for the opposing party that might have upset you or have presented an opposite opinion to really explain their point of view, and really try to understand their point of view before trying to present your case. You'll be surprise how often you learn something new. I live by that philosophy and it's done wonders for my life, even though I don't have a randomized controlled trial to prove that this philosophy works I think it will be useful for a lot of people.

Danny Lennon: Prefect. Thank you so much for that man and thank you for this whole conversation. I've really enjoyed as people know I really enjoy talking about science as it is, so this in particular was a great conversation to have, and I want to say thanks for coming on and doing it man.

Artin Entezarjou: Thank you very much Danny. It's been a pure pleasure.

Want to support the podcast? Here's how…

1. Leave a rating/review on iTunes: LINK
2. Support us on Patreon: LINK
3. Post on Instagram and tag: @sigmanutrition and @dannylennon_sigma