

Intermittent fasting offers an appealingly simple rule: change when you eat. Finish dinner earlier, delay breakfast or restrict food on selected days, and the promised benefits extend from weight loss and better blood sugar to cellular repair and longer life.

Some of those claims have meaningful human evidence behind them. Others depend on extending findings from laboratory experiments much further than the clinical research allows.

The useful question is not simply whether fasting works. It is whether it offers an advantage over other ways of eating—and whether that advantage matters enough to change what we recommend.

The Claim

Intermittent fasting describes several different approaches. Time-restricted eating confines daily food intake to a particular window, such as eight or ten hours. Alternate-day fasting alternates unrestricted days with days of little or no food. The 5:2 approach substantially restricts intake on two days each week.

These schedules differ in intensity and practicality. Evidence for one should not automatically be applied to another, particularly when moving from an overnight fast to several days without food. [1]

The commercial proposition often goes beyond weight management: fasting is said to reset metabolism, activate cellular repair and slow ageing. Those claims require separate examination.

Why Might It Work?

There are two plausible explanations for benefit.

The first is behavioural. Fewer hours available for eating can mean fewer snacks, less evening grazing and lower total energy intake. A simple time boundary may be easier for some people to follow than counting calories.

The second is physiological. Feeding and fasting affect insulin, fuel use and cellular signalling. Meal timing also interacts with circadian rhythms: our response to food varies across the day. Experimental research links fasting to stress-response pathways and autophagy, the processes through which cells recycle components. [2]

That is interesting biology. But demonstrating a cellular response is different from showing that a particular fasting schedule prevents disease or extends human life.

What Does the Human Evidence Show?

For weight loss, fasting is a reasonable option, but it generally produces results similar to conventional calorie restriction.

A 2025 *BMJ* systematic review and network meta-analysis examined 99 randomized trials involving 6,582 adults. Both intermittent fasting and continuous calorie restriction reduced weight compared with unrestricted eating. Alternate-day fasting had a small additional advantage over continuous restriction—approximately 1.3 kg—but the overall differences between approaches were modest, and a sustained superiority was not established in longer trials. [3]

A year-long trial published in *The New England Journal of Medicine* provides a useful example. Researchers assigned 139 adults with obesity to calorie restriction, either with an eating window from 8 am to 4 pm or without a time restriction. Average weight loss was 8.0 kg and 6.3 kg, respectively, but the difference was not statistically significant. There was also no clear additional benefit for body fat or metabolic risk factors. [4]

This does not mean fasting failed. Both approaches helped. It means that adding a strict eating window did not demonstrate a reliable advantage over the dietary intervention itself.

For someone who finds time restriction easier to maintain, that may still be valuable. Ease of adherence is a practical benefit, even when a diet has no unique metabolic advantage.

Does Eating Earlier Make a Difference?

This is where the evidence becomes more intriguing.

In a small controlled crossover study, eight men with prediabetes completed an early eating schedule, with dinner before 3 pm, and a comparison schedule. Food intake was adjusted to maintain weight. After five weeks, early eating improved insulin sensitivity and blood pressure despite the absence of weight loss. [5]

That is a signal that timing can matter independently of weight reduction. However, eight participants and an unusually early dinner do not establish a universal prescription.

Larger studies also give a mixed picture. A 2025 trial involving 197 adults compared early, late and self-selected eight-hour eating windows, each added to Mediterranean-diet education, with education alone. None of the fasting schedules produced a significant additional reduction in visceral fat, the primary outcome. [6]

Earlier eating therefore remains a reasonable consideration, rather than a guarantee of better results. These findings also challenge the assumption that delaying breakfast and eating late must reproduce the benefits seen in early-eating experiments.

Where Signal Becomes Noise

The strongest signal concerns weight management and selected metabolic measurements. The noise grows when these findings become claims about rejuvenation.

Animal studies and mechanistic research justify investigating fasting and longevity. They do not demonstrate that a daily 16-hour fast extends human lifespan. Nor is there an established fasting duration at which a clinically meaningful “repair mode” reliably switches on in everyone. [2]

The same caution applies to improved biomarkers. Lower insulin or a smaller waist may be useful, but they cannot tell us precisely how much longer someone will live.

Risks and Trade-offs

Fasting can become counterproductive if a narrow eating window makes adequate nutrition difficult or leads to compensatory overeating. Maintaining protein intake and muscle function deserves particular attention during weight loss, especially in older adults.

People using insulin or medicines that can cause hypoglycaemia need a medication and monitoring plan before fasting. Restrictive fasting is generally unsuitable during pregnancy or breastfeeding, for people who are underweight, or for those with an eating-disorder history. Frailty and existing muscle loss also warrant caution. [1]

These considerations are part of choosing an appropriate dietary strategy, rather than evidence that everyone should avoid fasting.

The Practical Recommendation

I would recommend intermittent fasting as an optional tool for adults who need to manage weight and find that a consistent eating schedule makes healthy eating easier. I would not prescribe it routinely to healthy people as a proven longevity intervention.

My starting point would be modest: reduce habitual late-night eating and establish a sustainable overnight break. If a shorter eating window is helpful, it should still accommodate adequate nutrition, exercise and normal social life. A 16:8 schedule is an option, not a requirement.

Where practical, I would favour moving dinner earlier over repeatedly postponing breakfast to permit late eating. That is a cautious application of the timing evidence, rather than a claim that one schedule suits everyone.

Judge the approach by what it achieves: sustainable weight change where needed, appropriate metabolic improvements, preserved strength, manageable hunger and a healthy relationship with food.

If fasting makes those goals easier, it can be useful. If it makes them harder, another eating pattern is a reasonable choice. The evidence supports flexibility far more clearly than it supports pursuing the longest possible fast.

References

1. Varady KA, Cienfuegos S, Ezpeleta M, Gabel K. Clinical application of intermittent fasting for weight loss: progress and future directions. *Nature Reviews Endocrinology*. 2022;18(5):309–321. doi:10.1038/s41574-022-00638-x.
2. de Cabo R, Mattson MP. Effects of intermittent fasting on health, aging, and disease. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2019;381(26):2541–2551. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1905136.
3. Semnani-Azad Z, Khan TA, Chiavaroli L, et al. Intermittent fasting strategies and their effects on body weight and other cardiometabolic risk factors: systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised clinical trials. *BMJ*. 2025;389. doi:10.1136/bmj-2024-082007.
4. Liu D, Huang Y, Huang C, et al. Calorie restriction with or without time-restricted eating in weight loss. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2022;386(16):1495–1504. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2114833.
5. Sutton EF, Beyl R, Early KS, Cefalu WT, Ravussin E, Peterson CM. Early time-restricted feeding improves insulin sensitivity, blood pressure, and oxidative stress even without weight loss in men with prediabetes. *Cell Metabolism*. 2018;27(6):1212–1221.e3. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2018.04.010.
6. Dote-Montero M, Clavero-Jimeno A, Merchán-Ramírez E, et al. Effects of early, late and self-selected time-restricted eating on visceral adipose tissue and cardiometabolic health in participants with overweight or obesity: a randomized controlled trial. *Nature Medicine*. 2025;31(2):524–533. doi:10.1038/s41591-024-03375-y.