

Subject: Dr Berg

From: Mark Cao <mark.cao@gmail.com>

Date: 11/21/2022, 11:15 AM

To: Hanh Yu <hanhcaoyu@gmail.com>

Hanh,

Dr. Berg has a huge following and genuinely helps a ton of people, because of the combination of his simple presentations, their conciseness, and his accuracy of information.

The best things about him:

- * He is scientifically correct about major ideas, such as the benefits of low-carb diets and fasting.
- * His info is almost always derived from good sources, including books about science.
- * Even when he may be incorrect, he doesn't advocate for anything that would lead to harm. At worst, his suggestions might not work, but they won't waste money or cause injury.

The bad about him:

- * He is not a real scientist, and does not think through "correlation versus causation." This shows in some of his advocacy, such as pushing Vitamin D supplementation. Vitamin D is a good example of a topic that is hard to get right. The level of Vitamin D in the body is positively correlated with countless positive bodily functions. But rarely are intervention studies ever done with Vitamin D, or any other nutritional studies. Sunlight is very likely to be the real source of real benefits correlated with Vitamin D (which means that Vitamin D is simply a biomarker of sunlight exposure, the true benefit). Dr Berg knows well about the benefits of sunlight, but he still pushes for the supplementation route sometimes harder than the natural route.
- * He sells supplements and other things, although he does that in a very low-key manner. He tends to push supplements a bit too much, although he does balance that out by advocating for food sources of nutrients.

I think of Dr Berg as a gateway drug into better sources of info. E.g., Andrew Huberman and Peter Attia are both much better and deeper than Dr. Berg, but all in all, I do believe that Dr Berg is very conscientious.

Mark