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Obesity is a worldwide epidemic and can be defined as a disorder of positive energy balance, which occurs when the amount of energy consumed is greater than the amount of energy expended. PURPOSE: To observe the differences in compensatory eating behaviors between four groups (aerobic training, concurrent training, resistance training, and a non-exercise control) in recreationally active, resistance trained, collegeaged subjects. METHODS: Ten recreationally active college-aged ( $21.7 \pm 1.3 \mathrm{yrs}$ ) males and females participated in this study. A 5-week, randomized, crossover design with one full week between each session. Preliminary assessments consisted of a PAR-Q, informed consent, body composition, rep-set best, and $\mathrm{VO}_{2 \max }$. Aerobic exercise (AE) consisted of $30-$ minutes of cycling at $70 \% \mathrm{HR}_{\max }$. Resistance exercise (RE) consisted of seven, full-body circuit of three sets of 12 repetitions at $70 \%$ set-rep best. Concurrent exercise (CE) consisted of four resistance exercises at the same intensity with 15 -minutes of cycling at $70 \%$ $\mathrm{HR}_{\text {max }}$. The control (CON) consisted of 30 -minutes of sitting. Food logs via MyFitnessPal were required for the 24-hour period following each session. SPSS 24.0 was used for data analysis using one-way and two-way ANOVAS and deltas. Level of significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$. RESULTS: There were no significant difference in total caloric (CON: 2,145 $\pm 807.9 \mathrm{kcal}$, AE: $2,040 \pm 657.2 \mathrm{kcal}, \mathrm{CE}: 1,973 \pm$ $764.8 \mathrm{kcal}, \mathrm{RE}: 2,354 \pm 1,077.0 \mathrm{kcal}, \mathrm{p}=0.743$ ), carbohydrate (CON: $219 \pm 66.4 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{AE}: 244 \pm 87.3 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{CE}$ : $204 \pm 55.4 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{RE}: 237 \pm 94.9 \mathrm{~g},=0.657$ ), fat (CON: $57 \pm 21.9 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{AE}: 58 \pm 24.0 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{CE}: 59 \pm 31.3 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{RE}: 63 \pm$ $23.8 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{p}=0.964$ ), or protein intake (CON: $97 \pm 48.6 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{AE}: 101 \pm 48.0 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{CE}: 89 \pm 53.4 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{RE}: 99 \pm 46.4 \mathrm{~g}$, $\mathrm{p}=0.942$ ), HR (CON: $77 \pm 10.3 \mathrm{bpm}$, AE: $151 \pm 21.9 \mathrm{bpm}, \mathrm{CE}: 153 \pm 16.2 \mathrm{bpm}, \mathrm{RE}: 136 \pm 15.8 \mathrm{bpm}, \mathrm{p}=$ 0.122 ), or RPE (CON: $6 \pm 0.0$, AE: $11 \pm 2.1, \mathrm{CE}: 12 \pm 1.9, \mathrm{RE}: 10 \pm 2.7, \mathrm{p}=0.147$ ) between the four sessions. CONCLUSION: These findings demonstrate that the exercise-induced caloric deficit was not compensated via an increase in caloric and/or macronutrient intake, therefore, resulting in a negative energy balance. Further, the aforementioned findings provide evidence that exercise is a viable mechanism to create an energy deficit, which can ideally lead to successful weight loss.

