Mitigating Disuse-Atrophy in Older Adults

Protein, Leucine, Resistance Training, and Muscle Power — What the Evidence Says

Eugene Capitano, BA, BSc, DC, DAc, MSc, ACSM-CPT, ACSM-EIM

Abstract

Muscle loss with age is not a single, uniform process. Muscle mass, strength, and power decline at different rates, and inactivity accelerates all three, but the severity depends heavily on the specific type and duration of disuse involved. This paper reviews the evidence on age- and disuse-related muscle loss, and outlines the two interventions best supported by the literature to counteract it: resistance training and adequate, leucine-rich protein intake. It also examines a specific, evidence-based refinement within resistance training, high-velocity power training, which targets the speed of force production rather than maximal force alone, and appears to offer a modest additional benefit for balance and mobility outcomes in older adults, though this evidence remains preliminary and statistically fragile. Protein supports the repair process that training triggers, but does not replace training as the primary stimulus for maintaining muscle mass, strength, and power with age.

---

1. Why Disuse-Atrophy Matters After 40

Muscle loss with age is not simply a matter of getting older, it is strongly tied to decreased movement and activity, and mass, strength, and power do not decline at the same speed.

Muscle mass is lost gradually, on the order of 0.8% per year beyond age 30 [1,2]. Muscle strength is lost considerably faster: about 3% per year on average across adulthood, but this accelerates with age, reaching roughly 15% per decade beyond age 50 and 2.5–4% per year specifically after age 75 [1,2]. Muscle power, the ability to produce force quickly, which depends heavily on fast-twitch (Type II) muscle fibers, declines faster still: up to approximately 6% per year after age 70 [6].

This ordering matters clinically, not just numerically. Power loss is disproportionately driven by the selective loss and atrophy of Type II fibers with age, and fast, forceful muscle contractions are precisely what is required to arrest a loss of balance before it becomes a fall. The introduction to Morrison et al.'s 2023 systematic review states that muscle power "declines faster than strength over time" and identifies functional decline, driven substantially by this power loss as a contributor to injurious falls and frailty risk in older adults [6]. This is consistent thread across multiple reviews in this space [1,2,6]. At the cellular level, this tracks with broader mechanistic reviews of sarcopenia, which attribute much of the age-related decline in muscle size and function to progressive loss of motor neurons and incomplete reinnervation of the muscle fibers they serve [25].

2. How Disuse Accelerates This Timeline

Not all forms of "inactivity" carry the same risk, and the evidence base draws a meaningful distinction between reduced daily movement and true immobilization.

In one frequently cited study, healthy older adults who reduced their daily steps by roughly three-quarters (to approximately 1,400 steps per day) for two weeks experienced a roughly 26% reduction in the muscle's postprandial (post-meal) protein synthetic response, without a measured reduction in muscle mass over that short window [3]. This reflects a drop in anabolic sensitivity, not yet a measured loss of tissue.

Full bed rest or limb immobilization is a substantially more severe disuse model. Two weeks of immobilization has been associated with strength losses comparable to approximately two to three years of typical age-related decline, and roughly a week of hospitalization (for example, following hip surgery) has been shown to produce substantial, measurable leg-muscle atrophy [2]. McKendry et al. note more broadly that disuse events of this kind are "detrimental to older adults' overall quality of life and substantially increase their risk of falls, physical and social dependence, and early mortality," and that recovery from disuse atrophy is measurably harder for older adults than for younger adults [4].

These are distinct severities of disuse and should be reported as such, not conflated: a reduced-step-count lifestyle is a real but comparatively modest anabolic stressor, while full immobilization or hospitalization is a far more consequential one.

3. Resistance Training: The Cornerstone

Research consistently shows that resistance training (RT) is one of the most effective strategies to counteract disuse-atrophy [4]. It activates muscle protein synthesis both during and after each session, and older adults can gain meaningful strength and muscle mass through consistent training programs [4]. Protein alone does not grow muscle — resistance training is the required stimulus, and protein supports the repair and growth that training triggers. This is not a marginal or preliminary finding: a Cochrane systematic review of 121 randomized controlled trials (6,700 participants) found that progressive resistance training produces a large improvement in muscle strength (standardized mean difference 0.84, 95% CI 0.67–1.00) and a smaller but significant improvement in overall physical function in older adults [22].

The general prescription supported by the evidence is: resistance training at least twice a week, using 1–3 sets of roughly 6–12 repetitions per exercise, performed to a genuinely high level of effort (close to, though not necessarily all the way to, muscular failure), with progressive increases in load or difficulty over time [2,4]. Heavy weights are not mandatory. Lower-load resistance training (roughly 30–50% of one-repetition maximum) performed with high effort has been shown to build strength and muscle to a similar degree as heavier loads (≥80% of 1RM), which may make training more accessible for people with joint limitations or those newer to exercise [2,4].

For some situations, particularly during bed rest or extended immobilization, blood-flow-restriction training combined with other approaches has shown early promise as an additional tool, though this evidence is still developing and should only be used under professional supervision [4].

Exercise alone, however, is not the whole picture. Without adequate protein intake, the muscle-building signal from training cannot be fully converted into new muscle tissue [8,9].

4. Muscle Power: A Distinct, Faster-Declining Quality

4.1 Why Power Is a Separate Training Target

Strength and power are related but distinct physical qualities. Strength describes the maximal force a muscle can produce, typically measured under slow, controlled conditions (for example, a one-repetition maximum lift). Power is the product of force and velocity — how quickly that force can be generated and applied. Recovering from a stumble, crossing an intersection before a traffic signal changes, or moving a foot from the accelerator to the brake are all time-limited events, typically resolving within a fraction of a second.

Sayers and Gibson (2014) make this point directly when discussing their own findings: sufficient strength is necessary to support body weight and prevent a trip from becoming a fall, but "without the necessary velocity to position the limb quickly, the aforementioned strength is superfluous" [7]. A muscle that is strong but slow to activate may still fail to prevent a fall, because the available force arrives too late to matter.

4.2 Direct Evidence: High-Speed Power Training vs. Traditional Strength Training

Sayers and Gibson (2014) randomized 72 older adults (mean age approximately 68–72 years) to one of three 12-week, three-times-weekly training arms: high-speed power training (HSPT: 3 sets of 12–14 repetitions at 40% of one-repetition maximum, performed with maximal intended concentric velocity), traditional slow-speed strength training (SSST: 3 sets of 8–10 repetitions at 80% of one-repetition maximum, performed with a controlled, slower tempo), or a non-training control group [7].

Both training groups improved leg-press strength and peak power similarly relative to control (leg-press strength: +23% HSPT vs. +28% SSST; peak power: +26% HSPT vs. +17% SSST) [7]. The key difference was not the overall magnitude of improvement, but its composition. HSPT shifted the external resistance at which peak power was produced from 67% to 52% of 1RM, a relative shift toward lower resistance and higher velocity, while SSST shifted this only marginally, from 65% to 62% of 1RM [7]. In practical terms, HSPT training made peak power more velocity-dominant, while SSST training left it force-dominant, even though both interventions produced comparable overall strength and power gains.

4.3 Meta-Analytic Evidence: High-Velocity Power Training vs. Traditional Resistance Training

Morrison et al. (2023) conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of 19 randomized controlled trials (1,055 participants) comparing high-velocity power training (HVPT, lighter loads, 0–60% of 1RM, moved with a concentric phase under one second) against traditional, moderate-to-heavy resistance training (TRT, a concentric phase of two to three seconds) in adults over 60 [6].

Across most functional outcomes, the two approaches produced comparable results. HVPT showed a weak-to-moderate advantage over TRT on two specific measures: the Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB; standardized mean difference [SMD] 0.27, 95% CI 0.02–0.53) and the Timed Up and Go test (TUG; SMD 0.35, 95% CI 0.06–0.63), both rated as low-certainty evidence under the review's own GRADE assessment [6]. Sensitivity analyses weakened this finding further: the SPPB advantage was not retained after removing trials with a high risk of bias, and portions of the TUG advantage were similarly attenuated under the same test [6]. The authors' own conclusion is appropriately cautious: "HVPT had similar effects to TRT for functional performance in older adults, but there is considerable uncertainty in most estimates … it is unclear whether the benefit is large enough to be clinically worthwhile" [6].

The American College of Sports Medicine's position stand on resistance training progression in older adults, cited within this review, recommends the concurrent use of both modalities: HVPT (one to three sets, 30–60% of 1RM, 12–15 repetitions) alongside TRT (one to three sets, 60–80%

of 1RM, 8–12 repetitions) [6]. This is a combined-approach recommendation, not a case for replacing traditional strength training with power training.

4.4 What This Evidence Does Not Cover

It is important to be precise about scope. "Power training" in this literature refers specifically to moving an external, weighted resistance quickly through a controlled range of motion, not bodyweight jumping, hopping, or plyometric exercise. Morrison et al. explicitly excluded plyometric and jump-based training from their review [6], so this evidence base cannot be used to support or refute claims about that separate training modality in older adults.

Likewise, neither study reviewed here directly compared power training against balance-specific interventions (for example, single-leg stance training, tai chi, or other proprioceptive work). The rationale for a power-training benefit is a physiological argument about the speed of force production, not a demonstrated superiority over dedicated balance training. Morrison et al. suggest that a combined approach, incorporating both strength/power training and balance-specific training, is likely to produce the best outcomes for functional performance, consistent with multicomponent physical activity guidelines [6].

5. Protein: The Missing Half of the Equation

5.1 How Much Protein Is Enough?

Most adults over 40 benefit from more protein than the general Recommended Dietary Allowance (RDA) suggests. A reasonable starting range is 1.2–1.4 grams per kilogram of body weight per day for adults in midlife (roughly 40–60), and 1.4–1.6 grams per kilogram per day for adults over 60 [10,11]. In frail individuals or those recovering from illness or injury, short-term intakes of up to 2.0 grams per kilogram per day may be appropriate under medical guidance [10,11].

A large systematic review and meta-analysis of 66 clinical trials found that protein intakes above 1.2 g/kg/day were associated with measurable gains in lean body mass during resistance training, with the most consistent benefit observed at or above 1.6 g/kg/day [12]. A separate meta-analysis and meta-regression of 49 studies (1,863 participants) found a similar ceiling: protein supplementation significantly increased gains in strength, lean mass, and muscle fiber size during resistance training, but intakes beyond approximately 1.6 g/kg/day produced no further measurable benefit [23]. Taken together, these findings point to a practical upper bound, more protein does not continue to help indefinitely once training-supporting needs are met.

5.2 The Leucine "Trigger"

Leucine, a branched-chain amino acid, plays a central role in switching on the body's muscle-building machinery (a signaling pathway called mTORC1) [8,13]. As muscle ages, it appears to require a higher leucine dose to produce the same effect. Evidence suggests the threshold rises from roughly 2 grams per meal in younger adults to 2.8–3 grams in older adults [13,14]. This is best understood as a threshold-like signal rather than a strict, all-or-nothing switch, protein quality, meal size, and overall training status all influence how strongly it fires [14].

In practical terms, adults aged 40–59 may benefit from around 25–30 grams of high-quality protein per meal (roughly 2–2.5 grams leucine). Adults over 60 may need 30–40 grams per meal (roughly 2.8–3 grams leucine) [13,14]. Spreading this across three to four meals a day, rather than one very large meal, helps ensure more of the day's meals reach the leucine threshold [9,15].

5.3 Timing: A Modest Factor, Not a Deadline

Getting protein around a workout is a reasonable, evidence-informed habit, but the research does not support the idea that a shake must be consumed within a narrow window to see benefits. Studies that have directly compared protein eaten immediately after exercise versus protein eaten a few hours later have found no significant difference in muscle or strength gains over 8–12 weeks, as long as total daily protein is adequate [16,17]. What appears to matter more is consistently meeting daily protein and leucine targets across several meals [12,16].

A pre-sleep protein dose (around 27 grams) has been shown in one 12-week trial to modestly improve overnight muscle-building response and strength gains when added to an existing training and diet plan [18]. A useful addition for some, though not a required part of every plan.

This is a case where the evidence base is genuinely mixed rather than uniformly settled, and that tension is worth stating plainly. An earlier, frequently cited trial in elderly men (n=13) found that protein taken immediately after resistance training produced measurable increases in quadriceps cross-sectional area and fiber size, while the same dose taken 2 hours later did not, with dynamic strength gains also somewhat larger in the immediate-feeding group [24]. This finding predates, and appears to conflict with, the more recent and larger trials cited above that found no significant timing effect. The newer evidence carries more weight here for two reasons: it comes from larger samples and more directly controls for total daily protein intake (the variable now understood to matter most), and it has been replicated across more than one independent trial. The older finding is not disregarded, but it should be read as an early, small-sample result that more recent, better-powered research has not confirmed, not as an unresolved contradiction to sweep aside.

6. The Synergy: Why Both Are Required

Resistance exercise appears to make muscle more efficient at using dietary amino acids for repair: one study found that exercised muscle incorporated roughly 16% (younger adults) to 30% (older adults) more amino acids into new muscle protein compared with resting muscle [8]. Combining regular resistance training with adequate, leucine-rich protein intake has been shown to meaningfully improve the muscle's blunted response to protein that occurs with aging and inactivity, in some cases bringing the response close to that of younger muscle, though full reversal is not consistently observed. Anabolic resistance is better understood as substantially improvable with training rather than fully eliminated by it [5,19,20].

By contrast, protein alone, without exercise, produces limited increases in muscle mass in most studies of older adults, and exercise without sufficient protein intake does not maximize the muscle-building response. Evidence consistently points to combining both for the best results [10,11].

7. Age-Specific Strategy

Adults in their 40s and 50s may benefit from consuming 25–30 grams of protein (roughly 2–2.5 grams leucine) per meal and performing two to three resistance-training sessions per week using moderate-to-high effort.

Adults over 60 often show a more blunted response to both protein and exercise, generally requiring a larger stimulus to achieve a comparable effect. A reasonable target is 30–40 grams of protein per meal (roughly 2.8–3 grams leucine) and at least two resistance-training sessions per week, training with a high degree of effort even at lighter loads where needed. Given the disproportionate rate of power loss in this age range, incorporating an explosive-tempo (HVPT-style) set or two into an existing strength program is a reasonable, low-risk complement, not a replacement, to standard training [6,7].

Adults 65 and older who are frail often show further reductions in the muscle's signaling response and face a higher risk of sarcopenia. For this group, total protein intake in the range of 1.5–2.0 grams per kilogram per day, with 30–40 grams per meal where tolerated, combined with light resistance training, balance work, and, where appropriate and supervised, neuromuscular electrical stimulation, can help maintain function [10,11,4].

8. The Take-Home Message

Muscle disuse accelerates age-related decline, but the combination of consistent resistance training and adequate, leucine-rich protein intake can help slow this process and, in many cases, meaningfully improve strength and function. The core strategy:

- Eat enough total protein daily (roughly 1.2–1.6 g/kg, adjusted for individual needs and health status).
- Distribute protein across three to four meals rather than concentrating it in one.
- Include protein reasonably close to resistance training sessions — exact timing is far less important than consistency.
- Aim to meet the leucine threshold at each main meal.
- Train with resistance at least twice weekly, with real effort and progressive overload.
- Consider adding an explosive-tempo (power) component to strength training after age 60, particularly if balance or mobility is a concern — as a complement to, not a substitute for, standard strength training and balance-specific work.

Train consistently, eat enough protein throughout the day, and do not stress over minute-by-minute timing — that combination is what the evidence actually supports for preserving strength, power, and independence with age.

9. Frequently Asked Questions

1. What causes disuse-atrophy? Muscle loss occurs when muscle protein breakdown exceeds muscle protein synthesis during periods of inactivity or reduced movement, often seen after illness, injury, or extended sedentary behavior [3,4].

2. Why does protein work better with exercise? Exercise activates muscle signaling pathways that make dietary amino acids more effective for muscle repair and growth, and research shows exercised muscle can incorporate substantially more dietary amino acids into new tissue than resting muscle [8].

3. How much protein do I need after 60? A reasonable general target is 1.4–1.6 g/kg/day, spread over 3–4 meals of roughly 30–40 g each, though individual needs vary, and those with kidney disease or other chronic conditions should consult a healthcare provider before changing protein intake significantly [10,11].

4. Why leucine? Leucine is an amino acid that plays a key role in triggering muscle protein

synthesis. Some evidence suggests aging muscle needs a somewhat higher leucine dose to produce a similar effect compared with younger muscle [13,14].

5. What's the difference between power training and traditional strength training? Traditional strength training uses a slow, controlled lifting tempo to build maximal force. Power training uses a lighter weight moved as fast as possible on the lifting phase, targeting how quickly, not just how much, force can be produced. Both build meaningful strength; power training additionally appears to offer a modest, though still preliminary, benefit for balance and mobility [6,7]. It is not the same as jumping or plyometric exercise, which has not been tested in this evidence base [6].

6. Why does TLC use non-instantized WPC 80? TLC PureOrigin™ WPC 80 is processed using a gentler method intended to preserve naturally occurring milk proteins and peptides. Some of these components, particularly glycomacropeptide, a peptide naturally present in whey, have been shown in independent research to support the growth of beneficial gut bacteria [21]. Research connecting gut microbiome health to muscle health (the "gut–muscle axis") is an active and promising area of study, but it is still emerging, and this specific product has not been directly tested for gut-integrity or nutrient-absorption outcomes. This is not a claim that the product treats or prevents any gut or muscle condition, only that gentler processing may help preserve naturally occurring milk components that early research suggests could offer gut-supportive benefits.

Medical and Nutritional Disclaimer

This information is provided for educational purposes only and is not intended to diagnose, treat, cure, or prevent any disease. Individuals must consult a qualified healthcare provider or registered dietitian before making significant changes to their diet or exercise regimen.

Important Safety Notice: Individuals with pre-existing renal impairment, diabetes, or other chronic metabolic conditions should consult a healthcare provider before significantly increasing protein intake. Protein needs vary by individual health status, kidney function, and medication use, and the ranges above are general educational guidance, not a personalized prescription.

Author Information

Eugene Capitano, BA, BSc, DC, DAc, MSc, ACSM-CPT, ACSM-EIM

Chiropractor | Functional Wellness Specialist | Clinical Researcher

MSc in Psychology & Neuroscience of Mental Health – King's College London. Eugene Capitano is a clinician-scientist integrating musculoskeletal rehabilitation, exercise physiology, and nutritional neuroscience. He holds a Master of Science in Psychology & Neuroscience of Mental Health from King's College London, is an American College of Sports Medicine-certified Exercise is Medicine® practitioner and Personal Trainer, and has over 25 years of clinical experience in chiropractic and functional wellness care. His research and professional focus bridge the gut–brain–muscle axis, exploring how targeted nutrition, resistance training, and mitochondrial health strategies optimize metabolic function and healthy aging.

Reference List

[1] Mitchell WK, Williams J, Atherton P, Larvin M, Lund J, Narici M. Sarcopenia, dynapenia, and the impact of advancing age on human skeletal muscle size and strength: a quantitative review. Frontiers in Physiology. 2012;3:260.

[2] Janssen SLJE, et al. From molecular to physical function: the aging trajectory. Current Research in Physiology. 2024. *(Cites Mitchell et al., 2012 for strength/mass decline rates; Rommersbach et al., 2020 for immobilization-related strength loss equivalent to ~2–3 years of aging; Kouw et al. for hospitalization-related leg-muscle atrophy; and Currier et al., 2023 for low-load vs. high-load resistance training equivalence.)*

[3] Paulussen KJM, McKenna CF, Beals JW, Wilund KR, Salvador AF, Burd NA. Anabolic resistance of muscle protein turnover comes in various shapes and sizes. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2021;8:615849.

[4] McKendry J, Coletta G, Nunes EA, Lim C, Phillips SM. Mitigating disuse-induced skeletal muscle atrophy in ageing: Resistance exercise as a critical countermeasure. Experimental Physiology. 2024;109:1650–1662.

[5] Kilroe SP, Von Ruff Z, Kalenta H, et al. Integrated muscle protein synthesis during disuse and rehabilitation in late-midlife adults. American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology. 2025;329(4):R537–R549.

[6] Morrison RT, Taylor S, Buckley J, Twist C, Kite C. High-velocity power training has similar effects to traditional resistance training for functional performance in older adults: a systematic review. Journal of Physiotherapy. 2023;69:148–159.

[7] Sayers SP, Gibson K. High-speed power training in older adults: A shift of the external resistance at which peak power is produced. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. 2014;28(3):616–621.

[8] Pennings B, Koopman R, Beelen M, Senden JM, Saris WH, van Loon LJ. Exercising before protein intake allows for greater use of dietary protein-derived amino acids for de novo muscle protein synthesis in both young and elderly men. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2011;93(2):322–331.

[9] Layman DK. Impacts of protein quantity and distribution on body composition. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2024;11:1388986.

[10] Bauer JM, Biolo G, Cederholm T, et al. Evidence-based recommendations for optimal dietary protein intake in older people: A position paper from the PROT-AGE Study Group. Journal of the American Medical Directors Association. 2013;14(8):542–559.

[11] Deutz NEP, Bauer JM, Barazzoni R, et al. Protein intake and exercise for optimal muscle function with aging: Recommendations from the ESPEN Expert Group. Clinical Nutrition. 2014;33(6):929–936.

[12] Nunes EA, Colenso-Semple L, McKellar SR, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of protein intake to support muscle mass and function in healthy adults. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle. 2022;13(2):795–810.

[13] Katsanos CS, Kobayashi H, Sheffield-Moore M, Aarsland A, Wolfe RR. A high proportion of leucine is required for optimal stimulation of the rate of muscle protein synthesis by essential amino acids in the elderly. American Journal of Physiology-Endocrinology and Metabolism. 2006;291(2):E381–E387.

[14] Zaromskyte G, Prokopidis K, Ioannidis T, Tipton KD, Witard OC. Evaluating the leucine trigger hypothesis to explain the post-prandial regulation of muscle protein synthesis in young and older adults: A systematic review. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2021;8:685165.

[15] Areta JL, Burke LM, Ross ML, et al. Timing and distribution of protein ingestion during prolonged recovery from resistance exercise alters myofibrillar protein synthesis. Journal of Physiology. 2013;591(9):2319–2331.

[16] Casuso RA, Goossens L. Does protein ingestion timing affect exercise-induced adaptations? A systematic review with meta-analysis. Nutrients. 2025;17(13):2070.

[17] Lak M, Bagheri R, Ghobadi H, et al. Timing matters? The effects of two different timing of high protein diets on body composition, muscular performance, and biochemical markers in resistance-trained males. Frontiers in Nutrition. 2024;11:1397090.

[18] Snijders T, Res PT, Smeets JSJ, et al. Protein ingestion before sleep increases muscle mass and strength gains during prolonged resistance-type exercise training in healthy young men. Journal of Nutrition. 2015;145(6):1178–1184.

[19] Wall BT, Dirks ML, Snijders T, van Dijk JW, Fritsch M, Verdijk LB, van Loon LJC. Short-term muscle disuse lowers myofibrillar protein synthesis rates and induces anabolic resistance to protein ingestion. American Journal of Physiology-Endocrinology and Metabolism. 2015;310(2):E137–E147.

[20] Hodson N, West DWD, Philp A, Burd NA, Moore DR. Molecular regulation of human skeletal muscle protein synthesis in response to exercise and nutrients: a compass for overcoming age-related anabolic resistance. American Journal of Physiology-Cell Physiology. 2019;317(6):C1061–C1078.

[21] Rackerby B, Le HNM, Haymowicz A, Dallas DC, Park SH. Potential prebiotic properties of whey protein and glycomacropeptide in gut microbiome. Food Science of Animal Resources. 2024;44(2):299–308.

[22] Liu CJ, Latham NK. Progressive resistance strength training for improving physical function in older adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2009;(3):CD002759.

[23] Morton RW, Murphy KT, McKellar SR, et al. A systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of the effect of protein supplementation on resistance training-induced gains in muscle mass and strength in healthy adults. British Journal of Sports Medicine. 2018;52(6):376–384.

[24] Esmarck B, Andersen JL, Olsen S, Richter EA, Mizuno M, Kjaer M. Timing of postexercise protein intake is important for muscle hypertrophy with resistance training in elderly humans. Journal of Physiology. 2001;535(Pt 1):301–311. *(Small trial, n=13; discussed in Section 5.3 as an older finding not replicated by larger, more recent trials.)*

[25] Larsson L, Degens H, Li M, et al. Sarcopenia: Aging-related loss of muscle mass and function. Physiological Reviews. 2019;99(1):427–511.