COMPARISONS BETWEEN DXA AND BIOIMPEDANCE DEVICES FOR APPENDICULAR LEAN MASS AND MUSCLE QUALITY IN HISPANIC ADULTS

Bassel Nassar[1], Grant M. Tinsley[2], Kyung-Shin Park[3], Stefan A. Czerwinski[1], Brett S. Nickerson[1*]

[1]School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA
[2]Department of Kinesiology and Sport Management, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA
[3]College of Nursing and Health Sciences, Texas A&M International University, Laredo, TX, USA

***Corresponding Author:** Brett S. Nickerson, Ph.D., CSCS*D, EP-C, FACSM, The Ohio State University, School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, College of Medicine, Atwell Hall 453 W. 10th Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43210, brett.nickerson@osumc.edu

Shortened Title: BIA- and DXA-derived MQI Models in Hispanic Adults

Abbreviation: ALM = appendicular lean mass; BIA = bioimpedance analysis; CCC = Lin's concordance correlation coefficient; DXA = dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; HGS = handgrip strength; LM = lean mass; MQI = muscle quality index; MFBIA = multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis; RMSE = root mean square error; SFBIA = single-frequency; TOST = two one-sided t-tests

This peer-reviewed article has been accepted for publication but not yet copyedited or typeset, and so may be subject to change during the production process. The article is considered published and may be cited using its DOI
10.1017/S000711452400076X
The British Journal of Nutrition is published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Nutrition Society

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare single- and multi-frequency bioimpedance (BIA) devices against dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) for appendicular lean mass (ALM) and muscle quality index (MQI) metrics in Hispanic adults. One-hundred thirty-one Hispanic adults (18–55 yrs.) participated in this study. ALM was measured with single-frequency (SFBIA), multi-frequency (MFBIA), and DXA. ALM_{TOTAL} (left arm + right arm + left leg + right leg) and ALM_{ARMS} (left arm + right arm) were computed for all three devices. Handgrip strength (HGS) was measured using a dynamometer. The average HGS was used for all MQI models (highest left hand + highest right hand)/2. MQI_{ARMS} was defined as the ratio between HGS and ALM_{ARMS}. MQI_{TOTAL} was established as the ratio between HGS and ALM_{TOTAL}. SFBIA and MFBIA had strong correlations with DXA for all ALM and MQI metrics (CCC values ranged from 0.86 [$MQI_{MFBIA\text{-}ARMS}$] to 0.97 [Arms LM_{SFBIA}]; all $p < 0.001$). Equivalence testing varied between methods (e.g., SFBIA vs. DXA) when examining the different metrics (i.e., ALM_{TOTAL}, ALM_{ARMS}, MQI_{TOTAL}, and MQI_{ARMS}). MQI_{ARMS} was the only metric that did not differ from the line of identity and had no proportional bias when comparing all the devices against each other. The current study findings demonstrate good overall agreement between SFBIA, MFBIA, and DXA for ALM_{TOTAL} and ALM_{ARMS} in a Hispanic population. However, SFBIA and MFBIA have better agreement with DXA when used to compute MQI_{ARMS} than MQI_{TOTAL}.

Keywords: Skeletal Mass, Muscular Strength, Handgrip Strength, Body Composition, Muscular Fitness

INTRODUCTION

Muscular strength and appendicular lean mass (ALM) are often used to diagnose sarcopenia and calculate muscle quality [1, 2]. The decline of muscular strength and ALM in aging has resulted in most research being centered on older adults. In addition, poor muscle quality is associated with chronic diseases such as type II diabetes, osteoporosis, and cardiovascular disease, all of which can have a profound impact on quality of life, and activities of daily living [3-5]. These health conditions have led to an interest in measuring muscle quality in older populations. Nonetheless, young and middle-aged adults may also benefit from monitoring muscle quality, especially when seeking to improve functional capacity [6]. For instance, young adults have the greatest increase in the risk of chronic diseases [7]. Therefore, improving functional capacity is also an important preventative tactic for young-to-middle aged adults. In addition, early identification of individuals with comprised strength and muscle functionality may help to reduce cost in public health services [8]. Collectively, these findings demonstrate the benefit of measuring muscle quality across various age spectra.

Methodological considerations are important to consider when assessing muscle quality. Further, the use of different methods, particularly body composition techniques, may yield different values when seeking to quantify muscle quality. For instance, muscle quality index (MQI), characterized by the ratio of muscular strength relative to skeletal muscle tissue, is often determined using dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) for the latter component [6, 9, 10]. Nonetheless, alternative approaches for body composition, such as bioimpedance analysis (BIA), can be used as an alternative to DXA for computing MQI [11, 12]. The utilization of different body composition methods across studies can make comparisons of previous findings challenging. For example, conflicting MQI results between studies could be attributed to the utilization of different body composition methods, instead of differences in characteristics between study cohorts.

Numerous studies have compared BIA and DXA for total and regional body composition metrics such as body fat, lean mass, and bone mineral content [13-19]. For example, research has shown the accuracy of single-frequency BIA for predicting appendicular lean and fat mass varies based on sex and segmental mass [15]. In addition, researchers have shown that BIA is more

accurate when utilized to predict lean mass instead of fat mass [15, 19, 20]. Lastly, validation research has shown BIA can be used to estimate bone mineral content, when compared to DXA, in healthy populations [16, 17]. It is important to highlight that many validation studies on BIA have been completed in non-Hispanic populations. This could be problematic when seeking to generalize BIA devices in Hispanics adults who have differing fat-free mass characteristics than assumed constants (i.e., hydration = 73.8% of fat-free mass), which are used to predict body composition via bioimpedance technology [21]. For instance, previous research has shown the hydration of fat-free mass varies from 63.76 to 79.55% in Hispanic adults (22). This could potentially have an impact on predicting body composition with BIA devices. Indeed, Nickerson and Snarr (13) revealed multi-frequency BIA has large proportional bias when estimating whole-body fat mass in Hispanic females. Despite these findings, the utilization of BIA in Hispanic adults needs further exploring.

One area that has yet to be evaluated in Hispanic adults is the agreement between various MQI models when using DXA- and BIA-derived ALM. Determining whether simpler techniques such as BIA can be used as an alternative to DXA for MQI models could be very helpful in clinical settings that do not have access to the latter method. For example, the cost and maintenance of a DXA machine can be very expensive. In addition, DXA emits radiation, which may be contraindicated in certain clinical populations and requires certified/licensed operator in some jurisdictions. Consequently, the utilization of DXA-derived ALM for determining MQI is limited to sophisticated clinical and research settings, which limits its application. As a result, more affordable, user-friendly, and non-radiological body composition techniques such as BIA are increasingly popular for computing MQI. Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to compare single- and multi-frequency BIA devices against DXA for ALM and MQI metrics in Hispanic adults.

METHODS

Participants

One-hundred and thirty-one participants (71 F, 60 M) were included in the present analysis (Table 1). Eligible participants were 1) 18 – 65 years of age; 2) reported no cardiac, pulmonary, or metabolic diseases; 3) weight and height< 159 kg and 193 cm, respectively, due to DXA table restrictions; and 4) Hispanic descent. Recruitment occurred via flyers, word of mouth, and classroom recruitment. All eligible participants in the present study successfully completed testing. Exclusion criteria included persons with non-disease related conditions that may affect body composition, intra- and extra-cellular fluid, or DXA measurements (i.e., those currently or recently pregnant, persons with limb amputations, and individuals with implanted metallic devices). All participants provided written informed consent and completed a medical history questionnaire prior to participation in the study. This study was conducted according to the guidelines presented in the Declaration of Helsinki and all procedures involving human subjects/patients were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the host university (IRB# 2021-03-16).

Procedures

All research participants reported to the laboratory for data collection following pre-testing guidelines, which included 1) no high-intensity exercise for 24 hours, 2) fasting ≥8 hours, 3) no alcohol or caffeine for ≥24 hours, 4) no water intake ≥2 hours. The adherence to pre-testing guidelines for each participant was assessed via a questionnaire upon arrival at the laboratory. Once pre-testing guideline adherence was ensured, hydration (i.e., urine specific gravity), anthropometric (i.e., height and body mass), single-frequency bioimpedance analysis (SFBIA), multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis (MFBIA), DXA, and muscular strength (i.e., handgrip strength) assessments were completed. Prior to all anthropometric and body composition measurements, shoes, jewelry, and metallic objects were removed to minimize measurement error. Hydration was assessed via urine specific gravity using a hand-held refractometer (Atago SUR-NE, Atago Corp Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Participants urine specific gravity values had to fall within the range of >1.004 and <1.029 to complete testing [23]. Standing height was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm using a stadiometer (SECA 213, Seca Ltd., Hamburg, Germany).

Multifrequency Bioimpedance Analysis

MFBIA was used to measure body mass (BM) to the nearest 0.1 kg. Moreover, MFBIA was the first body composition test completed. ALM_{TOTAL} (left arm + right arm + left leg + right leg) and ALM_{ARMS} (left arm + right arm) were computed based upon manufacturer's instructions (InBody 570, InBodyUSA, Cerritos, CA). The MFBIA device employed in the current study utilized a tetrapolar 8-point tactile electrode system, which sends three frequencies (i.e., 5, 50, and 500 kHz) of alternating currents through the body. For testing, subjects' feet were centered on the electrodes and the hand electrodes were grasped with arms being held wide enough so there was no contact between the arms and torso. The position was held for the duration of the test (approximately 45 seconds). Once the assessment was completed, participants were prompted to return the hand electrodes and step off the device.

Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry

Immediately after MFBIA testing, participants had their criterion ALM_{TOTAL} and ALM_{ARMS} derived using DXA (GE Lunar Prodigy; Software version 14.10.022; GE Lunar Corporation, Madison, WI, USA). Prior to each use, the DXA was calibrated according to manufacturer guidelines using a standardized calibration block. Participants were positioned supine on the DXA platform with arms resting along the sides of the body and feet secured with Velcro straps around the ankles to reduce movement for the duration of the scan. Reflection scanning was completed on any participant exceeding the scanning area of the DXA table. The positioning of participants receiving a reflection scan aimed to limit the amount of left side of the body (e.g., left arm) outside the scanning area of the DXA machine. After each scan, a trained technician manually adjusted regions of interest.

Single Frequency Bioimpedance Analysis

After DXA scans, participants had ALM_{TOTAL} (left arm + right arm + left leg + right leg) and ALM_{ARMS} (left arm + right arm) measured with SFBIA (Quantum V, RJL systems, Clinton MI) while lying on the DXA table. For SFBIA testing, the participants' right and left shoe and sock remained off, and their arms were placed $\geq 30°$ away from the body with legs separated and not touching. Excess hair at electrode sites was removed and the skin was cleaned with alcohol pads and dried prior to electrode placement. Surface electrodes were placed on the right and left

wrist beside the ulnar head and on the first joint of the middle finger. Surface electrodes were also placed on the right and left foot beside the medial malleolus and on the base of the second toe. Next, leads were attached to the eight electrodes and a single frequency (i.e., 50 kHz) whole-body impedance measurement was obtained for each subject. ALM_{TOTAL} and ALM_{ARMS} were computed using the built-in SFBIA algorithm.

Handgrip Strength

All handgrip tests were completed using a hydraulic hand dynamometer (Jamar, Performance Health Supply Inc., Cedarburg, WI). Prior to each test, the dynamometer was adjusted so the second third, fourth and fifth digit of the hand (i.e., proximal interphalangeal joint) was bent 90°. To complete each test, participants were instructed to be in a standing position, hold the dynamometer with the elbow flexed at 90°, and squeeze the dynamometer as hard as possible while avoiding the Valsalva maneuver [24]. Handgrip strength (HGS) was recorded in kg and the dynamometer was reset to zero prior to the next test. This procedure was repeated with the opposite hand and repeated two additional times. The highest value of the three readings for each hand was averaged to compute HGS.

HGS = (highest left hand + highest right hand)/2

Muscle Quality Index

MQI_{ARMS} was defined as the ratio between HGS and ALM_{ARMS} (HGS/ALM_{ARMS}) for each body composition device (i.e., SFBIA, MFBIA, and DXA). MQI_{TOTAL} was established as the ratio between HGS and ALM_{TOTAL} (HGS/ALM_{TOTAL}) for each body composition device (i.e., SFBIA, MFBIA, and DXA).

Statistical Analysis

The linear relationships between DXA, MFBIA, and SFBIA for all ALM and MQI variables were established using Deming regression, which accounts for errors in the measurement of both variables, [25] and compared to a perfect relationship (i.e., the line of identity). Pearson's R^2, root mean square error (RMSE), and Lin's concordance correlation coefficient (CCC) values were also calculated. Equivalence testing [26] was performed using two one-sided *t*-tests (TOST) to determine if DXA, MFBIA, and SFBIA variables were equivalent

based on equivalence regions of 2.5%, consistent with previous research [27]. Additionally, Bland-Altman analyses were performed, [28] including estimation of the 95% limits of agreement and linear regression to examine proportional bias. Associations between alternate MQI metrics were examined using Pearson's correlations. Statistical analyses were conducted in R (version 4.3.1) using the *DescTools*, [29] *deming*, [25] and *TOSTER* [26] packages. Values are presented as mean ± SD and statistical significance was accepted at $p<0.05$.

RESULTS

Total Appendicular Lean Mass Outcomes

Correlations between MQI metrics ranged from 0.71 to 0.94 (Figure 1). Strong, statistically significant correlations were observed for all ALM variables ($0.84 < R^2 < 0.93$; $p<0.001$), with CCC values of 0.91 to 0.95 (Table 2). The slope and intercept of the Deming regression line did not differ from 1 and 0, respectively for ALM_{DXA} vs. ALM_{SFBIA} and MQI_{DXA} vs. MQI_{MFBIA} but significantly differed for ALM_{DXA} vs. ALM_{MFBIA}, as well as MQI_{DXA} vs. MQI_{SFBIA} and ALM and MQI comparisons for MFBIA vs. SFBIA (Figures 2 – 3). Statistical equivalence was demonstrated for DXA vs. SFBIA (ALM_{TOTAL} and MQI_{TOTAL}), but not other comparisons. From Bland-Altman analysis, no proportional bias was observed for ALM_{DXA} vs. ALM_{SFBIA} or MQI_{DXA} vs. MQI_{MFBIA}, but slight proportional bias ($|slope| \leq 0.14$) was observed for other comparisons.

Arm Lean Mass Outcomes

Strong, statistically significant correlations were observed for all variables ($0.87 < R^2 < 0.98$; $p<0.001$), with CCC values of 0.86 to 0.97 (Table 2). The slope and intercept of the Deming regression line did not differ from 1 and 0, respectively for $ARMS_{DXA}$ vs $ARMS_{SFBIA}$ or any MQI_{ARMS} but significantly differed for $ARMS_{DXA}$ vs $ARMS_{MFBIA}$ and $ARMS_{MFBIA}$ vs $ARMS_{SFBIA}$ (Figures 4 – 5). Statistical equivalence was demonstrated for $ARMS_{DXA}$ vs $ARMS_{MFBIA}$ and MFBIA vs SFBIA (MQI_{ARMS}), but not other comparisons. From Bland-Altman analysis, no proportional bias was observed for $ARMS_{DXA}$ vs $ARMS_{SFBIA}$ or any MQI_{ARMS} but slight proportional bias ($|slope| \leq 0.14$) was observed for other comparisons.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to compare single- and multi-frequency BIA devices against DXA for ALM and MQI metrics in Hispanic adults. Results demonstrated that SFBIA and MFBIA had strong correlations with DXA for all ALM and MQI metrics. In addition, equivalence testing varied between methods (e.g., SFBIA vs. DXA) when examining the different metrics (i.e., ALM_{TOTAL}, ALM_{ARMS}, MQI_{TOTAL}, and MQI_{ARMS}). Lastly, there was proportional bias, albeit slight, for multiple comparisons between the bioimpedance devices and DXA when evaluating ALM and MQI. Nonetheless, MQI_{ARMS} was the only metric that did not differ from the line of identity and had no proportional bias when comparing all the devices against each other. These findings could be an indicator that MQI_{ARMS}, rather than MQI_{TOTAL}, may be better to use when there are different body composition techniques being administered across multiple research and clinical settings. It is also possible that MQI_{ARMS} performed better due to the use of a measure of upper body strength with ALM_{ARMS}. To support this postulation, future research may seek to evaluate MQI models that use lower body strength tests and ALM_{TOTAL} and ALM_{LEGS}.

Comparisons between bioimpedance devices and DXA have shown mixed results when seeking to estimate body composition in the upper and lower extremities. For example, Esco et al. [19] found MFBIA and DXA had excellent agreement when used to predict appendicular lean soft tissue (i.e., arms and legs) in collegiate female athletes. It is worth noting the lean soft tissue measures from Esco et al. [19] excluded bone tissue. Contrarily, Brewer et al. [30] found that MFBIA significantly underestimated ALM when compared against DXA in Division I college athletes. In addition, Nickerson [15] found large mean differences between SFBIA and DXA when comparing arms, legs, and total ALM in physically active adults. However, the 95% limits of agreement were small for all the comparisons, which suggest there may have been fixed bias of the SFBIA device [15]. Collectively, the current study findings demonstrate good overall agreement between SFBIA, MFBIA, and DXA for ALM_{TOTAL} and ALM_{ARMS} in a Hispanic population.

The comparison of MQI between different body composition methods is limited. Nonetheless, a previous study found a strong association (r = 0.81; $p < 0.001$) between a field-

and laboratory-based model using BMI and DXA, respectively [31]. Something worth highlighting is BMI and DXA utilize different metrics (kg/m^2 and kg, respectively). Therefore, analysis in previous research was limited to correlations and not equivalence testing and Bland-Altman analysis [31]. Accordingly, the current study adds to previous literature by employing identical body composition metrics (i.e., ALM_{TOTAL} and ALM_{ARMS}) across multiple devices (i.e., SFBIA, MFBIA, and DXA), which allows for a more comprehensive interpretation and rigorous statistical analysis. This brings forth a common issue in the literature which includes the use of different methods for measuring body composition and muscular strength components of MQI. For example, body composition can be measured with DXA, BIA, BMI, magnetic resonance imaging, or computed tomography when calculating MQI. Moreover, muscular strength can be measured using grip strength, chair stand test, leg extensions, etc. [1]. Altogether, the lack of consensus on which methods to use when quantifying MQI makes comparing previous research extremely difficult.

The similar agreement between all three body composition methods when predicting MQI_{ARMS} is a talking point worth further discussion. For example, previous research from Nickerson [15] revealed the agreement between SFBIA and DXA varies based on sex and segmental mass. Specifically, results demonstrated the error of SFBIA, when predicting segmental lean mass, was larger for males than females. One potential explanation of the increased error of SFBIA, when compared to DXA, was attributed to the larger segmental mass of males than females [15]. Accordingly, it's plausible the SFBIA and MFBIA devices in the current study have better agreement with DXA when used to predict MQI_{ARMS} than MQI_{TOTAL} since the former muscle quality metric has less segmental mass than the latter. The use of MQI_{ARMS} may also be more sensitive for detecting sex differences than MQI_{TOTAL}. For instance, Lopes et al. [32] found MQI was higher in females than males when using dominant handgrip strength and the corresponding arm's appendicular lean mass [32]. Contrarily, there were no differences between males and females when comparing MQI_{TOTAL} (i.e., combined HGS and ALM_{TOTAL}) [32]. The current study is the first ever to demonstrate similarity between MQI_{ARMS} and differences amongst MQI_{TOTAL} when comparing multiple body composition methods with similar body composition metrics (i.e., ALM). These findings highlight the need to further

explore MQI models when using various body composition tools, muscular strength methods (e.g., handgrip, chair stands, leg extension) and ALM measures (e.g., arms, legs, combined).

Although the current study has many strengths, it is not without limitations. First, it is worth mentioning the present study utilized young- and middle-aged adults. As a result, it is unknown whether the current study findings can be generalized to older adults. MQI is commonly evaluated in older adults due to loss of muscular strength and ALM, which is associated with aging. Nonetheless, MQI is important to evaluate across various age spectrums, including young- and middle-aged adults, particularly those interested in training interventions designed to improve physical functioning. Second, the current study sample consisted of Hispanic adults. Consequently, it is unknown whether present study findings can be generalized to non-Hispanic populations. Nonetheless, most of the research, regarding MQI, has been centered on non-Hispanic populations. Thus, the present study filled a gap in the literature by evaluating a population that has been underrepresented in body composition research. Altogether, the present study results should only be generalized to Hispanic adults 18 – 55 years of age. Third, it should be noted that current study results only apply to the SFBIA and MFBIA devices utilized in the present study. Numerous BIA devices are commercially available for use. Therefore, assuming results apply to all SFBIA and MFBIA should be avoided until further research can be conducted utilizing devices not included in the present study. Nonetheless, the present study uniquely showed that SFBIA and MFBIA have similar agreement with DXA when used to predict ALM and MQI. The ability of MFBIA to utilize low and high frequencies is often assumed to result in better accuracy than simpler SFBIA technology, which uses a single low frequency electrical current. However, our results demonstrate MFBIA does not result in better agreement than SFBIA. Thus, both devices yielded similar outcomes and are very promising for use when seeking to compute MQI. Lastly, the current study did not record the dominant hand of participants during testing. It's possible there are differences between dominant and non-dominant HGS. Therefore, the average HGS (left hand + right hand)/2 was used to compute MQI models in the current study. This approach likely helped minimize differences that may have existed between the dominant and non-dominant hand.

CONCLUSION

Comparisons of BIA vs. DXA for measuring MQI_{TOTAL} and MQI_{ARMS} have yet to be explored. Additionally, it was previously unknown whether various BIA devices (i.e., SFBIA and MFBIA) could be used interchangeably for measuring MQI, when compared to DXA. The current study uniquely showed that SFBIA and MFBIA have better agreement with DXA when used to compute MQI_{ARMS} than MQI_{TOTAL}. These results have significant clinical implications when seeking to compute MQI with different body composition methods (i.e., DXA, MFBIA, and SFBIA). For example, MQI_{ARMS} is advised for research facilities and multi-site studies that comprise of different body composition methods. Furthermore, MQI_{ARMS} may be better to assess than MQI_{TOTAL} when patients visit numerous health care locations that utilize varying BIA models for analysis of ALM. Future steps include the following: 1). Evaluating BIA devices beyond the models examined in the present study; 2). Comparison of MQI across various races/ethnicities; 3). Steps toward a consensus on how to standardize the measurement of MQI; and 4). Longitudinal studies evaluating the associations between MQI and health-related outcomes in clinical populations undergoing prevention and treatment interventions (e.g., obesity, sarcopenia, cancer).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge Rocio Gallegos for her efforts in the administrative assistance and data collection of the current study.

Financial Support

Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number SC1GM135099. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no potential, perceived, or real conflicts of interest to disclose.

Authorship

BSN and SAC contributed to conceptualization, study design, and funding acquisition. BSN and K-SP contributed to data collection and project administration. GMT conducted all statistical analysis. BN, BSN, and GMT contributed to writing the original draft preparation and editing. BM provided critical review of manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the final version of the manuscript.

TABLE 1

	All (n=131)		**F (n=71)**		**M (n=60)**	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Height (cm)	166.5	8.7	160.7	5.8	173.4	6.2
Weight (kg)	78.1	17.8	72.0	16.4	85.4	16.7
BMI (kg/m2)	28.1	5.8	27.9	6.3	28.3	5.1
Age (y)	29.1	11.3	29.9	11.2	28.2	11.5
Average Handgrip Strength (kg)	33.9	9.2	27.0	4.8	42.1	6.0

TABLE 2

		Variable 1		Variable 2						TOST Interval		
Variable 1	**Variable 2**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**CE**	**CE SD**	**SEE**	**CCC**	**LL**	**UL**	**Equivalence**
ALM_{DXA} (kg)	ALM_{MFBIA}	21.49	5.43	20.98	4.75	-0.51	1.49	1.23	0.95	-0.73	-0.30	N
ALM_{DXA} (kg)	ALM_{SFBIA}	21.49	5.43	21.65	5.31	0.16	1.62	1.58	0.95	-0.07	0.40	Y
ALM_{MFBIA} (kg)	ALM_{SFBIA}	20.98	4.75	21.65	5.31	0.67	1.50	1.46	0.95	0.46	0.89	N
$MQI_{DXA\text{-}ALM}$ (kg/kg)	$MQI_{MFBIA\text{-}ALM}$	1.59	0.26	1.62	0.26	0.03	0.11	0.10	0.91	0.01	0.04	N
$MQI_{DXA\text{-}ALM}$ (kg/kg)	$MQI_{SFBIA\text{-}ALM}$	1.59	0.26	1.58	0.29	-0.01	0.11	0.11	0.92	-0.03	0.01	Y
$MQI_{MFBIA\text{-}ALM}$ (kg/kg)	$MQI_{SFBIA\text{-}ALM}$	1.62	0.26	1.58	0.29	-0.04	0.10	0.10	0.93	-0.05	-0.02	N
Arms LM_{DXA} (kg)	Arms LM_{MFBIA}	5.74	1.86	5.81	1.62	0.07	0.52	0.43	0.95	-0.01	0.14	Y
Arms LM_{DXA} (kg)	Arms LM_{SFBIA}	5.74	1.86	5.94	1.87	0.20	0.48	0.47	0.96	0.13	0.27	N
Arms LM_{MFBIA} (kg)	Arms LM_{SFBIA}	5.81	1.62	5.94	1.87	0.13	0.43	0.38	0.97	0.07	0.19	N
$MQI_{DXA\text{-}ARMS}$ (kg/kg)	$MQI_{MFBIA\text{-}ARMS}$	6.08	1.04	5.94	1.04	-0.14	0.53	0.51	0.86	-0.21	-0.06	N
$MQI_{DXA\text{-}ARMS}$ (kg/kg)	$MQI_{SFBIA\text{-}ARMS}$	6.08	1.04	5.87	1.04	-0.21	0.47	0.46	0.88	-0.28	-0.14	N
$MQI_{MFBIA\text{-}ARMS}$ (kg/kg)	$MQI_{SFBIA\text{-}ARMS}$	5.94	1.04	5.87	1.04	-0.07	0.37	0.36	0.94	-0.13	-0.02	Y

TOST: two one-sided t-tests; CE: constant error; SEE: standard error of the estimate; LL: lower limit; UL: upper limit; ALM = appendicular lean mass; MQI = muscle quality index; LM = lean mass; DXA = dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; SFBIA = single-frequency bioimpedance analysis; MFBIA = multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis

Figure 1. Correlation Matrix.

Correlations between dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), single-frequency bioimpedance analysis (SFBIA), and multiple-frequency bioimpedance analysis (MFBIA) when measuring appendicular lean mass (ALM) and arms lean mass (LM).



Figure 2. Comparison of body composition devices for estimating appendicular lean mass.

Line of Identity: The ordinary least squares regression line as compared to the line of identity is displayed for single-frequency bioimpedance analysis (SFBIA), multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis (MFBIA), and dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) comparisons. Root mean square error (RMSE) and coefficient of determination (R^2) and are also presented. Results of appendicular lean mass (ALM) are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2A), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2C), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2E).

Bland Altman Analysis: The relationship between the average of the ALM estimates and a reference method (*x*-axis) and the difference in the estimate minus that of the reference method (*y*-axis) is displayed. The linear regression line indicates the degree of proportional bias. Horizontal dashed lines indicate the upper and lower limits of agreement (LOA), and the horizontal solid line indicates the constant error between methods. Linear regression equations and 95% LOA values are also displayed. Results of ALM are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2B), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2D), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2F).



Figure 3. Comparison of body composition devices for measuring muscle quality index in arms and legs (MQI_{TOTAL}).

Line of Identity: The ordinary least squares regression line as compared to the line of identity is displayed for single-frequency bioimpedance analysis (SFBIA), multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis (MFBIA), and dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) comparisons. Root mean square error (RMSE) and coefficient of determination (R^2) and are also presented. Results of muscle quality index (MQI_{TOTAL}) are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2A), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2C), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2E).

Bland Altman Analysis: The relationship between the average of the MQI_{TOAL} estimates and a reference method (*x*-axis) and the difference in the estimate minus that of the reference method (*y*-axis) is displayed. The linear regression line indicates the degree of proportional bias. Horizontal dashed lines indicate the upper and lower limits of agreement (LOA), and the horizontal solid line indicates the constant error between methods. Linear regression equations and 95% LOA values are also displayed. Results of MQI_{TOTAL} are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2B), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2D), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2F).



Figure 4. Comparison of body composition devices for estimating arms lean mass.

Line of Identity: The ordinary least squares regression line as compared to the line of identity is displayed for single-frequency bioimpedance analysis (SFBIA), multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis (MFBIA), and dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) comparisons. Root mean square error (RMSE) and coefficient of determination (R^2) and are also presented. Results of arms lean mass (LM) are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2A), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2C), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2E).

Bland Altman Analysis: The relationship between the average of the arms LM estimates and a reference method (*x*-axis) and the difference in the estimate minus that of the reference method (*y*-axis) is displayed. The linear regression line indicates the degree of proportional bias. Horizontal dashed lines indicate the upper and lower limits of agreement (LOA), and the horizontal solid line indicates the constant error between methods. Linear regression equations and 95% LOA values are also displayed. Results of arms LM are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2B), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2D), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2F).



Figure 5. Comparison of body composition devices for measuring muscle quality index in arms (MQI_{ARMS}).

Line of Identity: The ordinary least squares regression line as compared to the line of identity is displayed for single-frequency bioimpedance analysis (SFBIA), multi-frequency bioimpedance analysis (MFBIA), and dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) comparisons. Root mean square error (RMSE) and coefficient of determination (R^2) and are also presented. Results of arms muscle quality index (MQI_{ARMS}) are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2A), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2C), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2E).

Bland Altman Analysis: The relationship between the average of the MQI_{ARMS} estimates and a reference method (*x*-axis) and the difference in the estimate minus that of the reference method (*y*-axis) is displayed. The linear regression line indicates the degree of proportional bias. Horizontal dashed lines indicate the upper and lower limits of agreement (LOA), and the horizontal solid line indicates the constant error between methods. Linear regression equations and 95% LOA values are also displayed. Results of MQI_{ARMS} are displayed for MFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2B), SFBIA vs DXA (Figure 2D), and SFBIA vs MFBIA (Figure 2F).

REFERENCES

1. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, et al. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing. 2019;48(4):601.

2. Du K, Goates S, Arensberg MB, et al. Prevalence of sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity vary with race/ethnicity and advancing age. Divers Equal Health Care. 2018;15(4):175-83.

3. Park SW, Goodpaster BH, Strotmeyer ES, et al. Decreased muscle strength and quality in older adults with type 2 diabetes: the health, aging, and body composition study. Diabetes. 2006;55(6):1813-8.

4. Hsu W-L, Chen C-Y, Tsauo J-Y, et al. Balance control in elderly people with osteoporosis. Journal of the Formosan Medical Association. 2014;113(6):334-9.

5. Murai J, Nishizawa H, Otsuka A, et al. Low muscle quality in Japanese type 2 diabetic patients with visceral fat accumulation. Cardiovascular diabetology. 2018;17:1-10.

6. Barbat-Artigas S, Rolland Y, Zamboni M, et al. How to assess functional status: a new muscle quality index. The journal of nutrition, health & aging. 2012;16:67-77.

7. Hirode G, Wong RJ. Trends in the Prevalence of Metabolic Syndrome in the United States, 2011-2016. JAMA. 2020;323(24):2526-8.

8. Maffiuletti NA, Ratel S, Sartorio A, et al. The impact of obesity on in vivo human skeletal muscle function. Current Obesity Reports. 2013;2:251-60.

9. Erlandson M, Lorbergs A, Mathur S, et al. Muscle analysis using pQCT, DXA and MRI. European journal of radiology. 2016;85(8):1505-11.

10. Oba H, Matsui Y, Arai H, et al. Evaluation of muscle quality and quantity for the assessment of sarcopenia using mid-thigh computed tomography: a cohort study. BMC geriatrics. 2021;21:1-8.

11. Akamatsu Y, Kusakabe T, Arai H, et al. Phase angle from bioelectrical impedance analysis is a useful indicator of muscle quality. Journal of cachexia, sarcopenia and muscle. 2022;13(1):180-9.

12. Sato H, Nakamura T, Kusuhara T, et al. Effectiveness of impedance parameters for muscle quality evaluation in healthy men. The Journal of Physiological Sciences. 2020;70(1):53.

13. Nickerson BS, Snarr RL. Proportional bias of multifrequency bioimpedance analysis is larger in Hispanic females than males. Nutrition Research. 2022;103:40-6.

14. Nickerson BS, Snarr RL, Ryan GA. Validity of foot-to-foot bioelectrical impedance for estimating body composition in NCAA Division I male athletes: a 3-compartment model comparison. J Strength Cond Res. 2019;33(12):3361-6.

15. Nickerson BS. Agreement between single-frequency bioimpedance analysis and dual energy x-ray absorptiometry varies based on sex and segmental mass. Nutr Res. 2018;54:33-9.

16. Nickerson B, Tinsley G. Utilization of BIA-derived bone mineral estimates exerts minimal impact on body fat estimates via multicompartment models in physically active adults. Journal of Clinical Densitometry. 2018;21(4):541-9.

17. Stone TM, Wingo JE, Nickerson BS, et al. Comparison of Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis and Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry for Estimating Bone Mineral Content. Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab. 2018;28(5):542-6.

18. Esco MR, Nickerson BS, Russell AR. Comparison of bioelectrical impedance and DXA for measuring body composition among adults with Down syndrome. Disabil Health J. 2017;10(4):548-51.

19. Esco MR, Snarr RL, Leatherwood MD, et al. Comparison of total and segmental body composition using DXA and multifrequency bioimpedance in collegiate female athletes. J Strength Cond Res. 2015;29(4):918-25.

20. Nickerson BS, Esco MR, Bishop PA, et al. Validity of selected bioimpedance equations for estimating body composition in men and women: a four-compartment model comparison. J Strength Cond Res. 2017;31(7):1963-72.

21. Brozek J, Grande F, Anderson JT, et al. Densitometric analysis of body composition: revision of some quantitative assumptions. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 1963;110:113-40.

22. Nickerson BS, Tinsley GM, Fedewa MV, et al. Fat-free mass characteristics of Hispanic adults: Comparisons with non-Hispanic caucasians and cadaver reference values. Clinical Nutrition. 2020;39:3080-5.

23. Armstrong LE. Hydration assessment techniques. Nutrition Reviews. 2005;63(suppl_1):S40-S54.

24. American College of Sports Medicine. ACSM's health-related physical fitness assessment manual. 5th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Wolters Kluwer Health, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2017.

25. Therneau T. deming: Deming, Theil-Sen, Passing-Bablock and Total Least Squares Regression. 2018.

26. Lakens D. Equivalence tests: A practical primer for t-tests, correlations, and meta-analyses. Social Psychological and Personality Science. 2017;8(4):355-62.

27. McCarthy C, Tinsley GM, Bosy-Westphal A, et al. Total and regional appendicular skeletal muscle mass prediction from dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry body composition models. Sci Rep. 2023;13(1):2590.

28. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. Lancet. 1986;1(8476):307-10.

29. Signorell A. DescTools: Tools for Descriptive Statistics. 2022.

30. Brewer GJ, Blue MN, Hirsch KR, et al. Appendicular body composition analysis: validity of bioelectrical impedance analysis compared with dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry in division I college athletes. The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research. 2019;33(11):2920-5.

31. Melo G, Moraes M, Nascimento E, et al. Field-based versus laboratory-based estimates of muscle quality index in adolescents with and without Down syndrome. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research. 2022;66(12):1000-8.

32. Lopes LCC, Vaz-Gonçalves L, Schincaglia RM, et al. Sex and population-specific cutoff values of muscle quality index: Results from NHANES 2011–2014. Clinical Nutrition. 2022;41(6):1328-34.