Assessment of adult body composition using bioelectrical impedance: comparison of researcher calculated to machine outputted values
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ABSTRACT

Objectives: To explore the usefulness of Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis (BIA) for general use by identifying best-evidenced formulae to calculate lean and fat mass, comparing these to historical gold standard data and comparing these results with machine-generated output. In addition, we explored how to best to adjust lean and fat estimates for height and how these overlapped with body mass index (BMI).

Design: Cross-sectional observational study within population representative cohort study.

Setting: Urban community, North East England

Participants: Sample of 506 mothers of children aged 7–8 years, mean age 36.3 years.

Methods: Participants were measured at a home visit using a portable height measure and leg-to-leg BIA machine (Tanita TBF-300MA).

Measures: Height, weight, bioelectrical impedance (BIA).

Outcome measures: Lean and fat mass calculated using best-evidenced published formulae as well as machine-calculated lean and fat mass data.

Results: Estimates of lean mass were similar to historical results using gold standard methods. When compared with the machine-generated values, there were wide limits of agreement for fat mass and a large relative bias for lean that varied with size. Lean and fat residuals adjusted for height differed little from indices of lean (or fat)/height2. Of 112 women with BMI >30 kg/m2, 100 (91%) also had high fat, but of the 16 with low BMI (<19 kg/m2) only 5 (31%) also had low fat.

Conclusions: Lean and fat mass calculated from BIA using published formulae produces plausible values and demonstrate good concordance between high BMI and high fat, but these differ substantially from the machine-generated values. Bioelectrical impedance can supply a robust and useful field measure of body composition, so long as the machine-generated output is not used.

INTRODUCTION

The WHO defines obesity as “the disease in which excess body fat has accumulated to such an extent that health may be adversely affected”.1 Although prevention is the first step, being able to reliably identify people with excess fat is essential if the problem is to be recognised and appropriate measures taken. Body mass index (BMI) (weight/height2) is only an indirect measure of fatness, so reliable methods of assessing body composition are also needed. Hydrodensitometry is usually regarded as the nearest to a gold standard,2 but is impractical for most studies. For this reason, alternative less direct techniques have been developed. These include stable isotope methods and X-ray densitometry (DXA), but isotope methods require costly materials and processing while DXA equipment is non-portable. Thus, for ambulatory assessment, a cheaper and portable method such as Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis (BIA) is valuable. The equipment necessary is portable, relatively inexpensive and the procedure simple and painless, making it a suitable method for studying large groups of participants.3 4 Measurements are taken by using four surface electrodes at different sites which send an imperceptible electrical current through the body (50 kHz alternating current of 800 μA between electrodes). Although there are also whole body machines, the most commonly used field method has been the four electrode leg-to-leg (eg, Tanita), where the participant...
stands with bare feet on the analyser’s footpads. The impedance value \((Z)\) reflects the resistance and reactance that the electrical signal encounters when passing through the body; the ionised fluid in lean tissue acts as a conductor, and the current passes only through these fluids.\(^4\) The objective physical reading of impedance cannot be interpreted without further statistical manipulation, but assuming that \(LM \times TBW \times \text{height}^2/Z\), lean mass (LM) and total body water (TBW) can then be estimated, from which fat mass (FM) can be calculated.\(^3\)\(^4\)

Although BIA is already widely used in practice and some body composition research, there remain doubts about its accuracy and precision.\(^5\) In fact, the measurement of impedance itself is reasonably precise and repeatable as long as it is performed in healthy individuals using the same method.\(^6\) However, the problems begin with the transformation of the impedance data. As described above, impedance has to be mathematically transformed to create meaningful estimates of TBW and thus LM. However, the prediction equations used to convert impedance measurements into measures of body fatness seem to vary between BIA machine manufacturers and incorporate elements other than the key components of height, impedance and the resistivity and hydration constants. Most manufacturers do not publish their formulae for commercial reasons, but the formulae used for a Tanita leg-to-leg machine have been published and these reveal that they incorporate weight as well as height\(^2/Z\).\(^7\) It is not clear what impact this would have on the results.

A further problem is that lean and FM values are difficult to interpret in isolation, as they differ systematically depending on the participant’s height,\(^6\)\(^7\) so in estimates of adiposity, FM is usually adjusted for body size by expressing it as a percentage of total mass. However, this then renders LM invisible, which is inappropriate, in individuals where LM varies markedly, since this will create differences in percentage fat (%fat), despite identical FM.\(^6\) This thus risks misclassifying individuals with low LM as having excess body fat and underestimating FM in very muscular individuals. It has been proposed as an alternative that lean and fat should simply be expressed as indices by dividing each by height\(^2\)\(^6\)\(^8\) but we have shown in children that this still leaves considerable unadjusted confounding by height.\(^6\)\(^9\) We have previously described an alternative approach in children which produces lean and fat residuals that fully adjust both lean and FM for height and compares them to a large population reference.\(^6\)\(^8\) We have now further applied these to children from the Gateshead Millennium cohort.\(^9\) As part of the same study, we wished to compare these children to similar measures collected in their parents, but there is no generally recognised method of doing this for adults.

Finally, it is widely believed in the lay population that BMI is a poor predictor of actually fatness. Published information on this suggests generally that BMI has high specificity, but low sensitivity to identify high %fat,\(^10\) but as described above, %fat may not be the best way to identify excess FM. We have already explored the concordance between BMI and fat residuals in children and found good concordance in the upper ranges of both, with very weak concordance for low BMI.\(^11\)

We thus set out to:

1. Identify best-evidenced formulae to calculate lean and FM and compare these to historical gold standard data;
2. Compare these results with machine-generated output;
3. Explore how to best adjust estimates for height and how these overlap with BMI.

### PARTICIPANTS AND METHODS

#### Participants

The impedance data were obtained from mothers of participants in the Gateshead Millennium Study (GMS).\(^12\) This study set out to recruit all babies born to Gateshead residents between 1 June 1999 and 31 May 2000 in prespecified recruiting weeks. A wide range of information relating to feeding, growth and latterly obesity were collected on both children and parents and they have now been followed up to beyond age 9 years.\(^12\)

The work presented here is based on data collected on the children’s mothers in 2007, when the children were aged around 7 years. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

#### Procedure

The data were collected on the children’s parents at a home visit. While it was possible to study mothers at most of these visits, participation by fathers was minimal, so the paternal data were not used further. Impedance was measured using a single frequency (50 kHz) leg-to-leg BIA machine (Tanita TBF-300MA, Tokyo, Japan). The participants were measured wearing light clothing and bare feet after being asked to empty their bladders. The raw impedance and the machine calculated values for LM, FM and %fat were recorded. Height was measured without shoes and socks using a portable scale (Leicester height measure) to 0.1 cm with the head in the Frankfort plane. Weight was measured to 0.1 kg using the Tanita TBF-300MA. BMI was calculated as weight (kg)/height (m)\(^2\).

#### Analytical methods

The analysis was carried out using the software package R (V2.2.0). We used the measured impedance to arrive at our own estimates of TBW and thus lean and FM using best published estimates of various constants. We assumed the hydration constant to be equal to 0.732 in adults, supported by previous studies\(^13\)\(^14\)\(^15\) which gives the equation \(LM=TBW/0.732\). Values for the resistivity constant from various papers differ, but we used those of Bell,\(^15\) the only study where impedance was measured using leg-to-leg techniques. This gives a resistivity constant for adults
\( \rho = 0.66 \), that is, \( \text{TBW} = 0.66 \) (height\(^2\)/Z). Combining these two formulas, we obtained the following, simple prediction equation for adult women: \( \text{LM} = 0.66/0.732 \) (height\(^2\)/Z) or \( \text{LM} = 0.898 \) (height\(^2\)/Z). FM was then obtained as weight minus LM. To check whether the values we obtained for TBW, LM and FM using this approach were reasonable, we compared them to reference values from the two previous studies which had used gold standard measurement methods and published separate values for women.\(^{16, 17}\)

The first\(^{16}\) estimated TBW using \(^2\)H\(_2\)O dilution, body density using underwater weighting and a three-component model to estimate \%fat and LM. The second\(^{17}\) estimated TBW using either \(^3\)H\(_2\)O or \(^3\)H\(_2\)O dilution and FM and LM using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA).

**LM residual and FM residual**

In order to produce estimates of FM and LM adjusted for height, a regression method to obtain lean and fat residuals for children\(^{8}\) was adapted to produce lean and fat residuals for their mothers, using their height as a covariate. A range of transformations of raw LM and raw FM were explored in order to achieve approximate normality and constant variance of residuals when regressed on height. The residuals from regression were then standardised (subtracting the mean and dividing by the SD) to get the so-called lean and fat standardised residuals. In addition, lean and fat indices were calculated (LM or FM divided by height\(^2\)).

The Bland-Altman method\(^{18}\) was used to compare the Tanita-generated values of FM and LM and the ones produced following the equations presented in this paper. The Bland-Altman plot is widely used in the literature to evaluate the agreement between two methods that are measuring the same thing. This involves calculating the mean difference (bias) between the two measures for each individual and the limits of agreement. In addition, the difference is then plotted against the mean of the two measures, which supplies a visual presentation of how the spread and pattern of the points varies with the reading (variable bias). Linear regression was then used to test for a significant degree of variable bias.

**RESULTS**

When the cohort was formed in 1999–2000, 1009 (81%) eligible mothers agreed to join the study and impedance and growth data were collected on 498 mothers in 2007, with mean (SD) age 36.3 (5.6) years (age range 23.6–53.1 years). Sixteen (3.2%) women were underweight (BMI <19), 141 women (28%) were overweight (BMI 25–30) and 112 (22%) were obese (BMI >30).

**Table 1 Descriptive statistics for the anthropometric measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>IQR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>36.63</td>
<td>32.25, 40.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (cm)</td>
<td>163.00</td>
<td>158.90, 167.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>59.38, 78.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waist circumference (cm)</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>74.20, 90.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hip circumference (cm)</td>
<td>102.70</td>
<td>96.90, 111.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg/m(^2))</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>22.64, 29.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impedance (ohms)</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>511, 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generated using published constants</th>
<th>Generated using published constants</th>
<th>Tanita-generated data</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>p Value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>IQR</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>IQR</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBW (L)</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>29.0, 34.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (kg)</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>39.6, 47.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>42.3, 47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM (kg)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.0, 33.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>17.1, 31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Fat</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>30.4, 43.0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>28.6, 39.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One sample t test.

%Fat, percentage fat; BMI, body mass index; FM, fat mass; LM, lean mass; NA, not available; TBW, total body water.
fat, but only a minority of women with BMI <19 kg/m² (4, 25%) had less than 20% fat.

How well do the manufactures algorithms describe body composition?
The machine-calculated values were also available for all but eight mothers. The sample mean of the Tanita LM values was lower than our calculated values (mean (SD) difference $-1.19 (3.33)$ kg, 95% CI $-1.49$ to $-0.90$) while they were higher for FM and %fat (1.19 (3.33) kg, 95% CI 0.90 to 1.49 and 1.97 (4.86) %, 95% CI 1.54% to 2.40%, respectively). The two sets of results were compared using the Bland-Altman method,18 and major discrepancies were found between the two methods. The relative bias in LM calculated by Tanita varied from a mean of $-4.68$ for all participants in the lowest quintile for LM to $+2.55$ for the highest quintile (figure 1A). Using regression, this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Hewitt</th>
<th>Chumlea</th>
<th>GMS</th>
<th>Chumlea</th>
<th>GMS</th>
<th>Chumlea</th>
<th>GMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age(year)</td>
<td>32.6±6.0</td>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>23–29</td>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>40–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (kg)</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Fat</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM (kg)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not described in that paper.

%Fat, percentage fat; BMI, body mass index; FM, fat mass; GMS, Gateshead Millennium Study; LM, lean mass.

**Figure 1** Bland-Altman plots for (A) lean mass (LM), (B) fat mass (FM) and (C) percentage fat (%fat) comparing our own calculated values to the machine output values (Tanita).
revealed a statistically significant slope (B=0.387, p<0.001). No equivalent relationship was seen for FM or %fat (figure 1B, C).

**Calculation of lean residual and fat residual**

In order to achieve approximate normality and constant variance of errors, LM was inverse-transformed before being regressed on height. The resulting equation was obtained:

\[
\text{LM residual} = \frac{\left((-1/LM) - (-0.06745 + 0.0002714 \times \text{height})\right)}{0.003164}
\]

Similarly, FM was log-transformed and regressed on height. The resulting equation was obtained:

\[
\text{FM residual} = \frac{\left(\log(\text{FM}) - (1.711203 + 0.009028 \times \text{height})\right)}{0.449400}
\]

These residuals were normally distributed with mean 0 and variance 1. Fourteen women (2.4%) had fat residuals <-2 SD (roughly the 2.5th centile for the normal distribution) and 124 (25%) had fat residuals >0.68 SD (roughly the 75th centile) as expected.

**Relationship of the FM and LM residuals to other measurements**

As would be expected, there was no association between height and the lean and fat residuals (Spearman correlation (95% CI) of height with lean residual −0.02 (−0.11 to 0.07); with fat residual 0.01 (−0.07 to 0.10)), but nor was there any significant correlation of height with the lean index (LM/height\(^2\): −0.05 (−0.14 to 0.04)) or the fat index (FM/height\(^2\): −0.03 (−0.12 to 0.06)). Of the 112 women with BMI >30 kg/m\(^2\), 100 (91%) also had fat residuals >75th centile, while a BMI of >30 kg/m\(^2\) identified 81% of all with high fat residual. In contrast, of the 16 with BMI <19 kg/m\(^2\) only 5 (31%) also had fat residual <2nd centile (figure 2).

**DISCUSSION**

In this analysis, we set out first to identify the best published constants to use for estimating lean and FM from BIA. The use of different devices and methods, under different conditions and on different populations, can make it difficult to extrapolate formulas from one study to another, but when we compared our estimated values for FM, LM and TBW to historical data, these revealed that results for LM were similar, while in contrast there were striking increases in average fat for the youngest, though not in the oldest category, who were already

---

Figure 2  Scatter plot of lean mass adjusted for height (lean mass residual) against fat mass adjusted for height (fat mass residual) per body mass index (BMI) category (underweight (<19) and obese (≥30). The vertical lines denote the cut-off for low (<2nd centile) and high (>75th centile) fat residual.
relatively more adipose even in the earlier cohorts.\textsuperscript{16, 17} Overall, the participants had a high median %fat (34.5) and nearly a quarter had BMI in the obese range. The results thus vividly reflect the well-recognised secular trend to increased fatness in the population of young to middle-aged women. They also illustrate good concordance between high BMI and high adiposity.

Although based on a simplified mathematical model of the human body’s shape and composition, BIA has been shown to be a reliable method in population studies, though likely to have less accuracy in individuals.\textsuperscript{3–18} The large number of different published equations reflects differences in the reference methods, instrument used or the characteristics of the sample, but the constants used here seem to be the best ones currently in the public domain. The resulting prediction equation is strikingly simple in comparison to many others proposed in the literature, since it expresses LM as directly proportional to weight\textsuperscript{2} and that the relative activity constant (which relates impedance to TBW) was shown previously in children that lean and fat residuals are effective in fully adjusting for height as well as allowing the data to be expressed as SD scores compared with a reference population.\textsuperscript{8–9} However, with adult women, simply dividing LM and FM by height\textsuperscript{2} also fully adjusted for height, suggesting that this would be equally valid and simpler. This adds further weight to Well’s proposal\textsuperscript{22} that 1/Z could be used as a simple height-adjusted lean index, since lean index=LM/\textit{H}t\textsuperscript{2}=\textit{H}(\textit{H}/\textit{Z})/\textit{H}t\textsuperscript{2}=1/\textit{Z}. Ideally, any reference should be validated against a more direct measure of body composition, but such studies seem only to have been done in children.

We have also shown that, as in children,\textsuperscript{11} the correspondence between high fat index and BMI is strong, with BMI $\geq$30 kg/m\textsuperscript{2} showing 90% specificity and 80% sensitivity for fat index above the internal 75th centile. This is generally a much better correspondence than was found in a systematic review of the use of various BMI thresholds to detect high %fat measured, using different methods.\textsuperscript{16} However, most reviewed studies used much less stringent thresholds for both BMI and %fat, making comparison difficult.

In conclusion, these data demonstrate that using BIA in models with published constants produces estimates of LM that are, on average, very similar to earlier studies using more direct methods, while the larger FM values are entirely plausible given the secular trends in obesity. These suggest that the physical measurement of impedance can produce useful estimates when appropriately transformed. However, the machine-generated estimates are likely to vary between machines and manufacturers.
and usually do not only reflect the physical measurement of impedance. They cannot therefore be used to validate or verify other measures of adiposity such as BMI. We would recommend that researchers using BIA in future should not rely on machine-generated estimates and should instead express lean and fat indices, divided by height in order to adjust for height.
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