

1 Development and validation of a length- and habitus-based method of ideal and lean
2 body weight estimation for critically ill adults requiring urgent weight-based medical
3 intervention

4

5 ^{1,2}Mike Wells MD, PhD

6 ²Lara Goldstein MD, PhD

7 ³Giles Cattermole BM BCh, MA

8

9 ¹Department of Emergency Medicine and Critical Care, Herbert Wertheim School of
10 Medicine, Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA.

11

12 ²Division of Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the
13 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

14

15 ³Emergency Department, Princess Royal University Hospital, King's College Hospital
16 NHS Trust, London, UK.

17

18 Corresponding author: Prof M Wells profmikewells@gmail.com +1 (786) 389-0588
19 11200 SW 8th Street, Miami, FL 33199

20

21 Keywords: PAWPER tape; weight estimation; drug dosing; lean body weight.

22 Word count: 2993

23

24 **Article summary**

25 **1) Why is this topic important?**

26 Errors in weight estimation, or the use of an inappropriate weight scalar, can
27 translate into medication errors and potential patient harm. The ability to easily
28 estimate TBW, IBW and LBW would enhance patient safety and make correct drug
29 dosing more accessible during the provision of emergency and critical care.

30 **2) What does this study attempt to show?**

31 This study describes the derivation and validation of a point of care model to provide
32 estimates of IBW and LBW for the purposes of weight based dosing. The model is
33 an adult version of a well-studied paediatric weight estimation system.

34 **3) What are the key findings?**

35 The model was able to provide accurate estimations of IBW and LBW in a wide
36 range of patient-types. It was the first study to have evaluated such a system. It
37 established that this system would be useful to test in clinical trials.

38 **4) How is patient care impacted?**

39 The PAWPER XL-MAC system could provide quick and easy estimations of IBW
40 and LBW which can be used in obese patients for appropriate drug dose
41 calculations. This would improve the accuracy of dosing with a potential reduction in
42 medication errors and patient harm.

43 **ABSTRACT**

44 **Objective:** Accurate drug dosing in obese patients requires an estimation of ideal body
45 weight (IBW) or lean body weight (LBW) for dosing hydrophilic medications. Erroneous
46 weight estimates during the management of critically ill adults may contribute to poor
47 outcomes. Existing methods of IBW and LBW estimation or measurement are very
48 difficult to use during emergency care. A new point-of-care model is needed to provide
49 rapid estimates of IBW and LBW for this purpose.

50 **Methods** A model was derived based on the PAWPER XL-MAC tape, a paediatric
51 weight estimation system, which uses recumbent length and mid-arm circumference to
52 estimate IBW and LBW. The model was used to generate weight estimations in a
53 derivation sample (n=33155) and a validation sample (n=5926) from National Health
54 and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) datasets. The outcome measure was to
55 achieve >95% of IBW and LBW estimations within 20% of recognised reference
56 standards (P20>95%) and >70% of estimations within 10% of these standards
57 (P10>70%).

58 **Main Results:** The new model achieved a P20 of 100% and a P10 of 99.9% for IBW
59 and a P20 of 98.3% and a P10 of 78.3% for LBW. This accuracy was maintained in both
60 sexes, all ages, all ethnic groups, all lengths and in all habitus-types, except for the
61 morbidly obese female subgroup.

62 **Conclusions** The modified PAWPER XL-MAC model proved to be an accurate method
63 of IBW and LBW estimation. It could, therefore, have an important role in facilitating
64 emergency drug dose calculations in acutely or critically ill obese adult patients.

65 **Conclusions** The modified PAWPER XL-MAC model proved to be an accurate method
66 of IBW and LBW estimation. It could, therefore, have an important role in facilitating
67 emergency drug dose calculations in acutely or critically ill obese adult patients.

68 **INTRODUCTION**

69 Critically ill or injured obese patients are at high risk when it comes to the dose
70 calculations involving potentially life-saving treatments [1]. Paradoxically, these patients
71 are at risk of underdosing as well as overdosing of medications, if the various drugs
72 administered are not scaled to their appropriate weight descriptor [2]. Furthermore,
73 abnormalities in cardiac and respiratory function resulting from obesity, as well as the
74 effects of critically altered physiology on pharmacokinetics, may all narrow the
75 therapeutic window of high-risk drugs, increasing the jeopardy of dosing errors [3]. It
76 has been reasonably well established that (in general) lipophilic drugs should be dosed
77 to total body weight (TBW) in obese patients to prevent underdosing, but hydrophilic
78 drugs should be dosed to ideal body weight (IBW) or lean body weight (LBW) to avoid
79 overdosing [4]. The use of the correct scalar is, therefore, important for patient safety.

80
81 The real-world problem is that it is very hard to estimate IBW and LBW with existing
82 methods as they require virtually impossible-to-remember, complex formulas [5]. LBW
83 also cannot be directly measured in critically or acutely ill patients as there is no
84 validated easy-to-use point-of-care method for this purpose. This raises the question
85 about the potential harm that is incurred by obese patients during emergency and
86 critical care when weight-based drug therapy is not individualised appropriately. While
87 TBW can sometimes be measured by weighing critically ill patients, it may be difficult to
88 accomplish timeously, and – somewhat surprisingly – has not been well validated [6, 7].
89 Therefore, a method to estimate TBW and IBW or LBW is required to facilitate weight-
90 based medication dose calculations.

91
92 Since the prevalence of obesity exceeds 30% in many countries worldwide (including
93 the United States) it is inevitable that Emergency Physicians, Anaesthetists, and
94 Intensivists will be faced with managing critically ill obese patients on every shift [8]. It
95 is, therefore, important to be able to determine drug doses both accurately and easily in
96 these patients. The ability to estimate the correct dose according to the patient's body
97 habitus using the appropriate weight scalar might make the difference between
98 treatment failure (dose too small), efficacious treatment (dose just right), and overdose
99 with potentially harmful side effects (dose too large) [9]. However, using different weight
100 descriptors for different drugs during the emergency care of obese patients may
101 increase the complexity of the process of determining drug doses under already
102 cognitively stressful circumstances. For this reason, such a weight-estimation system
103 must be simple and easy to use [10].

104
105 There is recent evidence that the best of the dual length- and habitus-based paediatric
106 weight estimation systems can be successfully used in adults to estimate TBW [11-13].
107 One of these methods is the PAWPER XL-MAC tape which makes use of recumbent
108 body length and mid-arm circumference (MAC) to generate estimates of weight, which
109 can be read directly off the tape. It outperformed all other methods of TBW estimation,
110 except for patient self-estimations [11]. The PAWPER XL-MAC method has also been
111 shown to be able to predict IBW accurately in children [14, 15]. In adults, since IBW is
112 closely related to height and LBW is closely related to height and TBW, it is possible

113 that the PAWPER XL-MAC system could be adapted to predict IBW and LBW in
114 addition to TBW [16].

115
116 We hypothesized that the PAWPER XL-MAC method could be adapted for use in
117 adults, to produce accurate, easy-to-use estimates of IBW and LBW. The aim of this
118 study was, therefore, to develop and validate an adult version of the PAWPER XL-MAC
119 tape, using recumbent length and MAC to predict IBW and LBW.

120

121 **METHODS**

122 The model that was developed was based on the PAWPER XL-MAC tape paediatric
123 weight estimation system (see Figure 1) [17]. The process used for developing,
124 calibrating, and validating the new model is shown in Figure 2. The devised system has
125 already been validated for estimations of TBW (Wells M, Goldstein LN, Cattermole G.
126 Development and validation of a length- and habitus-based method of total body weight
127 estimation for critically ill adults requiring urgent weight-based medical intervention.
128 Submitted for publication).

129

130 **Method development**

131 The existing length-segments, MAC cutpoint values and habitus score (HS) categories
132 of the original paediatric version of the PAWPER XL-MAC tape were used for the
133 provisional model. New length-segments were added to extend the length of the tape
134 from 1800 mm to 2000 mm. The MAC cutpoints to define the HS categories were
135 extrapolated from data in the proximal segments. Initial TBW estimates for each HS

136 category were extrapolated from weights obtained from the Centers for Disease Control
137 and Prevention (CDC) weight-for-height charts in each length-segment (HS1 from the
138 15th centile, HS2 from the 25th centile, HS3 from the 50th centile, HS4 from the 85th
139 centile, HS5 from the 95th centile, HS6 from the 97.5th centile and HS7 from the 99th
140 centile). IBW estimates for each segment were defined to be predicted by the HS3
141 weight (“normal” weight) in that segment. Initial working LBW estimates for each HS
142 category in each length-segment were generated from the Janmahasatian formula [18].
143 The model was coded into an electronic worksheet (Microsoft Excel for Mac, 2020) and
144 then underwent the first stage of evaluation.

145

146 **Datasets**

147 The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) datasets from the
148 1999-2000 to the 2017-2018 surveys were downloaded from the CDC website [19]. The
149 downloaded data included the following variables: sequence number, sex, race, age,
150 TBW, height, body mass index (BMI), mid-arm circumference (MAC), fat mass (FM) and
151 fat free mass (FFM). Data from children under the age of 16 years was excluded, as
152 was data from individuals with incomplete or missing data. The datasets were pooled as
153 follows: the initial model testing was done in the NHANES 2011-2014 surveys, the
154 model calibration was done in the NHANES 1999-2014 surveys, and the model
155 validation was done in the 2015-2018 survey datasets.

156

157 **Initial model testing**

158 The initial model was used to generate estimates of IBW and LBW from height and
159 MAC for each individual in the dataset. The data was analysed separately for each
160 length-segment of the tape. Estimates of IBW by the tape were compared against a
161 “standard” IBW calculated using the method of Peterson [20]. Estimates of LBW by the
162 tape were compared against FFM data in the NHANES dataset (measured by dual
163 energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA)).

164
165 The specific outcomes that were evaluated were: mean percentage error (MPE), which
166 represents the estimation bias; the root mean square percentage error (RMSPE) which
167 quantifies the estimation precision; and the percentage of weight estimations that fall
168 within 10% (P10) and 20% (P20) of the reference weight standard, which denotes
169 overall accuracy.

170
171 After the initial testing it was evident that two additional habitus score categories were
172 needed to accommodate weight estimations in adults with severe and morbid obesity.
173 The length-segments and MAC cutpoints were modified accordingly. This new model
174 was then calibrated in the larger pooled dataset.

175
176 **Model calibration**

177 IBW and LBW estimates generated in the calibration dataset by the refined model were
178 again examined for each length-segment of the tape. The MAC cutpoint values and
179 predicted weight values on the tape were adjusted until a target P20 >95% and P10
180 >70% (or as close to this as possible) was obtained for each habitus score category in

181 each length-segment. The final model, shown in Table 1, was then subjected to formal
182 validation.

183

184 **Model validation**

185 The final model was validated by generating estimated weights in the pooled, unused
186 2015-2018 NHANES survey datasets. The performance of the model was evaluated in
187 the same way as in the calibration stage. Subgroup analyses by sex, age, race (as
188 defined in the NHANES datasets) and weight-status (determined by the CDC definitions
189 of BMI as underweight, normal weight, overweight, obese, severely obese, and morbidly
190 obese) were also performed.

191

192 To be able to compare the PAWPER XL-MAC for adults system with other, previously
193 described, LBW estimation methods, the root mean square error (RMSE) was
194 calculated in the calibration and validation datasets. This is not an ideal statistic to
195 evaluate predictive performance, but it is the only useful outcome measure that has
196 been reported in the few previously published studies.

197

198 All data was analysed using Stata Statistical Software (StataCorp. 2019. Stata
199 Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC). A significance
200 level of 0.05 was used throughout.

201

202 **Outcome measures**

203 The primary outcome measure was the performance of the model when compared to
204 calculated IBW and measured FFM. A P20 >95% and a P10 >70% was considered to
205 be an acceptable accuracy of estimation, as has previously been suggested for studies
206 on TBW estimation [21, 22].

207

208 **Ethics**

209 No ethical approval was required, as this study as no patient participants were included.

210 The data was obtained from the CDC's online open access databases, which are
211 completely anonymised.

212

213 **RESULTS**

214 **Characteristics of study participants**

215 The demographic details and characteristics of the participants included in the
216 calibration and validation studies are shown in Table 2. There were 33215 adults
217 included in the initial calibration study and 5926 in the validation study. There were
218 some important differences between the older derivation datasets and the most recent
219 pooled validation datasets. The validation dataset had a significantly lower proportion of
220 normal weight individuals and a higher proportion of obese, severely obese, and
221 morbidly obese individuals (Chi-squared test, $p < 0.0001$). There was also a significant
222 difference in the ethnic distribution, with a higher proportion of Mexican Americans and
223 lower proportion of Non-Hispanic Whites in the validation dataset (Chi-squared test,
224 $p < 0.0001$).

225

226 **Validation of IBW estimation by the modified PAWPER XL-MAC method**

227 The PAWPER XL-MAC method, using the HS3 weight to estimate IBW, achieved
228 almost perfect performance in both datasets. In both the calibration and validation
229 datasets the MPE was 2.0%, with a P10 of 99.9% and a P20 of 100%, with no
230 differences across any subgroups.

231

232 **Validation of LBW estimation by the modified PAWPER XL-MAC method**

233 The modified PAWPER XL-MAC method exceeded the predefined acceptable outcome
234 criteria in the validation dataset overall, and in every segment-by-segment analysis. The
235 outcomes of the analyses are shown in Table 3. Analysis by sex (male and female)
236 showed a significantly better performance in males in both the calibration and validation
237 datasets (Chi-squared test, $p < 0.0001$). Subgroup analyses by age and race (ethnicity)
238 showed little difference between the groups. In terms of body habitus, the primary
239 accuracy outcome was achieved in all subgroups except extremes of habitus (especially
240 morbidly obese females with a BMI $\geq 45 \text{ kg/m}^2$). In these participants the accuracy was
241 substantially lower in females than in males (Chi-squared test, $p < 0.0001$). The
242 relationship between MAC and BMI was disrupted in patients with very high BMI,
243 especially in females, which lead to the poorer LBW predictions in these subgroups.

244

245 In the analysis of the performance of LBW estimation, the RMSE in the calibration
246 dataset was 3.35 kg (3.33, 3.39), and 3.53 kg (3.45, 3.61) in the validation dataset.

247

248 **DISCUSSION**

249 This study presents the first description of a point-of-care weight estimation system that
250 can provide estimates of IBW and LBW for the purpose of weight-based drug dose
251 calculations in adult patients. The new PAWPER XL-MAC system for adults was able to
252 estimate both IBW and LBW with an acceptable degree of accuracy, sufficient to allow
253 for confidence that doses calculated from these scalars would be as accurate as can be
254 achieved in an acute or critical care setting. A previous study of the new PAWPER XL-
255 MAC system for adults showed that estimates of TBW were accurate, with a P10 of
256 71.3% and a P20 of 96.0% (unpublished data).

257

258 **The accuracy of LBW estimates**

259 More than 95% of the estimates were within 20% of actual FFM and nearly 80% of
260 estimates were within 10% of FFM. The accuracy of LBW estimation was similar across
261 BMI-categories in the population, although less accurate in morbidly obese participants.
262 The system performed consistently well in the subgroup analyses of age, gender, and
263 ethnicity.

264

265 The most common methods of estimating LBW in a clinical setting are formulas using
266 anthropometric variables such as TBW, height, abdominal circumference, and skinfold
267 measurements. More complex methods include techniques such as bioelectrical
268 impedance [23]. In practice, however, formulas based on TBW and height – such as the
269 Boer, James, Hume, and Janmahasatian formulas – are the methods most used in sick
270 patients [18, 24-27]. Of these formulas, there is no clear evidence or consensus on

271 which is the best, although the Boer and Janmahasatian currently appear to be the most
272 used [24, 28].

273

274 The estimation of LBW has been poorly studied and most previous studies have used
275 statistical methodology that is incomplete, or inappropriate for method comparison
276 studies. It is therefore difficult to evaluate their accuracy and to compare them with data
277 from other studies, including this one. However, accuracy as determined by the RMSE
278 metric from the present study (3.5 kg (3.5, 3.6)) compares favourably to that of the
279 Janmahasatian formula. In its original validation study, the Janmahasatian formula
280 achieved a RMSE of 4.4 kg (3.4, 5.2), and a RMSE of 5.2 kg (4.9, 5.4) in the only
281 subsequent study to evaluate its performance [18, 29].

282

283 **The accuracy of IBW estimates**

284 This is also the first published report of a point-of-care device that could provide an easy
285 and rapid estimation of IBW without calculations. The accuracy of IBW estimates was
286 virtually perfect with the use of the PAWPER XL-MAC system for adults. The observed
287 accuracy was not surprising, however, as almost all current methods of calculating IBW
288 are determined by, and therefore strongly associated with, length. There is no method
289 that is widely regarded as a gold-standard method for determining IBW, not least
290 because there is no true biologically cogent definition of IBW [5, 30]. Nonetheless, IBW
291 is widely used as a surrogate for LBW in drug dose calculations [31].

292

293 Little has changed in the various contemporary methods of calculating IBW since the
294 original derivation of the Devine formulas [32]. Modifications by Robinson *et al* and
295 Miller *et al* resulted in very similar results to the original Devine formula [33, 34].
296 These methods essentially determined that an ideal weight for an individual should be
297 based on a BMI of 22 kg/m² at their height, which was considered to be the weight
298 resulting in optimum health [31]. More recent methods have added some finesse and
299 ease to the calculation of IBW [5, 35].

300

301 **Relevance and implications for weight-based drug dosing**

302 It has been suggested that weight estimates that deviate more than 10% from actual,
303 measured weight could result in treatment that itself is ineffective in underdose or life
304 threatening in overdose [9]. Current evidence suggests that about 30 to 50% of weight
305 estimation errors result in dose errors that reach the patient. Harm may be detected in
306 as many as 10% of these dosing error incidents [2, 36]. Accurate weight estimation is
307 therefore relevant and important.

308

309 Given its accuracy, the PAWPER XL-MAC system for adults would be ideal to use in
310 any clinical environment where TBW and LBW cannot be measured, especially if the
311 treatment is time critical. The ability to obtain a rapid, accurate estimate of LBW would
312 open the way to clinicians being able to prescribe drug doses based on LBW, where this
313 would be most appropriate (e.g., propofol, ketamine, rocuronium, procainamide, digoxin,
314 epinephrine, fluid and blood therapy, electrolytes, opioids, and some antibiotics). This
315 would allow a far greater flexibility in, and access to, weight-based drug dose

316 calculations. Drug doses could be correctly scaled and individualised for each patient.
317 This could result in better clinical management as well as more accurate dosing during
318 clinical research related to any aspect of drug therapy.

319
320 However, a system that is too complex could be problematic [37]. Since the newly
321 developed PAWPER XL-MAC tape for adults system was specifically designed for use
322 during emergency and critical care, it requires no calculations and is as simple to use
323 with minimal training. Evidence from paediatric use of the PAWPER XL system has
324 suggested that human factor errors are low and that it is easy to use during
325 emergencies [37-39]. There is no reason to think that this should be different in adults,
326 but this will need to be confirmed in future prospective studies.

327

328 **The need for new approaches to drug dosing**

329 With an increased ability to determine LBW easily and rapidly at the bedside, new
330 strategies for drug dose scaling in normal weight, overweight and obese patients need
331 to be developed. Future research will also need to further define the best scalars to use
332 for individual drugs and to explore the biological validity and clinical role of scalars such
333 as IBW, adjusted body weight and normalised lean weight [1].

334

335 **Limitations**

336 The principal limitation of this study was that measurement of length and MAC by a
337 healthcare provider might not be as accurate as that performed by an expert in
338 anthropometry: the effects of human factor errors require evaluation in real-world or

339 simulation situations in future studies. Secondly, the development of this system from
340 data from the USA means that it might not be representative of any other population.
341 This system would need to be evaluated in a range of populations to establish its
342 accuracy in each. While the NHANES data is not directly representative of the general
343 US population demographics, the subgroup stratification by age and BMI is very similar
344 to that of the general US population.

345

346 **Conclusions**

347 The consistent high level of accuracy of IBW and TBW estimations achieved by the
348 modified PAWPER XL-MAC exceeded the pre-determined outcome measures.
349 Estimates were accurate in adults of both sexes, all heights, all ethnic groups, all ages,
350 and most habitus-types. The PAWPER XL-MAC for adults shows promise for being
351 used to aid in guiding drug dosing for drugs with narrow therapeutic windows in obese
352 patients when calculations of LBW would be difficult or excessively time-consuming. A
353 point-of-care system that can accurately estimate TBW, LBW and IBW under difficult
354 circumstances has the capacity to facilitate increased accuracy and appropriateness to
355 individualised drug dosing. It could potentially reduce patient harm from drug dosing
356 errors and could be useful for both clinical practice and research.

357

358 **REFERENCES**

- 359 [1] Friesen JHP. Normalised lean weight and drug doses for obese patients.
360 Anaesthesia. 2018;73(11):1444. 10.1111/anae.14463
- 361 [2] ECRI Institute. Medication safety- inaccurate patient weight can cause dosing
362 errors. PSO Navigator. 2014;6(1):1-11.
- 363 [3] Ingrande J, Lemmens HJ. Dose adjustment of anaesthetics in the morbidly
364 obese. Br J Anaesth. 2010;105 Suppl 1:i16-23. 10.1093/bja/aeq312
- 365 [4] Erstad BL, Barletta JF. Drug dosing in the critically ill obese patient-a focus on
366 sedation, analgesia, and delirium. Crit Care. 2020;24(1):315. 10.1186/s13054-
367 020-03040-z
- 368 [5] Friesen JHP. Practical Estimation of Ideal Body Weight and Normalized Lean
369 Weight. Obes Surg. 2020;30(6):2437-2438. 10.1007/s11695-019-04380-8
- 370 [6] Freitag E, Edgecombe G, Baldwin I, Cottier B, Heland M. Determination of body
371 weight and height measurement for critically ill patients admitted to the intensive
372 care unit: A quality improvement project. Aust Crit Care. 2010;23(4):197-207.
373 10.1016/j.aucc.2010.04.003
- 374 [7] Gerl H, Miko A, Nelson M, Godaire L. Are in-bed electronic weights recorded in
375 the medical record accurate? Medsurg Nurs. 2016;25(3):177-201.
- 376 [8] Organisation WH. Overweight and obesity [Accessed 21 July 2018]. Available
377 from:
378 [http://www.who.int/gho/ncd/risk_factors/overweight_obesity/overweight_adolesce](http://www.who.int/gho/ncd/risk_factors/overweight_obesity/overweight_adolescents/en/)
379 [nts/en/](http://www.who.int/gho/ncd/risk_factors/overweight_obesity/overweight_adolescents/en/)

- 380 [9] Orlando J, LaBond VA. Step right up! Healthcare provider weight estimation vs. a
381 professional weight guesser. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2019;37(2):356-357.
382 10.1016/j.ajem.2018.06.014
- 383 [10] Luten R, Wears RL, Broselow J, Croskerry P, Joseph MM, Frush K. Managing
384 the unique size-related issues of pediatric resuscitation: reducing cognitive load
385 with resuscitation aids. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2002;9(8):840-7. 10.1197/aemj.9.8.840
- 386 [11] Cattermole GN, Wells M. Comparison of adult weight estimation methods for use
387 during emergency medical care. *J Am Coll Emerg Physicians Open.*
388 2021;2(4):e12515. 10.1002/emp2.12515
- 389 [12] Akinola O, Wells M, Parris P, Goldstein LN. Are adults just big kids? Can the
390 newer paediatric weight estimation systems be used in adults? *S Afr Med J.*
391 2021;111(2):166-170. 10.7196/SAMJ.2021.v111i2.15061
- 392 [13] Cattermole GN, Manirafasha A. Accuracy of weight estimation methods in adults,
393 adolescents and children: a prospective study. *Emerg Med J.* 2020.
394 10.1136/emered-2020-209581
- 395 [14] Wells M, Goldstein LN, Bentley A. A validation study of the PAWPER XL tape:
396 accurate estimation of both total and ideal body weight in children up to 16 years
397 of age. *Trauma Emerg Care.* 2017;2(4):1-8. 10.15761/TEC.1000141
- 398 [15] Wells M, Goldstein LN. Optimising emergency weight estimation in underweight
399 and obese children: the accuracy of estimations of total body weight and ideal
400 body weight. *Eur J Emerg Med.* 2019;26(4):301-307.
401 10.1097/MEJ.0000000000000561

- 402 [16] Bouillon T, Shafer SL. Does size matter? *Anesthesiology*. 1998;89(3):557-60.
403 10.1097/00000542-199809000-00002
- 404 [17] Wells M, Goldstein LN, Bentley A. Development and validation of a method to
405 estimate bodyweight in critically ill children using length and mid-arm
406 circumference measurements - the PAWPER XL-MAC system. *S Afr Med J*.
407 2017;107(11):1015-1021. 10.7196/SAMJ.2017.v107i11.12505
- 408 [18] Janmahasatian S, Duffull SB, Ash S, Ward LC, Byrne NM, Green B.
409 Quantification of lean bodyweight. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2005;44(10):1051-65.
410 10.2165/00003088-200544100-00004
- 411 [19] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). National Center for Health
412 Statistics (NCHS). Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human
413 Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1999-2016.: National
414 Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data; 2016. Available from:
415 http://wwwn.cdc.gov/Nchs/Nhanes/Search/nhanes_continuous.aspx
- 416 [20] Peterson CM, Thomas DM, Blackburn GL, Heymsfield SB. Universal equation for
417 estimating ideal body weight and body weight at any BMI. *Am J Clin Nutr*.
418 2016;103(5):1197-203. 10.3945/ajcn.115.121178
- 419 [21] Stewart D. Accuracy of the Broselow tape for estimating paediatric weight in two
420 Australian Emergency Departments: University of Sydney; 2009
- 421 [22] Wells M, Goldstein LN, Bentley A. The accuracy of emergency weight estimation
422 systems in children - a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Emerg Med*.
423 2017;10(29):1-43. 10.1186/s12245-017-0156-5

- 424 [23] Duren D, Sherwood R, Czerwinski S, Lee M, Choh A, Siervogel R, et al. Body
425 composition methods: comparisons and Interpretation. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.*
426 2008;2(6):1139-1146.
- 427 [24] MacDonald JJ, Moore J, Davey V, Pickering S, Dunne T. The weight debate. *J*
428 *Intensive Care Soc.* 2015;16(3):234-238. 10.1177/1751143714565059
- 429 [25] Boer P. Estimated lean body mass as an index for normalization of body fluid
430 volumes in humans. *Am J Physiol.* 1984;247(4):F632-636.
- 431 [26] Hume R. Prediction of lean body mass from height and weight. *J Clin Pathol.*
432 1966;19(4):389-391. 10.1136/jcp.19.4.389
- 433 [27] James W. Research on obesity. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office; 1976.
- 434 [28] Caruso D, De Santis D, Rivosecchi F, Zerunian M, Panvini N, Montesano M, et
435 al. Lean body weight-tailored iodinated contrast injection in obese patient: Boer
436 versus James formula. *Biomed Res Int.* 2018;2018:8521893.
437 10.1155/2018/8521893
- 438 [29] Yu S, Visvanathan T, Field J, Ward L, Chapman I, Adams R, et al. Lean body
439 mass: the development and validation of prediction equations in healthy adults.
440 *BMC Pharmacol Tox.* 2013;14:53-62.
- 441 [30] Weber-Sanchez A, Velazquez OS, Weber-Alvarez P. Validation of the Broca
442 index as the most practical method to calculate the ideal body weight. *Journal of*
443 *Clinical Investigation and Studies.* 2018;1(1). 10.15761/jcis.1000105
- 444 [31] Pai MP, Paloucek FP. The origin of the "ideal" body weight equations. *Ann*
445 *Pharmacother.* 2000;34(9):1066-9.
- 446 [32] Devine B. Gentamicin therapy. *Drug Intell Clin Pharm.* 1974;8:650-655.

- 447 [33] Robinson JD, Lupkiewicz SM, Palenik L, Lopez LM, Ariet M. Determination of
448 ideal body weight for drug dosage calculations. *Am J Hosp Pharm*.
449 1983;40(6):1016-9.
- 450 [34] Miller D, Carlson J, Loyd B, Day B. Determining ideal body weight. *Am J Hosp*
451 *Pharm*. 1983;40:1622.
- 452 [35] Carron M, Guzzinati S, Ori C. Simplified estimation of ideal and lean body
453 weights in morbidly obese patients. *Br J Anaesth*. 2012;109(5):829-30.
454 10.1093/bja/aes368
- 455 [36] Bailey B, Gaunt M, Grissinger M. Update on medication errors associated with
456 incorrect patient weights. *Pa Patient Saf Advis*. 2016;13(2):50-57.
- 457 [37] Wells M, Goldstein LN. Human factor errors in the use of the PAWPER Tape
458 systems: an analysis of inter-rater reliability. *Cureus*. 2021;13(1):e12468.
459 10.7759/cureus.12468
- 460 [38] Wells M, Goldstein LN, Bentley A. The accuracy of paediatric weight estimation
461 during simulated emergencies: the effects of patient position, patient cooperation
462 and human errors. *Afr J Emerg Med*. 2018;8(2):43-50.
463 10.1016/j.afjem.2017.12.003
- 464 [39] Wells M, Goldstein LN. Drug dosing errors in simulated paediatric emergencies –
465 comprehensive dosing guides outperform length-based tapes with precalculated
466 drug doses. *Afr J Emerg Med*. 2020;10(2):74-80. 10.1016/j.afjem.2020.01.005

467 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

468 **Supplementary Figure 1** How to use the PAWPER XL-MAC tape. The method of using
469 the tape is the same for children and adults. Panel 1 – the tape is stretched from head

470 to heel using a one-person or, more ideally, a two-person technique. Panel 2 – the
471 segment at which the patient’s heel crosses the line is noted. Panel 3 – mid-arm
472 circumference is measured using the scale provided on the tape itself. Panel 4 – this
473 measurement can be applied in the length segment determined in Step 2. The weight
474 can then be read directly off the tape. This tape only shows total body weight, but the
475 adult version of the tape will have total body weight, ideal body weight and lean body
476 weight data.

477

478 **Figure 1** The process used in the development, calibration, and validation of the new
479 PAWPER XL-MAC method for estimating ideal body weight and lean body weight in
480 adults. Although lean body weight (LBW) and fat-free mass (FFM) are often used
481 interchangeably, there are subtle differences. These differences are not important for
482 dose calculations. In this paper LBW is used when referring to a predicted weight, while
483 FFM is used when referring to a DXA-measured weight.

484

Table 1 Final model for the male (upper panel) and female (lower panel) PAWPER XL-MAC adult tape. HS = habitus score, LBW = lean body weight, MAC = mid-arm circumference.

MALES Length (cm)	HS1		HS2		HS3		HS4		HS5		HS6		HS7		HS8		HS9	
	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)																
≤153.0	32	≤232	34	233 to 258	43	259 to 292	44	293 to 330	50	331 to 347	51	348 to 354	53	355 to 364	55	365 to 384	68	≥385
153.1 to 158.0	34	≤236	37	237 to 257	42	258 to 292	49	293 to 343	55	344 to 366	59	367 to 396	60	397 to 410	61	411 to 420	63	≥421
158.1 to 162.0	37	≤228	41	229 to 269	46	270 to 297	49	298 to 327	55	328 to 370	61	371 to 392	67	393 to 417	68	418 to 429	70	≥430
162.1 to 165.0	37	≤234	42	235 to 268	47	269 to 300	53	301 to 344	59	345 to 375	61	376 to 390	68	391 to 433	71	434 to 470	93	≥471
165.1 to 168.0	40	≤246	45	247 to 276	50	277 to 307	55	308 to 352	62	353 to 379	66	380 to 392	67	393 to 419	72	420 to 466	80	≥467
168.1 to 171.0	41	≤236	46	237 to 277	51	278 to 304	56	305 to 347	61	348 to 379	67	380 to 405	74	406 to 434	78	435 to 480	95	≥481
171.1 to 174.0	43	≤243	48	244 to 280	53	281 to 312	58	313 to 345	63	346 to 382	70	383 to 416	80	417 to 446	84	447 to 481	93	≥482
174.1 to 177.0	45	≤248	50	249 to 281	55	282 to 315	60	316 to 355	67	356 to 382	72	383 to 411	77	412 to 437	82	438 to 464	91	≥465
177.1 to 180.0	47	≤255	52	256 to 286	58	287 to 324	64	325 to 360	70	361 to 400	77	401 to 419	82	420 to 478	90	479 to 497	94	≥498
180.1 to 183.0	50	≤256	54	257 to 285	59	286 to 324	65	325 to 364	73	365 to 392	78	393 to 431	88	432 to 477	97	478 to 525	109	≥526
183.1 to 186.0	49	≤251	54	252 to 282	60	283 to 324	67	325 to 362	74	363 to 411	84	412 to 438	91	439 to 461	96	462 to 489	108	≥490
186.1 to 189.0	52	≤263	59	264 to 294	65	295 to 333	71	334 to 369	76	370 to 409	86	410 to 442	93	443 to 469	101	470 to 502	130	≥503
189.1 to 192.0	56	≤267	65	268 to 288	65	289 to 330	73	331 to 366	79	367 to 416	91	417 to 434	95	435 to 456	100	457 to 485	104	≥486
≥192.1	55	≤259	61	260 to 293	70	294 to 338	78	339 to 382	85	383 to 416	90	417 to 431	94	432 to 447	105	448 to 489	123	≥490


FEMALES	HS1		HS2		HS3		HS4		HS5		HS6		HS7		HS8		HS9	
	Length (cm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)	MAC range (mm)	LBW (kg)
≤144.0	24	≤196	26	197 to 238	29	239 to 272	33	273 to 301	35	302 to 334	37	335 to 370	43	371 to 394	44	395 to 472	46	≥473
144.1 to 147.0	24	≤217	27	218 to 244	30	245 to 270	33	271 to 305	37	306 to 342	40	343 to 375	45	376 to 394	47	395 to 436	50	≥437
147.1 to 150.0	28	≤222	30	223 to 244	33	245 to 284	37	285 to 324	40	325 to 360	44	361 to 384	46	385 to 401	50	402 to 442	56	≥443
150.1 to 153.0	30	≤215	32	216 to 255	34	256 to 287	37	288 to 312	40	313 to 349	45	350 to 395	48	396 to 419	55	420 to 472	58	≥473
153.1 to 156.0	30	≤223	33	224 to 253	35	254 to 291	38	292 to 321	42	322 to 345	45	346 to 405	50	406 to 427	57	428 to 473	63	≥474
156.1 to 159.0	31	≤219	34	220 to 260	37	261 to 297	41	298 to 330	44	331 to 366	49	367 to 411	54	412 to 433	58	434 to 506	72	≥507
159.1 to 162.0	33	≤225	36	226 to 258	39	259 to 294	42	295 to 334	47	335 to 380	53	381 to 418	59	419 to 439	60	440 to 479	68	≥480
162.1 to 165.0	34	≤226	37	227 to 262	40	263 to 294	44	295 to 334	49	335 to 380	54	381 to 418	59	419 to 450	63	451 to 483	70	≥484
165.1 to 168.0	34	≤229	39	230 to 260	42	261 to 296	45	297 to 335	51	336 to 377	56	378 to 415	63	416 to 463	66	464 to 509	78	≥510
168.1 to 171.0	39	≤229	41	230 to 270	44	271 to 296	47	297 to 339	52	340 to 382	58	383 to 421	61	422 to 457	68	458 to 511	82	≥512
171.1 to 174.0	39	≤237	43	238 to 269	45	270 to 302	49	303 to 337	54	338 to 374	60	375 to 425	64	426 to 461	72	462 to 497	80	≥498
174.1 to 177.0	39	≤235	44	236 to 271	47	272 to 303	50	304 to 349	55	350 to 379	62	380 to 409	67	410 to 462	74	463 to 479	78	≥480
177.1 to 180.0	43	≤236	46	237 to 270	49	271 to 322	54	323 to 349	57	350 to 368	60	369 to 418	68	419 to 450	73	451 to 480	78	≥481
≥180.1	47	≤256	48	257 to 277	49	278 to 312	55	313 to 344	63	345 to 378	69	379 to 406	69	407 to 434	77	435 to 479	85	≥480

Table 2 Demographic characteristics of the calibration (developmental) and validation datasets. UQ = upper quartile, LQ = lower quartile, BMI = body mass index. The NHANES datasets are not fully representative of the US population, as some subgroups of age and race or ethnicity are oversampled. This dataset therefore contains a higher proportion of Non-Hispanic Black participants, Hispanic participants and Asian participants than the general population. However, the overall age distribution and BMI distribution are very similar to that of the general US population.

	CALIBRATION DATASET			VALIDATION DATASET		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
N (%)	33215	16857	16358	5926	2886	3040
Age (years)						
Median (UQ, LQ)	38 (23, 53)	37 (22, 53)	40 (24, 53)	36 (24, 48)	35 (24, 47)	36 (25, 48)
<20 years (%)	6043 (18.2)	3298 (19.6)	2745 (16.8)	924 (15.6)	465 (16.1)	459 (15.1)
20 to 29.9 years (%)	5615 (16.9)	2926 (17.4)	2689 (16.4)	1252 (21.1)	630 (21.8)	622 (20.5)
30 to 39.9 years (%)	5507 (16.6)	2797 (16.6)	2710 (16.6)	1234 (20.8)	609 (21.1)	625 (20.6)
40 to 49.9 years (%)	5826 (17.5)	2814 (16.7)	3012 (18.4)	1241 (20.9)	571 (19.8)	670 (22.0)
50 to 59.9 years (%)	5038 (15.2)	2463 (14.6)	2575 (15.7)	1275 (21.5)	611 (21.2)	664 (21.8)
60 to 69.9 years (%)	2714 (8.2)	1324 (7.9)	1390 (8.5)	0	0	0
70 to 79.9 years (%)	1496 (4.5)	787 (4.7)	709 (4.3)	0	0	0
≥80 years (%)	976 (2.9)	448 (2.7)	528 (3.2)	0	0	0
BMI (kgm⁻²)						
Median (UQ, LQ)	26.9 (23.2, 31.5)	26.8 (23.4, 30.5)	27.1 (23.3, 33.6)	27.5 (23.4, 32.5)	27.3 (23.8, 31.5)	27.8 (23.1, 33.3)
<18.5 kg/m² (%)	843 (2.5)	381 (2.3)	462 (2.8)	156 (2.6)	68 (2.4)	88 (2.9)
18.5 to 24.9 kg/m² (%)	11369 (34.2)	5722 (33.9)	5647 (34.5)	1882 (31.8)	897 (31.1)	985 (32.4)
25 to 29.9 kg/m² (%)	10451 (31.5)	6053 (35.9)	4398 (26.9)	1750 (29.5)	964 (33.4)	786 (25.9)
30 to 34.9 kg/m² (%)	6008 (18.1)	2998 (17.8)	3010 (18.4)	1147 (19.4)	565 (19.6)	582 (19.1)
35 to 39.9 kg/m² (%)	2685 (8.1)	1080 (6.4)	1605 (9.8)	573 (9.7)	240 (8.3)	333 (11.0)
40 to 44.9 kg/m² (%)	1158 (3.5)	411 (2.4)	747 (4.6)	274 (4.6)	102 (3.5)	172 (5.7)
45 to 49.9 kg/m² (%)	443 (1.3)	131 (0.8)	312 (1.9)	97 (1.6)	32 (1.1)	65 (2.1)
≥50 kg/m² (%)	258 (0.8)	81 (0.5)	177 (1.1)	47 (0.8)	18 (0.6)	29 (1.0)
Ethnicity						
Mexican American (%)	2049 (15.7)	1008 (15.6)	1041 (15.8)	1074 (18.1)	508 (17.6)	566 (18.6)
Other Hispanic (%)	1343 (10.3)	606 (9.4)	737 (11.2)	674 (11.4)	305 (10.6)	369 (12.1)
Non-Hispanic White (%)	4321 (33.1)	2161 (33.5)	2160 (32.8)	1769 (29.9)	827 (28.7)	942 (31.0)
Non-Hispanic Black (%)	2891 (22.2)	1399 (21.7)	1492 (22.6)	1193 (20.1)	600 (20.8)	593 (19.5)
Non-Hispanic Asian (%)	1866 (14.3)	978 (15.1)	888 (13.5)	916 (15.5)	485 (16.8)	431 (14.2)
Other (%)	578 (4.4)	306 (4.7)	272 (4.1)	300 (5.1)	161 (5.6)	139 (4.6)
Weight (kg)						
Median (UQ, LQ)	76.2 (64.2, 90.4)	81.1 (70.2, 94.2)	70.1 (59.3, 84.8)	76.7 (64.2, 91.4)	81.4 (70.6, 95.6)	70.9 (59.2, 86.5)
Height (cm)						
Median (UQ, LQ)	167.6 (160.6, 175)	174.5 (169.3, 179.6)	161.1 (156.3, 165.9)	166.7 (159.7, 173.9)	173.7 (168.6, 178.4)	160.6 (155.7, 165.3)

Table 3 Results of the weight estimation performance analyses for the calibration (developmental) and validation datasets overall and by subgroups of age, weight status and ethnicity. MPE = mean percentage error, P10 = percentage of weight estimations within 10% of measured fat-free mass, P20 = percentage of weight estimations within 20% of measured fat-free mass.

LBW	CALIBRATION DATASET (N=33155)									VALIDATION DATASET (N=5926)								
	All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female		
	MPE (%)	P10 (%)	P20 (%)	MPE (%)	P10 (%)	P20 (%)	MPE (%)	P10 (%)	P20 (%)	MPE (%)	P10 (%)	P20 (%)	MPE (%)	P10 (%)	P20 (%)	MPE (%)	P10 (%)	P20 (%)
ALL	-0.6	80.0	98.4	-0.4	85.0	99.4	-0.7	74.9	97.3	-1.7	78.3	98.3	-0.8	83.9	99.1	-2.5	73.0	97.5
AGE																		
<20 years	-1.1	81.9	98.9	-0.8	85.8	99.5	-1.5	77.1	98.3	-0.9	82.3	98.7	-0.2	88.0	98.7	-1.5	76.5	98.7
20 to 29.9 years	-0.8	80.6	98.5	0.1	85.4	99.1	-1.7	75.3	97.7	-1.3	79.6	98.2	0.0	85.9	98.7	-2.6	73.3	97.7
30 to 39.9 years	-1.3	79.5	98.0	-0.6	84.6	98.8	-1.9	74.4	97.2	-2.3	77.1	98.2	-1.2	83.6	99.3	-3.4	70.7	97.1
40 to 49.9 years	-1.3	79.4	98.4	-0.9	84.8	99.2	-1.7	74.3	97.6	-2.3	76.8	98.6	-1.3	80.7	99.3	-3.1	73.4	98.1
50 to 59.9 years	-0.6	79.3	97.7	-1.0	84.5	98.6	-0.2	74.3	96.9	-1.7	77.1	97.8	-1.5	82.5	99.3	-1.8	72.1	96.4
60 to 69.9 years	1.4	79.3	98.0	-0.1	83.9	99.2	2.8	74.9	96.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
70 to 79.9 years	2.4	77.7	96.7	1.5	83.1	98.6	3.5	71.7	94.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
≥80 years	2.1	76.9	96.8	2.0	79.2	97.8	2.1	75.0	96.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BMI																		
<18.5 kg/m ² (%)	5.6	73.9	96.9	5.4	79.0	97.9	5.7	69.7	96.1	6.6	69.2	94.9	6.4	76.5	95.6	6.9	63.6	94.3
18.5 to 24.9 kg/m ² (%)	1.3	81.6	98.1	1.1	85.5	99.0	1.5	77.6	97.2	1.0	81.7	98.3	1.4	85.8	99.0	0.7	77.9	97.7
25 to 29.9 kg/m ² (%)	-0.4	83.9	98.8	-0.4	87.7	99.3	-0.4	78.7	98.2	-1.2	84.7	99.1	-0.5	88.2	99.3	-2.0	80.5	99.0
30 to 34.9 kg/m ² (%)	-2.4	78.4	98.6	-2.5	82.7	99.2	-2.3	74.2	98.0	-4.1	75.4	99.0	-3.3	80.7	99.5	-4.8	70.3	98.5
35 to 39.9 kg/m ² (%)	-3.9	71.9	97.9	-3.1	79.0	98.6	-4.4	67.2	97.4	-6.0	68.6	97.6	-4.5	78.3	99.2	-7.0	61.6	96.4
40 to 44.9 kg/m ² (%)	-4.1	68.1	96.8	-2.7	75.2	98.5	-4.9	64.3	95.9	-6.0	65.0	97.8	-3.7	74.5	99.0	-7.4	59.3	97.1
45 to 49.9 kg/m ² (%)	-6.6	65.7	91.6	-6.4	70.2	96.2	-6.7	63.8	89.7	-9.3	59.8	92.8	-8.0	62.5	100	-10.0	58.5	89.2
≥50 kg/m ² (%)	-7.7	56.6	90.7	-6.4	61.7	92.6	-8.4	54.2	89.8	-9.0	46.8	85.1	-3.3	66.7	94.4	-12.5	34.5	79.3
ETHNICITY																		
Mexican American	-2.5	77.5	98	-1.8	82.1	98.5	-3.2	72.9	97.6	-2.7	78.1	98.9	-1.8	83.9	99.2	-3.4	73	98.6
Other Hispanic	-1.9	79.6	98.4	-1.2	84.2	98.8	-2.5	75.8	98.1	-2.3	78.9	98.7	-1.7	82.6	99.7	-2.9	75.9	97.8
Non-Hispanic White	-0.9	80.2	97.6	-0.5	85.1	98.2	-1.4	75.4	97	-1.6	80.3	98.1	-0.9	86.5	99.2	-2.1	74.8	97.2
Non-Hispanic Black	-3.3	75	97.1	-2.2	82.9	98.1	-4.4	67.6	96.2	-3.6	74.4	97.5	-2.5	84.2	99.3	-4.7	64.6	95.6
Non-Hispanic Asian	2.1	79.8	98.3	2.7	82	98.6	1.5	77.4	98	2.1	79	98.6	2.9	80	98.4	1.1	78	98.8
Other	-1.7	77.2	97.6	-1	80.4	98.4	-2.6	73.5	96.7	-1.9	80.3	98.7	-0.8	85.7	98.8	-3.1	74.1	98.6



Step 1: Development of the model


The length-segments and mid-arm circumference (MAC) cutpoints devised in the original study to estimate total body weight (TBW) for adults were used in this study. In the same way in which the habitus score (HS) categories were designed to predict BMI-for-age centiles in children, this model was intended to predict the BMI categories used by the CDC to define weight status (see details to the right). Initial LBW estimates for each HS category in each length-segment were generated using the Janmahasatian formula. For the formula, the input for weight was the TBW estimate from the tape and the input for length was the midpoint of each length-segment.

HS1	BMI <18
HS2	BMI 18 to 20.9
HS3	BMI 21 to 24.9
HS4	BMI 25 to 29.9
HS5	BMI 30 to 34.9
HS6	BMI 35 to 39.9
HS7	BMI 40 to 44.9
HS8	BMI 45 to 49.9
HS9	BMI ≥50




Step 2: Initial testing of the model

The preliminary model was then tested on the NHANES 2011-2012 and the 2013-2014 survey datasets. The datasets were downloaded and pooled. Data from children under the age of 16 was excluded as was incomplete data. The preliminary cutpoint data for each length-segment was coded into an electronic worksheet and the performance of the model was evaluated for each length-segment. The predicted LBWs were adjusted for each tape segment until a satisfactory degree of weight estimation accuracy was achieved when compared with DXA-measured fat-free mass (FFM).



Step 3: Secondary testing and calibration of the model

The secondary model was then tested on the pooled 1999-2000, 2001-2002, 2003-2004, 2005-2006, 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012 and 2013-2014 NHANES survey datasets. As in Step 2, the predicted LBWs were adjusted in each tape length-segment until a satisfactory degree of weight estimation accuracy was achieved (primary endpoint: P20>95%, secondary endpoint: P10>70%).



Step 4: Validation of final model

The final model was then tested in two NHANES survey datasets that had not been used in the model design and development (the 2015-2016 and 2017-2018 surveys). Subgroup analyses by sex, age and race were included.



Step 5: Future creation of the actual tape

The validated data will be used to provide the parameters to compose the tape. The tape (the 76 kg length segment is shown below) will be 2000mm long with 14 length-segments. The tape will be a single-use, double-sided paper tape with data for males on one side and females on the other. The beginning of the tape will include a printed scale with which to measure MAC. The MAC cutpoint ranges (in mm) which define the nine habitus scores and the corresponding predicted weights (in kg) can be seen below.



Step 6: How the tape will be used

- Step 1** Measure the patient's recumbent length with the tape.
- Step 2** Measure MAC on the non-dominant arm, and read habitus score and estimated total, ideal and lean body weight directly off the tape at the measured length (as shown below: the numbers in yellow blocks are the predicted LBW, the number indicated by the green arrow is the predicted IBW).

MALES MEN HOMBRES		
1	≤255	58
2	256 to 286	65
3	287 to 324	76
4	325 to 360	88
5	361 to 400	101
6	401 to 429	117
7	430 to 470	130
8	471 to 497	152
9	≥498	160

Figure legends

Fig 1 How to use the PAWPER XL-MAC tape. The method of using the tape is the same for children and adults. Panel 1 – the tape is stretched from head to heel using a one-person or, more ideally, a two-person technique. Panel 2 – the segment at which the patient's heel crosses the line is noted. Panel 3 – mid-arm circumference is measured using the scale provided on the tape itself. Panel 4 – this measurement can be applied in the length segment determined in Step 2. The weight can then be read directly off the tape. This tape only shows total body weight, but the adult version of the tape will have total body weight, ideal body weight and lean body weight data.

Fig 2 The process used in the development, calibration, and validation of the new PAWPER XL-MAC method for estimating ideal body weight and lean body weight in adults. Although lean body weight (LBW) and fat-free mass (FFM) are often used interchangeably, there are subtle differences. These differences are not important for dose calculations. In this paper LBW is used when referring to a predicted weight, while FFM is used when referring to a DXA-measured weight.