

1 **Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis in the nutritional assessment**
2 **and prediction of complications in patients undergoing surgery**
3 **for head and neck malignancies, A pilot observational study**
4

5 Lai Yi Ting^{1¶}, Peh Hui Yee^{2¶}, Hanis Binte Abdul Kadir^{3&}, Lee Chun Fan^{4&}, N.
6 Gopalakrishna Iyer^{5-7¶}, Wong Ting Hway^{8¶}, Gerald Tay Ci An^{5¶*}

7 ¹Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, Singapore

8 ²Dietetics, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

9 ³Health Services Research unit, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

10 ⁴Centre for Quantitative Medicine, Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

11 ⁵Department of Head and Neck Surgery, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore

12 ⁶Department of Head and Neck Surgery, National Cancer Centre, Singapore

13 ⁷Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

14 ⁸Health Services and Systems Research, Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

15
16 ***Corresponding Author:**

17 Dr Gerald Tay Ci An

18 Senior Consultant

19 Department of Head and Neck Surgery, Singapore General Hospital

20 Tel: (65) 6222 3322

21 Fax: (65) 6321 4377

22 Email: gerald.tay.c.a@singhealth.com.sg (GC)

23
24 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

25 [&]These authors also contributed equally to this work.

26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background**

29 Patients with head and neck malignancies are especially vulnerable to developing
30 malnutrition, which has a significant impact on morbidity and mortality. Identification of high
31 risk patients is hence critical for optimising outcomes.

32 **Objective**

33 It is hypothesised that bioimpedance analysis (BIA) can provide information on
34 nutritional status and risk of perioperative complications in a timely and accurate manner. The
35 study objectives are; to correlate BIA parameters with Subjective Global Assessment (SGA)
36 scores, and determine the association of BIA parameters with common perioperative
37 complications in patients undergoing head and neck surgery.

38 **Method**

39 This is a cohort study of 61 patients who were admitted for elective head and neck
40 surgery from 2018-2019. Prior to surgery, patients were evaluated in a preoperative
41 multidisciplinary allied health professional clinic for formal SGA scoring. Bioelectrical
42 impedance analysis was performed using the Bodystat Quadscan 4000. One-way ANOVA and
43 Fisher's exact test were performed for associations between SGA and BIA parameters and
44 receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were plotted for determination of optimal cut-
45 off values of phase angle and Wellness marker in detecting malnutrition and perioperative
46 pneumonia using Youden's Index (YI).

47 **Results**

48 45 males and 16 females with mean \pm SD age of 62 ± 1.6 years old were included in
49 the study. Significant differences were observed in Wellness Marker ($p=0.004$) and phase angle

50 (p=0.006) amongst patients in the 3 SGA categories. BIA parameters (p=0.011 and p=0.032
51 for Wellness Marker and phase angle respectively) were associated with perioperative
52 pneumonia. No significant differences were observed for other perioperative complications
53 namely surgical site infections, salivary leak/fistula, and flap complications.

54 **Conclusion**

55 Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis is associated with Subjective Global Assessment and
56 shows promise as a preoperative tool, in conjunction with SGA, to detect malnutrition in patients
57 undergoing surgery for head and neck malignancies and highlight patients at risk of developing
58 perioperative pneumonia.

59 **Introduction**

60 Despite major advancements in healthcare, malnutrition remains ubiquitous in patients
61 worldwide. Various studies have estimated worrying prevalence rates ranging from 20-50%.(1-
62 3) In Singapore, up to one-third of admitted patients suffer from malnutrition.(4) The impact
63 of malnutrition cannot be underplayed. Prolonged stays, increased readmission rates, treatment
64 intolerance and higher in-patient and long-term mortality rates are known consequences in such
65 patients globally.(5-7) Malnourished surgical patients have additional intraoperative and post-
66 operative risks including: infections, delayed wound healing, impaired cardiorespiratory
67 functions, and an increased risk of developing severe perioperative complications.(8) The
68 culmination of these issues generate significant healthcare costs and reduce quality of life.(3)

69 Patients undergoing surgery for head and neck malignancies are notably vulnerable to
70 developing malnutrition and up to 80% of patients with head and neck cancer are
71 malnourished.(8) Common symptoms such as loss of appetite, xerostomia, taste alterations and
72 dysphagia impair deglutition and mastication processes, leading to poor feeding and
73 malnutrition.(9) Furthermore, inflammation and increased catabolism secondary to malignancy
74 can also severely deplete muscle mass.(10)

75 Timely and accurate identification of patients at high risk for malnutrition is critical as
76 it allows for early intervention for enhanced outcomes.(3) Therefore, there is a compelling need
77 for robust, reliable and quick screening instruments to detect malnutrition. The Subjective
78 Global Assessment (SGA), which relies on the nutritional history and clinical examination for
79 a subjective impression of nutrition status has been a widely endorsed method of nutritional
80 screening(11-13) and is considered by many to be the gold-standard. However, this method is
81 subjective, time consuming and requires expertise.(14)

82 In recent years, bioimpedance analysis (BIA) has been lauded as a portable, safe,
83 reproducible, inexpensive and non-invasive way of assessing body composition and nutritional
84 status.(15) Specifically, BIA utilizes predictive equations via measurements of resistance (R)
85 and reactance (Xc) of body tissues along with anthropometric data to generate the phase
86 angle(16), a useful parameter reflective of body cell mass and cell membrane functions.(17)
87 The Wellness marker, on the other hand, is a newly introduced parameter that calculates
88 impedance ratio at various levels of frequency to reflect the generalized state of health of body
89 cells without the need for predictive equations.

90 The favorable role of BIA in detection of malnutrition and prognosis have been
91 demonstrated in various surgical patient populations such as in cardiac surgery(18),
92 gastrointestinal surgery(19) and surgical cancer patients(20) internationally, however, no data
93 exists on the use of bioimpedance for detecting malnutrition in patients undergoing surgery
94 for head and neck malignancies in Singapore. Hence, the current study aims to determine the
95 correlation between SGA scores and BIA parameters, as well as the correlation of BIA
96 parameters with common perioperative complications in patients undergoing head and neck
97 surgery.

98 **Materials and Methods**

99 A prospective study was carried out on 61 patients out of a total of 97 patients scheduled
100 for major head and neck oncological surgery in a tertiary hospital in Singapore from 2018 to
101 2019. These patients consented to the use of their personal data for research purpose and the
102 study was approved by the institution's ethics committee CIRB No. 2018/2234. Due to patient
103 privacy policies of the institution, the authors are unable to give characteristics of those who
104 refused to be included in the study.

105 Prior to surgery, patients were evaluated in a preoperative multidisciplinary allied
106 health professional clinic. Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) scores were evaluated by
107 certified dietitians on 61 patients prior to surgery and patients were identified as either well
108 nourished, moderately malnourished or severely malnourished. Bioelectrical impedance
109 analysis measuring phase angles and Wellness marker values was performed using the
110 Bodystat Quadscan 4000 in 53 patients prior to surgery.

111 All patients were closely monitored and incidences of perioperative complications such
112 as pneumonia, surgical site infections, salivary leak and/or fistula formation and flap
113 complications were recorded until time of discharge.

114 Statistical analysis was performed with R (version 4.0.2). One-way ANOVA and
115 Fisher's exact test were used to test the association between the BIA parameters, SGA scores
116 and development of perioperative complications such as pneumonia and surgical site infections.
117 Patients who underwent flap surgeries and/or surgeries that had the potential for salivary leaks
118 were analysed for the development of flap complications and salivary leak respectively.
119 Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were plotted to analyse the area under the
120 curves (AUC). Optimal cut-off values of Wellness marker and phase angle for predicting
121 malnutrition and perioperative pneumonia were obtained according to the Youden Index (YI).

122 **Results**

123 **Patient characteristics**

124 45 males and 16 females aged ranging from 25 to 88 years old were included in the
125 study. The mean \pm SD age was 62 ± 1.6 years old and the mean \pm SD BMI was 23.3 ± 4.0 .

126 Most patients (90.2%) were diagnosed with squamous cell carcinoma in the head and
127 neck region. The remaining patients were diagnosed with adenoid cystic carcinoma, carcinoma
128 ex pleomorphic adenoma, osteosarcoma, and undifferentiated nasopharyngeal carcinoma
129 respectively.

130

131 **Prevalence of malnutrition**

132 Based on the SGA scoring, 24 (39.3%) patients were found to be well-nourished, 32
133 (52.5%) patients were moderately malnourished, and 3 (4.9%) patients were severely
134 malnourished.

135 Patient characteristics and nutritional status determined by SGA are summarised in

136 **Table I.**

137

138

139 **Table 1. Baseline patient characteristics**

Characteristics	N	Total	Mean ± SD¹
Age	61		62 ± 1.6
Gender	61		
Male		45 (73.8%)	
Female		16 (26.2%)	
BMI	61		23.3 ± 4.0
Length of stay	61		21 ± 19
Diagnosis	61		
Squamous cell carcinoma		55 (90.2%)	
Adenoid cystic carcinoma		2 (3.3%)	
Nasopharyngeal carcinoma		2 (3.3%)	
Carcinoma ex-pleomorphic		1 (0.02%)	
Osteosarcoma		1 (0.02%)	
Neoplasm sites	61		
Oral cavity		38 (62.3%)	
Oropharynx		7 (11.5%)	
Nasal cavity		3 (4.9%)	
Nasopharynx		1 (1.6%)	
Larynx		6 (9.9%)	
Hypopharynx		2 (3.3%)	
Salivary gland		2 (3.3%)	
Thyroid		1 (1.6%)	
Middle ear		1 (1.6%)	
T Staging	61		
T0		1 (1.6%)	
T1		15 (24.6%)	
T2		14 (23.0%)	
T3		13 (21.3%)	
T4		18 (29.5%)	
SGA² group	59		
Well nourished		24 (40.6%)	
Moderately malnourished		32 (53.1%)	
Severely malnourished		3 (6.3%)	
BIA parameters	53		
Phase angle (°)			5.95 ± 1.7
Wellness marker (Hz)			0.80 ± 0.05
Fat mass (% of TBW3)			29.0 ± 8.4
Lean mass (% of TBW)			71.0 ± 8.4
Water mass (% of TBW)			59.5 ± 6.7
Body cell mass (kg)			28.7 ± 6.4

140

141 **BIA parameters**

142 The mean ± SD value of phase angle recorded was 5.96° ± 1.7 while the mean ± SD

143 Wellness marker value was 0.80 ± 0.05. Other parameters recorded from BIA, including

144 individual components of fat, muscle and water masses as a percentage of total body weight
145 are summarised in Table I.

146 The mean \pm SD duration of stay was 21 ± 19 days. In the course of their hospital stay,
147 21 (34.4%) patients developed perioperative complications. Specifically, 6 developed
148 pneumonia, 9 patients developed surgical site infections, 2 patients developed salivary leak or
149 had fistula formation and 7 patients had flap complications. None of the patients suffered acute
150 myocardial infarctions or cerebrovascular accidents and there were no deaths recorded during
151 admission.

152 Among the 3 SGA groups, there were statistically significant differences in phase angle
153 ($p=0.006$) and the Wellness marker ($p=0.004$) measurements, as seen in **Table II**.

154 The optimal phase angle cut-off in predicting for moderate and severe malnutrition was
155 below 4.7° (sensitivity 45.2%, specificity 95.5% YI: 0.406) while the optimal Wellness marker
156 cut-off value in predicting for moderate and severe malnutrition was above 0.817. (sensitivity
157 60.0%, specificity 86.4% YI: 0.464). **Fig I** shows the receiver operating characteristic (ROC)
158 curve of phase angle and Wellness marker for detecting malnutrition respectively. Both phase
159 angle (AUC: 0.749) and Wellness marker (AUC: 0.755) provides fair diagnostic accuracy in
160 identifying patients who are malnourished.

161 Among all perioperative complications recorded, there were statistically significant
162 differences in phase angle ($p=0.032$) and Wellness marker ($p=0.011$) values in patients who
163 developed pneumonia. (**Table III**) No statistical differences in phase angle and Wellness
164 marker was observed for the development of surgical site infections, salivary leak/fistula, and
165 flap complications respectively.

166 The optimal phase angle cut off in predicting for perioperative pneumonia was below
167 5.5° (sensitivity 83.3%, specificity 69.8% YI: 0.531) while the optimal Wellness marker cut
168 off was above 0.829 (sensitivity 100%, specificity 74.4% YI:0.744). **Fig II** shows the receiver

169 operating characteristics (ROC) curve for phase angle and Wellness marker in predicting for
 170 development of perioperative pneumonia. Both phase angle (AUC 0.767) and Wellness marker
 171 (AUC 0.853) displayed good discriminating ability in predicting patients with perioperative
 172 pneumonia.

173 **Fig 1. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve of phase angle and wellness**
 174 **marker for detecting malnutrition.** Both phase angle (AUC: 0.749) and Wellness marker
 175 (AUC: 0.755) provides fair diagnostic accuracy in identifying patients who are malnourished.

176 **Fig 2. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve of phase angle and wellness**
 177 **marker for predicting the development of perioperative pneumonia.** Both phase angle
 178 (AUC 0.767) and Wellness marker (AUC 0.853) displayed good discriminating ability in
 179 predicting patients with perioperative pneumonia.

180 **Table II: Phase angle and Wellness marker differences across SGA groups**

Characteristic	Well- Nourished N = 26 ¹	Moderately malnourished N=32 ¹	Severely Malnourished N=3 ¹	p-value ²
Phase Angle (°)	6.79 (1.53)	5.41 (1.55)	4.97 (1.32)	0.006
Wellness Marker (Hz)	0.78 (0.05)	0.82 (0.05)	0.84 (0.04)	0.004

181 ¹ Mean (SD)
 182 ² One-way ANOVA

183 **Table III: Phase angle and Wellness marker differences in patients who developed**
 184 **perioperative complications**

Perioperative complications	N	Yes ¹	No ¹	p-value ²
<i>Pneumonia</i>	53			
Phase angle		4.77 (1.25)	6.26 (1.61)	0.032
Wellness marker (Hz)		0.85 (0.02)	0.79 (0.05)	0.011
<i>Surgical Site Infections</i>	53			
Phase angle		6.29 (0.91)	6.06 (1.77)	0.70
Wellness marker (Hz)		0.79 (0.03)	0.80 (0.05)	0.80
<i>Salivary Leak/Fistula</i>	34			
Phase angle		5.95 (0.64)	6.40 (1.57)	0.70
Wellness marker (Hz)		0.80 (0.02)	0.79 (0.05)	0.70
<i>Flap Complications</i>	25			
Phase angle		6.10 (1.10)	6.26 (1.86)	0.90
Wellness marker (Hz)		0.81 (0.04)	0.79 (0.05)	0.70

186 ¹ Mean (SD)
 187 ² One-way ANOVA

188 **Discussion**

189 In our study, we found that a sizeable proportion of patients undergoing surgery for
190 head and neck malignancies were malnourished (57.4%). Other studies have similarly reported
191 high incidences of malnutrition in head and neck cancer patients, with prevalence rates ranging
192 from 25% to 80%.(8, 21, 22)

193 Patients suffering from head and neck malignancies are especially susceptible to
194 developing malnutrition because of impaired metabolism from disease processes, poor oral
195 intake due to symptoms such as dysphagia, anorexia, mucositis, xerostomia and taste
196 alterations.(23, 24) Furthermore, many patients suffer from chronic malnutrition associated
197 with alcohol and tobacco use, compounding the present issue.(8)

198 Multiple cohort studies have demonstrated association between SGA scores and BIA
199 parameters in healthy subjects(25), hospital in-patients(15) and surgical patients.(18, 20, 26)
200 Notably, Malecka-Massalska *et al* demonstrated significantly lower phase angles amongst
201 malnourished patients in a cohort of 75 newly diagnosed head and neck cancer patients.(27)
202 Our results support these findings.

203 Bioimpedance analysis can provide valuable information on nutritional status via the
204 determination of phase angles, which is a measure of cell membrane integrity and vitality and
205 hence reliably reflects cellular health.(28) However, reference values of phase angles vary
206 according to sex, age, BMI and disease processes.(29) Therefore, interpretation of phase angles
207 should be population specific, as body composition varies between populations. For instance,
208 higher body fat percentages in Asians compared to Caucasian counterparts of the same BMI
209 presents significant challenges in comparing between studies. In the present study, we
210 established optimal cut-offs specific to head and neck surgical patients in an Asian context. It
211 may also be relevant for use in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, as these

212 patients form the majority (90.2%) in our study population. Further studies will be required to
213 validate and refine the values reported. The Wellness marker is a relatively newer parameter
214 introduced only in more modern BIA systems and differs from phase angle measurements in
215 that no predictive equations are required. Thus, Wellness marker values can be compared
216 across populations as it is not affected by the subject's weight, gender, age nor BMI values. To
217 our knowledge, there are no other studies on malnutrition with Wellness marker measurements.

218 Our study also established that BIA predicts development of perioperative pneumonia.
219 Several other studies have also demonstrated the role of BIA in predicting complications.(19)
220 In our study population, BIA was predictive only for perioperative pneumonia amongst other
221 complications studied, namely salivary leak, wound infections, and flap complications. BIA
222 does not readily predict for the latter complications as they are often multifactorial and are
223 likely more dependent on risk factors such as type of surgery, previous irradiation and other
224 technical factors, which varies greatly between individuals. On the contrary, malnutrition has
225 been strongly associated with pneumonia; protein calorie malnutrition has been found to impair
226 pulmonary cell-mediated immunity processes and clearance of pathogens, resulting in
227 increased incidence, severity and duration of pulmonary infections in malnourished
228 individuals.(30) Besides perioperative complications, studies focused on head and neck cancer
229 patients have also showed correlation of BIA parameters with prolonged hospital stay(31),
230 survival rates(9, 10, 32), and radiotherapy outcomes.(33)

231 The value of BIA has evolved greatly since it was validated for use in assessing human
232 body composition in 1983.(34) Since then, it has been well regarded as an objective, convenient,
233 non-invasive, safe, portable and inexpensive tool for assessment of malnutrition and more.(35,
234 36) BIA may also be particularly useful in determining nutritional status and prognosis in
235 cancer patients, as malignancy alter homeostatic processes and alters body composition.(37)
236 However, BIA measures cannot be extrapolated to other populations and requires individuals

237 to be relatively well hydrated for accurate measurements. (37) Due to limited validation studies
238 in hospitalised patients and variability between BIA devices and body compartments estimated
239 within studies, the prevailing American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN)
240 clinical guidelines have not yet recommended BIA for use in clinical populations. (38)The
241 SGA, on the other hand, is a validated method that is commonly employed in clinical settings.
242 While it has achieved wide acceptance in its use globally(39), SGA lacks sensitivity to detect
243 acute changes in nutritional status. (40, 41)Furthermore, it remains a subjective tool with inter-
244 observer variability which greatly impairs its applicability on a continuum.(12, 42) Unlike BIA,
245 SGA is also time consuming and requires trained professionals for reliable administration.(14)
246 Therefore, we propose the use of BIA as a useful and convenient adjunct with other measures
247 of nutrition in identifying and predicting for malnutrition and perioperative pneumonia.

248 The limitations of our study include a small patient cohort size from a single institution
249 and the lack of long term follow up data. In addition, the type of peri-operative pneumonia and
250 subsequent interventions these patients received have not been discussed within the scope of
251 this paper. Further research may be required to determine cost effectiveness and practicality of
252 BIA for routine use in an institutional setting.

253 **Conclusion**

254 Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis is associated with Subjective Global Assessment,
255 and can be used in assessing preoperative nutritional status for patients undergoing surgery for
256 head and neck malignancies. BIA shows promise as a preoperative tool, in conjunction with
257 SGA to detect malnutrition in patients undergoing head and neck surgery and highlight patients
258 at risk of developing perioperative pneumonia.

259 **References**

- 260 1. Kang MC, Kim JH, Ryu SW, Moon JY, Park JH, Park JK, et al. Prevalence of
261 Malnutrition in Hospitalized Patients: a Multicenter Cross-sectional Study. *J Korean Med Sci.*
262 2018;33(2):e10.
- 263 2. Pirlich M, Schütz T, Norman K, Gastell S, Lübke HJ, Bischoff SC, et al. The German
264 hospital malnutrition study. *Clin Nutr.* 2006;25(4):563-72.
- 265 3. Löser C. Malnutrition in hospital: the clinical and economic implications. *Dtsch Arztebl*
266 *Int.* 2010;107(51-52):911-7.
- 267 4. Lim SL, Ong KC, Chan YH, Loke WC, Ferguson M, Daniels L. Malnutrition and its
268 impact on cost of hospitalization, length of stay, readmission and 3-year mortality. *Clin Nutr.*
269 2012;31(3):345-50.
- 270 5. Barker LA, Gout BS, Crowe TC. Hospital malnutrition: prevalence, identification and
271 impact on patients and the healthcare system. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2011;8(2):514-
272 27.
- 273 6. Middleton MH, Nazarenko G, Nivison-Smith I, Smerdely P. Prevalence of malnutrition
274 and 12-month incidence of mortality in two Sydney teaching hospitals. *Intern Med J.*
275 2001;31(8):455-61.
- 276 7. Agarwal E, Ferguson M, Banks M, Batterham M, Bauer J, Capra S, et al. Malnutrition
277 and poor food intake are associated with prolonged hospital stay, frequent readmissions, and
278 greater in-hospital mortality: results from the Nutrition Care Day Survey 2010. *Clin Nutr.*
279 2013;32(5):737-45.
- 280 8. Müller-Richter U, Betz C, Hartmann S, Brands RC. Nutrition management for head
281 and neck cancer patients improves clinical outcome and survival. *Nutr Res.* 2017;48:1-8.
- 282 9. Büntzel J, Micke O, Kisters K, Büntzel J, Mücke R. Malnutrition and Survival -
283 Bioimpedance Data in Head Neck Cancer Patients. *In Vivo.* 2019;33(3):979-82.
- 284 10. Mantzorou M, Tolia M, Poultsidi A, Pavlidou E, Papadopoulou SK, Papandreou D, et
285 al. Can Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis and BMI be a Prognostic Tool in Head and Neck
286 Cancer Patients? A Review of the Evidence. *Cancers (Basel).* 2020;12(3).
- 287 11. Keith JN. Bedside nutrition assessment past, present, and future: a review of the
288 Subjective Global Assessment. *Nutr Clin Pract.* 2008;23(4):410-6.
- 289 12. Raguso CA, Maisonneuve N, Pichard C. [Subjective Global Assessment (SGA):
290 evaluation and followup of nutritional state]. *Rev Med Suisse Romande.* 2004;124(10):607-
291 10.
- 292 13. Makhija S, Baker J. The Subjective Global Assessment: a review of its use in clinical
293 practice. *Nutr Clin Pract.* 2008;23(4):405-9.
- 294 14. Player EL, Morris P, Thomas T, Chan WY, Vyas R, Dutton J, et al. Bioelectrical
295 impedance analysis (BIA)-derived phase angle (PA) is a practical aid to nutritional assessment
296 in hospital in-patients. *Clinical Nutrition.* 2019;38(4):1700-6.
- 297 15. Cardinal TR, Wazlawik E, Bastos JL, Nakazora LM, Scheunemann L. Standardized
298 phase angle indicates nutritional status in hospitalized preoperative patients. *Nutrition*
299 *Research.* 2010;30(9):594-600.
- 300 16. Barbosa-Silva MC, Barros AJ, Wang J, Heymsfield SB, Pierson RN, Jr. Bioelectrical
301 impedance analysis: population reference values for phase angle by age and sex. *Am J Clin*
302 *Nutr.* 2005;82(1):49-52.
- 303 17. Barbosa-Silva MC, Barros AJ. Bioelectrical impedance analysis in clinical practice: a
304 new perspective on its use beyond body composition equations. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab*
305 *Care.* 2005;8(3):311-7.
- 306 18. Visser M, van Venrooij LM, Wanders DC, de Vos R, Wisselink W, van Leeuwen PA,
307 et al. The bioelectrical impedance phase angle as an indicator of undernutrition and adverse
308 clinical outcome in cardiac surgical patients. *Clin Nutr.* 2012;31(6):981-6.

- 309 19. Barbosa-Silva MCG, Barros AJD. Bioelectric impedance and individual characteristics
310 as prognostic factors for post-operative complications. *Clinical Nutrition*. 2005;24(5):830-8.
- 311 20. Pena N, Mauricio S, Rodrigues A, Carmo A, Coury N, Correia M, et al. Association
312 Between Standardized Phase Angle, Nutrition Status, and Clinical Outcomes in Surgical
313 Cancer Patients. *Nutrition in Clinical Practice*. 2018;34.
- 314 21. Hammerlid E, Wirblad B, Sandin C, Mercke C, Edström S, Kaasa S, et al. Malnutrition
315 and food intake in relation to quality of life in head and neck cancer patients. *Head Neck*.
316 1998;20(6):540-8.
- 317 22. Gorenc M, Kozjek NR, Strojjan P. Malnutrition and cachexia in patients with head and
318 neck cancer treated with (chemo)radiotherapy. *Reports of Practical Oncology & Radiotherapy*.
319 2015;20(4):249-58.
- 320 23. Dechaphunkul T, Martin L, Alberda C, Olson K, Baracos V, Gramlich L. Malnutrition
321 assessment in patients with cancers of the head and neck: A call to action and consensus.
322 *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology*. 2013;88(2):459-76.
- 323 24. Jager-Wittenaar H, Dijkstra PU, Vissink A, van der Laan BFAM, van Oort RP,
324 Roodenburg JLN. Critical weight loss in head and neck cancer—prevalence and risk factors at
325 diagnosis: an explorative study. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2007;15(9):1045-50.
- 326 25. Kyle UG, Soundar EP, Genton L, Pichard C. Can phase angle determined by
327 bioelectrical impedance analysis assess nutritional risk? A comparison between healthy and
328 hospitalized subjects. *Clin Nutr*. 2012;31(6):875-81.
- 329 26. Meireles MS, Wazlawik E, Bastos JL, Garcia MF. Comparison between nutritional risk
330 tools and parameters derived from bioelectrical impedance analysis with subjective global
331 assessment. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2012;112(10):1543-9.
- 332 27. Małecka-Massalska T, Mlak R, Smolen A, Morshed K. Bioelectrical impedance phase
333 angle and subjective global assessment in detecting malnutrition among newly diagnosed head
334 and neck cancer patients. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2016;273(5):1299-305.
- 335 28. Lukaski HC, Kyle UG, Kondrup J. Assessment of adult malnutrition and prognosis
336 with bioelectrical impedance analysis: phase angle and impedance ratio. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr
337 Metab Care*. 2017;20(5):330-9.
- 338 29. Bosy-Westphal A, Danielzik S, Dörhöfer RP, Later W, Wiese S, Müller MJ. Phase
339 angle from bioelectrical impedance analysis: population reference values by age, sex, and body
340 mass index. *JPEN J Parenter Enteral Nutr*. 2006;30(4):309-16.
- 341 30. Martin TR. The relationship between malnutrition and lung infections. *Clin Chest Med*.
342 1987;8(3):359-72.
- 343 31. Lundberg M, Dickinson A, Nikander P, Orell H, Mäkitie A. Low-phase angle in body
344 composition measurements correlates with prolonged hospital stay in head and neck cancer
345 patients. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*. 2019;139(4):383-7.
- 346 32. Axelsson L, Silander E, Bosaeus I, Hammerlid E. Bioelectrical phase angle at diagnosis
347 as a prognostic factor for survival in advanced head and neck cancer. *Eur Arch
348 Otorhinolaryngol*. 2018;275(9):2379-86.
- 349 33. Małecka-Massalska T, Powrózek T, Prendecka M, Mlak R, Sobieszek G, Brzozowski
350 W, et al. Phase Angle as an Objective and Predictive Factor of Radiotherapy-induced Changes
351 in Body Composition of Male Patients With Head and Neck Cancer. *In Vivo*. 2019;33(5):1645-
352 51.
- 353 34. Lukaski H, Bolonchuk W, Hall C, Siders W. Validation of tetrapolar bioelectrical
354 impedance method to assess human body composition. *Journal of applied physiology
355 (Bethesda, Md : 1985)*. 1986;60:1327-32.
- 356 35. Mulasi U, Kuchnia AJ, Cole AJ, Earthman CP. Bioimpedance at the bedside: current
357 applications, limitations, and opportunities. *Nutr Clin Pract*. 2015;30(2):180-93.

- 358 36. Khalil SF, Mohktar MS, Ibrahim F. The theory and fundamentals of bioimpedance
359 analysis in clinical status monitoring and diagnosis of diseases. *Sensors (Basel)*.
360 2014;14(6):10895-928.
- 361 37. Grundmann O, Yoon SL, Williams JJ. The value of bioelectrical impedance analysis
362 and phase angle in the evaluation of malnutrition and quality of life in cancer patients—a
363 comprehensive review. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2015;69(12):1290-7.
- 364 38. Sheean P, Gonzalez MC, Prado CM, McKeever L, Hall AM, Braunschweig CA.
365 American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition Clinical Guidelines: The Validity of
366 Body Composition Assessment in Clinical Populations. *Journal of Parenteral and Enteral*
367 *Nutrition*. 2020;44(1):12-43.
- 368 39. Matarese LE, Charney P. Capturing the Elusive Diagnosis of Malnutrition. *Nutr Clin*
369 *Pract*. 2017;32(1):11-4.
- 370 40. Bauer J, Capra S, Ferguson M. Use of the scored Patient-Generated Subjective Global
371 Assessment (PG-SGA) as a nutrition assessment tool in patients with cancer. *European Journal*
372 *of Clinical Nutrition*. 2002;56(8):779-85.
- 373 41. Barbosa-Silva MCG, Barros AJD. Indications and limitations of the use of subjective
374 global assessment in clinical practice: an update. *Current Opinion in Clinical Nutrition &*
375 *Metabolic Care*. 2006;9(3).
- 376 42. Cooper BA, Bartlett LH, Aslani A, Allen BJ, Ibels LS, Pollock CA. Validity of
377 subjective global assessment as a nutritional marker in end-stage renal disease. *Am J Kidney*
378 *Dis*. 2002;40(1):126-32.
- 379

380 **Supporting Information**

381 **S1 File. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology**
382 **(STROBE) Checklist for cohort studies.**

Figure I: Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve of phase angle and Wellness marker for detecting malnutrition




Fig 1. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve of phase

Figure II: Receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve for phase angle and Wellness marker in predicting for development of perioperative pneumonia




Fig 2. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve of phase