

Title page

Defining reference values for body composition indexes by magnetic resonance imaging in UK Biobank

Authors

Liang Dai^{1#}, Xiao-yan Huang^{1,2#}, Yue-qi Lu³, Yu-yang Liu^{3,4}, Cong-ying Song¹, Jing-wen Zhang², Jing Li^{1,2}, Yue Zhang², Ying Shan^{1,2*} & Yu Shi^{5*}

¹ *Clinical Research Academy, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Peking University, 1120 Lianhua Road, Futian District, Shenzhen 518036, Guangdong, China*

² *Renal Division, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Peking University, 1120 Lianhua Road, Futian District, Shenzhen 518036, Guangdong, China*

³ *BGI-Shenzhen, 21 Hongan 3rd Street, Yantian District, Shenzhen 518083, Guangdong, China*

⁴ *College of Life Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, 19(A) Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing 100049, China*

⁵ *Department of Ultrasound, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Peking University, 1120 Lianhua Road, Futian District, Shenzhen 518036, Guangdong, China*

Equal contribution

*Co-correspondence to:

Dr. Ying Shan, Email: sylvia.shanboo@gmail.com, Tel: +86 755 8392 3333-6646, Fax: +86 755 8306 1340

Dr. Yu Shi, Email: shiyu@pkusz.com, Tel: +86 755 8392 3333-8931, Fax: +86 755 8306 1340

Abstract

Background: Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is the gold standard for body composition measurements, while such reference range data have not been reported yet.

Methods: We used MRI-measured body composition data from the UK Biobank cohort, including three lean tissue parameters and seven adipose tissue parameters. Participants aged between 45 to 74 years from both genders with at least one parameter data were screened. Age- and sex-specific percentile curves were generated by the lambda–mu–sigma method. Three levels of reference ranges were provided, which were equivalent to mean \pm 1 standard deviation (SD), 2 SDs, and 2.5 SDs, respectively.

Results: The final analysis set for each parameter ranged from 4 842 to 14 148 participants (53.4–56.6 % women) with median ages around 61 years after eligibility confirmation. For lean tissue parameters, from age 45 to age 70, median percentiles of total lean tissue volume and total thigh fat-free muscle volume reduced by 2.83 L and 1.73 L in men, and by 3.02 L and 1.51 L in women, respectively. Within the age range, median percentiles of weight-to-muscle ratio elevated by 0.51 kg/L in men and 0.83 kg/L in women, respectively. Adipose tissue parameters presented inconsistent trajectories. For men, median percentiles of muscle fat infiltration, visceral adipose tissue (VAT) volume, total abdominal adipose tissue index, and abdominal fat ratio elevated by 1.48 %, 0.32 L, 0.08 L/m² and 0.04, while abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue (ASAT) volume and total adipose tissue volume reduced by 0.47 L and 0.41 L from age 45 to age 70, respectively. And total trunk fat volume remained stable with aging (approximate 9.52 L). For women, muscle fat infiltration and VAT volume showed similar trends with men, increased by 1.68 % and 0.76 L from age 45 to age 70. Other five parameters firstly increased from age 45 to age 60 (ASAT volume: 0.35 L, total adipose tissue volume: 0.78 L, total trunk fat volume: 1.12 L, total abdominal adipose tissue index: 0.49 L/m², and abdominal fat ratio: 0.06), then kept stable (total abdominal adipose tissue index and abdominal fat ratio) or presented a slight reduction afterwards (ASAT volume: 0.33 L, total adipose tissue volume: 0.14 L, and total trunk fat volume: 0.20 L).

Conclusions: We have established reference ranges for MRI-measured body composition parameters based on large community-dwelling population. The data would benefit more accurate assessment of abnormal adipose and muscle conditions.

Keywords: Abdominal body composition; Lambda–mu–sigma method; Magnetic resonance imaging; Reference ranges

Introduction

Both lean mass and fat mass of the human body are critical for various health-related outcomes. It has been illustrated that a U-shaped relation exists between lean body mass and all-cause mortality [1]. For another, the intense relationship has also been repeatedly proven between adipose tissue and cardio-metabolic health [2, 3]. Hence, body composition evaluations benefit both clinicians and patients in understanding potential risks of negative health events. Body mass index (BMI), the classical body measurement index, has been criticized for a long time due to its poor accuracy for specific body composition [4, 5]. Waist circumference (WC) and waist-hip ratio (WHR), served as more sensitive indicators for adipose tissue accumulation, cannot comprehensively interpret potential disease risks [6, 7]. Therefore, more comprehensive body composition measurements are encouraged in clinical practice.

Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) are two commonly-used instruments for body composition analysis. BIA can estimate the adipose and muscle mass on the foundation of whole-body electrical conductivity [8]. Due to its convenience and low-cost, BIA is frequently used for body composition screening. DXA, as the name suggests, calculates body tissue mass based on absorption and depletion differences of X-rays with two energies [9]. As a snapshot technique, DXA can provide composition indexes in specific limbs. However, both instruments have their own limitations, such as inconsistent results from different brands, interference from body hydration status, and incapability to assess intra-muscular fat, which would lead to obesity paradox or muscle quality overestimation [10-13, S1-2]. It is a certain trend that more accurate instrument is needed for body composition evaluation.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) technique utilizes the interaction of hydrogen nuclei with magnetic field of the instrument to distinguish different body components [14], and serves as the gold standard for body composition measurements [15]. Owing to technology update, difficulties such as anatomical level selection and imaging analysis of MRI instrument have been much overcome [16]. In addition, no radiation exposure and reliable reproducibility further prompt MRI to be a promising technique in body composition assessment [17]. Currently no reference range data of body composition parameters assessed by MRI technique are reported, while interestingly, such studies have been published regarding BIA and DXA [18-19, S3]. Hence, we conducted this study to fill this gap. By using data from the UK Biobank, we developed sex-specific reference ranges for body composition indexes in a large community-dwelling population of middle-aged adults (aged 45-59 years) and young elders (aged 60-74 years), hoping to supplement MRI-based body composition standard for future studies.

Methods

Participants

The UK Biobank, initiated in 2006, has recruited more than half a million volunteers aged 40 to 69 years old via the United Kingdom National Health Service registers between April 2007 and December 2010. After baseline assessment, an imaging visit was arranged for approximate ten thousand participants since 2014, covering brain, heart, and body composition MRI measurements [20]. The UK Biobank got ethical approval from the North West Multi-Center Research Ethics Committee (REC reference: 11/NW/03820) and all participants provided written informed consent. The corresponding research plan for this study had been submitted to the UK Biobank (application ID 65814).

Our study screened subjects with MRI-measured body composition data from the UK Biobank cohort. Ten parameters were analyzed, including three lean tissue parameters (total lean tissue volume, total thigh fat-free muscle volume (FFMV), and weight-to-muscle ratio), and seven adipose tissue parameters (muscle fat infiltration, abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue (ASAT) volume, visceral adipose tissue (VAT) volume, total trunk fat volume, total adipose tissue volume, total abdominal adipose tissue index, and abdominal fat ratio). Participants aged between 45 to 74 from both genders and possessed with data for at least one parameter mentioned above were included. Ethnic minority, defined as sample size cannot support statistical estimation [21], and objective measurement mistakes based on documented error indicators were excluded from the analysis sets. We also excluded diseases, combined medications, surgeries and other physiological or pathological conditions that would influence the distribution of lean and fat mass, including endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases (ICD-10: E00-07, E10-14, E15-16, E20-E32, E34-35, E40-46, E50-56, E58-61, E63, E64, E70-80, E83-90), neoplasms (ICD-10: C00-97, D00-09, D37-38), human immunodeficiency virus infection (ICD-10: B20-24), administration of anti-obesity preparations, systemic hormonal preparations and anti-diabetes products, pregnancy, and certain abdominal wall, subcutaneous tissue and miscellaneous surgeries (OPCS3: 400, 878-879, 928; OPCS4: S50-52, S62.2-62.9, S63.8-63.9, T32, T76-77, X02.1, X02.8-X02.9, X05, X09.1, X09.3, X09.8-09.9, X15, X22). The detailed participants' flowchart for each parameter is shown in File S1.

MRI protocol and body composition analysis

MRI procedure was conducted using a Siemens MAGNETOM Aera 1.5 T scanner (Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany) with the dual-echo Dixon Vibe protocol from neck to knees. The imaging provided water and fat separated volumetric data set for body composition analysis. Detailed instrument process and analysis methods have been published elsewhere [22-24, S4]. In brief, the total 1.1m scanning was divided into six overlapping slabs, with 64 slices in slabs 1 and 6, 44 slices in slabs 2 to 4, and 72 slices in slab 5. The obtained images went through calibration, stacks fusion, and segmentation. After professional inspection by analysis engineer, lean and adipose volumes were finally determined [25]. The body composition analyses were completed by AMRA Profiler™ (AMRA AB, Linköping, Sweden).

Statistical analysis

Enrolled participants' basic characteristics and body composition parameters are presented as mean (standard deviation), or median (interquartile range) based on data features. Considering that body composition varies between two genders, we provided the sex-specific reference ranges.

We generated sex-specific percentile curves and age-and-sex-specific reference ranges using the lambda- μ -sigma (LMS) method [26]. The LMS method assumes underlying frequency distributions of the data, and estimates each of the distribution moments in the form of smooth curves plotted against age. Box-Cox Cole and Green (BCCG), Box-Cox power exponential (BCPE) and Box-Cox t (BCT) are LMS class of distributions. BCCG model estimates the first three moments of the measurement distribution as the age-varying median (μ), the coefficient of variation (σ), and skewness in the form of a Box-Cox transformation (λ). BCPE and BCT models extend BCCG model by adjusting for kurtosis (τ), based respectively on the power exponential distribution and the t distribution. In this study, for each body composition parameter, we fitted the three models and selected the optimal one based on local maximum likelihood. We generated reference curves

and provided reference ranges for both genders at specific ages according to the estimated coefficients in the optimal model. The R package “gamlss” was used for the above analysis.

In addition, according to the age segmentation criteria [27], we divided the whole population into two sub-categories, namely middle-aged adults (aged 45-59 years) and young elders (aged 60-74 years). Then, we conducted a consistency test (via Student’s t test) to detect if the measurement values in the sub-categories had significant difference, thus, to determine whether the reference ranges should be presented separately or jointly. The reference ranges were presented as mean \pm 1 standard deviation (SD), mean \pm 2SD, and mean \pm 2.5SD.

Results

Participants’ characteristics

The characteristics of included participants are shown in *Table 1*. The number of participants varied for ten parameters; hence the data analysis sets of the body composition were also different accordingly. The participant flowchart can be found in *Figure S1*. Because of low statistical power of ethnic minority, only Caucasians were included in further analyses. After confirmation of prescribed eligible criteria, the final data sets for ten parameters ranged from 4 842 to 14 148.

For the three lean volume parameters, medians of total lean tissue volume and total thigh FFMV were higher in men than in women, while median weight-to-muscle ratio was lower. For the seven fat volume parameters, median muscle fat infiltration, ASAT volume, total adipose tissue volume, total abdominal adipose tissue index, and abdominal fat ratio were higher in women than in men, but median VAT volume was higher in men compared with women. The remaining total trunk fat volume was comparable between women and men.

Lean volume parameters

Reference percentiles of lean tissue parameters are shown in *Table 2*. Both total lean tissue volume and total thigh FFMV showed a steady downward trend in either gender (*Figure 1*). For men, median total lean tissue volume and total thigh FFMV decreased by 2.83 L and 1.73 L from age 45 to age 70, respectively. Similarly, the reductions of these two parameters were 3.02 L and 1.51 L in women from age 45 to age 70, respectively. Weight-to-muscle ratio presented a gradual rising trend in both genders (*Figure 1*). Compared with age 45, median percentiles of weight-to-muscle ratio increased by 0.51 kg/L in men and 0.83 kg/L in women at age 70, respectively.

Reference data of lean volume parameters for middle-aged adults and young elders are presented in *Table 3*. Three levels of ranges were given, which were equivalent to mean \pm 1 standard deviation (SD), mean \pm 2 SDs, and mean \pm 2.5 SDs. The consistency tests between two populations were conducted in both genders and significant difference was found in each parameter (*Table S1*), which indicated that the reference ranges should be considered independently for middle-aged adults and young elders.

Reference values used in LMS method for lean volume parameters are available in *Data S1*.

Fat volume parameters

Reference percentiles of adipose tissue parameters are shown in *Table 4*. For men, four parameters (muscle fat infiltration, VAT volume, total abdominal adipose tissue index, and abdominal fat ratio) presented slight increasing trend with aging, two parameters (ASAT volume and total adipose tissue volume) presented gradual decreasing trend, and one parameter (total trunk fat volume) remained

stable (*Figures 2 and S1*). Compared with age 45, median percentiles of muscle fat infiltration, VAT volume, total abdominal adipose tissue index, and abdominal fat ratio elevated by 1.48 %, 0.32 L, 0.08 L/m², and 0.04 at age 70, respectively. Median percentiles of ASAT volume and total adipose tissue volume reduced by 0.47 L and 0.41 L from age 45 to age 70, respectively. For women, only muscle fat infiltration and VAT volume showed similar trends with men, increasing from 6.25 % and 1.61 L at age 45 to 7.93 % and 2.37 L at age 70, respectively (*Figure 3*). Total abdominal adipose tissue index and abdominal fat ratio firstly increased from age 45 to age 60 (3.16 L/m² to 3.65 L/m², and 0.49 to 0.55, respectively), then kept stable afterwards (*Figures 3 and S1*). The remaining three parameters, ASAT volume, total adipose tissue volume, and total trunk fat volume, presented rising trend from age 45 to age 60 at first, then a slight reduction after age 60. To be specific, compared with age 45, ASAT volume, total adipose tissue volume, and total trunk fat volume increased by 0.35 L, 0.78 L, and 1.12 L, respectively. Then, they decreased by 0.33 L, 0.14 L, and 0.20 L from age 60 to age 70, respectively.

Three levels of reference ranges for fat volume parameters are shown in *Table 4*, which were also equivalent to mean \pm 1 SD, mean \pm 2 SDs, and mean \pm 2.5 SDs. To be noticed, lower limits of certain parameters were below zero due to modeling computation. The reference ranges for those parameters should be treated as unilateral in consideration of clinical practice. Student's t tests between two populations showed inconsistent results among seven fat volume parameters (*Table S1*). Reference ranges for total trunk fat volume, total adipose tissue volume, total abdominal adipose tissue index in men, and ASAT volume in women may be combined between middle-aged adults and young elders. Nevertheless, based on population integrity and clinical application, we preferred separation of reference data according to the age segmentation criteria.

Reference values used in LMS method for lean volume parameters are available in *Data S1*.

Discussion

Using MRI data from the UK Biobank, we have established sex-specific abdominal body composition reference ranges for middle-aged adults and young elders in a natural population cohort. To our knowledge, this is first study regarding reference development of MRI-measured body composition parameters using such a large sample size. As the golden standard of body composition assessment, the MRI reference data generated from this study can help researchers determine more accurate diagnostic criteria for overweight/obesity, sarcopenia, amyotrophy, and other metabolic disorders. The introduction of age segmentation makes the reference ranges more practical and accurate in clinical practice. In addition, the established reference ranges may also benefit renovation of classic disease risk prediction models to achieve better efficiency.

Recent studies have reported the reference ranges of body composition parameters evaluated by BIA and DXA in various countries and regions [19, 28-30]. Due to different assessment tools and measurement units, the results from this study cannot directly compared with previous findings. However, we can still roughly compare the age-related trends of similar parameters. For lean parameters, the trajectories of our results were consistent with previous studies in Caucasians [33, 36], namely lean tissue contents gradually decreased with aging. Interestingly, the fat volume parameters did not follow the trends of recent reports. Though VAT volume and muscle fat infiltration showed slight elevation with aging, other parameters kept relatively stable or presented a slight reduction in the prescribed age range (45-74 years). Accord to a previous study also using UK Biobank data [28], the fat volume index assessed by BIA presented gradual rising trend with

aging. We speculated that this discrepancy may result from change of adipose density. It has been well-acknowledged that human adipose tissue composes of two main categories, namely white adipose tissue (WAT) and brown adipose tissue (BAT) [31, S7]. Based on recent researches, though the total adipose tissue volume may keep balance before extreme old age, the contents of sub-categories and fat distribution are in constant changing [32, 33]. Increasing with ages, both number and volume of WAT adipocytes increases, whereas BAT declines. In the meanwhile, ectopic fat infiltration in muscles, liver and pancreas increases. Our results have demonstrated that VAT volume and muscle fat infiltration presented gradual elevation with aging. Hence, we have reasons to speculate that, beneath the stable volume of adipose tissue, the composition of adipose tissue may have been altered, and further lead to the increasing adipose mass.

BMI and WC are two fundamental parameters for obesity diagnosis. However, based on the definition of obesity, which is characterized by an increase of body fat stores [34], simple anthropometric indices like BMI and WC apparently do not suffice. Moreover, concepts such as visceral obesity and localized adiposity gain increasing attention in recent years. Detailed assessment of adipose tissue distribution is necessary in clinical practice. DXA, a routine tool in quantifying body composition, can provide specific data on lean and fat volume of human body [35]. Whereas, as a two-dimensional scanning technique, DXA cannot distinguish visceral, deep, and superficial fat volume. MRI is a kind of three-dimensional imaging technique. The introduction of vertical axis makes it possible to obtain fat parameters of different body parts, achieving more accurate assessment. Nonetheless, medical expenditure for MRI is significantly higher than DXA. Clinicians should determine the most appropriate tool based on medical purpose and patient needs. Sarcopenia, defined as age-related loss of skeletal muscle, has driven great attention in recent decades [36, S8]. Sarcopenia is not only related to various adverse health outcomes, but dramatically increases medical expenditure [S9]. As a definite threat to public health, simple and accurate diagnostic method is particularly important for clinical practice. Currently, three parameters are evaluated for sarcopenia diagnosis, namely skeletal muscle strength, skeletal muscle mass, and physical performance [15, 37]. Among these, muscle quantity is the confirmatory index. Indeed, MRI technique serves as gold standard for non-invasive evaluation of muscle mass, while for disease diagnosis, it does not show superiority than BIA or DXA because cost-effectiveness is priorly considered and high precision is not necessary in routine practice. Therefore, though we provided reference ranges for MRI-based body composition parameters, it is still too aggressive for routine application of MRI in daily sarcopenia diagnosis.

Nevertheless, MRI technique should not be laid aside and neglected in body composition assessment. Apart from routine screening, MRI technique is more suitable for refined evaluation. Muscle quality, a relatively new concept, indicates that changes in muscle architecture and composition would impact muscle function [38], and currently can be directly assessed through highly-sensitive imaging instruments, i.e. CT and MRI [S10]. Skeletal muscle fat infiltration, also known as myosteatorsis, is the main indicator for muscle quality. It has been recognized as an independent risk factor for muscle mass, strength, and mobility after adjusting other body composition parameters [39]. Moreover, the accumulation of fat in muscle would negatively impact body metabolic status, and may further link to elevated risk of various health consequences such as diabetes, fracture, late recovery and mortality [S11-12]. Due to the synergetic effect of sarcopenia and myosteatorsis, it is a growing recognition that muscle mass and quality should be evaluated simultaneously in determining risk stratification in aging population. Then, as a solution, MRI technique would be an

appropriate choice. We suggest that, if conditions permit, MRI examination should be arranged for individuals who are suspicious with sarcopenia and desired for detailed health instructions.

The findings in this study filled the blank of MRI-based body composition reference data. Three levels of ranges were calculated according to conventional rules. In consideration of MRI accuracy and the large sample size, we tended to recommend more rigorous reference ranges. Future researchers can consider applying these reference values as grouping criteria, then design longitudinal studies to explore the relationship between body composition and health related outcomes. Once the data accumulation is sufficient, we can amend and finalize the reference ranges of body composition parameters.

Our study had certain inherent limitations that would influence the usage of established reference ranges. All MRI-based body composition data were from the UK Biobank cohort, which only contained aged above 45 years old. The estimation of reference values for whole population cannot be implemented, and further study should be conducted to fill the blank. In addition, due to the limited sample size of ethnic minorities, the reference ranges may be only suitable for European Caucasians. Such studies should also be supplemented in other regions. Besides, our study was a cross-sectional design. No longitudinal data was involved. The age-based curves of body composition parameters were actual the single timepoint data, thus cannot be strictly defined as intra-individual trajectories. The loss of longitudinal characters may further introduce detection bias in our estimation. Currently, the UK Biobank is conducting the repeated imaging tests. When data are sufficient, the reference ranges can be adjusted to get better accuracy.

Conclusion

In summary, we have established reference ranges for MRI-measured body composition parameters based on the UK Biobank study. The data would provide solid evidences for researchers and doctors of defining abnormal adipose and muscle conditions in middle-aged population and younger elders. Further studies are needed to supplement reference data on other age groups and ethnicities, and explore their relationship with health consequences.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the San-Ming Project of Medicine, Shenzhen (No. SZSM201812097), the Shenzhen Science and Technology Innovation Commission (No. JCYJ20200109140412476), and Peking University Shenzhen Hospital (No. LCYJ2020001).

Ethical statement

The authors certify that they comply with the ethical guidelines for publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle: update 2021 [40].

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding this study.

Reference

1. Lee DH, Keum N, Hu FB, Orav EJ, Rimm EB, Willett WC, et al. Predicted lean body mass, fat mass, and all cause and cause specific mortality in men: prospective US cohort study. *BMJ*. 2018;362:k2575. doi:10.1136/bmj.k2575

2. Guh DP, Zhang W, Bansback N, Amarsi Z, Birmingham CL, Anis AH. The incidence of comorbidities related to obesity and overweight: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9:88. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-88
3. Riaz H, Khan MS, Siddiqi TJ, Usman MS, Shah N, Goyal A, et al. Association between obesity and cardiovascular outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of mendelian randomization studies. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018;1:e183788. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.3788
4. Plachta-Danielzik S, Bosy-Westphal A, Kehden B, Gehrke MI, Kromeyer-Hauschild K, Grillenberger M, et al. Adiposity rebound is misclassified by BMI rebound. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2013;67:984-9. doi:10.1038/ejcn.2013.131
5. Rothman KJ. BMI-related errors in the measurement of obesity. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2008;32 Suppl 3:S56-9. doi:10.1038/ijo.2008.87
6. Kim SH, Després JP, Koh KK. Obesity and cardiovascular disease: friend or foe? *Eur Heart J*. 2016;37:3560-8. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehv509
7. Oliveros E, Somers VK, Sochor O, Goel K, Lopez-Jimenez F. The concept of normal weight obesity. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis*. 2014;56:426-33. doi:10.1016/j.pcad.2013.10.003
8. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Gómez JM, et al. Bioelectrical impedance analysis--part I: review of principles and methods. *Clin Nutr*. 2004;23:1226-43. doi:10.1016/j.clnu.2004.06.004
9. Mazess RB, Barden HS, Bisek JP, Hanson J. Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry for total-body and regional bone-mineral and soft-tissue composition. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1990;51:1106-12. doi:10.1093/ajcn/51.6.1106
10. Buckinx F, Landi F, Cesari M, Fielding RA, Visser M, Engelke K, et al. Pitfalls in the measurement of muscle mass: a need for a reference standard. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. 2018;9:269-78. doi:10.1002/jcsm.12268
11. Toomey CM, McCormack WG, Jakeman P. The effect of hydration status on the measurement of lean tissue mass by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. *Eur J Appl Physiol*. 2017;117:567-74. doi:10.1007/s00421-017-3552-x
12. Beaudart C, McCloskey E, Bruyère O, Cesari M, Rolland Y, Rizzoli R, et al. Sarcopenia in daily practice: assessment and management. *BMC Geriatr*. 2016;16:170-. doi:10.1186/s12877-016-0349-4
13. Bosello O, Vanzo A. Obesity paradox and aging. *Eat Weight Disord*. 2021;26:27-35. doi:10.1007/s40519-019-00815-4
14. Lustgarten MS, Fielding RA. Assessment of analytical methods used to measure changes in body composition in the elderly and recommendations for their use in phase II clinical trials. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2011;15:368-75. doi:10.1007/s12603-011-0049-x
15. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyère O, Cederholm T, et al. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age Ageing*. 2019;48:16-31. doi:10.1093/ageing/afy169
16. Lee K, Shin Y, Huh J, Sung YS, Lee IS, Yoon KH, et al. Recent issues on body composition imaging for sarcopenia evaluation. *Korean J Radiol*. 2019;20:205-17. doi:10.3348/kjr.2018.0479
17. Borga M, Ahlgren A, Romu T, Widholm P, Dahlqvist Leinhard O, West J. Reproducibility and repeatability of MRI-based body composition analysis. *Magn Reson Med*. 2020;84:3146-56. doi:10.1002/mrm.28360
18. Barbosa-Silva MC, Barros AJ, Wang J, Heymsfield SB, Pierson RN, Jr. Bioelectrical impedance analysis: population reference values for phase angle by age and sex. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2005;82:49-52.

doi:10.1093/ajcn.82.1.49

19. Kirk B, Bani Hassan E, Brennan-Olsen S, Vogrin S, Bird S, Zanker J, et al. Body composition reference ranges in community-dwelling adults using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry: the Australian Body Composition (ABC) Study. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. 2021;12:880-90. doi:10.1002/jcsm.12712
20. Sudlow C, Gallacher J, Allen N, Beral V, Burton P, Danesh J, et al. UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med*. 2015;12:e1001779. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779
21. Cole TJ. Sample size and sample composition for constructing growth reference centiles. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2021;30:488-507. doi:10.1177/0962280220958438
22. Borga M, West J, Bell JD, Harvey NC, Romu T, Heymsfield SB, et al. Advanced body composition assessment: from body mass index to body composition profiling. *J Investig Med*. 2018;66:1-9. doi:10.1136/jim-2018-000722
23. Linge J, Borga M, West J, Tuthill T, Miller MR, Dumitriu A, et al. Body composition profiling in the UK Biobank imaging Study. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*. 2018;26:1785-95. doi:10.1002/oby.22210
24. West J, Dahlqvist Leinhard O, Romu T, Collins R, Garratt S, Bell JD, et al. Feasibility of MR-based body composition analysis in large scale population studies. *PLoS One*. 2016;11:e0163332. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0163332
25. Karlsson A, Rosander J, Romu T, Tallberg J, Grönqvist A, Borga M, et al. Automatic and quantitative assessment of regional muscle volume by multi-atlas segmentation using whole-body water-fat MRI. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2015;41:1558-69. doi:10.1002/jmri.24726
26. Cole TJ, Green PJ. Smoothing reference centile curves: the LMS method and penalized likelihood. *Stat Med*. 1992;11:1305-19. doi:10.1002/sim.4780111005
27. Kanström L, Zamaro G, Sjöstedt C, Green G. Healthy ageing profiles: guidance for producing local health profiles of older people. Copenhagen: World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2008.
28. Lee MM, Jebb SA, Oke J, Piernas C. Reference values for skeletal muscle mass and fat mass measured by bioelectrical impedance in 390 565 UK adults. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. 2020;11:487-96. doi:10.1002/jcsm.12523
29. Ofenheimer A, Breyer-Kohansal R, Hartl S, Burghuber OC, Krach F, Schrott A, et al. Reference values of body composition parameters and visceral adipose tissue (VAT) by DXA in adults aged 18-81 years-results from the LEAD cohort. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2020;74:1181-91. doi:10.1038/s41430-020-0596-5
30. Hinton BJ, Fan B, Ng BK, Shepherd JA. Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry body composition reference values of limbs and trunk from NHANES 1999-2004 with additional visualization methods. *PLoS One*. 2017;12:e0174180. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0174180
31. Harms M, Seale P. Brown and beige fat: development, function and therapeutic potential. *Nat Med*. 2013;19:1252-63. doi:10.1038/nm.3361
32. Saely CH, Geiger K, Drexel H. Brown versus white adipose tissue: a mini-review. *Gerontology*. 2012;58:15-23. doi:10.1159/000321319
33. Conte M, Martucci M, Sandri M, Franceschi C, Salvioi S. The dual role of the pervasive "fattish" tissue remodeling with age. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*. 2019;10:114. doi:10.3389/fendo.2019.00114
34. Yumuk V, Tsigos C, Fried M, Schindler K, Busetto L, Micic D, et al. European guidelines for obesity management in adults. *Obes Facts*. 2015;8:402-24. doi:10.1159/000442721

35. Shepherd JA, Ng BK, Sommer MJ, Heymsfield SB. Body composition by DXA. *Bone*. 2017;104:101-5. doi:10.1016/j.bone.2017.06.010
36. Beaudart C, Rizzoli R, Bruyère O, Reginster JY, Biver E. Sarcopenia: burden and challenges for public health. *Arch Public Health*. 2014;72:45. doi:10.1186/2049-3258-72-45
37. Chen LK, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung TW, Chou MY, Iijima K, et al. Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia: 2019 consensus update on sarcopenia diagnosis and treatment. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2020;21:300-7.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2019.12.012
38. McGregor RA, Cameron-Smith D, Poppitt SD. It is not just muscle mass: a review of muscle quality, composition and metabolism during ageing as determinants of muscle function and mobility in later life. *Longev Healthspan*. 2014;3:9. doi:10.1186/2046-2395-3-9
39. Hilton TN, Tuttle LJ, Bohner KL, Mueller MJ, Sinacore DR. Excessive adipose tissue infiltration in skeletal muscle in individuals with obesity, diabetes mellitus, and peripheral neuropathy: association with performance and function. *Phys Ther*. 2008;88:1336-44. doi:10.2522/ptj.20080079
40. von Haehling S, Coats AJS, Anker SD. Ethical guidelines for publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle: update 2021. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. 2021;12:2259-61. doi:10.1002/jcsm.12899




Figure 1 Age-specific and sex-specific percentile curves for (a) total lean tissue volume in male, (b) total lean tissue volume in female, (c) total thigh fat-free muscle volume (FFMV) in male, (d) total thigh FFMV in female, (e) weight-to-muscle ratio in male, and (f) weight-to-muscle ratio in female.




Figure 2 Age-specific and sex-specific percentile curves for (a) muscle fat infiltration, (b) abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue (ASAT) volume, (c) visceral adipose tissue (VAT) volume, (d) total abdominal adipose tissue index, and (e) total adipose tissue volume in male.




Figure 3 Age-specific and sex-specific percentile curves for (a) muscle fat infiltration, (b) abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue (ASAT) volume, (c) visceral adipose tissue (VAT) volume, (d) total abdominal adipose tissue index, and (e) total adipose tissue volume in female.

Table 1 Participants' characteristics

Parameter	Gender	Median (IQR)	Age (mean±SD, years)	Height (mean±SD, m)	Weight (median (IQR), kg)	BMI (median (IQR), kg/m ²)
Total lean tissue volume (L)	Male (n=2 122)	28.37 (26.28, 30.67)	60.63 ± 7.21	1.76 ± 0.06	81.20 (73.50, 89.00)	26.13 (24.03, 28.45)
	Female (n=2 720)	20.51 (18.94, 22.26)	60.23 ± 7.10	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.90, 75.00)	25.00 (22.61, 28.08)
Total thigh FFMV (L)	Male (n=5 697)	12.41 (11.33, 13.55)	61.28 ± 7.06	1.76 ± 0.06	80.80 (73.50, 89.20)	26.04 (23.92, 28.51)
	Female (n=7 416)	8.19 (7.45, 8.96)	60.92 ± 6.86	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.60, 74.90)	24.95 (22.55, 27.99)
Weight-to-muscle ratio (kg/L)	Male (n=5 697)	6.49 (6.05, 7.03)	61.28 ± 7.06	1.76 ± 0.06	80.80 (73.50, 89.20)	26.04 (23.92, 28.51)
	Female (n=7 415)	8.13 (7.44, 8.93)	60.93 ± 6.86	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.60, 74.90)	24.95 (22.55, 28.00)
Muscle fat infiltration (%)	Male (n=5 674)	6.15 (5.33, 7.20)	61.28 ± 7.05	1.76 ± 0.06	80.80 (73.50, 89.20)	26.05 (23.92, 28.52)
	Female (n=7 388)	7.30 (6.37, 8.44)	60.91 ± 6.86	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.60, 74.90)	24.95 (22.54, 27.98)
ASAT volume (L)	Male (n=6 544)	5.23 (4.05, 6.74)	61.12 ± 7.06	1.77 ± 0.07	81.80 (74.40, 90.60)	26.20 (24.05, 28.73)
	Female (n=7 493)	7.22 (5.37, 9.50)	60.94 ± 6.86	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.60, 74.80)	24.94 (22.54, 27.96)
VAT volume(L)	Male (n=6 574)	4.39 (2.92, 6.00)	61.12 ± 7.06	1.77 ± 0.07	81.90 (74.40, 90.80)	26.22 (24.07, 28.76)
	Female (n=7 574)	2.20 (1.39, 3.25)	60.93 ± 6.87	1.63 ± 0.06	66.60 (59.70, 75.05)	24.97 (22.58, 28.09)
Total abdominal adipose tissue index (L/m ²)	Male (n=6 539)	3.13 (2.31, 4.03)	61.11 ± 7.06	1.77 ± 0.07	81.80 (74.40, 90.60)	26.20 (24.05, 28.73)
	Female (n=7 487)	3.59 (2.59, 4.78)	60.94 ± 6.87	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.60, 74.80)	24.94 (22.54, 27.96)
Total adipose tissue volume (L)	Male (n=2 122)	18.10 (14.48, 22.25)	60.63 ± 7.21	1.76 ± 0.06	81.20 (73.50, 89.00)	26.13 (24.03, 28.45)
	Female (n=2 720)	20.30 (16.18, 25.37)	60.23 ± 7.10	1.63 ± 0.06	66.50 (59.90, 75.00)	25.00 (22.61, 28.08)
Total trunk fat volume (L)	Male (n=5 668)	9.58 (7.09, 12.31)	61.28 ± 7.05	1.76 ± 0.06	80.80 (73.50, 89.10)	26.03 (23.92, 28.50)
	Female (n=7 329)	9.53 (6.90, 12.62)	60.92 ± 6.86	1.63 ± 0.06	66.40 (59.60, 74.60)	24.92 (22.52, 27.89)
Abdominal fat ratio	Male (n=5 668)	0.44 (0.37, 0.50)	61.28 ± 7.05	1.76 ± 0.06	80.80 (73.50, 89.10)	26.03 (23.92, 28.50)
	Female (n=7 329)	0.54 (0.46, 0.61)	60.92 ± 6.86	1.63 ± 0.06	66.40 (59.60, 74.60)	24.92 (22.52, 27.89)

ASAT, abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue; FFMV, fat-free muscle volume; IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

Table 2 Reference percentiles of lean tissue parameters for both genders at specific ages

	Age (years)	Total lean tissue volume (L)	Total thigh FFMV (L)	Weight-to-muscle ratio (kg/L)
Male	45	30.14 (24.52, 38.19)	13.53 (10.34, 17.27)	6.19 (5.04, 7.84)
	50	29.62 (23.78, 36.75)	13.23 (10.14, 16.80)	6.28 (5.14, 7.91)
	55	29.07 (23.09, 35.60)	12.91 (9.93, 16.31)	6.37 (5.23, 8.01)
	60	28.50 (22.62, 34.73)	12.57 (9.69, 15.79)	6.47 (5.33, 8.12)
	65	27.91 (22.22, 33.94)	12.19 (9.42, 15.24)	6.58 (5.43, 8.27)
	70	27.31 (21.69, 33.01)	11.80 (9.14, 14.69)	6.70 (5.53, 8.44)
Female	45	22.75 (18.26, 28.20)	9.32 (7.13, 12.22)	7.47 (5.79, 9.85)
	50	21.78 (17.19, 27.43)	8.83 (6.80, 11.43)	7.77 (6.05, 10.27)
	55	20.97 (16.57, 26.41)	8.44 (6.53, 10.81)	8.04 (6.26, 10.66)
	60	20.45 (16.43, 25.33)	8.19 (6.35, 10.39)	8.18 (6.39, 10.87)
	65	20.06 (16.27, 24.64)	8.00 (6.21, 10.10)	8.23 (6.48, 10.88)
	70	19.73 (15.96, 24.29)	7.81 (6.05, 9.84)	8.30 (6.58, 10.91)

FFMV, fat-free muscle volume.

Reference percentile was defined as median (3rd, 97th).

Table 3 Reference data of middle-aged adults and young elders for lean tissue parameters

Parameters	Male			Female		
	Mean±SD	Mean±2SD	Mean±2.5SD	Mean±SD	Mean±2SD	Mean±2.5SD
Middle-aged adults (45-59 years)						
Total lean tissue volume (L)	[25.98, 32.83]	[22.55, 36.26]	[20.83, 37.98]	[18.65, 24.09]	[15.92, 26.82]	[14.56, 28.18]
Total thigh FFMV (L)	[11.33, 14.76]	[9.61, 16.48]	[8.75, 17.34]	[7.40, 9.78]	[6.21, 10.97]	[5.62, 11.57]
Weight-to-muscle ratio (kg/L)	[5.67, 7.17]	[4.92, 7.92]	[4.54, 8.29]	[6.91, 9.27]	[5.73, 10.45]	[5.14, 11.04]
Young elders (60-74 years)						
Total lean tissue volume (L)	[24.71, 30.93]	[21.60, 34.04]	[20.04, 35.60]	[17.90, 22.40]	[15.65, 24.65]	[14.53, 25.78]
Total thigh FFMV (L)	[10.57, 13.68]	[9.01, 15.24]	[8.23, 16.02]	[6.97, 9.06]	[5.93, 10.10]	[5.40, 10.63]
Weight-to-muscle ratio (kg/L)	[5.92, 7.46]	[5.15, 8.23]	[4.77, 8.61]	[7.17, 9.58]	[5.97, 10.78]	[5.37, 11.38]

FFMV, fat-free muscle volume; SD, standard deviation.

Table 4 Reference percentiles of fat tissue parameters for both genders at specific ages

	Age (years)	Muscle fat infiltration (%)	Total abdominal		Total adipose tissue volume (L)	Total trunk fat volume (L)	Abdominal fat ratio	
			ASAT volume (L)	VAT volume (L)				adipose tissue index (L/m ²)
Male	45	5.25 (3.74, 8.09)	5.55 (2.14, 12.52)	4.09 (0.96, 9.25)	3.06 (0.98, 6.38)	18.41 (7.20, 33.07)	9.52 (3.27, 19.59))	0.41 (0.19, 0.58)
	50	5.49 (3.91, 8.49)	5.47 (2.17, 12.02)	4.17 (1.04, 9.25)	3.08 (1.05, 6.30)	18.31 (7.83, 32.61)	9.52 (3.35, 19.30)	0.42 (0.20, 0.59)
	55	5.76 (4.09, 8.93)	5.37 (2.21, 11.54)	4.24 (1.12, 9.25)	3.10 (1.11, 6.22)	18.22 (8.34, 32.20)	9.53 (3.43, 19.02)	0.43 (0.21, 0.59)
	60	6.05 (4.29, 9.42)	5.28 (2.23, 11.09)	4.30 (1.19, 9.26)	3.11 (1.15, 6.15)	18.14 (8.76, 31.82)	9.53 (3.51, 18.74)	0.43 (0.22, 0.59)
	65	6.38 (4.51, 9.96)	5.18 (2.24, 10.66)	4.36 (1.25, 9.28)	3.12 (1.19, 6.06)	18.06 (9.11, 31.47)	9.53 (3.60, 18.45)	0.44 (0.23, 0.60)
	70	6.73 (4.75, 10.56)	5.08 (2.25, 10.26)	4.41 (1.30, 9.31)	3.14 (1.20, 5.96)	18.00 (9.41, 31.15)	9.53 (3.69, 18.17)	0.45 (0.24, 0.60)
Female	45	6.25 (4.08, 10.09)	7.05 (2.55, 15.33)	1.61 (0.43, 5.06)	3.16 (1.10, 7.19)	19.70 (9.43, 38.92)	8.60 (2.93, 20.28)	0.49 (0.25, 0.66)
	50	6.57 (4.58, 9.86)	7.19 (2.64, 15.24)	1.85 (0.49, 5.35)	3.33 (1.18, 7.32)	20.09 (9.81, 38.53)	9.02 (3.14, 20.14)	0.51 (0.27, 0.67)
	55	6.90 (4.88, 10.25)	7.35 (2.75, 15.24)	2.08 (0.55, 5.63)	3.53 (1.26, 7.52)	20.39 (10.14, 38.13)	9.47 (3.36, 20.22)	0.53 (0.29, 0.69)
	60	7.24 (5.03, 11.10)	7.40 (2.81, 15.03)	2.24 (0.60, 5.73)	3.65 (1.32, 7.58)	20.48 (10.35, 37.47)	9.72 (3.52, 19.99)	0.55 (0.30, 0.70)
	65	7.58 (5.38, 11.40)	7.25 (2.81, 14.41)	2.32 (0.62, 5.67)	3.66 (1.34, 7.39)	20.41 (10.47, 36.61)	9.65 (3.56, 19.21)	0.55 (0.31, 0.69)
	70	7.93 (5.61, 12.10)	7.07 (2.80, 13.73)	2.37 (0.63, 5.57)	3.64 (1.36, 7.16)	20.34 (10.58, 35.85)	9.52 (3.58, 18.42)	0.55 (0.33, 0.69)

ASAT, abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

Reference percentile was defined as median (3rd, 97th).

Table 5 Reference data of middle-aged adults and young elders for fat tissue parameters

Parameters	Male			Female			
	Mean±SD	Mean±2SD	Mean±2.5SD	Mean±SD	Mean±2SD	Mean±2.5SD	
Middle-aged adults (45-59 years)	Muscle fat infiltration (%)	[4.51, 7.30]	[3.12, 8.69]	[2.42, 9.38]	[5.53, 8.52]	[4.04, 10.02]	[3.29, 10.76]
	ASAT volume (L)	[3.24, 8.34]	[0.69, 10.89]	[-0.58, 12.17]	[4.40, 11.15]	[1.02, 14.53]	[-0.67, 16.22]
	VAT volume (L)	[2.27, 6.72]	[0.05, 8.94]	[-1.06, 10.06]	[0.92, 3.73]	[-0.49, 5.14]	[-1.19, 5.84]
	Total abdominal adipose tissue index (L/m ²)	[1.86, 4.63]	[0.48, 6.01]	[-0.21, 6.70]	[2.03, 5.45]	[0.31, 7.16]	[-0.54, 8.02]
	Total adipose tissue volume (L)	[12.24, 25.29]	[5.71, 31.82]	[2.45, 35.08]	[13.77, 29.09]	[6.11, 36.75]	[2.28, 40.58]
	Total trunk fat volume (L)	[5.76, 14.20]	[1.54, 18.42]	[-0.57, 20.53]	[5.49, 14.58]	[0.95, 19.13]	[-1.33, 21.40]
	Abdominal fat ratio	[0.32, 0.52]	[0.22, 0.62]	[0.17, 0.67]	[0.40, 0.63]	[0.29, 0.74]	[0.24, 0.79]
Young elders (60-74 years)	Muscle fat infiltration (%)	[5.19, 8.25]	[3.66, 9.78]	[2.90, 10.55]	[6.17, 9.62]	[4.44, 11.35]	[3.58, 12.21]
	ASAT volume (L)	[3.28, 7.74]	[1.06, 9.96]	[-0.05, 11.07]	[4.51, 10.66]	[1.44, 13.73]	[-0.10, 15.27]
	VAT volume (L)	[2.45, 6.86]	[0.25, 9.07]	[-0.85, 10.17]	[1.17, 3.94]	[-0.21, 5.32]	[-0.90, 6.02]
	Total abdominal adipose tissue index (L/m ²)	[1.96, 4.58]	[0.66, 5.88]	[0.01, 6.54]	[2.23, 5.46]	[0.62, 7.07]	[-0.19, 7.88]
	Total adipose tissue volume (L)	[12.75, 24.69]	[6.78, 30.66]	[3.79, 33.64]	[14.29, 28.11]	[7.37, 35.03]	[3.92, 38.48]
	Total trunk fat volume (L)	[6.00, 13.94]	[2.03, 17.91]	[0.04, 19.89]	[5.92, 14.29]	[1.73, 18.47]	[-0.36, 20.57]
Abdominal fat ratio	[0.34, 0.53]	[0.24, 0.63]	[0.19, 0.68]	[0.43, 0.64]	[0.33, 0.74]	[0.28, 0.79]	

ASAT, abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue; SD, standard deviation; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.