

1 Association of Muscle Strength to Body Composition Measures using DXA, D₃Cr, and BIA in Collegiate Athletes

2 **Devon Cataldi**^{1,3}, Jonathan P. Bennett^{2,3}, Brandon K. Quon³, Lambert Leong³, Thomas L Kelly⁴, William J Evans⁵,
3 Carla M. Prado⁶, Steven B. Heymsfield⁷, John A Shepherd³

4 ¹College of Education: Kinesiology and Rehabilitation Science, University of Hawai'i

5 ²Department of Epidemiology, University of Hawai'i Cancer Center, 701 Ilalo St, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813 USA

6 ³University of Hawaii Cancer Center, Honolulu, HI, USA

7 ⁴Hologic Inc., Marlborough, MA, USA.

8 ⁵Department of Nutrition Sciences, University of California, Berkeley

9 ⁶Department of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

10 ⁷Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Louisiana State University, 6400 Perkins Rd, Baton Rouge, Louisiana,
11 70808 USA

12 **Corresponding Author:**

13 Devon Cataldi University of Hawai'i Cancer Center, 701 Ilalo Street, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813. Email:
14 cataldi@hawaii.edu

15 **Funding:** Hologic, Inc. Marlborough, MA, USA

16 **Running Heading:** Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

17 **Journal:** Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia, and Muscle

18 **Key Words** D₃Cr dilution; dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry; body composition; athletic performance; muscle
19 strength; muscle mass

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background** Measurements of body composition are helpful indicators of health outcomes, but muscle strength has
22 a greater correlation with disease risk and long-term health outcomes, particularly among older adults. Whole-body
23 DXA scans uniquely parse out total and regional lean soft tissue (LST) and appendicular (ALST), primarily composed
24 of skeletal muscle and often used to diagnose sarcopenia and frailty. An alternative approach measures the enrichment
25 of deuterated Creatinine (D₃Crn) in urine after ingesting a tracer dose of deuterated creatine (D₃Cr) to determine
26 creatine pool size and estimate whole-body muscle mass. The utility of D₃Cr relationships between strength and body
27 composition in young athletes has yet to be established. In this study, we investigated the association of muscle
28 strength and body composition using multiple methods including DXA, D₃Cr, and bioelectrical impedance (BIA), in
29 a collegiate athletic population. **Methods** The *Da Kine* Study enrolled 80 multi-sport collegiate athletes. Each subject
30 consumed a 60 mg dose of D₃Cr and completed whole-body DXA, BIA, and strength tests of the leg and trunk using
31 an isokinetic dynamometer. The analysis was stratified by sex. Pearson's correlations, forward stepwise linear
32 regression and quartile *p* trend significance were used to show the associations of body composition measures to
33 muscle strength. **Results** The mean (SD) age of the 80 (40M/40F) athletes was 21.8 (4.2) years. Raw whole-body
34 values had higher correlations with muscle strength in both sexes compared to the normalized values by height, body
35 mass (BM), and BMI. DXA LST had the highest leg ($R^2=0.36, 0.37$) and trunk ($R^2=0.53, 0.61$) strength in both males
36 and females. Trunk strength was more highly associated with body composition measures than leg strength in both
37 sexes and all measurement techniques. One or more DXA LST measures (total, leg, and ALST) were consistently
38 more highly associated with leg and trunk strengths for both sexes than BIA and D₃Cr measures. Adjusting all body
39 composition values by age, BMI, and BIA variables did not improve the associations. A significant *p* trend across
40 quartiles was observed for DXA LST and ALST for all measures of strength in both sexes. **Conclusion** Although
41 statistical significance was not reached between devices, DXA body composition output variables, especially LST,
42 showed the highest associations with both sexes' leg and trunk muscle strength. Furthermore, without adjustment for
43 demographic information or BIA variables, whole-body values show stronger associations with muscle strength.
44 Future research should investigate the impact of muscle mass changes on LST and functional measures.

45

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

46 **Introduction**

47 The decline in skeletal muscle mass and strength with age is associated with the functional decline that
48 typically characterizes dynapenia, sarcopenia, and frailty [1]. These structural and functional-related changes in
49 skeletal muscle or appendicular lean soft tissue (ALST) are accompanied by an increased risk of morbidity and
50 mortality [2]. Despite conflicting cut points and adjustments for defining sarcopenia, several definitions rely on
51 measuring muscle mass or its derivatives such as ALST [3].

52 Many methods exist in determining ALST and/or muscle mass including bioimpedance analysis (BIA),
53 ultrasound, computerized tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), but the most commonly utilized
54 method is dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) [4]. DXA provides a clinical advantage over CT and MRI due to
55 being broadly available in the US and Europe for osteoporosis assessment [5]. However, DXA has setbacks such as
56 subjecting individuals to low-level radiation and a lack of direct measurement of skeletal muscle. DXA LST includes
57 other tissues that are not made up of pure skeletal muscle, such as tendinous, cartilaginous, and truncal organic tissues
58 and their contents, such as the gut, which can provide a misleading estimate of lean soft tissue (LST). The use of
59 ALST minimizes these errors and hence provides a more accurate estimate of skeletal muscle. ALST by DXA is
60 highly predictive of total body skeletal muscle mass as quantified by MRI ($R^2=0.96$) and CT ($R^2=0.97$) [6].

61 DXA systems have become progressively more available within elite and professional sports environments,
62 however, DXA does not directly measure muscle mass or strength, but rather through its association with LST, which
63 may explain its limited performance in predicting fall or fracture risk [7]. DXA LST has not been as strongly associated
64 with functional measures, including falls, fractures, mortality, and disability, however, the measure is supposed to be
65 a surrogate of muscle strength, with the combination of DXA ALST and BIA has been suggested to provide insight
66 into both muscle quantity and quality [8]. Muscle quality captures the physiological and metabolic state of muscle
67 tissue and is theorized to explain the loss of muscle function before the loss of muscle mass [9]. There is no agreement
68 on the definition between measures of muscle quality; however, fatty or connective tissue infiltration within muscle
69 tissue has been proposed as measures of muscle quality. [10]. The inclusion of BIA phase angle, as a surrogate measure
70 of muscle quality, appears to improve DXA ALST in its association with grip and lower limb power in both males
71 and females [9, 11] and could potentially provide the same results in athletes. Lastly, DXA LST consists of both
72 protein and water components such that changes in hydration status may obscure true functional muscle mass changes

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

73 (i.e. the protein) between subjects. For example, it has been observed that regular exercise training, particularly in a
74 warm environment can result in up to 20% plasma volume expansion [12], or other words increasing body hydration.

75 A novel method for measuring muscle mass, Deuterated D₃ Creatine (D₃Cr), has recently been studied
76 against other conventional methods in its accuracy and utility in quantifying muscle mass and strength [13, 14]. A
77 recent review outlines the specific methodologies and assumptions used in the D₃Cr method for assessing muscle
78 mass [13]. Measuring muscle mass by D₃Cr has several advantages over DXA including no radiation exposure, cost-
79 effectiveness, and its practicality for both field and at-home settings. However, D₃Cr can only provide estimates of
80 total body skeletal muscle mass and no other body composition estimates. Furthermore, a considerable amount of time
81 is required for D₃Cr dilution, sample collection, and analysis (>three days to weeks), to provide a result. Finally, the
82 D₃Cr dilution method requires high-performance liquid chromatography units and tandem mass spectrometry, which
83 are highly specialized techniques that require substantial technical and methodological considerations needed for
84 adapting the D₃Cr method. For perspective into the different methods included in the current study, **Figure 1** shows
85 a pro/con list comparing the D₃Cr dilution method in addition to other procedures like DXA and BIA, where all
86 methods estimate skeletal muscle mass [15].

87 D₃Cr has been reported to provide an accurate assessment of skeletal muscle mass with associations to MRI
88 muscle volume in older males/females, post-menopausal females, young males ($r=0.87$) [16], and athletes ($r=0.90$)
89 [17]. D₃Cr muscle mass has associations with DXA ALST ($r=0.58$), grip strength ($r=0.20$), walking speed ($r=0.29$)
90 in older males [18], and physical function in boys with Duchenne muscular dystrophy [19]. As a result, D₃Cr shows
91 promise for use in muscle assessment in clinical and field research [20]. Research further suggests that in all quartiles
92 of the older adult male population, DXA had weak or no associations than D₃Cr-derived muscle mass for serious
93 injurious falls (p -trend=0.022), grip strength and with mortality and incident disability (p -trend=<0.001) [21],
94 indicating possible advantages of D₃Cr for assessments of functional status and falls/fracture prevention. D₃Cr
95 methods have also been explored in postmenopausal females, showing a stronger relationship in physical function
96 using the short physical performance battery test over DXA LST [22]. The comparative advantages of D₃Cr estimates
97 of muscle mass and physical strength in young adults and children are unknown. No other studies have shown
98 isokinetic strength estimates using D₃Cr in athletes. To date, the only other studies using D₃Cr in younger populations
99 have found associations with total body water ($r=0.92$) and body mass (BM) ($r=0.94$) [23] in infants. On the other

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

100 hand, young adult athletes are an ideal opportunistic population to study since they have a vested interest in strength
101 and functional performance [24] and because strength can vary greatly due to the specific sport itself [25].

102 This study seeks to clarify how DXA LST and D₃Cr muscle mass are related to strength and muscle in young
103 fit adults. We compared D₃Cr, common DXA representations of LST including total body and appendicular masses,
104 and the leg and trunk strength. Additionally, we investigated whether BIA variables explain more variability in
105 strength than using DXA or D₃Cr measures alone. We hypothesized that D₃Cr and DXA LST have similar
106 associations with strength in young adults as previously reported in older adults.

107 **Methods**

108 This cross-sectional study referred to as the *Da Kine Study* investigated a sample of collegiate and intramural
109 student-athletes who received a battery of measures related to strength and body composition including demographics,
110 D₃Cr, whole-body DXA, and BIA. This study was approved by the University of Hawaii'i Research Compliance and
111 Institutional Review Board (IRB), Protocol # 2018-01102. Written consent was obtained from all participants.

112 **Study Population**

113 Between April 2019 and March 2020, 80 healthy male and female collegiate and intramural athletes (≥ 18
114 years) of all BMI ranges were enrolled. Athletes were recruited if they were competing in-season or participating in
115 an off-season strength and conditioning routine specific to their sport. All sports played are represented in
116 **Supplemental Table 1**. Recruitment was performed by investigators visiting coaches and trainers during practice
117 times, where participants were provided with an overview of the study, the study requirements, and expected
118 outcomes. Participants were required to fast at least eight hours before testing and avoid extraneous exercise for 24
119 hours before the testing day. The athletes were instructed to not consume alcohol the day before or exercise the day
120 of the exam day. On the testing day, participants arrived at the University of Hawaii Cancer Center, where they
121 confirmed adherence to the pretesting protocols, voided and changed into form-fitting clothing (form-fitting shorts, a
122 sports bra for females, and a swim cap); participants were provided an exam gown for comfort during the study.
123 Anthropometric measures and strength tests were measured by the same technician for all measures. The primary race
124 was reported by the participant. Height and weight measurements were made using a SECA 264 (Seca, Chino, CA,
125 USA) measuring station. Participants were excluded from participation if they were pregnant or breastfeeding, unable
126 to perform strength measures due to injury, had metal implants (knee, hip, shoulder, etc.), or had received surgical

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

127 procedures that altered body composition (ex; liposuction or breast reduction/enhancement). Full details of the testing
128 procedure are outlined elsewhere [26].

129 **D₃Cr Creatine Dilution Method to Measure Muscle Mass**

130 Before dosing, participants were asked to abstain from supplemented creatine (> 8 weeks), and high dietary
131 sources of creatine (>48 hours) which was verified verbally before the start of the study. D₃Cr is a stable isotope that
132 is given orally in water and distributed to the muscle compartment of the body. This method follows certain
133 assumptions and is comprehensively reviewed in a recent historical review [13]. In brief, dietary creatine is typically
134 ingested, digested, absorbed, and transported into muscle against a gradient and is metabolized into creatinine which
135 is excreted in the urine. D₃Cr follows the same physiological path as dietary creatine and the enrichment of labeled
136 creatinine in the urine is then collected to determine a creatine pool size and as a result estimate whole-body muscle
137 mass. For this study, each subject ingested a single 60 mg dose of D₃Cr three days before laboratory testing. Fasted
138 second-morning void of urine was collected upon arrival at the laboratory, and aliquots were stored at 20°C. Aliquots
139 were frozen and shipped for processing at the Department of Nutritional Science and Toxicology at the University of
140 California, Berkeley. The methodologies utilized in the *Da Kine Study* differ slightly from previous protocols (e.g.,
141 single urine spot collection), whereas the current study collected urine in 50ml urine vials, however, these differences
142 should not have adversely influenced data quality.

143 As a methodological reference, muscle mass was estimated using the D₃Cr dilution method described in the
144 protocol outlined in previous work [27]. The D₃Cr method to measure muscle mass had an updated algorithm that
145 corrected for a certain loss of creatine in the urine, theoretically making the method more accurate [27]. To account
146 for body size differences across participants, the primary outcome of D₃Cr muscle mass and its ratio to BM were
147 included in the analysis, following previously published procedures [18, 21].

148 **Dual Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry**

149 Whole-body DXA scans were performed using a Hologic Discovery/A system (Hologic Inc., Marlborough,
150 MA, USA) The scans were analyzed at the University of Hawaii Cancer Center by a trained technologist using Hologic
151 Apex version 4.5, whole-body Fan Beam, with the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Body
152 Composition Analysis calibration option disabled. DXA systems were calibrated according to standard Hologic
153 protocols and all scans were taken using standardized procedures [28]. The DXA scans provided whole-body LST
154 (with and without head based on previous studies [9, 29, 30]), ALST, and leg LST measures. Further variables were

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

155 created to normalize body composition measures by BM (LST/ BM and ALST/ BM), height (ALST/ht²), and BMI
156 (ALST/ BMI) to match variables previously defined in the literature [3, 31].

157 **Bioelectrical Impedance**

158 Multifrequency BIA (MF-BIA) was performed on all participants using the InBody S10 (InBody, Cerritos,
159 CA, USA). All scans were acquired in the supine position on the DXA scan table immediately following the DXA
160 scan and after lying flat for ten minutes. The MF-BIA system utilizes six frequencies ranging from 1kHz -1MHz for
161 the prediction of water compartments and body composition. Each measurement was performed as per the device
162 manufacturer's recommendations. Measures included 50 kHz whole-body phase angle, intracellular water,
163 extracellular water, extracellular to intracellular water (E/I) ratio, skeletal muscle mass, and ALST. The InBody S10
164 does not have an athlete-specific result, and so the generic measure was provided for this analysis.

165 **Strength Assessments**

166 Whole-body muscle strength assessment was performed by collecting right knee and trunk extension on an
167 isokinetic dynamometer (Humac NORM, Computer Sports Medicine, Stoughton, MA, USA). First, the concentric
168 and eccentric strength of the knee extensors/flexors was assessed at 60 and 180°, and subsequently, concentric and
169 eccentric tests for the trunk were performed at 60 and 120°. Participants were positioned on the Humac testing chair
170 with a trunk-to-thigh angle of approximately 95° and fastened into the machine as per the manufacturer's instructions.
171 Straps were used to stabilize each participant's lower leg, thigh, and waist. Before testing, each participant was allowed
172 to warm up/practice to familiarize themselves with the test. After a short rest period, they performed five isometric
173 contractions of knee extension and flexion. After another short rest period (~five minutes), participants performed a
174 consecutive cycle of concentric knee extension and flexion. After completing the lower body strength test, they were
175 asked to rest and prepare for the trunk strength test. The upper body trunk strength test consisted of two parts: five
176 repetitions of the maximal effort of trunk flexion and extension with rest and the second part of 15 consecutive
177 repetitions. As shown in **Figure 2** trunk flexion and extension strength were measured on the modular trunk
178 component of the Humac.

179 All data collection was followed by the recommended protocol of the Humac NORM manual [32]. No gravity
180 correction was used for any tests. Before the start of the test, verbal instructions were given to push as hard and fast
181 as possible through the full range of motion. During the test, verbal encouragement was made, but the computer screen
182 was positioned so that participants could not see real-time feedback on their effort. Isokinetic peak torque was recorded

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

183 as the maximum torque in Newton-meters (Nm) achieved during the repetitions. The primary dependent muscle
184 strength variable was isokinetic leg and trunk extension. Isokinetic leg and trunk extension incorporate more muscles
185 into the action, producing the largest mean Nm peak force which would be more representative of whole-body muscle
186 mass measures.

187 **Statistical Analysis**

188 Data were divided by sex because there is reason to believe the association of muscle size with muscle
189 strength may vary, given known sex differences in strength and body composition. All measures were tested for
190 normality of the residuals using the Shapiro–Wilks’s test and found to be normally distributed. Pearson’s product
191 correlation coefficient was used to show determine the associations between like measures. A *p*-value of < 0.05 was
192 considered significant. Generalized linear modeling was used to compute the means of the various whole-body
193 strength tests across quartiles of body composition measures and report 95% confidence intervals and *p* trend from
194 these models. We controlled the influence of outliers by using an a priori outliers check, defining outliers as more than
195 3 standard deviations from the mean value. Least squares mean (LSMEANS) were compared between groups. The
196 base model was built using a forward stepwise selection of demographic information (age, BMI, height, and weight)
197 and the BIA variables as a baseline comparison when all other body composition measures were added to the base
198 model. Significance levels for entry and stay were 0.10 and 0.05 respectively. Results were reported as adjusted R^2
199 and RMSE. Bootstrapping (n=1000) 95% confidence intervals for the R^2 of each model, using the percentile method
200 was used to report overlapping. All statistical calculations were performed using SAS 9.4 (SAS, Cary, NC, USA).

201 **Results**

202 Of the 80 participants recruited, 1 was missing D₃Cr and 2 was missing a valid trunk strength measurement.
203 Two D₃Cr muscle mass results were excluded from the analysis due to their non-physiological possibility. After data
204 processing, 75 (38 females) participants were included in the final analysis, **Table 1** shows the characteristics of the
205 study participants separated by sex. Participant recruitment with exclusions is presented in **Supplemental Figure 1**.
206 All variables differed between sexes ($p < 0.05$), and given the strong *a priori* suggestion that muscle size and strength
207 are likely to vary between males and females justify the separate analysis by sex. All measures, including strength,
208 were normally distributed.

209 **Table 2** shows the Pearson correlations and 95% confidence intervals of D₃Cr muscle mass and selected
210 DXA measures to whole-body muscular strength outcomes, with values significantly different from zero ($p < 0.05$)

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

211 bolded. Demographic information was included in the analysis as a point of reference between other body composition
212 measures. Age, D₃Cr/ BM, ALST/ BMI, phase angle, and intracellular water were not statistically correlated to any
213 strength measure. Significant correlations were not observed for D₃Cr muscle mass and male and female leg strength.
214 When comparing group correlations between male leg to female leg and male trunk to female trunk, the Pearson
215 correlation coefficient of all measures (D₃Cr, DXA, and BIA) was generally within the same range as each other.
216 However, when comparing leg strength to trunk measures, trunk strength was generally more highly associated with
217 all body composition measures. There were neither discernable nor unique differences in the associations of DXA
218 LST (with and without head) and strength measures (without head LST not shown). There was a large overlapping
219 effect of the 95% confidence intervals per variable comparison, which implies that each variable may not have a
220 statistically significant difference. For example, all measures of DXA LST overlapped with measures of D₃Cr,
221 however, DXA LST confidence intervals did not overlap with other measures like DXA ALST/ht². Further strength
222 analyses such as isokinetic trunk and leg flexion strength and isometric leg flexion/ extension measures were
223 performed in the *Da Kine Study* and are shown in **Supplemental Table 2** in males and **Supplemental Table 3** in
224 females. For the whole-body variables of interest, partial correlations were performed by adjusting for height and
225 weight which can be found in Supplemental Table 4 in males and Supplemental Table 5 in females. DXA LST, right
226 leg LST, ALST, and ALST/ BM all showed significant correlations in both sexes across all measures of isokinetic/
227 isometric strength in both leg and trunk strength. Age, D₃Cr/ BM, and ALST/ BMI were all non-significant in both
228 sexes across all measures of isokinetic/ isometric strength in both leg and trunk strength.

229 **Table 3** shows the results of the model performance of the base model and the additional body composition
230 measures (DXA and D₃Cr). Stepwise forward regression selected only height and weight as the candidate variables
231 to form the base mode, where all other variables, including BIA variables, were not included. DXA LST had the
232 highest leg ($R^2=0.36, 0.37$) and trunk ($R^2=0.53, 0.61$) strength in both males and females. However, DXA right leg
233 LST had the highest R^2 for females' leg strength ($R^2=0.40$). Trunk strength was more highly associated with body
234 composition measures than leg strength in both sexes and all measurement techniques. One or more of the DXA LST
235 measures (total, leg, and ALST) was consistently more highly associated with leg and trunk strengths for both sexes
236 than BIA and D₃Cr measures. Significant increases in model R^2 were not observed due to all variables having large
237 overlapping effects of the 95% R^2 confidence intervals, including the base model.

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

238 D₃Cr muscle mass consistently performed lower than DXA variables, in line with Table 2 which showed
239 non-significant Pearson's correlations with D₃Cr muscle mass in both male and female leg strength. All of the BIA
240 variables performed similarly to the DXA variables but were not superior to DXA LST. Visualization of the variance
241 in the data is described in **Figure 3** as a scatterplot of DXA LST and D₃Cr muscle mass to leg and trunk strength.
242 Large variance is seen within the males over the females in leg and trunk strength, with DXA LST showing less
243 variance over D₃Cr muscle mass.

244 **Figure 4** shows the quartiles of body composition measures related to strength. Males showed a significant
245 *p* trend for all DXA variables except for ALST/ht² in both strength measures. Only DXA LST and ALST showed a
246 significant *p* trend throughout measures of strength in both males and females, suggesting the importance of using
247 LST measures, as opposed to normalized LST measures. In males, D₃Cr showed a significant *p* trend for trunk strength
248 in both D₃Cr/ BM and D₃Cr alone but not for leg strength. In females, DXA and D₃Cr variables had a significant *p*
249 trend in both strength measures, except for D₃Cr/ BM.

250 Discussion

251 The purpose of this study was to explore the use of clinical and laboratory-based whole and regional body
252 composition measures associations with muscle strength in young fit adults and contrast these results with published
253 findings in older adults. Our study showed that DXA LST was more highly associated with both leg and trunk strength
254 than D₃Cr or other candidate measures, with or without using adjustment for demographics, or BIA variables. The
255 only exception was a higher association of female DXA right leg LST with leg strength versus whole-body LST.
256 Further, all body composition predictors had a higher association with trunk strength than leg strength for both males
257 and females. Lastly, ALST/ht², commonly used in definitions of sarcopenia [3], was not as highly associated with
258 strength in general as DXA right leg LST and total LST (Table 2), underscoring the limitation of using this approach
259 of normalizing body composition measures to height in the associations of absolute strength. Raymond-Pope found
260 similar findings to our study in that right leg LST from DXA correlated with right leg isokinetic extension with an
261 $r=0.80$ in female college athletes [33]. Further, Bourgeois found comparable findings to ours who used right leg LST
262 associations to leg strength with an $R^2=0.57$ in an adult population [8].

263 There are potential implications of comparing upper and lower body relationships within populations such
264 as athletes and older adults, such that lower body muscle strength is typically wasted faster in older adults [34]. Grip
265 strength is routinely used in older populations as a determinant of poor outcomes and as part of sarcopenia definitions;

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

266 however, calf circumference and lower extremity strength may be more important for mobility outcomes [35]. In the
267 current study, the sports that were collected could be less related to lower-body strength and more related to upper-
268 body strength, or vice versa. In other words, different sports require different body adaptations; so, the sport may have
269 less of a demand on an individual's upper body or lower body (ex; soccer vs. baseball). We found that trunk strength
270 was more highly associated with using body composition measures over leg strength in both sexes.

271 The combination of DXA and BIA has previously been shown to increase the association of DXA measures
272 and muscle strength in older adults by using variables such as phase angle, intracellular and extracellular water, or the
273 ratio of the two [9, 11]. We found that phase angle showed no association with all measures of strength, whereas the
274 water compartments had significant correlations to muscle strength, with the extracellular fluid being the highest.
275 Furthermore, none of the BIA variables were selected in the forward stepwise regression modeling to improve either
276 DXA and D₃Cr associations to muscle strength. These results point to potential physiological differences between
277 athletes and the literature for older adults, where BIA variables such as phase angle may serve as a better tool to reflect
278 muscle strength. The relationship between muscle mass and strength remains unclear despite a positive linear
279 association between mass and strength [36]. This may be the result of the type of strength being assessed [37], different
280 types of sport-specific training, and consequently muscle fiber types and their contribution to strength versus power
281 [38], the effect of increased fat deposition in muscle, associated with greater fat oxidation in athletes [39], or the effect
282 of LST hydration [40]. However, these findings support that LST reflects muscle strength in this population.

283 Results of the D₃Cr performance compared to DXA for associations with strength and functional measures
284 have been mixed in older adult populations most likely due to several factors. The studies available that compare
285 D₃Cr, DXA, and strength measures generally show a higher association for DXA measures than for D₃Cr. One study
286 on older adults performed knee isokinetic strength tests of one repetition maximum and maximum voluntary
287 contraction (MVC) and found that D₃Cr muscle mass showed a slightly higher association over measures from DXA
288 LST and ALST (MVC: $R^2=0.70, 0.65, 0.63$ respectively, [41]). Grip strength does not test major muscle groups that
289 directly resist gravity but is a more accessible measure and commonly utilized in sarcopenia studies instead of trunk
290 and leg strength. For example, the males in the MrOS study underwent D₃Cr, whole-body DXA, and grip strength
291 where it was observed that the trend of increasing DXA ALST/ht² was more significantly associated with grip strength
292 than for D₃Cr muscle mass/ BM ($p<0.001$ versus 0.002 respectively) [21]. Buehring et al. [30] found that in males

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

293 and females over 70 years, DXA LST had a higher R^2 than D₃Cr in maximum hand grip strength (DXA LST $R^2=0.40$,
294 D₃Cr $R^2=0.12$).

295 However, studies that compared D₃Cr muscle mass, DXA measures, and functional tests often show a
296 stronger association between D₃Cr and function than DXA [42-44]. The males in the MrOS study underwent
297 functional measures including walking speed, 6-minute walk, chair-to-sit tests, and a jump test for lower extremity
298 power, all commonly used measures of functional limitations in older adult populations [21]. The D₃Cr measures
299 showed a significant trend to lower extremity power (watts/kg) and short physical performance battery score while
300 ALST/ht² showed no association. Other studies showed a similar superior association of D₃Cr to functional tests
301 versus DXA measures [42-44]. In another study, D₃Cr muscle mass/ BM was shown to be more highly associated
302 with habitual walking speed ($p=0.038$) than DXA LST ($p=0.513$), ALST ($p=0.573$), ALST/h² ($p=0.604$) or ALST/
303 BM ($p=0.069$) in an older adult population [18]. One contrasting study is Buehring. [30] who found that DXA LST
304 had a higher R^2 than D₃Cr for maximum jump power (DXA LST $R^2=0.40$, D₃Cr $R^2=0.34$) [30] in older males and
305 females. We have no comparable functional measures in our study.

306 Many of the studies referred to above report results for either both sexes combined (e.g. Buehring, Raymond-
307 Pope, and Bourgeois) or just for one sex, such as the males in the MrOS study. Considerable sex differences related
308 to body size are relevant when predicting muscle strength with body composition. In our study, right leg LST was
309 associated with leg strength with an $R^2=0.36$ and 0.37 for males and females respectively. Non-significant
310 relationships, or those with relatively low correlation, may become significant when subgroups like sex are combined
311 [45]. The combined association for males and females for right leg LST and leg strength was $R^2= 0.53$, virtually
312 identical to Bourgeois. We recommend reporting sex-specific muscle strength associations to avoid this type of
313 correlation inflation and to not generalize results seen in males for females.

314 The majority of D₃Cr research to evaluate associations to physical performance to date has been conducted
315 in older adults and by using fundamentally different performance metrics in comparison to the current study, such as
316 the six-minute walk, lower extremity power, short physical performance battery score, or hand grip strength tests.
317 Further, the units of lean and muscle measure varied greatly across studies. In our study, we found that D₃Cr performed
318 better than D₃Cr/ BM and that DXA ALST and LST performed better than ALST/ht² for strength associations. We
319 also found that the normalized fractions of LST/ BM and D₃Cr muscle mass/ BM did not show statistical significance
320 to the leg and trunk strength measures while other studies found significant associations to grip strength and function.

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

321 The MrOs studies often normalized D₃Cr by BM, and ALST was normalized by height squared, fundamentally
322 different normalizations. The use of different normalizations for what are similar measures of muscle is questionable.
323 Differences in units and normalizations may partly explain the mixed results between studies. Based on the similarity
324 of our findings in young adults to previous studies in older adults where the same measures are presented, we predict
325 that our findings in young adults will also hold for older adults if similar comparisons were made.

326 Our study collected body composition and strength measures from a racially-diverse group of collegiate
327 athletes who participate in multiple different sports. To our knowledge, this is the first investigation evaluating the
328 relationships between D₃Cr measures of muscle mass and DXA for their ability to determine muscle strength in a
329 young athletic population. Another strength of our study is that both males and females were separated in this analysis
330 to more accurately report expected correlations by sex. Unlike DXA and BIA, D₃Cr collection in athletes comes with
331 strict protocol adherence that can corrupt the data. For example, creatine supplementation is very common in sports
332 and even high dietary creatine sources. Thereby, thorough investigations on dietary creatine and supplementation are
333 warranted in this demographic [17]. Limitations to our study include the following. A comprehensive dietary record
334 was not collected in these participants and therefore we were unable to assure creatine consumption of the participants.
335 Furthermore, two male participants were excluded due to a non-physiologically possible determination of muscle mass
336 by D₃Cr, which was inferred by the processing laboratory that these participants may have been supplementing with
337 dietary creatine. This underscores the importance of following protocol when collecting D₃Cr data from athletes to
338 avoid potential data corruption. Further limitations include hand-held dynamometry and functional measures
339 commonly used to assess older adults were not collected in our study. Although we feel that measurement of the thigh
340 and abdominal/ back muscles are more functionally relevant than grip strength, we were unable to directly compare
341 our results too much of the sarcopenic literature. It is unclear if the results presented in athletes would be generalizable
342 to older adults, and suggest further investigation. Finally, an inability to test the models due to the small sample size
343 which would likely display an underpowered approach for the p-trend and potentially other results.

344 **Conclusion**

345 From this investigation, we conclude that DXA standard body composition output variables, specifically
346 LST, provide a higher relationship with the strength of the major muscle groups of the abdomen and legs compared
347 to D₃Cr muscle mass, BIA, and demographic variables in both male and female collegiate athletes; however, these
348 associations were not statistically different from one another. Furthermore, we found that whole body values from all

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

349 methods that were not adjusted for demographic information or BIA variables showed higher associations to muscle
350 strength in both males and females. Future research in athletes should examine the effects of changes in muscle mass
351 due to training, weight loss, and/or gain on LST and functional measures.

352 **Acknowledgment**

353 We gratefully acknowledge En Liu and Nisa Kelly for subject recruitment and implementation of the study protocol.
354 We thank the lab of Dr. William Evans and Dr. Mahalakshmi Shankaran for processing our samples and providing
355 the D₃Cr muscle mass results. The authors of this manuscript certify that they comply with the ethical guidelines for
356 authorship and publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle [46].

357 **Funding Statement**

358 Hologic Inc. [grant numbers 081018, 2018] supported this work

359 **Conflicts of Interest**

360 JS received an investigator-initiated grant from TK at Hologic, Inc. to fund the larger study and also has received other
361 grants on body composition from Hologic and GE Healthcare. SBH is on the Medical Advisory Board for Tanita
362 Corporation. CMP reports receiving honoraria and/or paid consultancy from Abbott Nutrition, Nutricia, Nestle Health
363 Science, Pfizer, and AMRA medical. All other authors report no conflicts of interest. Data described in the manuscript,
364 codebook, and analytic code will be made available upon request pending an application and approval, payment, and
365 or other.

366 **Ethical Standards**

367 All authors certify that they comply with the Ethical guidelines for authorship and publishing in the Journal of
368 Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle.

369 **Author Contributions**

370 **John Shepherd and Thomas Kelly:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition **Devon Cataldi Brandon Quon and**
371 **Lambert Leong:** Data curation, Formal analysis **John A Shepherd:** Investigation, Validation, Visualizations **John**
372 **A Shepherd:** Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision All Authors: Roles/Writing -
373 Original draft, review & editing. **Jonathan Bennett, Carla Prado,** William Evans and Steven Heymsfield: data
374 analysis/ interpretation. All authors provided a critical review of the manuscript.

375

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

376 **References**

- 377 1. Cruz-Jentoft, A.J. and A.A. Sayer, *Sarcopenia*. The Lancet, 2019. **393**(10191): p. 2636-2646.
- 378 2. Cruz-Jentoft, A.J., et al., *Prevalence of and interventions for sarcopenia in ageing adults: a systematic*
- 379 *review. Report of the International Sarcopenia Initiative (EWGSOP and IWGS)*. Age and ageing, 2014.
- 380 **43**(6): p. 748-759.
- 381 3. Cruz-Jentoft, A.J., et al., *Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis*. Age and
- 382 ageing, 2019. **48**(1): p. 16-31.
- 383 4. Guglielmi, G., et al., *The role of DXA in sarcopenia*. Aging clinical and experimental research, 2016. **28**(6):
- 384 p. 1047-1060.
- 385 5. Glüer, C.-C., et al., *Accurate assessment of precision errors: how to measure the reproducibility of bone*
- 386 *densitometry techniques*. Osteoporosis international, 1995. **5**(4): p. 262-270.
- 387 6. Kim, J., et al., *Total-body skeletal muscle mass: estimation by a new dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry*
- 388 *method*. The American journal of clinical nutrition, 2002. **76**(2): p. 378-383.
- 389 7. Hind, K., et al., *Interpretation of dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry-Derived body composition change in*
- 390 *athletes: a review and recommendations for best practice*. Journal of Clinical Densitometry, 2018. **21**(3): p.
- 391 429-443.
- 392 8. Bourgeois, B., et al., *Improved strength prediction combining clinically available measures of skeletal*
- 393 *muscle mass and quality*. Journal of cachexia, sarcopenia and muscle, 2019. **10**(1): p. 84-94.
- 394 9. Kuchnia, A.J., et al., *Combination of DXA and BIS body composition measurements is highly correlated*
- 395 *with physical function—an approach to improve muscle mass assessment*. Archives of Osteoporosis, 2018.
- 396 **13**(1): p. 1-9.
- 397 10. Crawford, R.J., et al., *Manually defining regions of interest when quantifying paravertebral muscles fatty*
- 398 *infiltration from axial magnetic resonance imaging: a proposed method for the lumbar spine with*
- 399 *anatomical cross-reference*. BMC musculoskeletal disorders, 2017. **18**(1): p. 1-11.
- 400 11. Rush, B., et al., *Combination of DXA and BIS predicts jump power better than traditional measures of*
- 401 *sarcopenia*. JBMR plus, 2021. **5**(8): p. e10527.
- 402 12. Sawka, M.N., et al., *Blood volume: importance and adaptations to exercise training, environmental*
- 403 *stresses and trauma sickness*. 2000.
- 404 13. McCarthy, C., et al., *D3-creatine dilution for skeletal muscle mass measurement: historical development*
- 405 *and current status*. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle, 2022.
- 406 14. Prado, C.M. and S. von Haehling, *D 3-Creatine dilution for body composition assessment: A direct take on*
- 407 *the matter*. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle, 2022.
- 408 15. McCarthy, C., et al., *D3-creatine dilution for skeletal muscle mass measurement: historical development*
- 409 *and current status*. Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle, 2022. **13**(6): p. 2595-2607.
- 410 16. Evans, W.J., et al., *D(3) -Creatine dilution and the importance of accuracy in the assessment of skeletal*
- 411 *muscle mass*. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle, 2019. **10**(1): p. 14-21.
- 412 17. Morris-Paterson, T.E., et al., *Total body skeletal muscle mass estimated by magnetic resonance imaging*
- 413 *and creatine (methyl-d3) dilution in athletes*. Scand J Med Sci Sports, 2020. **30**(3): p. 421-428.
- 414 18. Duchowny, K.A., et al., *Association of change in muscle mass assessed by D3-creatine dilution with*
- 415 *changes in grip strength and walking speed*. Journal of cachexia, sarcopenia and muscle, 2020. **11**(1): p.
- 416 55-61.
- 417 19. Evans, W.J., et al., *Profoundly lower muscle mass and rate of contractile protein synthesis in boys with*
- 418 *Duchenne muscular dystrophy*. J Physiol, 2021.
- 419 20. Clark, R.V., et al., *Total body skeletal muscle mass: estimation by creatine (methyl-d3) dilution in humans*.
- 420 *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 2014. **116**(12): p. 1605-1613.
- 421 21. Cawthon, P.M., et al., *Strong relation between muscle mass determined by D3-creatine dilution, physical*
- 422 *performance, and incidence of falls and mobility limitations in a prospective cohort of older men*. The
- 423 *Journals of Gerontology: Series A*, 2019. **74**(6): p. 844-852.
- 424 22. Zhu, K., et al., *The Association of Muscle Mass Measured by D3-Creatine Dilution Method With Dual-*
- 425 *Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry and Physical Function in Postmenopausal Women*. J Gerontol A Biol Sci
- 426 *Med Sci*, 2021. **76**(9): p. 1591-1599.
- 427 23. Evans, W.J., et al., *D3-creatine dilution for the noninvasive measurement of skeletal muscle mass in*
- 428 *premature infants*. Pediatric Research, 2021. **89**(6): p. 1508-1514.
- 429 24. Schweighofer, N., et al., *DXA-Derived indices in the characterisation of sarcopenia*. Nutrients, 2021.
- 430 **14**(1): p. 186.

Muscle Strength and D₃Cr in Athletes

- 431 25. Andersen, E., R.G. Lockie, and J.J. Dawes, *Relationship of absolute and relative lower-body strength to*
432 *predictors of athletic performance in collegiate women soccer players.* Sports, 2018. **6**(4): p. 106.
- 433 26. Cataldi, D., et al., *Agreement and Precision of Deuterium Dilution for Total Body Water and*
434 *Multicompartment Body Composition Assessment in Collegiate Athletes.* The Journal of Nutrition, 2022.
- 435 27. Shankaran, M., et al., *Dilution of oral D3-Creatine to measure creatine pool size and estimate skeletal*
436 *muscle mass: development of a correction algorithm.* Journal of cachexia, sarcopenia and muscle, 2018.
437 **9**(3): p. 540-546.
- 438 28. Lu, Y., et al., *Dual X-ray absorptiometry quality control: Comparison of visual examination and process-*
439 *control charts.* Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, 1996. **11**(5): p. 626-637.
- 440 29. Jones, W., et al., *Precision of the GE Lunar total body-less head scan for the measurement of three-*
441 *compartment body composition in athletes.* Journal of Clinical Densitometry, 2022.
- 442 30. Buehring, B., et al., *Comparison of muscle/lean mass measurement methods: correlation with functional*
443 *and biochemical testing.* Osteoporosis International, 2018. **29**(3): p. 675-683.
- 444 31. Heymsfield, S.B., et al., *Scaling of body composition to height: relevance to height-normalized indexes.*
445 *The American journal of clinical nutrition,* 2011. **93**(4): p. 736-740.
- 446 32. Humac, C., *NormTM Testing & Rehabilitation System User Guide Model 770.* Stoughton, MA, 2003.
- 447 33. Raymond-Pope, C.J., et al., *Association of compartmental leg lean mass measured by dual X-ray*
448 *absorptiometry with force production.* The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research, 2020. **34**(6): p.
449 1690-1699.
- 450 34. Serra-Rexach, J.A., et al., *Short-term, light-to moderate-intensity exercise training improves leg muscle*
451 *strength in the oldest old: a randomized controlled trial.* Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 2011.
452 **59**(4): p. 594-602.
- 453 35. Fragala, M.S., et al., *Strength and function response to clinical interventions of older women categorized by*
454 *weakness and low lean mass using classifications from the Foundation for the National Institute of Health*
455 *sarcopenia project.* Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences, 2015.
456 **70**(2): p. 202-209.
- 457 36. Akagi, R., et al., *Muscle volume compared to cross-sectional area is more appropriate for evaluating*
458 *muscle strength in young and elderly individuals.* Age and ageing, 2009. **38**(5): p. 564-569.
- 459 37. Evangelidis, P.E., et al., *Strength and size relationships of the quadriceps and hamstrings with special*
460 *reference to reciprocal muscle balance.* European journal of applied physiology, 2016. **116**(3): p. 593-600.
- 461 38. Hahn, T., A. Foldspang, and T. Ingemann-Hansen, *Dynamic strength of the quadriceps muscle and sports*
462 *activity.* British journal of sports medicine, 1999. **33**(2): p. 117-120.
- 463 39. Amati, F., et al., *Skeletal muscle triglycerides, diacylglycerols, and ceramides in insulin resistance:*
464 *another paradox in endurance-trained athletes?* Diabetes, 2011. **60**(10): p. 2588-2597.
- 465 40. St-Onge, M.-P., et al., *Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry lean soft tissue hydration: independent*
466 *contributions of intra-and extracellular water.* American Journal of Physiology-Endocrinology and
467 *Metabolism,* 2004. **287**(5): p. E842-E847.
- 468 41. Cegielski, J., et al., *The Combined Oral Stable Isotope Assessment of Muscle (COSIAM) reveals D-3*
469 *creatine derived muscle mass as a standout cross-sectional biomarker of muscle physiology vitality in older*
470 *age.* GeroScience, 2022: p. 1-10.
- 471 42. Orwoll, E., et al., *CT muscle density, D3Cr muscle mass and body fat associations with physical*
472 *performance, mobility outcomes and mortality risk in older men.* J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci, 2021.
- 473 43. Zanker, J., et al., *Factor analysis to determine relative contributions of strength, physical performance,*
474 *body composition and muscle mass to disability and mobility disability outcomes in older men.*
475 *Experimental Gerontology,* 2022. **161**: p. 111714.
- 476 44. Zanker, J., et al., *Walking speed and muscle mass estimated by the D3-Creatine dilution method are*
477 *important components of sarcopenia associated with incident mobility disability in older men: A*
478 *classification and regression tree analysis.* Journal of the American Medical Directors Association, 2020.
479 **21**(12): p. 1997-2002. e1.
- 480 45. Makin, T.R. and J.-J.O. de Xivry, *Ten common statistical mistakes to watch out for when writing or*
481 *reviewing a manuscript.* Elife, 2019. **8**.
- 482 46. von Haehling, S., et al., *Ethical guidelines for publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and*
483 *Muscle: update 2017.* 2017, Wiley Online Library. p. 1081-1083.
- 484

PROS

TECHNIQUE

CONS

D₃Cr Dilution



- Safe
- Relatively easy to obtain samples
- Accessible for remote settings and non-ambulatory patients



- No other body composition value is provided
- Specialized laboratory facilities needed Assumed muscle creatine concentration varies with: age; creatine intake, fitness; and health/disease status.

Whole-Body DXA Scan

- Time (<10 minutes)
- Results can be processed on the same day and provide a spectrum of valuable body composition indices
- Provides multiple disease-related measures







- Radiation exposure, albeit low
- Requires a clinic visit and technician
- Height and weight restriction
- Generally not associated with incident outcomes

Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis


- Time (<2 minutes)
- Affordable, portable, and accessible to most
- Provides fluid compartments and PhA (potential for muscle quality and strength)




- Questionable individual-level accuracy in healthy and clinical populations
- Population and machine-specific

DXA Lean Soft Tissue Correlation to Leg Strength**DXA Lean Soft Tissue Correlation to Trunk Strength****D₃Cr Skeletal Muscle Mass Correlation to Leg Strength****D₃Cr Skeletal Muscle Mass Correlation to Trunk Strength**


Male Leg Strength



Male Trunk Strength



Female Leg Strength



Female Trunk Strength




Table 1 – Descriptive Characteristics

Variable	Males (n=37)				Females (n=38)			
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Weight (kg)	81.29	9.71	61.90	101.25	62.88	11.22	43.90	101.80
Height (cm)	180.31	10.33	159.30	203.00	167.35	8.11	154.70	185.30
Age (years)	24.27	4.80	18.00	36.00	21.86	4.25	18.00	35.00
BMI (kg/m ²)	25.11	3.23	20.15	32.79	22.41	3.32	17.79	32.24
Leg ISOK Ex (Nm)	138.36	34.64	67.00	200.00	91.49	25.75	54.00	145.00
Trunk ISOK Ex (Nm)	273.71	89.89	137.00	494.00	165.16	44.41	72.00	259.00
D ₃ Cr SMM (kg)	41.30	7.06	30.37	53.40	24.35	3.19	17.87	31.08
D ₃ Cr SMM/ BM (kg)	0.51	0.07	0.38	0.68	0.39	0.06	0.26	0.55
DXA LST (kg)	67.35	7.16	52.90	81.67	46.38	6.30	34.82	59.07
DXA Right Leg LST (kg)	70.43	7.46	55.74	85.11	48.65	6.56	36.52	61.55
DXA ALST (kg)	12.11	1.49	9.42	15.07	8.41	1.20	5.71	11.20
DXA ALST/ BM (kg)	33.40	3.78	25.53	41.21	21.84	3.25	15.05	28.50
DXA ALST/ht ² (kg/m ²)	0.41	0.03	0.33	0.46	0.35	0.04	0.25	0.42
DXA ALST/ BMI	10.30	1.12	8.39	12.83	7.79	0.94	5.65	9.56
BIA PhA (°)	1.35	0.19	0.91	1.70	0.98	0.13	0.72	1.25
BIA ICW (L)	7.30	0.65	5.70	8.70	6.51	0.79	5.50	9.80
BIA ECW (L)	31.65	3.74	24.30	38.40	21.67	3.18	15.40	27.30
BIA SMM (kg)	39.28	4.88	29.60	48.00	26.27	4.14	18.10	33.60
BIA E/I	0.59	0.02	0.56	0.64	0.60	0.01	0.58	0.63

Abbreviations: ALST – appendicular lean soft tissue, BM – body mass, BMI – body mass index, LST – lean soft tissue, SMM – skeletal muscle mass, ECW – extracellular water, E/I – extracellular-to-intracellular water ratio, ICW – intracellular water, ECW – extracellular water, PhA – phase angle, SD – standard deviation, ISOK – isokinetic, ISOM – isometric, Flex – flexion, Ex – extension

Table 2 – Pearson's Correlation (*r*) of D₃Cr Muscle Mass, DXA and BIA Measures to Isokinetic Strength

Parameter	Male				Female			
	Leg ISOK Ex		Trunk ISOK Ex		Leg ISOK Ex		Trunk ISOK Ex	
	<i>r</i>	95%CI	<i>r</i>	95%CI	<i>r</i>	95%CI	<i>r</i>	95%CI
Weight (kg)	0.15	-0.07,0.53	0.40	0.06,0.64	0.36	0.0,0.59	0.46	0.15,0.7
Height (cm)	0.47	0.15,0.68	0.60	0.29,0.76	0.27	0.02,0.61	0.68	0.42,0.82
Age (years)	0.07	-0.29,0.35	-0.09	-0.41,0.24	-0.11	-0.48,0.16	0.05	-0.46,0.21
BMI (kg/m ²)	0.34	-0.11,0.51	0.23	-0.13,0.5	0.11	-0.12,0.51	0.50	0.16,0.71
D ₃ Cr SMM (kg)	0.27	0.0,0.6	0.67	0.42,0.82	0.30	0.05,0.63	0.41	0.13,0.69
D ₃ Cr SMM /BM (kg)	0.11	-0.28,0.38	-0.28	-0.05,0.57	0.08	-0.42,0.23	0.38	-0.59,0.04
DXA LST (kg)	0.55	0.26,0.74	0.68	0.44,0.82	0.54	0.25,0.74	0.74	0.51,0.86
DXA Right Leg LST (kg)	0.55	0.14,0.68	0.69	0.3,0.76	0.54	0.33,0.77	0.73	0.49,0.85
DXA ALST (kg)	0.46	0.23,0.72	0.59	0.37,0.79	0.55	0.28,0.75	0.69	0.53,0.86
DXA ALST / BM (kg)	0.53	-0.04,0.56	0.64	-0.06,0.55	0.50	0.11,0.66	0.72	0.21,0.73
DXA ALST /ht ² (kg/m ²)	0.43	-0.27,0.38	0.28	-0.31,0.35	0.34	-0.15,0.49	0.51	-0.36,0.32
DXA ALST/ BMI (kg/kg/m ²)	0.06	-0.35,0.31	0.01	-0.27,0.38	0.21	-0.16,0.51	-0.09	-0.24,0.47
BIA PhA (°)	0.24	0.09,0.65	0.32	0.39,0.8	0.28	0.04,0.64	0.22	0.29,0.79
BIA ICW (L)	0.03	0.13,0.68	0.06	0.35,0.78	0.23	0.06,0.65	0.13	0.29,0.78
BIA ECW (L)	0.39	-0.15,0.48	0.65	-0.41,0.24	0.35	-0.31,0.38	0.60	-0.48,0.23
BIA SMM (kg)	0.40	0.1,0.66	0.65	0.39,0.8	0.35	0.04,0.64	0.59	0.28,0.78
BIA E/I	0.30	0.09,0.65	0.55	0.39,0.8	0.48	0.04,0.64	0.62	0.29,0.79

Abbreviations: ALST – appendicular lean soft tissue, BM – body mass, BMI – body mass index, LST – lean soft tissue, SMM – skeletal muscle mass, ECW – extracellular water, E/I – extracellular-to-intracellular water ratio, ICW – intracellular water, ECW – extracellular water, PhA – phase angle, SD – standard deviation, ISOK – isokinetic, ISOM – isometric, Flex – flexion, Ex – extension

Bolded values indicate statistical significance ($p < 0.05$)

Table 3 –Regression Results of D₃Cr Muscle Mass to DXA Measures to Strength

Parameter	Male						Female					
	Leg ISOK Ex			Trunk ISOK Ex			Leg ISOK Ex			Trunk ISOK Ex		
	R ²	95% CI	RMSE	R ²	95% CI	RMSE	R ²	95% CI	RMSE	R ²	95% CI	RMSE
Base Model (Model 0)	0.25	0.05-0.54	31.3	0.38	0.13-0.66	49.1	0.18	0.02-0.49	24.4	0.49	0.2-0.73	19.7
Model0+D ₃ Cr SMM	0.27	0.07-0.56	33.5	0.49	0.27-0.71	44.0	0.26	0.15-0.64	22.0	0.54	0.26-0.78	19.4
Model0+DXA LST	0.36	0.15-0.62	29.3	0.53	0.3-0.74	45.2	0.37	0.05-0.57	24.2	0.61	0.36-0.8	17.4
Model0+DXA Right Leg LST	0.29	0.08-0.57	31.3	0.42	0.18-0.66	48.8	0.40	0.18-0.64	20.9	0.57	0.3-0.78	18.0
Model0+DXA ALST	0.33	0.12-0.6	30.0	0.44	0.21-0.68	46.7	0.36	0.13-0.63	21.6	0.60	0.34-0.8	17.8
Model0+BIA SMM	0.29	0.08-0.58	31.4	0.47	0.23-0.71	46.0	0.24	0.04-0.6	31.4	0.52	0.22-0.77	46.0

Abbreviations: ALST – appendicular lean soft tissue, RL – Right Leg, SMM – skeletal muscle mass, LST – lean soft tissue, SMM – skeletal muscle mass, ICW – intracellular water. ISOK – isokinetic, ISOM – isometric, Flex – flexion, Ex – extension

Base Model included height and weight variables. RMSE units are in Nm. All models are reporting adjusted R²