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

^{1,2}Mike Wells MD, PhD

²Lara Goldstein MD, PhD

³Giles Cattermole BM BCh, MA

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

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

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

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

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

Word count: 2993

Article summary

1) Why is this topic important?

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

2) What does this study attempt to show?

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

3) What are the key findings?

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

4) How is patient care impacted?

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

ABSTRACT

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

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

METHODS

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

Method development

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

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

Datasets

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

Initial model testing

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

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

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

Model calibration

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

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

Model validation

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

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

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

Outcome measures

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

Ethics

No ethical approval was required, as this study as no patient participants were included. The data was obtained from the CDC's online open access databases, which are completely anonymised.

RESULTS

Characteristics of study participants

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

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

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION

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

The accuracy of LBW estimates

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

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

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

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

The accuracy of IBW estimates

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

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

Relevance and implications for weight-based drug dosing

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

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

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

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

The need for new approaches to drug dosing

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

Limitations

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

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

Conclusions

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

REFERENCES

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

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

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

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

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

FIGURE LEGENDS

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

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

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

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

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

All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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

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

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

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

Step 1: Development of the model

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

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

Step 2: Initial testing of the model

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

Step 3: Secondary testing and calibration of the model

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

Step 4: Validation of final model

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

Step 5: Future creation of the actual tape

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

Step 6: How the tape will be used

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

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

Figure legends

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

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