

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

1 Translation, adaptation, and measurement properties of the Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire
2 among university students in Indonesia

3 Reza Setyono Ashari¹, Rahmaningsih Mara Sabirin², Stevani Tia Bella Merlinda³, Dilia Ananda Pratiwi^{1,6},
4 Melati Nilna Tsania⁴, Rakhmat Ari Wibowo^{2,5*}

5
6 ¹ Biomedical Science Postgraduate Programme, Department of Physiology, Faculty of Public Health Medicine,
7 and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

8 ² Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada,
9 Yogyakarta, Indonesia

10 ³ Department of Nutrition and Health, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health, and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah
11 Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

12 ⁴ School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada,
13 Yogyakarta, Indonesia

14 ⁵ Physical Activity for Health Research Centre, Institute of Sport, Physical Education, and Health Sciences,
15 Moray House School of Education and Sport, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

16 ⁶ Department of Physiotherapy, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan Bhakti Husada, Cikarang, Indonesia

17 *Corresponding author:

18 Email address: R.wibowo@ed.ac.uk

19

20 ABSTRACT

21 **Background:** Despite the abundant evidence showing the benefits of muscle-strengthening exercise (MSE), no
22 epidemiological tool is available for assessing MSE among Indonesian university students. This study aimed to
23 adapt the Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire (MSEQ) into the Indonesian context and test the validity
24 and reliability of the MSEQ Indonesian version.

25 **Methods:** Translation and cultural adaptation, content validity studies, concurrent validity studies, and reliability
26 studies were conducted with a total of 121 respondents. The concurrent validity study compared the results of
27 measuring MSE frequency, intensity, duration, and volume with those of the 7-day diary and relative handgrip
28 strength. For the reliability study, the respondents were asked to fill the MSEQ Indonesian version twice with a
29 time interval of 7 days.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

30 **Results:** Moderate-to-strong correlations were observed between the results for the weekly frequency, duration,
31 intensity, and volume of MSE and those of the 7-day diary and hand grip strength. Test–retest reliabilities were
32 good to excellent for machine weight, holistic, and overall MSE but poor for bodyweight MSE. In assessing the
33 target muscle group, the MSEQ Indonesian version showed good test–retest reliability for machine-weight MSE
34 but poor-to-very good test–retest reliability for bodyweight, free weight, and holistic MSE.

35 **Conclusions:** Our study showed acceptable validity and reliability of the MSEQ Indonesian version to be used
36 for assessing MSE among university students in Indonesia. Further studies are warranted to ensure the
37 generalizability of our findings among the adult population.

38

39 **Keywords:** hand strength, reproducibility of results, surveys and questionnaires, human, muscles

40

41 **Word count:** 2828

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

42 **Introduction**

43 Recent guidelines strongly recommend adults to engage in muscle-strengthening physical
44 activities (MSPAs) at least twice a week in addition to moderate–vigorous aerobic physical activity
45 (MVPA) to acquire additional health benefits^[1]. Muscle-strengthening exercise (MSE) is a form of
46 MSPAs that uses weight training equipment, elastic bands, free weights, or body weight and is
47 performed during leisure time^[2]. Compared with the MSPAs that are accrued during occupational
48 or domestic activities and may increase the risks of musculoskeletal problems, MSE is backed up
49 by consistent evidence showing its health benefits, including lowering the risk of mortality^[3].

50 No surveillance system comprehensively covering the important dimensions of MSPAs is
51 available in many countries, including Indonesia^{[4],[5]}. The absolute burden associated with the lack
52 of physical activity is very high in middle-income countries, including Indonesia, because of their
53 large population size^[6]. Despite the potential benefit of physical activity in reducing
54 noncommunicable diseases^[7], the number of people undertaking sufficient physical activity in
55 Indonesia has declined in the recent 5-year period (2013 to 2018)^[8]. Furthermore, the university
56 student population, a key population for Indonesia’s demographic dividend, performs less physical
57 activity than the general adult population. Given the health, cognitive, and academic outcome
58 benefits of supplementing MSPAs to MVPA^[9], the establishment of MSPA surveillance systems
59 among university students in Indonesia should be advocated.

60 The Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire (MSEQ) is a valid and reliable instrument
61 designed to assess MSE in an online, self-report format developed for the adult population^[10]. The
62 items assessed include the following dimensions: 1) frequency, 2) intensity, 3) duration, 4) type of
63 exercise, and 5) targeted muscle groups of MSE^[11]. However, the MSEQ is still unavailable in
64 Bahasa Indonesia and has not been considered in the Indonesian context. Therefore, our study aimed
65 to adapt and translate the MSEQ to Bahasa Indonesia. A pilot test was conducted to examine its
66 validity and reliability among university students.

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

67 **Methods**

68 This study was part of a larger study on the implementation and evaluation of a physical activity
69 program in a university setting. We conducted this study in accordance with the Declaration of
70 Helsinki after obtaining an ethical approval from the Medical and Health Research Ethics
71 Committee Faculty of Medicine, Public Health, and Nursing Universitas Gadjah Mada (Ref No:
72 KE/FK/0661/EC). Written informed consent from participants was obtained and documented before
73 data collection.

74 The MSEQ was translated to Bahasa Indonesia and culturally adapted to the Indonesian context
75 by employing Beaton's and Sousa's guidelines and a previous questionnaire translation study
76 (Figure 1)^{[11],[12],[13]}. The initial Indonesian version of the questionnaire was revised according to the
77 results of content validation and then pilot-tested to examine the concurrent validity and reliability
78 of the final version among university students and to report dropout rates and other problems that
79 arose. Owing to the limited evidence on the gold standard for assessing the frequency, intensity,
80 type, duration, and target muscle group of MSE in free-living contexts, concurrent validity was
81 assessed rather than criterion validity to determine the extent of its agreement with the other
82 noncriterion measures of MSE^{[14],[15]}.

83 *Translation*

84 Forward translations were conducted by two independent translators to translate the
85 English/original version to Bahasa Indonesia, producing translation I (TL I) and translation II (TL
86 II). The 1st translator is an Indonesian who has excellent English proficiency and is naïve in the
87 physical activity field, and the 2nd translator is an Indonesian who has excellent English proficiency
88 and a master's degree in the physical activity field. A committee consisting of four researchers
89 covering three academic fields (physical activity for health, medicine, and physiotherapy) compared
90 TL I and TL II with the English/original version in the aspects of completeness, appropriateness,
91 and comprehension and synthesized a preliminary initial translated version (PI-TL). The committee
92 then assessed the content validity of PI-TL by interviewing experts and discussing with nonexpert
93 informants. On the basis of the results, the committee discussed and revised PI-TL into a prefinal

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

94 version of the translated version (P-FTL). Backward translations were independently conducted by
95 the 3rd and 4th translators, producing back translation version I (BTL I) and back translation version
96 II (BTL II), respectively. The 3rd translator is a UK English native who is naïve to the physical
97 activity field and has lived in Indonesia for more than 20 years, and the 4th translator is an Indonesian
98 who has lived in the UK for more than 10 years. Finally, a committee compared BTL I and BTL II
99 to the original version, synthesized a final translated version (FTL), and created guidelines to score
100 and analyze the MSEQ Indonesian version (Supplementary material 1). The FTL was then tested
101 for concurrent validity and reliability.

102

103 *Validity study*

104 Content validity

105 Content validity assessments using a mixed method approach were conducted during the
106 translation and cross-cultural adaptation to assess the completeness, appropriateness, and
107 comprehension of PI-TL. Purposive sampling was conducted from 4th July 2022 to recruit experts
108 (a public health researcher, an exercise science researcher, and a practitioner) and nonexperts
109 representing university students. Guided by interview and discussion guides (Supplementary
110 material 2), interviews with experts and FGDs with nine university students were conducted. All
111 interviews and group discussions were audio recorded and then transcribed verbatim. Two
112 researchers analyzed the verbatim transcripts of the interviews and discussions using the framework
113 method^[16]. In addition, a survey using the COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health
114 status Measurement Instruments (COSMIN) questionnaire for assessing content validity^[17]
115 (Supplementary material 3) was administered to the experts and nonexpert informants before the
116 interview or group discussion to examine the content validity of PI-TL. The total score was 50
117 points, representing 25 points of completeness, 5 points of relevance, and 20 points of
118 comprehension. The expert and nonexpert informants were then asked to assess the completeness,

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

119 appropriateness, and comprehension of P-FTL using a similar questionnaire for content validity
120 assessment.

121 Concurrent validity

122 Concurrent validity was assessed by comparing the final version of the Indonesian MSEQ to a
123 7-day diary as a subjective criterion measure and handgrip strength (HGS) as an objective criterion
124 measure. The 7-day diary was chosen because of its short recall period, resulting in high accuracy
125 in capturing behaviors^[18]. Meanwhile, HGS was chosen because it represents a physiological
126 measure of the MSE's habit effect^[19]. For the pilot study, 66 respondents were set as the minimum
127 sample population to adequately assess and identify problems to anticipate 10.6% inattentive
128 responses^{[20],[21]}. Students were conveniently recruited from a public university in Java Island,
129 Indonesia from 22nd August to 4th September 2022. HGS was assessed on their dominant hand in the
130 morning following the Southampton protocol using a hand dynamometer (Camry EH101,
131 Zhongshan Camry Electronic, China)^[22]. The age- and sex-specific z-score of BMI-adjusted
132 absolute maximal HGS was used to consider the age-, sex-, and BMI-dependent HGS normative
133 data^{[23],[24],[25],[26]}. On the same day before the HGS assessment, the respondents were asked to fill
134 out the self-administered MSEQ Indonesian online form, followed by the 7-day diary for 7
135 consecutive days. The researchers provided a daily reminder for the respondents. The respondents
136 who failed to fill the diary in 24 hours were categorized as dropouts.

137 *Reliability study*

138 A minimum sample of 73 respondents was set to adequately examine the test-retest reliability
139 of the MSEQ Indonesian version by anticipating 20% dropout and 10.6% inattentive response^[20]. A
140 convenient sampling was conducted in one public and one private universities on Java Island and a
141 public university on Sumatra Island through social media from 24th October to 6th November 2022.
142 The respondents were asked to fill out the self-administered MSEQ Indonesian version online form
143 twice at a 7-day interval.

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

144 *Statistical analysis*

145 Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences V.22 (SPSS, IBM).
146 Correlation between MSEQ and 7-day diary was examined using Spearman rank correlation and
147 categorized as strong (at least 0.8), moderately strong (0.6–0.8), fair (0.3–0.5), or poor (<0.3)^[27].
148 Bland–Altman plots were also created to report the mean of the difference and precision for the
149 agreement between the questionnaire and the diary^[28]. The mean of the difference below half of
150 twice/week of MSPAs was considered acceptable as suggested by the guidelines^[1]. Partial
151 correlation tests controlling for BMI were conducted between the HGS z-score and the weekly
152 frequency, weekly duration, average weekly intensity, and total weekly volume of MSE to examine
153 the concurrent validity of the MSEQ Indonesian version to the physiological outcomes of MSE.
154 Calculations were conducted for the intraclass coefficient correlation (ICC) of the weekly frequency,
155 duration, volume, and average intensity of MSE and the Cohen’s kappa and agreement of the target
156 muscle group captured using the MSEQ Indonesian version. ICC values less than 0.5 were
157 categorized as poor, 0.5 to 0.75 as moderate, 0.75 to 0.9 as good, and greater than 0.90 as excellent
158 reliability^[29]. Cohen’s kappa less than 0.2 was categorized as poor, 0.21 to 0.4 as fair, 0.41 to 0.6 as
159 moderate, 0.61 to 0.8 as good, and 0.81 to 1 as very good^[30].

160

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

161 **Results**

162 Our study flow and characteristics of respondents are summarized in Figure 1 and Table 1.

163 **Table 1** Respondents' Characteristics

		Content Validity	Concurrent Validity		Reliability (n=39)
		FGD sources (n=9)	Subjective (n=22)	Objective (n=70)	
Age (mean±SD) in years					
Sex	Male (n[%])	2 (22.2%)	2 (9.1%)	9 (12.8%)	13 (26.7%)
	Female (n[%])	7 (77.8%)	20 (90.9%)	61 (87.2%)	88 (73.3%)
Level of study	Undergraduate (n[%])	5 (55.6%)	21 (95.4%)	69 (98.5%)	(71.1%)
	Postgraduate (n[%])	4 (44.4%)	1 (4.6%)	1 (1.5%)	13 (28.9%)
Field of study	Social sciences (n[%])	3 (33.3%)	-	6 (8.6%)	23 (51.1%)
	Health sciences (n[%])	5 (55.6%)	22 (100%)	61 (87.1%)	13 (28.9%)
	Natural sciences (n[%])	1 (11.1%)	-	3 (4.3%)	9 (20%)
Type of residence	Private rent (n[%])	6 (66.7%)	14 (63.7%)	40 (57.1%)	31 (68.9%)
	University dormitory (n[%])	1 (11.1%)	1 (4.6%)	7 (10%)	2 (4.4%)
	With parents (n[%])	2 (22.2%)	7 (31.7%)	23 (32.9%)	12 (26.7%)

164

165 *Content validity*

166 We made several adjustments to the questionnaire, including adding and adjusting illustrations;
 167 customizing the options; adding day options to frequency questions; explaining intensity, exercise
 168 type, and duration; adding pages; adjusting layout; and emphasizing some explanations by applying
 169 bold marks (Supplementary material 4). Before the adjustments, the questionnaire got a score of
 170 40.89 points, consisting of 20.11 points for relevance, 4.11 points for comprehensiveness, and 16.67
 171 points for comprehension. Points for relevance (20.56 points), comprehensiveness (4.22 points), and
 172 comprehensibility (17.56 points) increased after the adjustment, resulting in a total of 42.34 points.

173 *Subjective concurrent validity*

174 Data from 22 out of the 71 recruited respondents were analyzed to examine the concurrent
 175 validity of the MSEQ Indonesian version against the 7-day diary. However, 49 respondents dropped

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

176 out from the 7-day diary recording, leaving only 22 respondents for analysis. Most of the
177 respondents in the final analysis were female (90.9%), undergraduate students (95.4%), and lived in
178 a private-rented house (63.7%) (Table 1).

179

180 All the MSE dimensions had a strong correlation (r range 0.73 to 0.82) (Table 2). Bland–Altman
181 plots showed that the Indonesian MSEQ can be considered acceptable to measure all the MSE
182 dimensions, with a slight overestimation of duration and intensity and underestimation of volume at
183 +0.09 minutes/week, +0.15 MET, and –56.95 MET minutes/week, respectively (Figure 2).

184

185 **Table 2** Spearman Test Relative 7-Day Diary and HGS to MSE frequency, duration, average
186 intensity, and volume of MSEQ

Measurement	Dimension of MSE	Spearman rho	P value
7-Day Diary	Frequency	0.82 (95% CI 0.60-0.92)	0.000*
	Duration	0.81 (95% CI 0.58-0.92)	0.000*
	Average intensity	0.73 (95% CI 0.45-0.88)	0.000*
	Volume	0.81 (95% CI 0.59-0.92)	0.000*
Hand-grip strength	Frequency	0.35 (95% CI 0.25-0.77)	0.003*
	Duration	0.30 (95% CI 0.12-0.54)	0.011*
	Average Intensity	0.32 (95% CI 0.07-0.50)	0.006*
	Volume	0.35 (95% CI 0.10-0.52)	0.003*

187 *Statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance.

188 MSE, Muscle-Strengthening Exercise; MSEQ, Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire

189

190 *Objective concurrent validity study*

191 Data from 70 out of the 71 respondents were examined to examine the concurrent validities of
192 MSE reported through the MSEQ Indonesian version against the relative maximal HGS as
193 physiological outcomes (Figure 1). One respondent dropped out. Most of the respondents in the final
194 analysis were female (87.2%), undergraduate students (98.5%), and lived in a private-rented house
195 (57.1%) (Table 1). A moderate correlation (r range from 0.30 to 0.35) was observed between the
196 relative maximum HGS and the frequency, duration, average intensity, and volume of MSE in the
197 MSEQ (Table 2).

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

198 *Reliability study*

199 The MSEQ Indonesian version showed moderate-to-excellent test–retest reliability (ICC range
 200 from 0.54 to 0.99) in assessing the frequency, duration, intensity, and volume of overall, machine
 201 weight, free weight, and holistic MSE. Its reliability was poor in examining body weight MSE (ICC
 202 range from 0.23 to 0.48) for all dimensions (Table 3) and poor-to-very good (Cohen’s kappa range
 203 from –0.13 to 0.79) in assessing the target muscle groups of body weight, free weight, and holistic
 204 MSE (Table 4). Meanwhile, it had very good reliability in assessing the target muscle groups of
 205 machine-weight MSE (Cohen's kappa range from 0.84 to 1) (Table 4).

206 **Table 3** ICC Analysis Results of Reliability Study

Data types	Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC)	95% Confidence Interval (CI)	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Overall MSE			
Frequency	0.71	0.50	0.83
Average Intensity	0.54	0.27	0.73
Duration	0.97	0.95	0.99
Volume	0.98	0.96	0.99
Machine Weight			
Frequency	0.95	0.91	0.98
Average Intensity	0.89	0.79	0.94
Duration	0.98	0.95	0.99
Volume	0.98	0.97	0.99
Bodyweight			
Frequency	0.39	0.09	0.63
Average Intensity	0.48	0.21	0.69
Duration	0.36	0.07	0.60
Volume	0.23	-0.07	0.50
Free Weight			
Frequency	0.82	0.68	0.90
Average Intensity	0.70	0.49	0.83
Duration	0.99	0.98	1.00
Volume	0.99	0.97	0.99
Holistic			
Frequency	0.92	0.85	0.96
Average Intensity	0.93	0.87	0.96
Duration	0.90	0.83	0.95
Volume	0.97	0.94	0.98

207 MSE, Muscle-Strengthening Exercise

208
 209
 210
 211
 212

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

213 **Table 4** Cohen's Kappa Analysis Result of Reliability Study

Domains	Cohen's Kappa Coefficient (SE of Kappa)	95% Confidence Interval (CI)		Percentage Agreement (%)
		Lower Limit	Upper Limit	
Machine Weight				
Legs	1 (0)	1	1	100
Hips	1 (0)	1	1	100
Back	1 (0)	1	1	100
Abdomen	1 (0)	1	1	100
Chest	0.84 (0.15)	0.54	0.14	97.4
Shoulders	0.84 (0.15)	0.54	0.14	97.4
Arms	0.84 (0.15)	0.54	0.14	97.4
Bodyweight				
Legs	0.66 (0.13)	0.41	0.90	84.6
Hips	0.36 (0.19)	-0.01	0.73	82.05
Back	-0.13 (0.06)	-0.24	-0.01	71.8
Abdomen	0.47 (0.15)	0.18	0.76	76.9
Chest	0.36 (0.19)	-0.03	-0.74	82.05
Shoulders	-0.11 (0.05)	-0.21	-0.02	76.9
Arms	0.27 (0.16)	-0.04	0.58	79.5
Free Weight				
Legs	0.79 (0.21)	0.38	1.19	97.4
Hips	0.47 (0.32)	-0.15	1.09	94.9
Back	0.66 (0.32)	0.03	1.28	97.4
Abdomen	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.08	0.01	92.3
Chest	0.47 (0.32)	-0.15	1.09	94.9
Shoulders	-0.07 (0.03)	-0.13	0.00	87.2
Arms	0.64 (0.24)	0.18	1.10	94.9
Holistic				
Legs	-	-	-	97.4
Hips	0.64 (0.24)	0.18	1.10	94.9
Back	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.06	0.01	94.9
Abdomen	0.64 (0.23)	0.19	1.09	94.9
Chest	0.66 (0.32)	0.03	1.28	97.4
Shoulders	-	-	-	97.4
Arms	0.48 (0.31)	-0.12	1.08	94.9

214 SE, Standard Error

215

216

217

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

218 **Discussion**

219 Our study reported the translation and adaptation of the MSEQ into its Indonesian version. We
220 have made several modifications based on themes developed by end-users' and experts' opinions.
221 Owing to the translation and cultural adaptation, an improvement was observed from 40.89 to 42.34
222 of the 50 score of the COSMIN quantitative questionnaire for assessing content validity^{[17],[31]}. In
223 this pilot study, the MSEQ Indonesian version showed strong correlation and good precision with
224 the 7-day diary but a weak correlation with HGS. It also had acceptable test–retest reliability in
225 assessing the frequency, intensity, duration, and volume of MSE. However, it only showed
226 acceptable reliability in assessing the targeted muscle groups of machine-weight MSE.

227 Compared with the original version, the MSEQ Indonesian version had higher test–retest
228 reliability (ICC range from 0.51 to 0.96 and from 0.54 to 0.97, respectively) and concurrent validity
229 (ρ range from 0.30 to 0.77 and from 0.73 to 0.82, respectively) in assessing the frequency, duration,
230 and intensity of overall MSE^[10]. This finding indicated that the addition of definition and explanation
231 questions enhanced the comprehension of the MSEQ Indonesian version and consequently its
232 reliability and validity^[32]. Although they failed to improve the validity of GPAQ in assessing the
233 intensity of aerobic activity^[33], the show cards illustrating MSE examples might have helped the
234 subjects identify the type of MSE they engaged in because MSE might be harder to understand than
235 aerobic activities^[34]. The provided list of days in the option to recall the frequency of MSE
236 functioned as memory cues that help the subjects recall their behavior; this phenomenon can also
237 explain the improvement in the validity and reliability of the MSEQ Indonesian version^[35].
238 Meanwhile, the addition of several components helped the subjects identify and recall their MSE
239 behavior but also resulted in a high burden for them, leading to loss of interest and an increase in
240 nonresponse items^{[36],[37],[38],[39],[40]}. Our study found a 1.4% dropout rate for a single administration
241 of MSEQ and a 33.8% dropout rate for two consecutive administrations of MSEQ at a 7-day interval.
242 Future studies using the MSEQ Indonesian version are recommended to use reminders and
243 prenotification to maintain the completion rate^{[38],[39]}.

244 The MSEQ Indonesian version's test–retest reliability score had an almost similar pattern to the
245 original version in assessing target muscle groups. It also had an almost perfect agreement in

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

246 assessing target muscle groups during MSE using weight machines (Cohen's kappa range from 0.84
247 to 1). Several experts argued that MSE using weight machines is easier and does not require complex
248 knowledge compared with the other MSE domains^[41]. Therefore, users may find it easier to recall
249 their MSE using weight machines compared with the other MSE domains.

250 In addition to the MSEQ, several questionnaires have recently been developed to assess MSE,
251 including the 2015 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) for assessing the weekly
252 frequency of MSE^[42], the Cancer Prevention Study-3 (CPS-3) for assessing the weekly duration of
253 MSE^[43], and the Muscle-Strengthening Activity Scale (MSAS) for assessing the frequency and
254 duration of muscle-strengthening activities^[44]. Owing to the nature of the comprehensive items in
255 the MSEQ Indonesian version, our pilot validity study found the higher validity of the MSEQ
256 Indonesian version for assessing the weekly frequency and duration of MSE compared with the
257 BRFSS in assessing whether participants met the recommended muscle-strengthening activities
258 engagement at least twice per week (Cohen's kappa range 0.40 to 0.52)^[42] and the CPS-3 in assessing
259 the weekly duration of MSE (Spearman correlation of 0.71)^[43]. The MSAS uses seven items to
260 assess the frequency and duration of MSPAs, but no study has assessed its validity to date^[45].

261 The MSEQ Indonesian version showed better concurrent validity (r range from 0.30 to 0.36)
262 against HGS than the available questionnaires, including the muscle-strengthening activity question
263 of the European Health Interview Survey-Physical Activity Questionnaire and the total activity of
264 the International Physical Activity Questionnaire-Long Form^[46]. Therefore, the MSEQ Indonesian
265 version could be utilized in examining the dose-response relationship of frequency, intensity,
266 duration, and volume with muscle strength, which requires further epidemiological studies^{[47],[48]}.

267 By considering the feedback and suggestions from end-users and experts from multidisciplinary
268 teams, we translated and culturally adapted the MSEQ into its Indonesian version. The Indonesian
269 version showed good validity and reliability for assessing the frequency, duration, intensity, volume,
270 target muscle group, and different types of MSE. Although no gold standard is available for
271 assessing all constructs of the MSE, we conducted construct validation studies using subjective and
272 objective measures. In addition, we designed and reported our study under the COSMIN guidelines
273 and provided detailed explanations of the terminologies used in our study to resolve several

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

274 limitations of previous investigations, including poor methodologies and ambiguity of
275 terminologies, as identified by a recent systematic review^[49].

276 *Limitations*

277 The MSEQ Indonesian version could not cover all the dimensions of MSE, particularly
278 repetition, number of sets, rest between periods, and load-based intensity^[50]. However, we added
279 duration into the MSEQ Indonesian version to allow for the analysis of the weekly volume of MSE.
280 An additional limitation of our study was the representativeness of our respondents in the concurrent
281 validity and reliability study. Although we recruited respondents from different types of universities
282 and different geographical locations in Indonesia, they were not representative of Indonesian
283 university students. Nevertheless, our study provided several important feasibility outcomes,
284 including recruitment rates and dropout rates, which can be used in designing further large studies
285 with representative respondents, either Indonesian university students or general Indonesian
286 adults^[51].

287 **Conclusion**

288 The MSEQ Indonesian version showed acceptable validity and reliability for assessing the
289 weekly frequency, weekly duration, average intensity, weekly volume, and targeted muscle groups
290 of MSE among university students. Further studies should be conducted by considering some of the
291 feasibility outcomes reported in our study to examine the validity and reliability of the MSEQ
292 Indonesian version among representative Indonesian university students and adults.

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

300 **Acknowledgements**

301 We sincerely thank Universitas Gadjah Mada Publishing and Publication Agency for
302 proofreading the manuscript. We also extend our gratitude to all experts and students who
303 provided their input on the questionnaire.

304 **Contributors**

305 RSA and RAW conceptualized and designed the study. RSA, DAP, and MNT collected the
306 data. RAW and RMS monitored the data collection. RSA and MNT analyzed the qualitative data.
307 RSA, STBM, and RAW analyzed the quantitative data. RSA drafted and revised the manuscript;
308 RMS, STBM, DAP, MNT, and RAW wrote and revised the manuscript.

309 **Funding**

310 This research was supported by the Junior Researcher Grant, Faculty of Medicine, Public
311 Health, and Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada (Ref No:324 /UN1/FKKMK/PPKE/PT/2022).

312 **Competing interests**

313 The authors declare that this research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or
314 financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

315 **Data availability statement**

316 The anonymized collected data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding
317 author.

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328 **References**

- 329 1. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World Health
330 Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med.*
331 2020;54(24):1451-62. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-102955. PubMed PMID: 33239350; PubMed
332 Central PMCID: PMCPMC7719906.
- 333 2. Loustalot F, Carlson SA, Kruger J, Buchner DM, Fulton JE. Muscle-strengthening
334 activities and participation among adults in the United States. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 2013;84(1):30-8.
335 doi: 10.1080/02701367.2013.762289. PubMed PMID: 23611006; PubMed Central PMCID:
336 PMCPMC10150941.
- 337 3. Momma H, Kawakami R, Honda T, Sawada SS. Muscle-strengthening activities are
338 associated with lower risk and mortality in major non-communicable diseases: a systematic review
339 and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Br J Sports Med.* 2022;56(13):755-63. Epub 20220228. doi:
340 10.1136/bjsports-2021-105061. PubMed PMID: 35228201; PubMed Central PMCID:
341 PMCPMC9209691.
- 342 4. Piercy KL, Troiano RP, Ballard RM, Carlson SA, Fulton JE, Galuska DA, et al. The
343 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. *JAMA.* 2018;320(19):2020-8. doi:
344 10.1001/jama.2018.14854. PubMed PMID: 30418471; PubMed Central PMCID:
345 PMCPMC9582631.
- 346 5. Kesehatan K. Laporan Riset Kesehatan Dasar (Riskesdas) 2018. Jakarta: Badan
347 Litbangkes, Kemenkes RI; 2019.
- 348 6. Katzmarzyk PT, Friedenreich C, Shiroma EJ, Lee IM. Physical inactivity and non-
349 communicable disease burden in low-income, middle-income and high-income countries. *Br J*
350 *Sports Med.* 2022;56(2):101-6. Epub 20210329. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-103640. PubMed
351 PMID: 33782046; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8478970.
- 352 7. Arifin H, Chou KR, Ibrahim K, Fitri SUR, Pradipta RO, Rias YA, et al. Analysis of
353 Modifiable, Non-Modifiable, and Physiological Risk Factors of Non-Communicable Diseases in
354 Indonesia: Evidence from the 2018 Indonesian Basic Health Research. *J Multidiscip Healthc.*
355 2022;15:2203-21. Epub 20220930. doi: 10.2147/JMDH.S382191. PubMed PMID: 36213176;
356 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC9532265.
- 357 8. Basrowi RW, Rahayu EM, Khoe LC, Wasito E, Sundjaya T. The Road to Healthy Ageing:
358 What Has Indonesia Achieved So Far? *Nutrients.* 2021;13(10):3441. Epub 20210928. doi:
359 10.3390/nu13103441. PubMed PMID: 34684441; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8537107.
- 360 9. Robinson K, Riley N, Owen K, Drew R, Mavilidi MF, Hillman CH, et al. Effects of
361 Resistance Training on Academic Outcomes in School-Aged Youth: A Systematic Review and
362 Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med.* 2023;53(11):2095-109. Epub 20230719. doi: 10.1007/s40279-023-
363 01881-6. PubMed PMID: 37466900; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10587249.
- 364 10. Shakespear-Druery J, De Cocker K, Biddle SJH, Bennie J. Muscle-Strengthening Exercise
365 Questionnaire (MSEQ): an assessment of concurrent validity and test-retest reliability. *BMJ Open*
366 *Sport Exerc Med.* 2022;8(1):e001225. Epub 20220214. doi: 10.1136/bmjsem-2021-001225.
367 PubMed PMID: 35237446; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8845318.
- 368 11. Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Guillemin F, Ferraz MB. Guidelines for the process of cross-
369 cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2000;25(24):3186-91. doi:
370 10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014. PubMed PMID: 11124735.
- 371 12. Sousa VD, Rojjanasrirat W. Translation, adaptation and validation of instruments or scales
372 for use in cross-cultural health care research: a clear and user-friendly guideline. *J Eval Clin Pract.*
373 2011;17(2):268-74. Epub 20100928. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01434.x. PubMed PMID:
374 20874835.
- 375 13. Arovah NI, Heesch KC. Social cognitive measures related to exercise behaviour:
376 Validation in Indonesian middle-aged and older adults. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health.*
377 2022;14:100975. doi: ARTN 100975
378 10.1016/j.cegh.2022.100975. PubMed PMID: WOS:000819926400009.
- 379 14. Shakespear-Druery J, De Cocker K, Biddle SJH, Gavilan-Carrera B, Segura-Jimenez V,
380 Bennie J. Assessment of muscle-strengthening exercise in public health surveillance for adults: A
381 systematic review. *Prev Med.* 2021;148:106566. Epub 20210418. doi:
382 10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106566. PubMed PMID: 33878352.

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

- 383 15. Kelly P, Fitzsimons C, Baker G. Should we reframe how we think about physical activity
384 and sedentary behaviour measurement? Validity and reliability reconsidered. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys*
385 *Act.* 2016;13:32. Epub 20160301. doi: 10.1186/s12966-016-0351-4. PubMed PMID: 26931142;
386 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4772314.
- 387 16. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for
388 the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res Methodol.*
389 2013;13:117. Epub 20130918. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-117. PubMed PMID: 24047204;
390 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3848812.
- 391 17. Terwee CB, Prinsen CAC, Chiarotto A, Westerman MJ, Patrick DL, Alonso J, et al.
392 COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: a
393 Delphi study. *Qual Life Res.* 2018;27(5):1159-70. Epub 20180317. doi: 10.1007/s11136-018-1829-
394 0. PubMed PMID: 29550964; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5891557.
- 395 18. Rush EC, Valencia ME, Plank LD. Validation of a 7-day physical activity diary against
396 doubly-labelled water. *Ann Hum Biol.* 2008;35(4):416-21. doi: 10.1080/03014460802089825.
397 PubMed PMID: 18608111.
- 398 19. Trosclair D, Bellar D, Judge LW, Smith J, Mazerat N, Brignac A. Hand-Grip Strength as a
399 Predictor of Muscular Strength and Endurance. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research.*
400 2011;25:S99. doi: 10.1097/01.JSC.0000395736.42557.bc.
- 401 20. Viechtbauer W, Smits L, Kotz D, Bude L, Spigt M, Serroyen J, Crutzen R. A simple
402 formula for the calculation of sample size in pilot studies. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2015;68(11):1375-9.
403 Epub 20150606. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.04.014. PubMed PMID: 26146089.
- 404 21. Costa PT, McCrae RR. The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). *The SAGE*
405 *Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment: Volume 2 — Personality Measurement and*
406 *Testing*; SAGE Publications Ltd; 2008. p. 179-98.
- 407 22. TNSBRC. Procedure for measuring hand grip strength using the jamar dynamometer.
408 Biomed Res Cent; 2016.
- 409 23. CDC. Modified z-scores in the CDC growth charts Data. Centre for Disease Control and
410 prevention; 2008.
- 411 24. Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Kuttly VR, Lanan F, Hui C, et al. Reference ranges of
412 handgrip strength from 125,462 healthy adults in 21 countries: a prospective urban rural
413 epidemiologic (PURE) study. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle.* 2016;7(5):535-46. Epub 20160412.
414 doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12112. PubMed PMID: 27104109; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4833755.
- 415 25. Lee YL, Lee BH, Lee SY. Handgrip Strength in the Korean Population: Normative Data
416 and Cutoff Values. *Ann Geriatr Med Res.* 2019;23(4):183-9. Epub 20191226. doi:
417 10.4235/agmr.19.0042. PubMed PMID: 32743310; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7370763.
- 418 26. Cooper R, Shkolnikov VM, Kudryavtsev AV, Malyutina S, Ryabikov A, Arnesdatter
419 Hopstock L, et al. Between-study differences in grip strength: a comparison of Norwegian and
420 Russian adults aged 40-69 years. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle.* 2021;12(6):2091-100. Epub
421 20211003. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12816. PubMed PMID: 34605224; PubMed Central PMCID:
422 PMCPMC8718040.
- 423 27. Chan YH. Biostatistics 104: correlational analysis. *Singapore Med J.* 2003;44(12):614-9.
424 PubMed PMID: 14770254.
- 425 28. Abu-Arafah A, Jordan H, Drummond G. Reporting of method comparison studies: a review
426 of advice, an assessment of current practice, and specific suggestions for future reports. *Br J*
427 *Anaesth.* 2016;117(5):569-75. doi: 10.1093/bja/aew320. PubMed PMID: 27799171.
- 428 29. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation
429 Coefficients for Reliability Research. *J Chiropr Med.* 2016;15(2):155-63. Epub 20160331. doi:
430 10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012. PubMed PMID: 27330520; PubMed Central PMCID:
431 PMCPMC4913118.
- 432 30. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data.
433 *Biometrics.* 1977;33(1):159-74. doi: 10.2307/2529310. PubMed PMID: 843571.
- 434 31. Mokkink LB, de Vet HCW, Prinsen CA, Terwee CB. COSMIN Methodology for
435 Conducting Systematic Reviews of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs). *Encyclopedia*
436 *of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*; Springer International Publishing; 2023. p. 1-3.

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

- 437 32. Conrad FG, Schober MF. Clarifying question meaning in a household telephone survey.
438 Public Opin Q. 2000;64(1):1-28. doi: 10.1086/316757. PubMed PMID: 10810073.
- 439 33. Rudolf K, Lammer F, Stassen G, Frobose I, Schaller A. Show cards of the Global Physical
440 Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ) - do they impact validity? A crossover study. BMC Public Health.
441 2020;20(1):223. Epub 20200212. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-8312-x. PubMed PMID: 32050940;
442 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC7017628.
- 443 34. Vasudevan A, Ford E. Motivational Factors and Barriers Towards Initiating and
444 Maintaining Strength Training in Women: a Systematic Review and Meta-synthesis. Prev Sci.
445 2022;23(4):674-95. Epub 20211120. doi: 10.1007/s11121-021-01328-2. PubMed PMID: 34800250;
446 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC9072266.
- 447 35. Lahaut VMHCJ, Jansen HAM, van de Mheen D, Garretsen HFL. Comparison of two
448 formats of the weekly recall and quantity–frequency alcohol measures. Journal of Substance Use.
449 2009;8(3):164-9. doi: 10.1080/14659890310001600179.
- 450 36. Sharma H. How short or long should be a questionnaire for any research? Researchers
451 dilemma in deciding the appropriate questionnaire length. Saudi J Anaesth. 2022;16(1):65-8. Epub
452 20220104. doi: 10.4103/sja.sja_163_21. PubMed PMID: 35261591; PubMed Central PMCID:
453 PMCPCMC8846243.
- 454 37. Iglesias C, Torgerson D. Does length of questionnaire matter? A randomised trial of
455 response rates to a mailed questionnaire. J Health Serv Res Policy. 2000;5(4):219-21. doi:
456 10.1177/135581960000500406. PubMed PMID: 11184958.
- 457 38. Koitsalu M, Eklund M, Adolfsson J, Gronberg H, Brandberg Y. Effects of pre-notification,
458 invitation length, questionnaire length and reminder on participation rate: a quasi-randomised
459 controlled trial. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2018;18(1):3. Epub 20180105. doi: 10.1186/s12874-017-
460 0467-5. PubMed PMID: 29304734; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC5756335.
- 461 39. Sahlqvist S, Song Y, Bull F, Adams E, Preston J, Ogilvie D, iConnect c. Effect of
462 questionnaire length, personalisation and reminder type on response rate to a complex postal survey:
463 randomised controlled trial. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2011;11:62. Epub 20110506. doi:
464 10.1186/1471-2288-11-62. PubMed PMID: 21548947; PubMed Central PMCID:
465 PMCPCMC3110121.
- 466 40. Kost RG, de Rosa JC. Impact of survey length and compensation on validity, reliability,
467 and sample characteristics for Ultrashort-, Short-, and Long-Research Participant Perception
468 Surveys. J Clin Transl Sci. 2018;2(1):31-7. Epub 20180706. doi: 10.1017/cts.2018.18. PubMed
469 PMID: 30393572; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPCMC6208327.
- 470 41. Haff GG. Roundtable discussion: Machines versus free weights. Strength and Conditioning
471 Journal. 2000;22(6):18-30. doi: Doi 10.1519/00126548-200012000-00004. PubMed PMID:
472 WOS:000165859000004.
- 473 42. Yore MM, Ham SA, Ainsworth BE, Kruger J, Reis JP, Kohl HW, 3rd, Macera CA.
474 Reliability and validity of the instrument used in BRFSS to assess physical activity. Med Sci Sports
475 Exerc. 2007;39(8):1267-74. doi: 10.1249/mss.0b013e3180618bbe. PubMed PMID: 17762359.
- 476 43. Subbiah K, Rees-Punia E, Patel AV. Reliability and Validity of Self-reported Muscle-
477 strengthening Exercise in the Cancer Prevention Study-3. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53(5):888-
478 93. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002547. PubMed PMID: 33105384.
- 479 44. Hart PD. Development and Item Analysis of A Multidimensional Scale to Measure Muscle
480 Strengthening Activity Behavior: The Muscle Strengthening Activity Scale (MSAS). EAS J Psychol
481 Behav Sci. 2019;1(2):29-35.
- 482 45. Hart PD. Construct Validity Evidence for the Muscle Strengthening Activity Scale
483 (MSAS). American Journal of Public Health Research. 2019;7(5):189-93. doi: 10.12691/ajphr-7-5-
484 4.
- 485 46. Baumeister SE, Ricci C, Kohler S, Fischer B, Topfer C, Finger JD, Leitzmann MF. Physical
486 activity surveillance in the European Union: reliability and validity of the European Health Interview
487 Survey-Physical Activity Questionnaire (EHIS-PAQ). Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2016;13:61. Epub
488 20160523. doi: 10.1186/s12966-016-0386-6. PubMed PMID: 27215626; PubMed Central PMCID:
489 PMCPCMC4877949.

Muscle-Strengthening Exercise Questionnaire Indonesian Version

- 490 47. Wernbom M, Augustsson J, Thomee R. The influence of frequency, intensity, volume and
491 mode of strength training on whole muscle cross-sectional area in humans. *Sports Med.*
492 2007;37(3):225-64. doi: 10.2165/00007256-200737030-00004. PubMed PMID: 17326698.
- 493 48. Grgic J, Schoenfeld BJ, Davies TB, Lazinica B, Krieger JW, Pedisic Z. Effect of Resistance
494 Training Frequency on Gains in Muscular Strength: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
495 *Sports Med.* 2018;48(5):1207-20. doi: 10.1007/s40279-018-0872-x. PubMed PMID: 29470825.
- 496 49. Silsbury Z, Goldsmith R, Rushton A. Systematic review of the measurement properties of
497 self-report physical activity questionnaires in healthy adult populations. *BMJ Open.*
498 2015;5(9):e008430. Epub 20150915. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008430. PubMed PMID:
499 26373402; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4577932.
- 500 50. Kompf J, Rhodes R. Are We Getting the Full Picture? A Systematic Review of the
501 Assessment of Resistance Training Behavior. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise*
502 *Science.* 2023;28(2):133-45. doi: 10.1080/1091367x.2023.2258869.
- 503 51. Eldridge SM, Lancaster GA, Campbell MJ, Thabane L, Hopewell S, Coleman CL, Bond
504 CM. Defining Feasibility and Pilot Studies in Preparation for Randomised Controlled Trials:
505 Development of a Conceptual Framework. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(3):e0150205. Epub 20160315. doi:
506 10.1371/journal.pone.0150205. PubMed PMID: 26978655; PubMed Central PMCID:
507 PMC4792418.
- 508
- 509






Figure 1

a) Frequency of MSE




Mean difference 0
95% limits of agreement (-1.912764, 1.912764)
Means lie between 0 and 5.50

b) Duration of MSE




Mean difference 0.0909
95% limits of agreement (-111.7966604, 111.9784604)
Means lie between 0 and 495.0

c) Intensity of MSE



Mean difference 0.1545
95% limits of agreement (-4.0167916, 4.3257916)
Means lie between 0 and 7.50

d) Volume of MSE



Mean difference -56.9545
95% limits of agreement (-765.3175904, 651.4085904)
Means lie between 0 and 2220.0

Figure 2