

1 **Upper arm length along with mid-upper arm circumference to enhance wasting**  
2 **prevalence estimation and diagnosis: sensitivity and specificity in 6 to 59 month-**  
3 **old children.**

4 Mouhamed Barro<sup>1</sup>, Mohamed Daouda Baro<sup>2</sup>, Djibril Cisse<sup>2</sup>, Noel Zagre<sup>3</sup>, Thierno Ba<sup>4</sup>, Shanti  
5 Neff-Baro<sup>5</sup>, Yacouba Diagana<sup>6</sup>  
6

7 <sup>1</sup>Association Nutrition et Développement, Nouakchott, Mauritania; <sup>2</sup>UNICEF Mauritania; <sup>3</sup>UNICEF West and Central Africa  
8 Regional Office; <sup>4</sup>Ministry of Health, Mauritania <sup>5</sup>Independent Consultant; <sup>6</sup>University of Nouakchott Al Aasriya, Mauritania.  
9

10 **Corresponding author:** Mouhamed Barro, 2 Square de la poterne 91300 Massy,

11 E-mail: mouhamedracinebarro@gmail.com,  
12

13 **Summary**

14 **Objective:** To evaluate the added value of the use of upper arm length (UAL) along with MUAC  
15 (mid-upper arm circumference) to diagnose and estimate the prevalence of wasting in comparison  
16 to current WHO standard and others MUAC based methods.

17 **Design:** We included UAL to usual anthropometric measurements during a Mauritanian national 6-  
18 59-month-old cross-sectional nutritional survey. Children were classified into 3 groups UALG1,  
19 UALG2 and UALG3 according to the following UAL limits:  $\leq 150$  mm, 151-180, and  $> 180$ mm  
20 respectively. We used a Receiver Operating Characteristic curve to determine the best MUAC cut-  
21 off for each group with weight-for-height Z score as a reference standard. We compared the wasting  
22 prevalence, sensitivity, and specificity, of all diagnostic methods.

23 **Findings:** In total, 12 619 children were included in the study. Wasting prevalence was 16.1%,  
24 5.0% and 12.5% when diagnosed by WHZ  $< -2$ , MUAC  $< 125$  mm and MUAC-UALG methods  
25 respectively. Using the MUAC-UALG method increased the sensitivity for wasting diagnosis from  
26 17.98 % with MUAC  $< 125$  mm to 39.43% with MUAC-UALG. The specificity decreased from  
27 97.49% with MUAC  $< 125$  to 92.71% with MUAC-UALG. With MUAC-height Z score and  
28 MUAC  $< 138$  mm, sensitivity was 26.04% and 69.76% and specificity were 97.40% and 75.64%  
29 respectively.

30 **Conclusion:** This alternative method using MUAC measuring tape to measure UAL increases the  
31 wasting diagnosis accuracy and allows for a better estimation of wasting prevalence. This method  
32 could be used as a potential alternative method for quick surveys in emergency settings such as  
33 Corona virus disease 2019 context.  
34  
35

## 36 Introduction

37 Wasting is a major public health problem in low- and middle-income countries. The risk of death is  
38 higher in wasted children defined by a weight-for-height z-score (WHZ) below -2, when compared  
39 to non-wasted children<sup>(1)</sup>. When diagnosed with wasting, children can be treated at home<sup>(2)</sup>. The  
40 earlier the child is diagnosed the shorter the duration of the treatment.<sup>3</sup> However, wasting screening  
41 and diagnosis has been a challenge for the entire humanitarian community. WHZ remains difficult  
42 to obtain routinely at the community level as it requires heavy equipment and well-trained staff.  
43 Mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) is therefore preferred in the field due to its simplicity  
44 (MUAC < 115mm for severe wasting, MUAC < 125 mm for wasting) as per the WHO  
45 recommendations.<sup>1</sup> However, MUAC has shown its limits for wasting diagnosis as well as  
46 prevalence estimation.

47 In 2019, wasting (as defined by WHZ score below -2) affected more than 47 million children under  
48 five years old world-wide.<sup>4</sup> Although both low WHZ and MUAC are recommended for wasting  
49 diagnosis,<sup>1</sup> only low WHZ is used for wasting prevalence evaluation by WHO.<sup>4</sup> The use of current  
50 WHO's MUAC cut-off recommendation does not allow for wasting prevalence estimation with an  
51 acceptable accuracy.<sup>5</sup>

52 Different MUAC cut-offs have been proposed in the past decades for wasting diagnosis (also called  
53 acute malnutrition). In the 1960's, a study based on a population of non-malnourished Polish  
54 children showed that MUAC had little or no relation to age and gender in children aged one to five  
55 years<sup>(6)</sup>. Shakir A. and Morlaey D suggested a coloured cord to measure upper-arm circumference  
56 for screening and diagnosis of wasting in children 6-59 months-old<sup>(7)</sup>. Children were categorized in  
57 three groups according to their MUAC: red, yellow and green for MUAC under 125 mm, between  
58 125 mm and 135 mm, and over 135 mm respectively. In 1985 Bernt Lindtjorn showed that these  
59 cut-off points greatly exaggerate wasting prevalence rates and proposed new cut-off points (110  
60 mm and 130 mm)<sup>(8)</sup>. Benr and Nathanail compared the WHZ < -2 and MUAC <125 mm methods  
61 and concluded that these two methods identify similar proportions of wasted children<sup>(9)</sup>. However,  
62 beyond the cut-off itself, the use of a single cut-off for wasting diagnosis in all children within this  
63 age range has been debated<sup>(10,11)</sup>. Indeed, MUAC has been reported to be age specific and the use of  
64 MUAC with a single cut-off underestimates wasting in older children<sup>(12,13)</sup>. To address this bias, a  
65 MUAC-based method taking into account child's age and sex has been implemented. A Z-score is  
66 assigned to each child according to their MUAC, age and sex<sup>(14)</sup>. However, the difficulty of  
67 determining the children's age led to the use of another index, based on MUAC, height, and sex<sup>(15)</sup>.  
68 These methods certainly improve the sensitivity of wasting diagnosis but are not simple enough to  
69 be used for routine diagnoses. In fact, the determination of the children's age on the one hand and  
70 their exact height on the other hand are essential for the MUAC-age and MUAC-height indices.

71 Due to the necessity of calculating the Z-score for each child, both methods are not really routinely  
72 used in the field.

73 We therefore considered an alternative method of wasting diagnosis with greater sensitivity and  
74 greater potential for routine use. Children's height or age is not required. The method is based on  
75 the use of MUAC in relation to child's upper arm length (UAL) which can be measured at the same  
76 time as the MUAC measurement, using the same measuring tape. We tested this method in a  
77 nutritional survey conducted in July 2015 according to the methodology "Standardized Monitoring  
78 and Assessment of Relief and Transitions" (SMART) in Mauritania. The current study aimed at  
79 evaluating the added value of the use of UAL along with the MUAC to diagnose and estimate the  
80 prevalence of wasting in comparison to the WHO standard as well as other MUAC based methods.

81

## 82 **Methodology**

### 83 Data collection

84 Data collected from the national SMART survey conducted in Mauritania in 2015 were used for the  
85 present study<sup>(16)</sup>. It was a cross-sectional survey with two-stage random sampling, led by the  
86 nutrition department of the Ministry of Health with technical support from UNICEF. The survey  
87 followed SMART survey's guideline<sup>(17)</sup>. All of the measurements were carried out by teams of  
88 trained investigators who were experienced in taking anthropometric measurements. A national  
89 representative sample of children under five years old was used for this survey.

90 Weight was measured with a precision of 100 g using an electronic SECA type weighing scale.

91 Height was measured in cm with a precision of 0.1 cm using SHORR toises. MUAC was collected  
92 in all children aged 6 to 59 months with precision to 1 mm using MUAC tapes. UAL was measured  
93 by the same MUAC tape as those used for MUAC measurement. This length corresponds to that  
94 used to determine the mid-upper arm location, namely the length between the tip of the elbow (the  
95 olecranon) and the tip of the scapula (acromion). The oedema was systematically searched at the top  
96 of both feet by exerting a pressure with the thumb for 3 seconds. Standardization of the  
97 measurements and plausibility checks were done according to the standards and recommendations  
98 of the SMART methodology<sup>(17)</sup>.

99

### 100 Data analysis

101 After a double entry to clean the anthropometric data, Z-scores were calculated using ENA Delta  
102 software November 2014. Children were excluded from the analysis based on the following criteria:  
103 MUAC, height, sex or weight not recorded, extreme WHZ ( $< -5$  or  $> +5$ ), or arbitrarily considered  
104 extreme UAL ( $< 7$  cm or  $> 30$  cm). Wasting by low WHZ was defined by (WHZ  $< -2$  using the

105 2006 WHO growth reference. Wasting by low MUAC-height Z score (MUAC-HZ) was defined by  
106  $MUAC-HZ < -2$ . Wasting by MUAC-125 mm (MUAC-125) was defined by  $MUAC < 125$  mm.  
107 Additionally, we compared our diagnosis approach with another MUAC cut-off proposed by  
108 Laillou and colleagues, wasting by MUAC 138 mm (defined by  $MUAC < 138$  mm)<sup>(18)</sup>. Wasted  
109 children (according to the WHZ  $< -2$ ) were divided into the following three groups of the same size,  
110 according to their UAL: Children with  $UAL \leq 150$ mm,  $151 \leq UAL \leq 180$ mm and  $UAL \geq 180$ mm  
111 were classified in UAL group1 (UALG1), UAL group2 (UALG2) and UAL group3 (UALG3)  
112 respectively (Figure 1). In order to diagnose wasting by MUAC with different cut-offs, three  
113 different cut-offs were established for each UALG. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC)  
114 methodology was used to determine new MUAC cut-offs with improved sensitivity for wasting  
115 diagnosis for each UALG with a minimum specificity of 90% (S1). Data were analysed using IBM  
116 SPSS statistics software.

117 The accuracy of our diagnosis method was evaluated according to the STARD recommendation<sup>(19)</sup>.  
118 Wasting by WHZ  $< -2$  was used as reference standard to calculate the sensitivity and specificity of  
119 all the diagnosis methods that we tested. Sensitivity reflects the ability of the test to identify wasting  
120 among those identified by WHZ  $< -2$ . Specificity reflects the ability to correctly identify non wasted  
121 cases among those identified by WHZ  $> -2$ . Medcalc online version  
122 ([https://www.medcalc.org/calc/diagnostic\\_test.php](https://www.medcalc.org/calc/diagnostic_test.php)) was used to calculate sensitivity, specificity,  
123 positive predictive value, negative predictive value, with 95% confidence interval for each wasting  
124 diagnosis method.

125

#### 126 **Statistic tests**

127 Mean and standard deviation were calculated for continuous values. Correlations between  
128 continuous variables were evaluated using pearson test. Mean UAL, MUAC, age, height, and WHZ  
129 comparison among UAL groups was performed by Student T-tests. Wasting prevalence was  
130 calculated for each wasting diagnostic method.

131

#### 132 **Results**

133 Anthropometric measurements were taken from 12,626 children aged 6 to 59 months throughout  
134 Mauritania. In total, 36 children ( $< 0.29\%$ ) presenting missing or inaccurate data were excluded  
135 from analysis (figure 2). A total of 12,590 children with 49.9% girls were included in this study. No  
136 child was found with bilateral oedema during the survey.

137 Our results demonstrated that UAL was correlated to height (pearson correlation = 0.65,  $p < 0.001$ )  
138 and age (pearson correlation = 0.62,  $p < 0.001$ ) and MUAC was correlated to age (pearson  
139 correlation = 0.45,  $p < 0.001$ ) as well as height (pearson correlation = 0.51,  $p < 0.001$ )).  
140 Using ROC curves with WHZ as a reference standard allowed to determine the following MUAC  
141 cut-offs for each UALG for wasting diagnosis: 125mm, 130mm and 135mm for UALG1, UALG2  
142 and UALG3 (figure 1 and S1).  
143 The mean and standard deviation of childrens' age, weight, and MUAC are described in table 1.  
144 Mean MUAC, height, and age significantly increased with UALG ( $p < 0.001$ ) (table 1). The  
145 prevalence of wasting as determined by  $WHZ < -2$  was 12.5% (table 2). When evaluated by  
146 MUAC-UALG method, wasting prevalence was 16.1%. With MUAC-125, MUAC-HZ and  
147 MUAC-138 the prevalence of wasting was 5.0%, 6.3% and 31.7% respectively.  
148 The diagnosis test accuracy for each indicator is summarised in the table 3. Overall, MUAC-125  
149 had the lowest sensitivity (17.98% [16.33% ; 19.73%]) and the highest specificity (97.49% [97.18 ;  
150 97.78]) (table 3). With single fixed cut-off indicators (MUAC-125 or MUAC-138) sensitivity  
151 decreases, and specificity increases with UALG. This was not observed with adapted cut-offs  
152 (MUAC-HZ or MUAC-UALG) (S2). Although MUAC-138 had the highest sensitivity (69.76%  
153 [67.71 ; 71.76]), it had the lowest specificity (75.64% [74.81 ; 76.45]) leading to more than 24 %  
154 false positives. MUAC-UALG had a higher sensitivity (39.43% [37.29 ; 41.59]) than MUAC-125  
155 and MUAC-HZ. MUAC-UALG had a higher specificity than MUAC-138 and a lower specificity  
156 than MUAC-HZ and MUAC-125.  
157 MUAC-125 had a lower PPV (57.87% [54.15 ; 61.50]) than MUAC-HZ (65.62% [62.43 ; 68.67])  
158 and a lower NPV than that of all other indicators. MUAC-138 had the lowest PPV (35.42% [34.42 ;  
159 36.44]) although the NPV was the highest among the indicators (92.89% [92.43 ; 93.32]).

160

## 161 **Discussion.**

162 In this study, we demonstrated two principal results related to the use of MUAC-UALG.  
163 First, the use of UAL along with MUAC enhanced WHZ based wasting prevalence estimation  
164 (table 2). Wasting prevalence evaluated by MUAC-UALG was the closest to that of  $WHZ < -2$   
165 when compared to other existing diagnosis methods. Using MUAC-125 and MUAC-HZ, wasting  
166 prevalence was three and two times lower than that of  $WHZ < -2$  respectively. Wasting prevalence  
167 determined by MUAC-138 was almost three times higher than that of  $WHZ < -2$ . Fixed cut-off  
168 MUAC often overestimates or underestimates the number of wasting cases, depending on the  
169 threshold chosen.<sup>9,13</sup> A fixed cut-off of 138 mm makes it possible to diagnose cases of wasting in  
170 older children but overestimates the number of wasting cases in the youngest children. Wasting

171 prevalence according to the WHO standard MUAC cut-off of 125 mm is two times lower than that  
172 determined by the WHZ <-2 (table 2). When using a fixed cut-off at 138mm, the prevalence is two  
173 times higher than the prevalence using WHZ <-2. With the MUAC-UALG method, more wasted  
174 children belonging to UAL groups 2 and 3 can be diagnosed.

175 Second, the use of UAL in combination with MUAC enhanced the wasting diagnosis accuracy. We  
176 selected MUAC cut offs for each UALG in such a way to minimize the number of false positives  
177 (S1). Higher sensitivity could be obtained by selecting higher MUAC cut offs for each UALG, but  
178 we believe that this approach would have a negative impact on the malnutrition management  
179 system. Although the whole community needs nutrition interventions, those who are malnourished  
180 need it more. In our study, around 82 % (1- Sensitivity) of children with WHZ < -2 were not  
181 diagnosed with wasting when the current WHO MUAC cut off (MUAC-125) was used (table 3).  
182 The use of this single cut-off leaves older children behind, but using a higher single cut off is not  
183 adequate either. Indeed, an increasingly high rate of non-malnourished children could rise health  
184 workers' burden and affect the quality wasting management. Although MUAC-ULAG alone could  
185 not detect all malnourished children, the overlap between WHZ and MUAC-UALG is higher than  
186 the overlap between MUAC-125 and WHZ. The MUAC-UALG method allows children's age (for  
187 non-stunted children) and height to be taken into account through their arm length, unlike with the  
188 MUAC-125 approach. Fiorentino and colleagues showed that MUAC-125 was more adapted to  
189 younger children<sup>(20)</sup>. Thus, this method will allow field workers to diagnose more wasted children  
190 according to WHZ compared to the use of MUAC 125. MUAC by age group could be considered as  
191 a viable method but would not be accurate in stunted children. Moreover, children's ages are not  
192 always easy to determine in the field, whereas UAL can be measured very easily. Fiorentino and  
193 colleagues had proposed different cut-offs according to age group and sex for children under five  
194 years old. With their method, the sensitivity ranged between 68% and 70% but the false positive  
195 rate was high, ranging between 30% and 32%<sup>(20)</sup>. Further studies on MUAC-UALG that evaluate  
196 the link with mortality are needed. Studies investigating wasting diagnostic methods could consider  
197 the MUAC-UALG as a diagnosis mean for comparison in the future<sup>(21)</sup>. Except for the MUAC-HZ  
198 for which ENA software did not provide values for 79 children, each indicator's accuracy was  
199 calculated in the same population. Thus, indicator accuracies were compared with no risk of  
200 statistical bias. The MUAC-UALG method does not require any harmful nor stressful actions  
201 against children.

202 The study was conducted in the Mauritanian population which is not representative of the world  
203 population. However, a multi-centric study in different populations is feasible given the simplicity  
204 of collecting children's UAL. WHZ was used as a reference standard for this study although this  
205 index is only a proxy for wasting. The overlap ratio between WHZ and MUAC varies by country.<sup>5</sup>

206 However, WHZ is widely used and accepted for wasting prevalence estimation around the world by  
207 the WHO. A more specific wasting diagnosis tool is needed in the future to compare with MUAC-  
208 UALG. Other alternative approaches could be used to evaluate the accuracy of MUAC-UALG  
209 method to identify more vulnerable children. Thus, MUAC-UALG mortality and or morbidity  
210 prediction capacity, and its association with wasting clinical biomarkers among children with low  
211 grade inflammation status could be considered.

212 At the community level, compared to the WHZ method, it is easier to use the MUAC-UALG which  
213 does not require any investment in equipment to measure height and weight. Measuring height and  
214 weight can be a challenge in emergency settings such as in corona virus disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
215 context. The portability of the MUAC tape is an advantage for its adoption by community health  
216 workers. The cost is also much lower than a scale measuring height and weight. Three MUAC  
217 tapes with different cut-offs according to UALG can be used by community health workers in the  
218 field for wasting diagnosis.

219 This study is aligned with the Council of Research & Technical Advice on Acute Malnutrition  
220 (CORTASAM) recommendations regarding the priority research<sup>(22)</sup>. Indeed, CORTASM group has  
221 recognized that the current MUAC admissions criteria for wasting (MUAC-115mm) does not select  
222 for all high-risk children, leaving behind some children who would be diagnosed as wasted by  
223 WHZ or WAZ methods. More research is needed concerning the options available to identify these  
224 high-risk children and ensure successful diagnosis and treatment, but the MUAC-UALG method is  
225 a promising candidate.

226 To our knowledge, the use of UAL in wasting diagnosis has never been proposed. This method  
227 does not add any additional tasks to the diagnostic process and has the potential to improve it. This  
228 method could be adopted in the field as a part of monitoring nutritional status of children and as an  
229 admission criterion in community-based management of acute malnutrition. Like MUAC-height or  
230 MUAC-age z-score, future studies aimed at the creation of a MUAC-UAL z-score should be  
231 considered. Using upper arm length-for-age z-score could also be considered as a substitute for the  
232 height-for-age method in diagnosing cases of chronic malnutrition. Indeed, UAL is simpler and less  
233 expensive than height measurement. A comparison of each child's UAL with a same age and sex  
234 reference population could be considered for stunting diagnosis. Thus, in nutrition programs,  
235 weight-for-age monitoring could be supplemented with UAL-for-age in cases where children's  
236 height is not known.

237 Beside wasting, obesity is also a major concern even in LMIC.<sup>4</sup> Increasing the MUAC cut-off for  
238 wasting diagnosis for all children could have a negative impact if many non-wasted children who  
239 will receive treated. It could also prevent those in need to get enough supplements in an event of  
240 shortage. Our data showed that 9.6% of children were considered as wasted despite having a Body

241 Mass Index Z-score > -1 when MUAC < 138mm. With MUAC-UALG this percentage drops to  
242 2.6%.  
243

## 244 **Conclusion**

245 The diagnosis of wasting by a fixed cut-off MUAC has limitations that can be mitigated by the use  
246 of MUAC-for-height and MUAC-for-age indicators. The complexity of accurately collecting age  
247 and height in the field makes MUAC-UALG a good alternative for wasting diagnosis and  
248 prevalence estimation. MUAC-UALG could be used in emergency setting such as in COVID-19  
249 context. The sensitivity and specificity of this method is higher than that of fixed MUAC cut-off  
250 methods and remains close to that of the MUAC-for-height and MUAC-for-age methods in  
251 Mauritanian children. Thus, using UAL along with MUAC enhances the accuracy of wasting  
252 diagnosis and the estimation of wasting prevalence. Future studies involving data from more  
253 children in different regions may lead to new perspectives on the use of MUAC-UALG as an  
254 anthropometric measure to diagnose wasting in developing countries. We recommend the inclusion  
255 of arm length in every national nutritional survey to collect more data for a multi-centric study.

256

## 257 Acknowledgments

258 We would like to thank all participants and all investigators for their effort in data collecting.

## 259 Bibliography

- 260 1. World Health Organization & UNICEF (2009) WHO child growth standards and the identification of  
261 severe acute malnutrition in infants and children: a joint statement by the World Health Organization  
262 and the United Nations Children's Fund.
- 263 2. UNICEF (2007) Community-based management of severe acute malnutrition: a joint statement by the  
264 World Health Organization, the World Food Programme, the United Nations System Standing  
265 Committee on Nutrition and the United Nations Children's Fund. Geneva: UNICEF.
- 266 3. Goossens S, Bekele Y, Yun O, et al. (2012) Mid-Upper Arm Circumference Based Nutrition  
267 Programming: Evidence for a New Approach in Regions with High Burden of Acute Malnutrition.  
268 PLoS ONE 7, e49320 [Wiley AS, editor].
- 269 4. Levels and trends in child malnutrition: Key findings of the 2020 Edition of the Joint Child  
270 Malnutrition Estimates. United Nations Children's Fund, World Health Organization, World Bank  
271 Group.



- 272 5. Grellety E & Golden MH (2016) Weight-for-height and mid-upper-arm circumference should be used  
273 independently to diagnose acute malnutrition: policy implications. *BMC Nutr.* **2**.
- 274 6. Jelliffe DB (1966) The assessment of the nutritional status of the community; with special reference to  
275 field suveys in developing regions of the world. Geneva: .
- 276 7. Shakir A & Morley D (1974) Measuring Malnutrition. *The Lancet*.
- 277 8. Lindtjørn B (1985) Masuring Acute Malnutrition: A need to redifine Cutt-Off Points for Arm  
278 Circumference? *The Lancet* **326**, 1229–1230.
- 279 9. Bern C & Nathanail L (1995) Is mid-upper-arm circumference a useful tool for screening in emergency  
280 settings? *The Lancet* **345**, 631–633.
- 281 10. Gernaat HBPE, Dechering WHJC & Voorhoeve HWA (1996) Absolute Values or Z Scores of Mid-  
282 upper Arm Circumference to Identify Wasting? Evaluation in a Community as Well as a Clinical  
283 Sample of Under Fives from Nchelenge, Zambia. *J. Trop. Pediatr.* **42**, 27–33.
- 284 11. Hall G, Chowdhury S & Bloem M (1993) Use of mid-upper-arm circumference Z scores in nutritional  
285 assessment. *The Lancet* **341**, 1481.
- 286 12. de Onis M & Habicht JP (1996) Anthropometric reference data for international use: recommendations  
287 from a World Health Organization Expert Committee. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **64**, 650–658.
- 288 13. Janes MD, MacFarlane SBJ & Moody JB (1979) Anthropometric measurement of malnutrition. *The*  
289 *Lancet*.
- 290 14. de Onis M, Yip R & Mei Z (1997) The development of MUAC-for-age reference data recommended  
291 by a WHO Expert Committee. *Bull. World Health Organ.* **75**, 11–18.
- 292 15. Mei Z, Grummer-Strawn LM, de Onis M, et al. (1997) The development of a MUAC-for-height  
293 reference, including a comparison to other nutritional status screening indicators. **75**, 9.
- 294 16. Ministère de la Santé (2015) ENQUETE NUTRITIONNELLE NATIONALE SMART  
295 MAURITANIE.
- 296 17. ACF – International, SMART Initiative at ACF – Canada and & CDC Atlanta (2014) GUIDELINES  
297 Rapid SMART surveys for Emergencies.
- 298 18. Laillou A, Prak S, de Groot R, et al. (2014) Optimal Screening of Children with Acute Malnutrition  
299 Requires a Change in Current WHO Guidelines as MUAC and WHZ Identify Different Patient Groups.  
300 *PLoS ONE* **9**, e101159 [Bhutta ZA, editor].

- 301 19. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, et al. (2015) STARD 2015: an updated list of essential items for  
302 reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. *BMJ*, h5527.
- 303 20. Fiorentino M, Sophonneary P, Laillou A, et al. (2016) Current MUAC Cut-Offs to Screen for Acute  
304 Malnutrition Need to Be Adapted to Gender and Age: The Example of Cambodia. *PLOS ONE* **11**,  
305 e0146442 [Buchowski M, editor].
- 306 21. Girma T, Hother Nielsen A-L, Kæstel P, et al. (2018) Biochemical and anthropometric correlates of  
307 bio-electrical impedance parameters in severely malnourished children: A cross-sectional study. *Clin.*  
308 *Nutr.* **37**, 701–705.
- 309 22. Briend A, Diop EI, Lemma F, et al. (2018) A research agenda for acute malnutrition. A statement from  
310 the council of recherche & technical advice on acute malnutrition (CORTASAM). Council of Research  
311 & Technical Advice on Acute Malnutrition (CORTASAM).
- 312
- 313

314

315 **Table 1: Anthropometric measurements by UALG.**

316 UALG1  $\leq$  150mm,  $150 \leq$  UALG2  $\leq$  180, UALG3  $>$  180 mm. T test was used to compare all continuous variables. The  
317 p values were  $<$  0.001 between UALGs for all tested variables.

	n	Age, months		Weight, kg		Height, cm		MUAC, mm	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
UALG1	2582	17.9 <sup>a</sup>	12.2	8.8 <sup>a</sup>	2.4	75.6 <sup>a</sup>	10.3	137.3 <sup>a</sup>	12.1
UALG2	4224	25.0 <sup>b</sup>	11.3	10.1 <sup>b</sup>	2.0	82.1 <sup>b</sup>	8.2	141.2 <sup>b</sup>	10.9
UALG3	5784	39.4 <sup>c</sup>	13.0	12.6 <sup>c</sup>	2.4	92.9 <sup>c</sup>	9.4	147.3 <sup>c</sup>	11.3
Total	12590	30.2	15.2	11.0	2.8	85.7	11.6	143.2	12.0

318 MUAC: mid-upper-arm circumference; UALG: upper arm length group.

319

320

321

322 **Table 2: Wasting prevalence determined by different methods.**


	Wasting				
Wasting indicators	WHZ < -2	MUAC-125	MUAC-138	MUAC-HZ	MUAC-UALG
n	12590	12590	12590	12511	12590
Prevalence (%)	2024 (16.1%)	629 (5.0%)	3986 (31.7%)	794 (6.3%)	1568 (12.5%)

323 WHZ < -2: weight-for-height Zscore < -2; MUAC-125: mid-upper-arm circumference < 125 mm; MUAC-138: mid-  
324 upper-arm circumference < 138 mm; MUAC-HZ: MUAC-height Z score; MUAC-UALG: mid-upper-arm  
325 circumference per upper arm length group.

326 **Table 3: Wasting diagnosis accuracy based on sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive**  
 327 **value for each indicator.**  
 328 Weight-for-height z-score < -2 was used as reference standard.


	Sensitivity		Specificity		Positive predictive value		Negative predictive value	
	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
Wasting by MUAC-125	17.98	16.33 , 19.73	97.49	97.18 , 97.78	57.87	54.15 , 61.50	86.12	85.87 , 86.37
Wasting by MUAC-138	69.76	67.71 , 71.76	75.64	74.81 , 76.45	35.42	34.42 , 36.44	92.89	92.43 , 93.32
Wasting by MUAC-HZ	26.04	24.13 , 28.02	97.40	97.08 , 97.70	65.62	62.43 , 68.67	87.37	87.08 , 87.65
Wasting by MUAC-UALG	39.43	37.29 , 41.59	92.71	92.20 , 93.20	50.89	48.72 , 53.06	88.88	88.52 , 89.22

329 MUAC-125: mid-upper-arm circumference < 125 mm; MUAC-138: mid-upper-arm circumference < 138 mm; MUAC-  
 330 HZ: MUAC-height Z score; MUAC-UALG: mid-upper-arm circumference by upper arm length group.



MUAC = mid-upper-arm circumference. UAL = upper arm length. UALG = upper arm length group,

**Figure 1 : Classification of children according to their UAL and MUAC cut-off for each UALG.**



**Figure 2 : Flow of participants for wasting diagnosis test.**

Children with not recorded MUAC, weight, height, or sex were excluded. Children with too high or too low UAL were excluded. MUAC = mid-upper arm circumference, UAL = upper arm length, WHZ = weight-for-height Z score.