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

[1,2]Mike Wells
[2]Lara Nicole Goldstein
[3]Giles Cattermole

[1]Department of Emergency Medicine and Critical Care, Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine, Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA

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

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

Corresponding author: Professor M Wells profmikewells@gmail.com +1 (786) 389-0588
Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th Street, Miami, FL 33199

Word count manuscript: 3032
Word count abstract: 235

ABSTRACT

Background Erroneous weight estimation during the management of emergency presentations in adults may contribute to patient harm and poor outcomes. Patients can often not be weighed during emergencies and a weight estimation is required to facilitate weight-based therapies. Many existing methods of weight estimation are either unacceptably inaccurate or very difficult to use during the provision of emergency care.

Methods The weight estimation system developed in this study was based on and modified from the PAWPER XL-MAC method, a paediatric weight estimation system that uses recumbent length and mid-arm circumference (MAC) to predict total body weight. This model was validated in the 2015 – 2018 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) datasets. The primary outcome measure was to achieve >95% of estimations within 20% of measured weight (P20>95%).

Results The modified PAWPER XL-MAC model achieved a P20 of 96.0% and a P10 of 71.3% in the validation dataset (N=11520). This accuracy (P20>95%) was maintained in both sexes, all ages, all ethnic groups, all lengths and in all habitus-types, except for the subgroup of severely obese individuals.

Conclusions The modified PAWPER XL-MAC model proved to be a very accurate method of weight estimation. It is more accurate than most other published reports of existing methods of weight estimation, except for patients' own estimations. It therefore could have a role in facilitating emergency drug dose calculations, if prospective studies bear out the accuracy found in this study.

INTRODUCTION

There may be as much as a 250% increase in poor outcomes in stroke patients if their estimated weight, from which the dose of intravenous thrombolytics is calculated, differs from their actual total body weight by more than 10% [1]. This is important since as many as 85% of stroke patients may have thrombolytic doses calculated from estimated weights, when accurate measured weights cannot be obtained prior to initiating treatment [2, 3]. During medical emergencies it is frequently necessary to estimate weight to allow drug dose calculations, as obtaining a measured weight may not be possible or it may delay urgent treatment. If an estimated weight is inaccurate, it could give rise to critical medication dosing errors resulting in severe harm or even death [4]. The use of inaccurate methods of estimating weight, therefore, "cannot be considered to be good medical practice" [5]. Furthermore, it is essential that the weight estimation is as accurate as can be achieved without impacting negatively on resuscitative care by excessively consuming time or cognitive resources [6, 7]. This imperative for dosing accuracy applies not only to thrombolytic drugs, but many other emergently prescribed drugs including antimicrobials, anticoagulants, many cardiac medications, anticonvulsant, and antiepileptic medications [8].

Weight estimation in adults has not been as widely studied as in children, in whom the dual length- and habitus-based methods (such as the PAWPER XL tape and the Mercy method) have been established to be the most accurate [9-11]. In adults, the most accurate weight estimations generally come from the patients themselves, but patients are often not able to provide an estimation of their own weight, and self-estimates by overweight and obese patients are frequently inaccurate [12]. Other existing methods of weight estimation have not been shown to be sufficiently accurate for safe drug dosing and may be too complex or time-consuming to use during emergency care [3, 13].

Recently, attention has shifted to evaluating the best of the paediatric dual length- and habitus-based weight estimation systems in adults. The paediatric PAWPER XL-MAC method and the Mercy method have had a preliminary evaluation in adult populations, and outperformed other methods of weight estimation, except for patient self-estimations [14-16]. These methods have shown promise but would need to be modified and optimised for adults.

The selection of an important weight estimation method is important for both decision-makers and clinicians to develop appropriate policies and practices to ensure patient safety. Optimising dosing for weight-based drugs would maximise efficacy and minimise adverse effects

We hypothesized that the PAWPER XL-MAC method could be adapted for use in adults, to produce an accurate, easy-to-use weight estimation system. The aim of this study was, therefore, to develop and validate an adult version of the PAWPER XL-MAC tape, using recumbent length and mid-arm circumference (MAC) to predict total body weight.

METHODS

This adult weight estimation model was based on the PAWPER XL-MAC tape paediatric weight estimation system [17]. The process used for developing, calibrating, and validating the new model is described below, with an overview in Figure 1.

Method development

The PAWPER XL-MAC tape is used as follows: firstly, the tape is held alongside the patient, and the patient's length measured from head to heel. The point where the patient's heel crosses the tape is noted – this is the length-segment that provides the relevant weight-data. Secondly, MAC is measured from the patient's non-dominant arm (ideally), using the scale on the PAWPER XL-MAC tape. From this measurement, the patient's habitus score (HS) can be determined, and their predicted weight read directly off the tape. Each length-segment on the tape has MAC ranges to define each habitus score category. The habitus score categories range from HS1 to HS7, with HS1 representing a very underweight patient, HS3 a normal weight patient and HS7 a severely obese patient. The other habitus scores represent intermediate body types.

The existing length-segments, MAC cutpoint values and HS categories of the original paediatric PAWPER XL-MAC tape were used for the new provisional model. New length-segments were added to extend the length of the tape from 1800 mm to 2000 mm. The MAC cutpoints and predicted weights for these segments were extrapolated from data in the "shorter" segments. The model was then coded into an electronic worksheet (Microsoft Excel for Mac, 2020) and underwent a first stage of evaluation. The coding generated a weight estimation (kg) with an input of height (cm) and MAC (mm).

Datasets

The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) datasets from the 1999-2000 to the 2017-2018 surveys were downloaded from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) website [18]. The downloaded data included the following variables: sequence number, sex, race, age, total body weight (TBW), height, body mass index (BMI) and MAC. Data from children under the age of 16 years was excluded, as were all individuals with incomplete data. The datasets were pooled as follows: the initial model testing was done in the NHANES 2011-2012 and 2013-2014 surveys, the model calibration was done in the NHANES 1999-2000, 2001-2002, 2003-2004, 2005-2006, 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012 and 2013-2014 surveys, and the model validation was done in the 2015-2016 and 2017-2018 survey datasets.

Initial model testing

The initial model was used to generate estimates of weight from height and MAC for each individual in the dataset. The data was then analysed separately for each length-segment of the tape (e.g., the 180.1 to 183.0 cm length segment). The specific outcomes that were then evaluated were: mean percentage error (MPE), which represented the estimation bias; the root mean square percentage error (RMSPE) which quantified the estimation precision; and the percentage of weight estimations that fell within 10% (P10) as well as within 20% (P20) of measured weight, which denoted overall accuracy.

After the initial testing it was apparent that the following changes needed to be made to the original model: males and females needed to be evaluated separately; two additional habitus score categories were added to accommodate weight estimations in severely obese adults; and the length-segments needed to be reduced in size. This new model was then calibrated in a larger pooled dataset.

Model calibration

Weight estimates generated in the calibration dataset by the refined model were again examined in each length-segment of the tape. The MAC cutpoint values and predicted weights for each habitus score were adjusted until a target P20 >95% and P10 >70% was obtained for each habitus score category in each length-segment (based on previously suggested acceptable accuracy targets) [11]. At the upper limits of BMI there was a substantially reduced ability of MAC to discriminate between BMI categories. This suggested a biological limitation of using this single variable for further refinement of the model in these categories. The final

model, shown in Table 1, was finally subjected to formal validation using unused data from the most recent NHANES surveys datasets.

Model validation

The final model was validated by generating estimated weights in the pooled unused 2015-2016 and 2017-2018 NHANES survey datasets. The performance of the model was evaluated by comparing the estimated weights against actual measured weight using the MPE, RMSPE, P10 and P20. 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, and severely obese) were performed. A Bland & Altman analysis was performed and graphically represented by subgroups of weight-status [19]. During the model development and analysis, the association between BMI and MAC was observed to be substantially weaker in severely obese patients than in thinner patients. For this reason, a correlation analysis between BMI and MAC was performed in these subgroups to evaluate and quantify this difference in the relationship.

All data was analysed using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, Washington: Microsoft, 2016) and Stata Statistical Software (StataCorp. 2019. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC). A significance level of 0.05 was used for all analyses.

Outcome measures

The primary outcome measure was the performance of the model when compared to measured TBW. A P20 >95% and a P10 >70% was considered to be an acceptable accuracy of estimation, as has previously been suggested [11, 20]. This benchmark is regularly achieved in children by the paediatric dual length-based, habitus-modified weight-estimation systems.

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 46340 adults included in the initial calibration study and 11520 in the validation study. Interestingly, there were some important differences between the pooled older derivation datasets (1999 to 2014) and the most recent pooled validation datasets (2015 to 2018). The validation dataset was significantly older and heavier (t-test $p<0.0001$ for each), with a lower proportion of normal weight individuals and a

higher proportion of obese and especially severely 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 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. Analysis by sex showed virtually identical results in both the calibration and validation datasets (see Table 3). Subgroup analyses by age, BMI, and race (ethnicity) are also shown in Table 3. The primary accuracy outcome was achieved in all subgroups except extremes of habitus (severely obese adults). When controlled for the prevalence of severe obesity, adults over the age of 80 years also achieved the primary accuracy outcome.

The Bland & Altman plots of the pooled NHANES validation datasets, as well as for subgroups representing extremes of habitus, are shown in Figure 2.

DISCUSSION

Importance of and need for accurate weight estimation

Several major patient safety organisations have determined that incorrect estimation of weight is one of the key causes of medication errors [21, 22]. Approximately 65% to 75% of weight estimation errors reach the patient in terms of dose errors, and patient harm can be identified in between 1% and 10% of these incidents [21, 22]. Therefore, this is an important issue. An accurate weight is important for weight-based dosing for many emergency, critical care and cardiac drugs [22]. Given that patients' weight often cannot be measured during emergencies [3], that patients are frequently unable to provide an estimate of their own weight [23], and that the consequences of inaccurate weight estimation could be catastrophic, it is essential to always have access to an accurate and easy-to-use weight estimation method [1, 12, 24]. The accuracy of the weight estimate (and therefore the dose) will determine whether the drug will produce optimal effectiveness (correct dose), toxic effects, possibly including death (overdose), or insufficient or no effects at all (underdose) [8]. The need for accurate weight estimation is therefore not uncommon and is relevant for medical practice in multiple disciplines and multiple locations: the pre-hospital environment, the Emergency Department, the Intensive Care Unit, the Operating Room and even the general ward.

Findings in this study

In this study, the modified PAWPER XL-MAC model satisfied the primary outcome measures by achieving a P20 in >95% of adults (equivalent to a critical error rate of <5%). The findings were consistent across all lengths, both sexes, all ages, all ethnic groups and in all habitus-types except in severely obese adults (who accounted for approximately 5% of the validation study sample).

Height and MAC proved again to be highly predictive for weight estimation, and other studies in both adults and children have shown the value of this combination to predict weight [15, 17, 25]. MAC has a strong evidence-base supporting its value as a surrogate for body habitus and has been repeatedly shown to be the single anthropometric variable most predictive of body weight, other than height [26]. Furthermore, both height and MAC are reliable, easy-to-perform measurements with a high inter-user agreement [27, 28].

Existing methods of estimating weight in adults

Weight estimation in adults has not been well studied previously, and the methodology and quality of the existing studies has frequently been poor. Nonetheless, a number of different methods of weight estimation have been studied in adults (see Table 4). In general, patient self-estimates have proven to be the most accurate, with accuracy of between 80 and 100% of estimations within 20% of measured weight [14, 15, 29]. However, patients are often not able to provide an estimation of their weight, with some studies reporting in excess of 80% of patients falling into this category [2]. In addition, there is a large variation in findings between studies, with some showing excellent self-estimations and others dismal results [30, 31]. Much of the accuracy reported in studies is dependent on the number of obese and severely obese patients in the sample, as self-estimations by these patients are often poor [31]. Nonetheless, this method remains the method of choice in *compos mentis* patients who are confident that they can provide a weight estimate.

Guesses of weight by relatives and healthcare providers are often very inaccurate, with critical error rates of >40% [32-34]. Although some studies have shown reasonable accuracy, this is inconsistent and often when study populations are comprised mostly of normal weight patients weighing less than 100kg [35]. Similarly, univariate anthropometric formulas have generally not proven to achieve satisfactory accuracy, although MAC has shown reasonable weight

estimation performance (with a P20 of 90%) in one previous study [26, 36-38]. Multivariate anthropometric formulas have shown some promise in initial studies, only to disappoint in subsequent attempts at validation [12, 13, 37, 39]. The best of these formulas, the Lorenz formula, achieved a P20 of >95% in the initial study, a P20 of only 85% in a subsequent validation study, but then an excellent accuracy in a recent virtual study [12, 13, 16]. Furthermore, multiple anthropometric measurements might be difficult to acquire in emergencies, and these formulas involve complex equations which might be difficult to use and vulnerable to error, as has been seen in paediatric studies [40, 41].

The new PAWPER XL-MAC adult model vs existing methods of weight estimation

The performance of the modified PAWPER XL-MAC system developed in this study compared favourably with the accuracy of other previously published methods (see Table 4 for the details). This comparison was hindered by the difference in proportion of obese adults in the current study sample and that of previously published studies. The very high proportion of severely obese adults was unique amongst weight estimation studies, including one evaluating weight estimation in obese patients [39]. Nonetheless, with the increasing prevalence of severe obesity in many global populations, studies (and appropriate methodologies) are needed to optimise weight estimation strategies in this subgroup of patients [42]. Despite this potential bias, the adult PAWPER XL-MAC system was better than most other systems, with only patient self-estimates more accurate.

The role of weight estimation during time-critical emergency care

Whenever possible, even in emergencies, an accurate measured weight should be obtained as soon as is practically possible [43]. The weighing process, however, might be difficult and very time-consuming in non-ambulant patients and, for example, in stroke patients who are candidates for thrombolysis the use of sling-scales may delay door-to-needle time [44]. In-bed scales are far from universally accessible and cannot always be used even if they are available. Interestingly, there are almost no studies validating the accuracy of in-bed scales and none that we could find relating to emergency care. The limited data available suggests that their use can be associated with large and clinically significant errors [45, 46].

Few of the existing weight estimation methods for adults were designed for emergency use, which is why a system that has been specifically designed for this purpose would be desirable even in the best equipped environments. Two main factors characterise emergency weight

estimation systems: accuracy and usability. Accuracy is important because, as Orlando and colleagues stated: “Estimates that deviate >10% from actual weight could make treatment itself life threatening” [34]. In addition to accuracy, usability is also important in a weight estimation system – it must not require a substantial amount of training to learn, and must be quick and easy to use, as weight estimation itself can lead to delays in emergency treatment [44]. The PAWPER XL and PAWPER XL-MAC systems were designed for emergency use, and data from paediatric studies suggested that they fulfil the accuracy and usability criteria and are relatively less impacted by human factor errors than other weight estimation systems [27, 47, 48]. This needs to be established in prospective studies of emergency care in adult patients, however.

Limitations

The main limitation of this study was that measurement of length and MAC in a supine adult receiving emergency care by a stressed healthcare provider might not be as accurate as that performed in a cooperative adult by an expert in anthropometry. The effects of human factor errors require evaluation in real-world or simulation situations in future studies. The other major limitation of the study was that the development of this system was from data from the USA only. This means that it might not be representative of any other population, especially populations from low- and middle-income countries. This system would need to be evaluated in a range of populations to establish its accuracy in each.

Conclusions

The consistent level of high accuracy achieved by the modified PAWPER XL-MAC method across a large sample of adults exceeded the pre-determined outcome measures. Weight estimates were accurate in adults of both sexes, all lengths, all ethnic groups, all ages, and all habitus-types, except for severely obese adults (BMI ≥40kg.m^{-2}). It is possible that severely obese adults will remain a challenge for accurate weight estimation and appropriate drug dose determination. The PAWPER XL-MAC for adults shows promise for being used to aid in guiding dosing for drugs with narrow therapeutic windows when weight cannot be measured, or when measuring weight would be excessively time-consuming. The experience with the PAWPER XL-MAC tape in children, with its high degree of accuracy and ease-of-use, suggests that it might be resilient to use during emergencies in adults as well. Future prospective studies in diverse populations will be required to establish the accuracy and ease-of-use of the PAWPER XL-MAC tape system to confirm the findings of this study.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no financial conflicts of interest

Acknowledgements

None

REFERENCES

[1] Paliwal PR, Sharma AK, Komal Kumar RN, Wong LYH, Chan BPL, Teoh HL, et al. Effect of erroneous body-weight estimation on outcome of thrombolyzed stroke patients. J Thromb Thrombolysis. 2020;50(4):921-928. 10.1007/s11239-020-02118-3

[2] Diedler J, Ahmed N, Glahn J, Grond M, Lorenzano S, Brozman M, et al. Is the maximum dose of 90 mg alteplase sufficient for patients with ischemic stroke weighing >100 kg? Stroke. 2011;42(6):1615-20. 10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.603514

[3] van de Stadt SI, van Schaik SM, van den Berg-Vos RM. [Estimating weight accurately for safe treatment: body weight estimation in patients with acute ischaemic stroke is frequently inaccurate]. Ned Tijdschr Geneeskd. 2015;159:A8909.

[4] The Joint Commission. A Best Practice in Kilograms 2020 [Accessed 2021/1/15]. Available from: https://www.jointcommission.org/resources/news-and-multimedia/blogs/dateline-tjc/2020/06/17/a-best-practice-in-kilograms/

[5] Luscombe M, Owens B. Weight estimation in resuscitation: is the current formula still valid? Arch Dis Child. 2007;92(5):412-415. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/adc.2006.107284

[6] National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention. Recommendations to weigh patients and document metric weights to ensure accurate medication dosing 2018 [Accessed 2021/01/15]. Available from: https://www.nccmerp.org/recommendations-weigh-patients-and-document-metric-weights-ensure-accurate-medication-dosing-adopted

[7] Wells M, Kramer E. Optimizing emergency drug dosing in children. Acad Emerg Med. 2008;15(12):1325.

[8] Tyson RJ, Park CC, Powell JR, Patterson JH, Weiner D, Watkins PB, et al. Precision Dosing Priority Criteria: Drug, Disease, and Patient Population Variables. Front Pharmacol. 2020;11:420. 10.3389/fphar.2020.00420

[9] Young KD, Korotzer NC. Weight estimation methods in children: a systematic review. Ann Emerg Med. 2016;68(4):441-451 e10. 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2016.02.043

[10] Wells M, Goldstein LN, Bentley A. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the accuracy of weight estimation systems used in paediatric emergency care in developing countries. Afr J Emerg Med. 2017;7:S36-S54. 10.1016/j.afjem.2017.06.001

[11] 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

[12] Darnis S, Fareau N, Corallo CE, Poole S, Dooley MJ, Cheng AC. Estimation of body weight in hospitalized patients. QJM. 2012;105(8):769-74. 10.1093/qjmed/hcs060

[13] Lorenz MW, Graf M, Henke C, Hermans M, Ziemann U, Sitzer M, et al. Anthropometric approximation of body weight in unresponsive stroke patients. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2007;78(12):1331-6. 10.1136/jnnp.2007.117150

[14] 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

[15] Cattermole GN, Manirafasha A. Accuracy of weight estimation methods in adults, adolescents and children: a prospective study. Emerg Med J. 2020. 10.1136/emermed-2020-209581

[16] 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

[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] National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data. 2016. Available from: https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/continuousnhanes/default.aspx.

[19] Bland J, Altman D. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical assessment. Lancet. 1986;1(8476):307-310.

[20] Stewart D. Accuracy of the Broselow tape for estimating paediatric weight in two Australian Emergency Departments: University of Sydney; 2009 [Accessed 7 February 2020, Master of Biostatistics]. Available from: https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au//bitstream/2123/6265/1/Declan%20Stewart%20WPP%20final.pdf

[21] Bailey B, Gaunt M, Grissinger M. Update on medication errors associated with incorrect patient weights. Pa Patient Saf Advis. 2016;13(2):50-57.

[22] ECRI Institute. Medication safety- inaccurate patient weight can cause dosing errors. PSO Navigator. 2014;6(1):1-11.

[23] Cassier-Woidasky A. To weigh or to estimate for exact dosage of thrombolysis – ways to get the body-weight in German stroke units. Akt Neurol. 2015;42:205-211.

[24] Dancsecs KA, Nestor M, Bailey A, Hess E, Metts E, Cook AM. Identifying errors and safety considerations in patients undergoing thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke. Am J Emerg Med. 2021;47:90-94. 10.1016/j.ajem.2021.03.043

[25] Abdel-Rahman SM, Ridge AL. An improved pediatric weight estimation strategy. Open Med Dev J. 2012;4:87-97. 10.2174/1875181401204010087

[26] Cattermole GN, Graham CA, Rainer TH. Mid-arm circumference can be used to estimate weight of adult and adolescent patients. Emerg Med J. 2017;34(4):231-236. 10.1136/emermed-2015-205623

[27] 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

[28] WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. Reliability of anthropometric measurements in the WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study. Acta Paediatr. 2006;450(Suppl):38-46. 10.1111/j.1651-2227.2006.tb02374.x

[29] Maukonen M, Mannisto S, Tolonen H. A comparison of measured versus self-reported anthropometrics for assessing obesity in adults- a literature review. Scand J Public Health. 2018;46:565-579.

[30] Lin BW, Yoshida D, Quinn J, Strehlow M. A better way to estimate adult patients' weights. Am J Emerg Med. 2009;27(9):1060-4. 10.1016/j.ajem.2008.08.018

[31] Hernandez-Barrera L, Trejo Valdivia B, Tellez-Rojo MM, Barquera S, Munoz-Manrique C. Validity assessment of self-reported weight and its correction process among Mexican adult women of reproductive age. PLoS One. 2020;15(7):e0235967. 10.1371/journal.pone.0235967

[32] Barrow T, Khan MS, Halse O, Bentley P, Sharma P. Estimating weight of patients with acute stroke when dosing for thrombolysis. Stroke. 2016;47(1):228-31. 10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.011436

[33] Boehringer B, Pfohl B, Tilney PVR. Accuracy of critical care transport team estimation of patient height and weight in scene responses. Air Med J. 2020;39(4):262-264. 10.1016/j.amj.2020.04.010

[34] 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

[35] Gill D, Halsey L, Kalkat H, Patel S, Kar A. Estimated weight is not a reliable measure for dosing tissue plasminogen activator for thrombolysis in acute ischaemic stroke. Int J Stroke. 2016;11(2):NP25-6. 10.1177/1747493015616641

[36] Weber-Sanchez A, Velazquez OS, Weber-Alvarez P. Validation of the Broca index as the most practical method to calculate the ideal body weight. Journal of Clinical Investigation and Studies. 2018;1(1). 10.15761/jcis.1000105

[37] Kokong DD, Pam IC, Zoakah AI, Danbauchi SS, Mador ES, Mandong BM. Estimation of weight in adults from height: a novel option for a quick bedside technique. Int J Emerg Med. 2018;11(1):54. 10.1186/s12245-018-0212-9

[38] Opdam MH, Koekkoek K, Boeije T, Mullaart N, van Zanten ARH. Mid-arm circumference method is invalid to estimate the body weight of elderly Emergency Department patients in the Netherlands. Medicine (Baltimore). 2019;98(32):e16722. 10.1097/MD.0000000000016722

[39] Crandall CS, Gardner S, Braude DA. Estimation of total body weight in obese patients. Air Med J. 2009;28(3):139-145. 10.1016/j.amj.2009.02.002

[40] Bonadio W. Frequency of emergency medicine resident dosing miscalculations treating pediatric patients. Am J Emerg Med. 2019. 10.1016/j.ajem.2019.03.027

[41] Marikar D, Varshneya K, Wahid A, Apakama O. Just too many things to remember? A survey of paediatric trainees' recall of Advanced Paediatric Life Support (APLS) weight estimation formulae. Arch Dis Child. 2013;98(11):921. 10.1136/archdischild-2013-304360

[42] 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

[43] Pennsylvania Patient Safety Authority. Medication errors- significance of accurate patient weights. Pa Patient Saf Advis. 2009;6(1):10-16.

[44] Truc My Nguyen T, van de Stadt SI, Groot AE, Wermer MJ, den Hertog HM, Droste HM, et al. Thrombolysis related symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage in estimated versus measured body weight. Int J Stroke. 2020;15(2):159-166. 10.1177/1747493019851285

[45] 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

[46] 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.

[47] 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

[48] Wells M, Goldstein LN. How and why paediatric weight estimation systems fail - a body composition study. Cureus. 2020;12(3):e7198. 10.7759/cureus.7198

Legends to figures

Figure 1 The methodology followed in this study. MAC = mid-arm circumference, BMI = body mass index, CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, HS = habitus score, NHANES = national health and nutrition examination survey, P10 = percentage of weight estimations within 10% of actual weight, P20 = percentage of weight estimations within 20% of actual weight,

Figure 2 Bland & Altman diagram by subgroups of weight status. The x-axis represents an individual's actual weight; the y-axis represents the percentage error of the difference between estimated and actual weight (100 x [estimated weight – actual weight]/actual weight). A negative value thus indicates an underestimation of weight. The red dashed lines represent the 95% limits of agreement of these residuals. The different colour markers represent individuals with different weight status, as shown in the key. The relationship between MAC and BMI was disrupted in patients with very high BMI, which lead to poorer weight predictions in these patients. A Pearson's correlation analysis between BMI and MAC showed an r^2 of 0.72 (0.71, 0.73) for patients with a BMI<40 $kg.m^{-2}$ and an r^2 of 0.29 (0.27, 0.31) for patients with a BMI ≥40 $kg.m^{-2}$.

Ethics statement

Ethical approval was not required for this study, as no patient participants were included. The data was obtained from the CDC's online open access databases, which are completely anonymised.

MALES	**HS1**		**HS2**		**HS3**		**HS4**		**HS5**		**HS6**		**HS7**		**HS8**		**HS9**	
Length	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**
(cm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)
≤153.0	**39**	≤232	**45**	233 to 258	**55**	259 to 292	**62**	293 to 330	**71**	331 to 347	**80**	348 to 354	**90**	355 to 364	**98**	365 to 384	**108**	≥385
153.1 to 158.0	**42**	≤236	**48**	237 to 257	**57**	258 to 292	**66**	293 to 343	**78**	344 to 366	**88**	367 to 396	**100**	397 to 410	**110**	411 to 420	**120**	≥421
158.1 to 162.0	**44**	≤228	**53**	229 to 269	**61**	270 to 297	**69**	298 to 327	**79**	328 to 370	**90**	371 to 392	**102**	393 to 417	**115**	418 to 429	**125**	≥430
162.1 to 165.0	**47**	≤234	**54**	235 to 268	**62**	269 to 300	**73**	301 to 344	**85**	345 to 375	**95**	376 to 390	**105**	391 to 433	**120**	434 to 470	**135**	≥471
165.1 to 168.0	**49**	≤246	**58**	247 to 276	**66**	277 to 307	**76**	308 to 352	**89**	353 to 379	**99**	380 to 392	**108**	393 to 419	**125**	420 to 466	**140**	≥467
168.1 to 171.0	**52**	≤236	**59**	237 to 277	**67**	278 to 304	**77**	305 to 347	**90**	348 to 379	**100**	380 to 405	**113**	406 to 434	**131**	435 to 480	**155**	≥481
171.1 to 174.0	**54**	≤243	**60**	244 to 280	**70**	281 to 312	**80**	313 to 345	**92**	346 to 382	**105**	383 to 416	**115**	417 to 446	**135**	447 to 481	**158**	≥482
174.1 to 177.0	**55**	≤248	**63**	249 to 281	**72**	282 to 315	**84**	316 to 355	**96**	356 to 382	**106**	383 to 411	**120**	412 to 437	**140**	438 to 464	**160**	≥465
177.1 to 180.0	**58**	≤255	**65**	256 to 286	**76**	287 to 324	**88**	325 to 360	**101**	361 to 400	**115**	401 to 419	**130**	420 to 478	**148**	479 to 497	**164**	≥498
180.1 to 183.0	**59**	≤256	**67**	257 to 285	**77**	286 to 324	**91**	325 to 364	**105**	365 to 392	**118**	393 to 431	**135**	432 to 477	**152**	478 to 525	**170**	≥526
183.1 to 186.0	**60**	≤251	**67**	252 to 282	**79**	283 to 324	**91**	325 to 362	**108**	363 to 411	**125**	412 to 438	**142**	439 to 461	**155**	462 to 489	**175**	≥490
186.1 to 189.0	**62**	≤263	**72**	264 to 294	**84**	295 to 333	**98**	334 to 369	**111**	370 to 409	**127**	410 to 442	**144**	443 to 469	**158**	470 to 502	**180**	≥503
189.1 to 192.0	**67**	≤267	**74**	268 to 288	**86**	289 to 330	**100**	331 to 366	**113**	367 to 416	**132**	417 to 434	**144**	435 to 456	**159**	457 to 485	**185**	≥486
≥192.1	**69**	≤259	**73**	260 to 293	**90**	294 to 338	**106**	339 to 382	**120**	383 to 416	**135**	417 to 431	**144**	432 to 447	**160**	448 to 489	**185**	≥490

FEMALES	**HS1**		**HS2**		**HS3**		**HS4**		**HS5**		**HS6**		**HS7**		**HS8**		**HS9**	
Length	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**	**TBW**	**MAC range**
(cm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)	(kg)	(mm)
≤144.0	**34**	≤196	**42**	197 to 238	**47**	239 to 272	**55**	273 to 301	**62**	302 to 334	**71**	335 to 370	**80**	371 to 394	**86**	395 to 472	**108**	≥473
144.1 to 147.0	**35**	≤217	**44**	218 to 244	**49**	245 to 270	**56**	271 to 305	**65**	306 to 342	**74**	343 to 375	**82**	376 to 394	**88**	395 to 436	**101**	≥437
147.1 to 150.0	**39**	≤222	**44**	223 to 244	**53**	245 to 284	**61**	285 to 324	**72**	325 to 360	**78**	361 to 384	**88**	385 to 401	**93**	402 to 442	**104**	≥443
150.1 to 153.0	**40**	≤215	**47**	216 to 255	**54**	256 to 287	**63**	288 to 312	**73**	313 to 349	**80**	350 to 395	**91**	396 to 419	**107**	420 to 472	**125**	≥473
153.1 to 156.0	**42**	≤223	**48**	224 to 253	**56**	254 to 291	**64**	292 to 321	**74**	322 to 345	**81**	346 to 405	**98**	406 to 427	**113**	428 to 473	**127**	≥474
156.1 to 159.0	**43**	≤219	**50**	220 to 260	**59**	261 to 297	**69**	298 to 330	**80**	331 to 366	**91**	367 to 411	**105**	412 to 433	**116**	434 to 506	**140**	≥507
159.1 to 162.0	**45**	≤225	**52**	226 to 258	**61**	259 to 294	**71**	295 to 334	**85**	335 to 380	**99**	381 to 418	**110**	419 to 439	**118**	440 to 479	**136**	≥480
162.1 to 165.0	**46**	≤226	**53**	227 to 262	**62**	263 to 294	**73**	295 to 334	**86**	335 to 380	**99**	381 to 418	**112**	419 to 450	**123**	451 to 483	**139**	≥484
165.1 to 168.0	**47**	≤229	**55**	230 to 260	**64**	261 to 296	**75**	297 to 335	**89**	336 to 377	**102**	378 to 415	**115**	416 to 463	**132**	464 to 509	**160**	≥510
168.1 to 171.0	**50**	≤229	**58**	230 to 270	**67**	271 to 296	**77**	297 to 339	**90**	340 to 382	**107**	383 to 421	**120**	422 to 457	**136**	458 to 511	**156**	≥512
171.1 to 174.0	**52**	≤237	**59**	238 to 269	**69**	270 to 302	**79**	303 to 337	**91**	338 to 374	**108**	375 to 425	**125**	426 to 461	**139**	462 to 497	**165**	≥498
174.1 to 177.0	**52**	≤235	**61**	236 to 271	**71**	272 to 303	**82**	304 to 349	**98**	350 to 379	**110**	380 to 409	**126**	410 to 462	**135**	463 to 479	**150**	≥480
177.1 to 180.0	**57**	≤236	**64**	237 to 270	**74**	271 to 322	**90**	323 to 349	**99**	350 to 368	**115**	369 to 418	**125**	419 to 450	**140**	451 to 480	**155**	≥481
≥180.1	**63**	≤256	**72**	257 to 277	**77**	278 to 312	**85**	313 to 344	**106**	345 to 378	**125**	379 to 406	**133**	407 to 434	**142**	435 to 479	**160**	≥480

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

	CALIBRATION DATASET			VALIDATION DATASET		
	All	**Male**	**Female**	**All**	**Male**	**Female**
N (%)	46340	22554	23786	11520	5724 (49.7)	5796 (50.3)
Age (years) Median (UQ, LQ)	43 (26, 61)	43 (26, 61)	42 (26, 61)	47 (30, 63)	48 (30, 63)	46 (30, 62)
<20 years	14.8	15.7	13.9	9.8	10.2	9.5
20 to 29.9 years	15.4	14.5	16.3	14.6	14.3	14.8
30 to 39.9 years	14.8	14.3	15.2	14.7	14.3	15.1
40 to 49.9 years	14.7	14.5	14.9	14.3	13.6	15
50 to 59.9 years	12.5	12.8	12.2	15.2	14.9	15.4
60 to 69.9 years	13.5	13.7	13.3	16.7	17.3	16.2
70 to 79.9 years	8.9	9.3	8.6	9.3	10	8.6
>=80 years	5.4	5.2	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.3
BMI (kgm^{-2}) Median (UQ, LQ)	27.1 (23.5, 31.6)	27 (23.7, 30.7)	27.3 (23.3, 32.52)	28.1 (24.1, 33)	27.8 (24.3, 32.1)	28.5 (24, 33.9)
<18.5 kgm^{-2}	2.4	2.0	2.7	2.0	1.9	2.2
18.5 to 24.9 kgm^{-2}	32.7	32.3	33.0	27.7	27.3	28.1
25 to 29.9 kgm^{-2}	32.4	36.9	28.1	31.0	34.8	27.6
30 to 34.9 kgm^{-2}	18.8	18.7	18.9	20.8	21.2	20.5
35 to 39.9 kgm^{-2}	8.2	6.5	9.8	10.3	8.8	11.8
40 to 44.9 kgm^{-2}	3.4	2.5	4.3	4.7	3.8	5.5
45 to 49.9 kgm^{-2}	1.3	0.7	1.9	2.0	1.3	2.6
>=50 kgm^{-2}	0.9	0.5	1.2	1.4	0.9	1.8
Ethnicity (%)						
Mexican American	12.6	12.7	12.4	16.0	15.5	16.4
Other Hispanic	9.7	8.9	10.4	11.1	10.0	12.1
Non-Hispanic White	38.2	38.6	37.8	33.2	34.4	32.1

Non-Hispanic Black	23.6	23.7	23.6	22.2	21.8	22.6
Non-Hispanic Asian	12.7	12.6	12.8	12.9	13.2	12.6
Other	3.2	3.4	3.0	4.6	5.1	4.1
Weight (kg) Median (UQ, LQ)	76.3 (64.5, 90.4)	81.7 (70.8, 94.8)	70.4 (59.8, 84.4)	77.9 (65.4, 93.1)	83.1 (71.7, 97.9)	72.1 (60.6, 87.025)
Height (cm) Median (UQ, LQ)	167.1 (160.1, 174.6)	174.4 (169.1, 179.6)	160.9 (156, 165.7)	166.1 (159, 173.7)	173.5 (168.2, 178.6)	159.8 (155, 164.6)

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. Clearly there will also be regional differences in all of the subgroup compositions, which could affect the performance of a model derived from the overall pooled samples.

	CALIBRATION DATASET (N=46340)									VALIDATION DATASET (N=11520)								
	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	-0.1	72.6	96.8	0.0	72.7	96.9	-0.2	72.5	96.7	-1.2	71.3	96	-0.7	71.5	96.1	-1.7	71.2	96
AGE																		
<20 years	1.7	77.0	98.2	2.9	76.3	97.8	0.4	77.8	98.5	1.3	75.9	98.0	2.5	76.3	97.5	0.1	75.5	98.5
20 to 29.9 years	1.0	72.8	96.8	3.1	71.8	95.9	-0.8	73.8	97.6	1.1	72.5	96.2	3.5	70.0	94.4	-1.0	74.9	97.9
30 to 39.9 years	0.7	72.1	96.4	1.8	72.0	96.1	-0.4	72.2	96.6	0.1	73.2	96.3	1.4	74.2	95.9	-1.1	72.2	96.6
40 to 49.9 years	0.4	73.2	96.7	0.6	73.9	96.9	0.2	72.6	96.5	-0.9	72.7	96.1	0.1	72.3	95.7	-1.7	73.0	96.4
50 to 59.9 years	-0.8	73.0	96.8	-1.2	74.7	97.9	-0.3	71.3	95.7	-1.8	70.9	96.2	-1.5	72.6	97.3	-2.2	69.4	95.2
60 to 69.9 years	-1.2	70.7	96.4	-2.7	71.6	97.2	0.4	69.8	95.6	-2.7	69.3	94.6	-2.9	72.0	96.2	-2.4	66.7	93.0
70 to 79.9 years	-2.4	69.4	96.2	-4.6	69.9	96.9	-0.2	68.9	95.5	-3.9	68.4	96.8	-5.4	68.6	96.9	-2.3	68.2	96.8
≥80 years	-3.7	68.1	96.5	-6.2	65.6	96.1	-1.5	70.4	96.9	-5.6	63.5	93.7	-7.0	58.4	94.3	-4.3	68.4	93.2
BMI																		
<18.5 kgm^{-2}	8.8	53.8	95.9	9.8	51.1	94.4	8.2	55.6	96.9	9.0	55.2	95.5	10.0	60.0	95.4	8.2	59.5	96.0
18.5 to 24.9 kgm^{-2}	3.7	73.8	97.0	4.5	71.0	96.4	2.9	76.5	97.6	3.5	75.0	97.3	4.3	71.3	96.2	2.7	78.4	98.2
25 to 29.9 kgm^{-2}	-0.2	79.9	98.0	-0.4	81.8	98.4	-0.1	77.5	97.5	-0.6	79.8	97.6	-0.5	80.2	97.4	-0.7	79.3	97.9
30 to 34.9 kgm^{-2}	-3.1	70.1	97.5	-4.3	69.3	97.6	-1.9	70.8	97.4	-3.6	71.1	96.7	-3.8	70.2	96.9	-3.4	72.0	96.5
35 to 39.9 kgm^{-2}	-5.3	60.9	95.5	-6.8	54.6	94.9	-4.3	64.9	95.9	-6.3	58.9	95.4	-6.1	59.9	95.0	-6.4	58.1	95.8
40 to 44.9 kgm^{-2}	-6.4	60.4	90.8	-6.9	60.8	91.1	-6.2	60.2	90.7	-7.7	54.6	90.9	-7.8	57.9	90.0	-7.6	52.5	91.6
45 to 49.9 kgm^{-2}	-8.7	57.6	87.3	-8.7	52.7	87.4	-8.6	59.3	87.3	-11.2	41.0	81.1	-9.8	38.0	87.3	-11.8	42.4	78.1
≥50 kgm^{-2}	-12.3	39.0	81.2	-12.1	43.3	77.5	-12.4	37.2	82.8	-14.8	28.6	80.1	-11.3	39.6	83.3	-16.4	23.6	77.0
ETHNICITY																		
Mexican American	-1.2	74.3	97	-1.3	75.1	98.1	-1.1	73.4	95.9	-2.5	69.8	96.5	-2.6	70.5	96.9	-2.4	69.2	96.2
Other Hispanic	-0.4	75.2	96.8	0.0	74.8	97.2	-0.8	75.6	96.4	-1.7	75	96.6	-1.2	76.3	95.6	-2	74.0	97.3
Non-Hispanic White	-1.2	71.9	96.4	-1.4	71.3	96.4	-1.0	72.5	96.4	-2.3	71	95.9	-2.4	70.2	96.1	-2.2	71.8	95.6
Non-Hispanic Black	0.2	72.1	96.5	1.8	71	96	-1.3	73.3	97.1	-0.5	68.7	94.9	1.7	69.7	95.0	-2.5	67.8	94.8
Non-Hispanic Asian	2.8	77.1	97.3	2.8	75.5	97.1	2.9	78.6	97.6	2.5	74.9	97.4	2.3	75.5	97.5	2.7	74.2	97.3
Other	0.7	67.9	95.1	1.1	67.9	96.9	0.2	68	93.1	-1.5	73.3	95.7	0	71.6	95.3	-3.3	75.3	96.2

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 actual weight, P20 = percentage of weight estimations within 20% of actual weight.

Method	Description and examples	Accuracy	Comments
Patient estimation	The patient provides an estimate of their own weight if they are capable of doing so.	The most accurate weight estimation method at the present time. P10 range: 80 – 100% P20 range: 90 – 100%	Estimations may be substantially less accurate in overweight and obese patients. Critically ill or injured patients are not always able to provide a weight estimation. e.g., Hernandez-Barrera *et al* [1].
Family estimation	Family members provide an estimation of weight.	This has not been well studied. P10 range: 60 – 70% P20 range: no data	Few studies have formally evaluated this, although many papers regard this as an inaccurate method. Estimations are seldom better than guesses by healthcare providers. e.g., Breuer *et al* [2], Bailey *et al* [3].
Healthcare provider guesses	Doctors, nurses or paramedics guess the weight of the patient.	May not be accurate or reliable – very dependent on estimator and patient factors. P10 range: 39 – 74% P20 range: 73 – 94%	Large variation in accuracy between individual healthcare providers and frequent large errors of weight estimation. Many studies which report good accuracy have major flaws (generally low prevalence of obese patients and few patients of >100kg). e.g., Thomas *et al* [4].
Single variable anthropometric formulas	Height and MAC have been used in single-variable formulas e.g., Kokong formula, MAC formula.	Not accurate or reliable outside of original development studies. P10 range: 42 – 60% P20 range: 67 – 90%	Although height has been used to predict IBW, it is biologically implausible to be able to predict total body weight accurately using a single variable. MAC fares better, but variable between populations. e.g., Kokong *et al* [5], Cattermole *et al* [6].
Multiple variable anthropometric formulas	Height, tibial length, MAC, chest, hip, waist, thigh, or calf circumference have been used in various combinations in different formulas e.g., Chumlea, Rabito, Lorenz and Crandall formulas.	Some studies have shown excellent accuracy in initial studies, but inconsistent results on follow-up studies. P10 range: 36 – 91% P20 range: 58 – 95%	The quality of reporting in many of the studies evaluating these systems has been poor. While promising, especially the Lorenz formula, none of these formulas has yet proven to be consistently accurate. The difficulty of taking multiple measurements in patients not able to cooperate might be difficult, inaccurate, and time-consuming. e.g., Lorenz *et al* [7], Crandall *et al* [8].
Computerised methods	Automatic biometric estimation of weight.	Good accuracy. P10 range: 79 – 93% P20 range: no data.	This technique has never been validated outside of early, development studies. e.g., Pfitzner *et al* [9], Velardo *et al* [10].
Paediatric weight estimation methods	Mercy method (uses humeral length and MAC), PAWPER XL-MAC method (uses length and MAC).	Very accurate in children; preliminary studies using the unmodified systems in adults has shown promise. P10 range: 60 – 65% P20 range: 85 – 92%	These systems have been tested in paediatric emergencies. If they can be successfully adapted for use in adults, they may be very useful. e.g., Cattermole *et al* [11], Akinola *et al* [12].

Table 4 Total body weight estimation methods in adults. The accuracy ranges were obtained from different studies, or subgroup analyses within studies. P10 = percentage of weight estimations within 10% of actual weight, P20 = percentage of weight estimations within 20% of actual weight.

[1] Hernandez-Barrera L, Trejo Valdivia B, Tellez-Rojo MM, Barquera S, Munoz-Manrique C. Validity assessment of self-reported weight and its correction process among Mexican adult women of reproductive age. PLoS One. 2020;15(7):e0235967. 10.1371/journal.pone.0235967

[2] Breuer L, Nowe T, Huttner HB, Blinzler C, Kollmar R, Schellinger PD, et al. Weight approximation in stroke before thrombolysis: the WAIST-Study: a prospective observational "dose-finding" study. Stroke. 2010;41(12):2867-71. 10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.578062

[3] Bailey B, Gaunt M, Grissinger M. Update on Medication Errors Associated with Incorrect Patient Weights. Pa Patient Saf Advis. 2016;13(2):50-57.

[4] Thomas RA, Empey JA, Seth S, Crozier J. Guess the weight: the accuracy of estimated weight for surgical admissions - a comparison study. Scott Med J. 2019;64(2):56-61. 10.1177/0036933018805657

[5] Kokong DD, Pam IC, Zoakah AI, Danbauchi SS, Mador ES, Mandong BM. Estimation of weight in adults from height: a novel option for a quick bedside technique. Int J Emerg Med. 2018;11(1):54. 10.1186/s12245-018-0212-9

[6] Cattermole GN, Graham CA, Rainer TH. Mid-arm circumference can be used to estimate weight of adult and adolescent patients. Emerg Med J. 2017;34(4):231-236. 10.1136/emermed-2015-205623

[7] Lorenz MW, Graf M, Henke C, Hermans M, Ziemann U, Sitzer M, et al. Anthropometric approximation of body weight in unresponsive stroke patients. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2007;78(12):1331-6. 10.1136/jnnp.2007.117150

[8] Crandall CS, Gardner S, Braude DA. Estimation of total body weight in obese patients. Air Med J. 2009;28(3):139-145. 10.1016/j.amj.2009.02.002

[9] Pfitzner C, May S, Nuchter A. Body Weight Estimation for Dose-Finding and Health Monitoring of Lying, Standing and Walking Patients Based on RGB-D Data. Sensors (Basel). 2018;18(5). 10.3390/s18051311

[10] Velardo C, Dugelay J, editors. Weight estimation from visual body appearance. 2010 Fourth IEEE International Conference on Biometrics: Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS); 2010; Washington, DC.

[11] Cattermole GN, Manirafasha A. Accuracy of weight estimation methods in adults, adolescents and children: a prospective study. Emerg Med J. 2020. 10.1136/emermed-2020-209581

[12] Akinola O, Wells M, Parris P, Goldstein L. 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

Note to editor: these references could be kept in the table legend, or added to the main reference list, according to your instructions.

Step 1: Development of the model

The MAC cutpoints currently used by the paediatric PAWPER XL tape to define the seven habitus scores in each length-segment were used as a starting point for the adult tape. In the same way in which the habitus score 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). Cutpoint values for length-segments above 180 cm (the length of the paediatric PAWPER XL tape) were extrapolated from the existing data. These MAC ranges were derived to predict the habitus scores (and **total body weight**) in each length segment of the tape.

HS1 BMI<18
HS2 BMI 18 to 19.9
HS3 BMI 20 to 24.9
HS4 BMI 25 to 29.9
HS5 BMI 30 to 34.9
HS6 BMI 35 to 39.9
HS7 BMI ≥40

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 MAC cutpoints and predicted weights were adjusted for each tape segment until a satisfactory degree of weight estimation accuracy was achieved. It was apparent in this phase of model development that males and females needed to be separated to optimise weight estimation, and that additional habitus score categories needed to be added to allow better weight estimation in severely obese adults (see right).

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 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 MAC ranges and predicted weights 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 body weight directly off the tape at the measured length. Use the green side for males and the purple side for females.




Underweight
Normal weight
Overweight
Obese
Severely obese
60
40
20
0
-20
-40
-60
Percentage error (%)
0
20
40
60
80
100
120
140
160
180
200
Measured total body weight (kg)

Figure 1 The methodology followed in this study. MAC = mid-arm circumference, BMI = body mass index, CDC = Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, HS = habitus score, NHANES = national health and nutrition examination survey, P10 = percentage of weight estimations within 10% of actual weight, P20 = percentage of weight estimations within 20% of actual weight,

Figure 2 Bland & Altman diagram by subgroups of weight status. The x-axis represents an individual's actual weight; the y-axis represents the percentage error of the difference between estimated and actual weight (100 x [estimated weight – actual weight]/actual weight). A negative value thus indicates an underestimation of weight. The red dashed lines represent the 95% limits of agreement of these residuals. The different colour markers represent individuals with different weight status, as shown in the key. The relationship between MAC and BMI was disrupted in patients with very high BMI, which lead to poorer weight predictions in these patients. A Pearson's correlation analysis between BMI and MAC showed an r^2 of 0.72 (0.71, 0.73) for patients with a BMI<40 $kg.m^{-2}$ and an r^2 of 0.29 (0.27, 0.31) for patients with a BMI ≥40 $kg.m^{-2}$.