

1 **Comparison of Phase Angle Using Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis According to Device**  
2 **Type and Examination Posture**

3

4 **Running title:** Comparison of multiple PhA using BIA

5

6 Jihyun Yang<sup>1</sup>, Byung Chul Chun<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Jeehyun Kim<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Jae-myeong Lee<sup>5</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup>Division of Nephrology, Department of Internal Medicine, Sungkyunkwan University School  
9 of Medicine, Kangbuk Samsung Hospital, 29 Saemunan-ro, Jongno-gu, Seoul, 03181, Korea

10 <sup>2</sup>Department of Preventive Medicine, Korea University College of Medicine, Goryeodae-ro 73,  
11 Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, 02841, Republic of Korea

12 <sup>3</sup>Graduate School of Public Health, Korea University College of Medicine, Goryeodae-ro 73,  
13 Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, 02841, Republic of Korea

14 <sup>4</sup>Transdisciplinary Major in Learning Health Systems, Department of Healthcare Sciences,  
15 Graduate School, Korea University College of Medicine, Goryeodae-ro 73, Seongbuk-gu,  
16 Seoul, 02841, Republic of Korea

17 <sup>5</sup>Division of Acute Care Surgery, Department of Surgery, Korea University Anam Hospital,  
18 Korea University College of Medicine, Goryeodae-ro 73, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul, 02841, Republic  
19 of Korea

20

21 **Corresponding author:** Jae-myeong Lee, Division of Acute Care Surgery, Department of  
22 Surgery, Korea University Anam Hospital, Korea University College of Medicine, Goryeodae-  
23 ro 73, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 02841, Republic of Korea

24 Phone: 82-2-920-6622

25 E-mail: [ljm3225@hanmail.net](mailto:ljm3225@hanmail.net)

26

27 Word count: 1440

28 Number of figures: 3

29 Number of tables: 2

30 **Abstract**

31 **Background:** Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) is gaining popularity as a body  
32 composition assessment tool for patients. Although it has been studied and validated in different  
33 populations, age groups, and clinical settings, including critically ill patients, there are concerns  
34 about BIA reproducibility and reliability in different device types and postures. This study  
35 aimed to evaluate the reliability of BIA according to different devices, postures, and lead types.

36 **Methods:** Cross-sectional observational data of 74 healthy volunteers (32 women and 42 men)  
37 were collected. We used two types of devices, three types of postures (standing, sitting, and  
38 lying), and two lead types (clamp lead and adhesive lead) to measure the whole-body phase  
39 angle (phA) at a single frequency of 50 kHz. The measurements were validated using the  
40 intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) and Bland–Altman plot analysis.

41 **Results:** All phA measurements recorded with two types of devices, three different postures,  
42 and two types of leads were equivalent to each other (mean ICC = 0.9932, 95% confidence  
43 interval (CI) 0.9905–0.0053). The average mean difference in phA was 0.31 (95% CI 0.16–  
44 0.46). The largest phA value was measured using BWA with an adhesive-type lead in the lying  
45 position. There were no differences between standing and sitting positions.

46 **Conclusion:** This is the first study to show the consistency and reliability of BIA in measuring  
47 phA using different devices, lead types, and postures. This could provide the confidence that  
48 BIA can be used in various clinical settings.

49

50 **Keywords:** Bioelectrical impedance analysis; Intraclass correlation coefficient; Bland–Altman;  
51 Comparison; Reliability

## 52 **Introduction**

53 Body composition measurements can be useful for improving health in the general population,  
54 achieving the best performance in athletes, and predicting clinical outcomes and nutritional  
55 status in patients (1–3). Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) is a representative method for  
56 body composition analysis, using resistance values or impedance resulting from differences in  
57 electrical conductivity according to the biological characteristics of the tissues (4). It can be  
58 used to evaluate body water composition during treatment planning and monitoring in patients  
59 with fluid imbalance. BIA is becoming popular as a body composition assessment tool for  
60 patients (1). It has been studied in the general population, patients with malignancy, sarcopenia,  
61 obesity, frailty, chronic kidney disease, or cardiovascular disease, as well as in patients in  
62 surgical care, and intensive care units (5–15).

63 However, although BIA has always been a topic of discussion, several limitations have been  
64 noted, including the reliability of different algorithms, time of measurement, effect of eating or  
65 exercise prior to measurement, ethnicity, sex, and age (15–20). It has also been speculated  
66 whether similar/reliable results can be obtained with different devices, measurement methods,  
67 postures, and contact locations of the electrode, because of technical limitations (21,22).  
68 However, there are no clear data yet.

69 Various devices have been developed to measure BIA. Inbody<sup>®</sup> (Inbody Co., Ltd., Korea)  
70 used in this study is a product that can quantitatively evaluate water composition in the human  
71 body through the measurement of human impedance using multiple frequencies. This study was  
72 designed to examine the differences in the BIA method for measuring body composition using  
73 different devices, postures, and electrode lead types. We measured the phase angle (pA) at a  
74 single frequency of 50 kHz using different methods and analyzed and compared the results.

75

## 76 **Methods**

### 77 **Study population**

78 This cross-sectional observational study was conducted between May and August 2019. Data  
79 were obtained from 74 healthy volunteers, including 32 women and 42 men (Supplementary  
80 Information). Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants. Patients who  
81 were under 20 years of age, were pregnant, or had a pacemaker insertion before enrollment  
82 were excluded. We used the BSM330 (Inbody, Seoul, Korea) to measure the body weight and  
83 height of the participants. We compared the different phA measurements. This study was  
84 approved by the Korea University Institutional Review Board (IRB No. 2020AN0145), which  
85 has been conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki.

86

### 87 **BIA measurement protocol/technique**

88 The BIA method was applied as follows: The participants were asked to refrain from consuming  
89 any drinks or exercising 4 h before the measurements to minimize disturbance of body fluids.  
90 The participants were asked to remain in a standing position for at least 10 min at the beginning  
91 of the test. Then, phA was measured for all participants in the standing position using a multi-  
92 frequency bioelectrical impedance analyzer (Inbody 970, Inbody, Seoul, Korea) with a grab  
93 lead. The device was then changed to BWA 2.0 (Inbody, Seoul, Korea), and phA was measured  
94 in the standing position, initially using a clamp lead, followed by an adhesive lead. The  
95 participants were asked to switch to a sitting position and were given a 10-min break before the  
96 next test. Thereafter, the participants were tested in the sitting position using both the clamp  
97 lead and the adhesive lead. Finally, the participants were switched to the lying position, and

98 after a 10-min break, they were tested using the clamp lead followed by the adhesive lead. It  
99 took approximately 1 h to complete the entire sequence for each participant. Data on seven  
100 measurement methods, including two devices, two lead types, and three postures, were  
101 collected. This study was conducted in a single individual.

102

### 103 **Statistical analysis**

104 We compared the results of the seven measurements using the two-way random effects,  
105 absolute agreement, and single rater/measurement intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)  
106 method. This implies that our measurement was conducted by a single rater who was selected  
107 randomly, and the extent to which the measurements absolutely matched was evaluated (23).  
108 ICC values greater than 0.90 imply excellent reliability, whereas values less than 0.5 indicate  
109 poor reliability (23). Bland–Altman plots were used to investigate the range of agreement and  
110 bias between each measurement (24). Statistical significance was set at  $p < 0.05$  for all analyses.  
111 Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS (version 26.0; IBM, Chicago, IL) and MedCalc  
112 20.008 (MedCalc Software Ltd., Ostend, Belgium).

113

### 114 **Results**

115 The baseline characteristics and average phase angles are presented in Table 1 and Fig. 1,  
116 respectively. The data were not normally distributed and are presented as median  $\pm$  range and  
117 mean  $\pm$  standard deviation.

118

### 119 **ICC of the phase angle (phA)**

120 The mean ICC of the 50-kHz whole-body phA was 0.9932 (95% confidence interval [CI]  
121 0.9905–0.9953) (Fig. 2).

122

### 123 **Differences between the seven measurement methods**

124 We further explored the differences in the results using the Bland–Altman plot analysis (Fig. 3,  
125 Table 2). The mean difference in the phA was 0.31 (95% CI 0.16–0.46; minimum -0.24,  
126 maximum 1.035). No differences in phA were observed between the use of BWA 2.0, adhesive  
127 lead in the sitting position, clamp lead in the lying position, and the use of BWA 2.0, adhesive  
128 lead in the sitting and standing postures (both mean difference = 0.00,  $p = 0.95$  and  $0.99$ ,  
129 respectively). The difference between the BWA 2.0 adhesive lead in the lying position and  
130 Inbody 970 was the highest (mean difference = 1.04,  $p < 0.001$ ).

131

### 132 **Discussion**

133 In this study, we confirmed that the value of phA may not be the same for different devices,  
134 postures, and electrodes; however, statistical analyses showed that these values exhibited  
135 significant levels of consistency.

136 BIA measures the volume of fluid and its distribution in the human body using changes in  
137 the resistance of the current passing through the fluid with the solute. When this technology  
138 was first developed, a single frequency was used to measure the total volume of the human  
139 body under the hypothesis that the body has a homogeneous cylindrical structure and current  
140 passes through it via electrolytes and water. Since then, further technologies have been  
141 developed to measure extracellular and intracellular fluids separately using multiple  
142 frequencies, with low-frequency currents not passing through the cell membrane and high-

143 frequency currents passing through it (4). Based on extensive research along with continuous  
144 improvements in BIA devices, the European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism  
145 published guidelines for their utilization in clinical practice (20). Although BIA can be useful  
146 and appropriately applied in certain populations, particularly in the general population, it has  
147 several limitations. This study provides an answer to one of these limitations.

148         The Bland–Altman plot method only defines the intervals of agreements; it does not  
149 indicate whether these limits are acceptable. Acceptable limits must be defined a priori based  
150 on clinical necessity, biological considerations, or other goals (24). Using the Bland–Altman  
151 plot to compare each parameter, we identified statistically significant differences between the  
152 different methods of measuring body composition; however, no clinically significant difference  
153 was observed. Previous studies conducted in the general healthy population in Iran and Taiwan  
154 reported body  $\text{phA}$  of  $7.32 \pm 1.17$  and  $6.0 \pm 0.8$ , respectively (25,26).

155         Notably, Inbody 970 showed the smallest value and BWA 2.0, with the adhesive  
156 electrode in the lying position, showing the largest value. In addition, the measurement using  
157 BWA 2.0, with an adhesive electrode in the standing position, was the same as that with  
158 clamping in the sitting position. Because the exact equation is not disclosed, it is difficult to  
159 determine the cause of this difference. It is speculated that the adhesive electrode method may  
160 detect electricity flow and reflect the characteristics of the body components better than the  
161 clamping method, and that the lying position is the most stable.

162         This is the first study to present consistency in results between different methods of  
163 measuring body composition using statistical analysis. The strength of this study is that we  
164 directly compared the results of different methods for each subject. However, this study has  
165 some limitations. First, we did not compare dual X-ray absorptiometry, which is the gold  
166 standard for body composition measurements. Second, the measurements were conducted only



167 in Asian populations. Third, elderly individuals aged >75 years were not included, and the study  
168 population comprised relatively middle-aged adults. Fourth, we did not compare all devices;  
169 only two representative devices were used.

170 In conclusion, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to show the  
171 consistency and reliability of BIA for measuring phA using different devices, lead types, and  
172 postures. This study provides information that BIA measured values in various situations can  
173 be used interchangeably.

174

#### 175 **Conflict of interest**

176 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

177

#### 178 **Funding**

179 None

180

#### 181 **Acknowledgments**

182 Not applicable

183

## 184 **References**

- 185 1. Dehghan M, Merchant AT. Is bioelectrical impedance accurate for use in large  
186 epidemiological studies? *Nutr J*. 2008 Dec;7(1):26.
- 187 2. Campa F, Toselli S, Mazzilli M, Gobbo LA, Coratella G. Assessment of Body  
188 Composition in Athletes: A Narrative Review of Available Methods with Special  
189 Reference to Quantitative and Qualitative Bioimpedance Analysis. *Nutrients*. 2021 May  
190 12;13(5):1620.
- 191 3. Mialich MS, Sicchieri JMF, Junior AAJ. Analysis of Body Composition: A Critical  
192 Review of the Use of Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis. *International Journal of Clinical  
193 Nutrition*. :10.
- 194 4. Kyle U. Bioelectrical impedance analysis?part I: review of principles and methods.  
195 *Clinical Nutrition*. 2004 Oct;23(5):1226–43.
- 196 5. Aleixo GFP, Shachar SS, Nyrop KA, Muss HB, Battaglini CL, Williams GR. Bioelectrical  
197 Impedance Analysis for the Assessment of Sarcopenia in Patients with Cancer: A  
198 Systematic Review. *The Oncol*. 2020 Feb;25(2):170–82.
- 199 6. Di Vincenzo O, Marra M, Di Gregorio A, Pasanisi F, Scalfi L. Bioelectrical impedance  
200 analysis (BIA) -derived phase angle in sarcopenia: A systematic review. *Clinical Nutrition*.  
201 2021 May;40(5):3052–61.
- 202 7. Orsso CE, Silva MIB, Gonzalez MC, Rubin DA, Heymsfield SB, Prado CM, et al.  
203 Assessment of body composition in pediatric overweight and obesity: A systematic review  
204 of the reliability and validity of common techniques. *Obesity Reviews*.  
205 2020;21(8):e13041.
- 206 8. Lee SW, Ngoh CLY, Chua HR, Haroon S, Wong WK, Lee EJ, et al. Evaluation of different  
207 bioimpedance methods for assessing body composition in Asian non-dialysis chronic  
208 kidney disease patients. *Kidney Res Clin Pract*. 2019 Mar 31;38(1):71–80.
- 209 9. Mullie L, Obrand A, Bendayan M, Trnkus A, Ouimet M, Moss E, et al. Phase Angle as a  
210 Biomarker for Frailty and Postoperative Mortality: The BICS Study. *J Am Heart Assoc*  
211 [Internet]. 2018 Sep 4 [cited 2021 Jun 24];7(17). Available from:  
212 <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/JAHA.118.008721>
- 213 10. Bansal N, Zelnick LR, Himmelfarb J, Chertow GM. Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis  
214 Measures and Clinical Outcomes in CKD. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*. 2018  
215 Nov;72(5):662–72.
- 216 11. Böhm A, Heitmann BL. The use of bioelectrical impedance analysis for body composition  
217 in epidemiological studies. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2013 Jan;67(S1):S79–85.
- 218 12. Stuivenberg N. The use of bio-electrical impedance analysis (BIA) to guide fluid  
219 management, resuscitation and deresuscitation in critically ill patients: a bench-to-bedside  
220 review. 2014;46(5):11.

- 221 13. Chung YJ, Kim EY. Usefulness of Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis as a Guidance of  
222 Fluid Management in Critically Ill Patients after Major Abdomen Surgery; a Single Center,  
223 Prospective Cohort Study. *Surg Metab Nutr*. 2020 Dec 30;11(2):53–60.
- 224 14. Lee YH, Lee J-D, Kang DR, Hong J, Lee J. Bioelectrical impedance analysis values as  
225 markers to predict severity in critically ill patients. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2017  
226 Aug;40:103–7.
- 227 15. Segal KR, Gutin B, Presta E, Wang J, Itallie TBV. Estimation of human body composition  
228 by electrical impedance methods: a comparative study. *Journal of Applied Physiology*  
229 [Internet]. 1985 May 1 [cited 2021 Jun 24]; Available from:  
230 <https://journals.physiology.org/doi/abs/10.1152/jappl.1985.58.5.1565>
- 231 16. Wattanapenpaiboon N, Lukito W, Strauss B, Hsu-Hage BH-H, Wahlqvist M, Stroud D.  
232 Agreement of skinfold measurement and bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) methods  
233 with dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) in estimating total body fat in Anglo-  
234 Celtic Australians. *Int J Obes*. 1998 Sep;22(9):854–60.
- 235 17. Oshima Y, Shiga T. Within-day variability of whole-body and segmental bioelectrical  
236 impedance in a standing position. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2006 Aug;60(8):938–41.
- 237 18. Gallagher M, Walker K, O’Dea K. The influence of a breakfast meal on the assessment of  
238 body composition using bioelectrical impedance. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 1998 Feb;(52):94–7.
- 239 19. Deurenberg P, Weststrate JA, Paymans I, van der Kooy K. Factors affecting bioelectrical  
240 impedance measurements in humans. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 1988 Dec;42(12):1017–22.
- 241 20. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Manuel Gómez J, et al.  
242 Bioelectrical impedance analysis—part II: utilization in clinical practice. *Clinical*  
243 *Nutrition*. 2004 Dec;23(6):1430–53.
- 244 21. Mally K, Dittmar M. Comparison of three segmental multifrequency bioelectrical  
245 impedance techniques in healthy adults. *Annals of Human Biology*. 2012 Nov;39(6):468–  
246 78.
- 247 22. Genton L, Herrmann FrançoisR, Spörri A, Graf CE. Association of mortality and phase  
248 angle measured by different bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) devices. *Clinical*  
249 *Nutrition*. 2018 Jun;37(3):1066–9.
- 250 23. Koo TK, Li MY. A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation  
251 Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*. 2016 Jun  
252 1;15(2):155–63.
- 253 24. Giavarina D. Understanding Bland Altman analysis. *Biochem Med*. 2015;25(2):141–51.
- 254 25. Kumar S, Dutt A, Hemraj S, Bhat S, Manipadybhima B. Phase Angle Measurement in  
255 Healthy Human Subjects through Bio-Impedance Analysis. *Iran J Basic Med Sci*. 15(6):5.
- 256 26. Lee L-W, Lu H-K, Chen Y-Y, Lai C-L, Chu L-P, Hsieh M-C, et al. Prediction and  
257 discrimination of skeletal muscle function by bioelectrical impedance vector analysis

258 using a standing impedance analyzer in healthy Taiwanese adults. Moran JM, editor. PLoS  
259 ONE. 2020 Jun 12;15(6):e0231604.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the participants

	All (n=74)	Men (n=42)	Women (n=32)
Age (years)	34.5 ± 10.2 (31, 20–63)	32.8 ± 8.6 (32, 20–63)	36.6 ± 11.7 (32, 22–58)
Height (cm)	169.1 ± 9.4 (169.5, 148–189.6)	175.4 ± 6.2 (176,162–189.6)	150.7 ± 5.66 (160.7, 148–171)
Weight (kg)	69.5 ± 15.6 (72, 40–115.3)	80 ± 10.7 (79.4, 53.9–115.3)	55.7 ± 8.94 (54.9, 40.5–73.8)
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	24.1 ± 3.8 (24.5, 15.8–33)	25.9 ± 2.7 (25.8, 20.5–33)	21.6 ± 3.6 (20.4, 15.8–30.3)
Phase angle			
Aly	6.8 ± 1.1 (6.8, 4.8–9.3)	7.5 ± 0.9 (7.3, 5.8–9.3)	5.9 ± 0.7 (5.8, 4.8–7.6)
Asit	6.4 ± 1.1 (6.5, 4.3–9.0)	7.2 ± 0.9 (7.0, 5.4–9.0)	5.5 ± 0.7 (5.4, 4.3–7.3)
Astd	6.4 ± 1.1 (6.4, 4.3–9.0)	7.1 ± 0.9 (7.0, 5.6–9.0)	5.5 ± 0.8 (5.4, 4.3–7.3)
Cly	6.7 ± 1.2 (6.7, 4.6–9.2)	7.4 ± 0.9 (6.9, 5.3–9.0)	5.7 ± 0.7 (5.4, 4.3–7.2)

Csit	6.4 ± 1.2 (6.5, 4.3–9.0)	7.2 ± 0.9 (6.9, 5.3–9.0)	5.4 ± 0.7 (5.4, 4.3–7.2)
Cstd	4.4 ± 1.2 (6.4, 4.2–9.0)	7.1 ± 0.9 (6.9, 5.2–9.0)	5.3 ± 0.8 (5.3, 4.2–7.1)
I970	5.8 ± 0.8 (5.9, 4.1–7.5)	6.3 ± 0.5 (6.3, 4.7–7.5)	5.0 ± 0.5 (4.9, 4.1–5.9)

BMI, body mass index; Aly: BWA device, adhesive type lead in lying posture; Asit: BWA device, adhesive type lead in sitting posture; Astd: BWA device, adhesive type lead in standing posture; Cly: BWA device, clamp lead in lying posture; Csit: BWA device, clamp lead in sitting posture; Cstd: BWA device, clamp lead in standing posture.

Table 2. The difference between each 50-kHz 50kHz phase angle measurement according to Bland–Altman B-A plot analysis

	Aly	Asit	Astd	Cly	Csit	Cstd	I970
Aly		0.36*	0.36*	0.12*	0.36*	0.44*	1.04*
Asit			0.00	0.27*	0.03	0.04*	0.68*
Astd				0.24*	0.00	0.08*	0.68*
Cly					0.24*	0.31*	0.91*
Csit						0.07*	0.67*
Cstd							0.6*
I970							

Aly: BWA device, adhesive type lead in lying posture; Asit: BWA device, adhesive type lead in sitting posture; Astd: BWA device, adhesive type lead in standing posture; Cly: BWA device, clamp lead in lying posture; Csit: BWA device, clamp lead in sitting posture; Cstd: BWA device, clamp lead in standing posture; \*  $p < 0.001$ .

## Figure legends

Fig. 1. The average of seven different measurements of the 50-kHz phase angle.




Fig. 2. The comparison of intraclass correlation coefficient of 50-kHz whole body phase angle measured using different methods.







Fig. 3. The Bland–Altman plot analysis of different methods of measuring the 50-kHz phase angle.



Inbody 970



- BWA 2.0
- Clamp
  - Adhesive
  - Standing
  - Sitting
  - Lying