

Accuracy and Precision of 3D Optical Imaging for Body Composition and their Associations to Metabolic Markers by Age, BMI, and Ethnicity

Michael C. Wong^{1,2}, Jonathan P. Bennett^{1,2}, Brandon Quon¹, Lambert T. Leong¹, Isaac Y. Tian³, Yong E. Liu¹, Nisa N. Kelly¹, Cassidy McCarthy⁴, Dominic Chow⁵, Sergi Pujades⁶, Andrea K. Garber⁷, Gertraud Maskarinec¹, Steven B. Heymsfield⁴, John A. Shepherd^{1,2}

¹ Department of Epidemiology, University of Hawaii Cancer Center, Honolulu, HI;

² Department of Human Nutrition, Food and Animal Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI;

³ Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA;

⁴ Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA;

⁵ John A. Burns School of Medicine, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA;

⁶ Inria, Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LJK, Grenoble, France;

⁷ Department of Pediatrics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA;

ABSTRACT

Background: Recent three-dimensional optical (3DO) imaging advancements have provided a more accessible, affordable, and self-operating opportunities for assessing body composition. 3DO is accurate and precise compared to clinical measures measured by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) in diverse study samples. However, the accuracy and precision of an overall 3DO body composition model in specific subgroups is unknown. Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate 3DO's accuracy and precision by subgroups of age, body mass index (BMI), and ethnicity/race.

Methods: A cross-sectional analysis was performed using the Shape Up! Adults study. Each participant received duplicate 3DO and DXA scans. 3DO meshes were digitally registered and reposed using Meshcapade to standardize the vertices and pose. Principal component analysis was performed on the registered 3DO meshes to orthogonalize and reduce the dimensionality of the data. The resulting principal components estimated DXA whole-body and regional body composition using stepwise forward linear regression with five-fold cross-validation. Duplicate 3DO and DXA scans were used for test-retest precision. Student's t-test was performed between 3DO and DXA by subgroup to determine significant differences. One-way ANOVA determined if intra-group precision had significant differences. P-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results: Six hundred thirty-four participants (females = 346) had completed the study at the time of the analysis. 3DO total fat mass (FM) and fat-free mass (FFM) in the entire sample achieved R^2 s of 0.94 and 0.92 with RMSEs of 2.91 kg and 2.76 kg, respectively, in females and similarly in

males. 3DO total FM and FFM achieved a %CV (RMSE) of 1.76% (0.44 kg) and 1.97% (0.44 kg), while DXA had a %CV (RMSE) of 0.98% (0.24 kg) and 0.59% (0.27 kg), respectively, in females and similarly in males. There were no mean differences by age group (p-value > 0.068). However, there were mean differences for underweight females, NHOPI females and males, and Asian and black females (p-value < 0.038). There were no significant differences among the subgroups for precision (p-value > 0.109).

Conclusion: A single 3DO body composition model derived from a highly-stratified dataset performed well against DXA with minimal differences detected for accuracy and precision. Adjustments to specific subgroups may be warranted to improve the accuracy in those that had significant differences. Nevertheless, 3DO produced accurate and precise body composition estimates that can be used on diverse populations.

Keywords: Body Composition, Three-Dimensional Optical, Diversity, DXA

INTRODUCTION

Obesity is defined by having excess adiposity and has been a growing epidemic for the past few generations (1-3). This excess adiposity is linked to the development of cardiovascular disease, type-II diabetes, and up to 20% of cancers (4-6). Body mass index (BMI) is generally used to classify obesity. However, BMI only uses height and weight and does not account for muscle or fat mass, and therefore, a poor method for nutritional assessment on an individual level. Instead, body composition methods have been developed to quantify fat mass (FM) and fat-free mass (FFM) in order to provide a more thorough health assessment (7).

Magnetic resonance and computer tomography (CT) are among criterion methods for body composition (8, 9). However, these methods are expensive, require trained/certified technicians, use large radiation doses (CT), lack accessibility to people outside clinical settings, and are not recommended for routine use. Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), air displacement plethysmography (ADP), and bioelectric impedance analysis (BIA) are among the more accessible modalities developed for body composition, but even they have limitations such as requiring trained technicians (DXA and ADP), using ionizing radiation (DXA), many built-in physiological assumptions (ADP and BIA), inconsistent accuracy and precision by make and model (BIA), and not providing regional/compartmental compositions (ADP) (10-12). The ideal method would include total and regional composition, free of ionizing radiation, self-operating, and accessible to many.

In the last two decades or so, three-dimensional optical (3DO) imaging has been deeply explored as a health assessment method. 3DO scanners generally output a detailed 3D mesh that

represents the person's body shape and automated anthropometric estimates (i.e., circumferences, lengths, surface areas, and volumes) (13, 14). During the early days, researchers validated the accuracy and precision of the automated anthropometry to criterion methods (e.g., tape measurements to circumferences/lengths, underwater weighing or ADP to total volume) (15, 16). 3DO waist circumference, hip circumference, and waist-hip-ratio were highly associated to metabolic markers and improved predictions for metabolic syndrome (17, 18). Researchers also showed that these automated anthropometric estimates, where some would be difficult and tedious to obtain manually, were predictive of DXA FM and FFM (19-22).

Since 3DO anthropometry was as good, if not better than manual measurements, as health descriptors, researchers attempted to create better shape descriptors using the 3DO mesh to utilize the entire body. They showed that body shape descriptors by the 3DO mesh were more predictive of body composition as compared to DXA and were correlated to metabolic biomarkers (23). Since then, the methodology to obtain these body shape descriptors have improved by incorporating automated processing methods, agnostic models across multiple 3DO scanners, pose-independent models, and a 2D to 3D pipeline (24-27). Although much has been accomplished in this field in a short amount of time, 3DO body composition has not been evaluated at the subgroup level. In order for 3DO to be accepted as a viable body composition method, 3DO must be scrutinized at a more minute scale. The hypothesis was that 3DO body composition does not differ from DXA by subgroups of age, BMI, or ethnicity/race. The objective of this study was to evaluate the accuracy and precision by subgroups of age, BMI, and ethnicity/race as compared to DXA.

METHODS

Study Design

Shape Up! Adults was a cross-sectional study of healthy adults (NIH R01 DK109008, ClinicalTrials.gov ID NCT03637855). This study was designed to investigate the associations between body shape and composition with various health markers. Participants underwent whole-body 3DO scans, dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) scans, blood serum tests, and functional tests for hand grip and knee extension strength.

Participants

Participants were recruited at Pennington Biomedical Research Center (PBRC), University of Hawaii Cancer Center (UHCC), and University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). All participants provided informed consent. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) at PBRC (IRB study #2016-053), UCSF (IRB #15-18066), and the University of Hawaii Office of Research Compliance (UH ORC, CHS #2017-01018). Volunteers were pre-screened over the phone and were deemed ineligible if they were pregnant, breastfeeding, had missing limbs, non-removable metal, previous body-altering surgery (e.g., breast augmentation, liposuction), hair that could not be contained in a swim cap, were unable to stand still for one minute, or unable to lay still for three minutes. Pretesting preparations included an eight-hour fast (water and prescribed medications were allowed) and no strenuous exercise 24 hours prior to the study visit. Participants were stratified by age (18-39, 40-59, ≥ 60 years), ethnicity (non-Hispanic white (white), non-Hispanic black (black), Hispanic, Asian, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific

Islander (NHOPH)), sex, and BMI (<18.5, 18.5-25, 25-30, >30 kg/m²). Height and weight were measured on a SECA 274 Stadiometer (SECA GmbH, Hamburg, Germany).

Metabolic Blood Biomarkers

Each participant had 40 ml of blood drawn intravenously by a certified, trained phlebotomist. Prior to blood draw, participants fasted for at least eight hours with the exception of water and prescription medication. Blood samples were placed on ice and processed within four hours into plasma, whole blood, buffy coat components, and serum. Samples were stored in -80°C at each study site until sent to PBRC for batched analysis. Serum chemistry panels were assayed by a DXC600 instrument (Beckman Coulter, Inc.; Brea, CA). LDL cholesterol was calculated as [total cholesterol] – [HDL cholesterol] – [triglycerides]/5 (all values in mg/dL) as described by Friedewald, et al. (28). Insulin was measured by immunoassay on an Immulite 2000 platform (Siemens Corporation; Washington, DC). Present analysis used fasting glucose, HbA1c, total cholesterol, LDL and HDL cholesterol, serum triglycerides, and insulin measurements.

Strength Measurements

Isokinetic leg strength was measured using a Biodex System 4 (Biodex Medical Systems Inc., Shirley, NY, USA) or HUMAC NORM (Computer Sports Medicine Inc., Stoughton, MA, USA) dynamometer. Only the dominant leg was used for testing. The dominant leg was defined as the leg one would use to kick a ball. Participants were fastened into the seat with a seat belt and a Velcro strap over their dominant leg to isolate movement. The dynamometer was adjusted accordingly to accommodate the participant's upper and lower leg length. The participants then practiced at an endurance of 50% of maximal effort for isokinetic testing until they were

comfortable with the procedures. For the isokinetic measurement, resistance was set at 60° per second. After the practice round, participants performed a set of five repetitions at maximal effort. Peak torque was recorded as the maximum torque (in units of Newton-meters) achieved during the repetitions.

Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry

Participants received duplicate whole-body DXA scans with a Hologic Discovery/A or Horizon system (Hologic Inc., Marlborough, Massachusetts) according to International Society for Clinical Densitometry guidelines (29) with repositioning. Participants were scanned once, asked to get off the table, and laid back on the table for the second scan. A phantom was scanned daily for quality control and used for calibration across sites. All scans were analyzed at UHCC by a single certified technologist using Hologic Apex version 5.6 with the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Body Composition Analysis calibration option disabled (30).

3D Optical Surface Scans

Participants changed into form-fitting tights, a swim cap, and a sports bra if female. Duplicate 3DO surface scans were taken on the Fit3D ProScanner version 4.x (Fit3D Inc., San Mateo, California) within ten minutes of each other and with repositioning. Participants grasped telescoping handles on the scanner platform and stood upright with shoulders relaxed and arms positioned straight and abducted from their torso. The platform rotates once around and takes approximately 45 seconds for the completion of the scan. Final point clouds were converted to a mesh connected by triangles with approximately 300,000 vertices and 600,000 faces to represent the body shape (20).

3DO meshes were sent to Meshcapade (Meshcapade GmbH, Tübingen, Germany) for registration and to be digitally reposed. Their algorithm registers each mesh to a 110,000-vertex template with full anatomical correspondence. This means each vertex corresponds to a specific anatomical location across all registered meshes. All meshes were digitally reposed to a T-pose, where the person was standing straight, arms were brought horizontal and in plane with the body, and arms and legs were straightened (26, 31).

Statistical Analysis

Since vertices in the 3D meshes are highly correlated to neighboring vertices, principal component analysis (PCA) was performed on the registered meshes to orthogonalize and reduce the dimensionality of the data so that fewer variables are needed to describe the data's variance (23). The resulting outputs were principal components (PCs) that could be used for analysis.

Stepwise forward linear regression with five-fold cross-validation was used to predict DXA body composition with the PCs. The independent variables were the PCs and demographics (i.e., age and BMI), while the dependent variables were DXA whole-body and regional body composition measures. PC-only models were created first and then adjusted with age and BMI as potential covariates for the PC + demographics models. Results were reported with the coefficient of determination (R^2) and root mean square error (RMSE).

Test-retest precision, also known as short-term precision, was performed on the duplicate DXA and 3DO meshes. The percent coefficient of variation (%CV) and RMSE were used to quantify the test-retest precision defined by Gluer et al. (32). Precision between subgroup was calculated

similarly and compared within the strata of age, BMI, and ethnicity/race with a one-way ANOVA.

A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

The accuracy of 3DO total FM, FFM, and %fat was evaluated at the subgroup level with the stratifications mentioned previously. Mean differences were calculated between 3DO PC + demographic estimates and DXA (3DO – DXA). Paired Student's t-test determined if the differences were statistically significant (p-value < 0.05). If significant, the percent mean difference would be calculated $[(DXA - 3DO) / DXA * 100]$. Percent mean differences under 2% was considered small, 2-5% moderate, and > 5% large.

Pearson correlations were performed between total FM, FFM, and %fat by 3DO and DXA to metabolic blood markers and leg strength. A bootstrap confidence interval was implemented to determine if the strength of the association between 3DO and DXA were significantly different (33). P-values < 5.6E-5 were considered significant correlations after Bonferroni adjustment (Bonferroni, 0.05/900) (34). The metabolic marker and strength sub-analysis was performed in SAS version 9.4 for Windows (SAS Institute, Cary, North Carolina). All other analyses were performed in R version 4.2.1 (R Core Teams).

RESULTS

Six hundred thirty-four participants had completed the study at the time of the analysis (Table 1). Average age of females and males was 46.6 ± 15.9 and 43.5 ± 15.8 years, respectively. Average BMI of females and males was 27.1 ± 7.35 and 28.2 ± 5.94 kg/m², respectively. Ethnicity/racial breakdown for females was 23.7% Asian, 20.8% non-Hispanic Black, 13.9% Hispanic, 8.4% NHOPI, and 33.2% non-Hispanic black. Ethnicity/racial breakdown for males was 25.3% Asian, 22.2% non-Hispanic Black, 11.5% Hispanic, 5.9% NHOPI, and 35.1% non-Hispanic black. Average DXA %fat was $34.1\% \pm 7.57\%$ for females and $22.9\% \pm 6.6\%$ for males.

Sex-specific statistical shape models were created with the registered and reposed 3DO meshes. Three PCs captured 95% of the shape variance in each of the female and male shape models. 3DO PC-only equations were highly correlated to DXA body composition values (Table 2). 3DO total FM and FFM in females achieved R²s of 0.94 and 0.92 with RMSEs of 2.91 kg and 2.76 kg, while males achieved R²s of 0.94 and 0.94 with RMSEs of 3.04 kg and 2.97 kg, respectively. Female and male 3DO %fat had moderate correlations to DXA (R²; 0.75 and 0.73, RMSE; 3.82% and 3.31%, respectively). Regional 3DO FM and FFM estimates (i.e., arms, legs, and trunk) had strong correlations to DXA (R² range: 0.79 – 0.95, RMSE range: 0.27 – 1.86 kg) for females and males. After possible adjustments for age and BMI as covariates (PC + demographics), there were marginal improvements to the R²s and RMSEs.

3DO test-retest precision was comparable to DXA (Table 3). 3DO total FM and FFM achieved a %CV (RMSE) of 1.76% (0.44 kg) and 1.97% (0.44 kg) in females, while DXA had a %CV (RMSE) of 0.98% (0.24 kg) and 0.59% (0.27 kg), respectively. In females, 3DO VAT, arm FM, and

trunk FM (%CV; 4.4%, 2.72%, and 1.55%, RMSE; 0.02 kg, 0.04 kg, and 0.18 kg, respectively) achieved better test-retest precision than DXA (%CV; 8.08%, 3.16%, and 1.16%, RMSE; 0.03 kg, 0.05 kg, and 0.23 kg, respectively). Test-retest precision for males had similar statistics. However, only 3DO VAT was better than DXA in males. When comparing the precision across subgroups of age, BMI, and ethnicity/race, there were no significant differences (data not shown, p -value > 0.109).

When comparing 3DO total FM, FFM, %fat, and VAT to DXA by age subgroups (Table 4), there were no mean differences in either females or males (p -value > 0.068). For the BMI subgroups (Table 5), underweight females had significant differences for total FM, FFM, and %fat (mean differences (MD) = 1.23 kg, -1.23 kg, and 3.12%, respectively, p -value < 0.014) as well as %fat for the females with obesity (MD = -0.79%, p -value = 0.023). There were no mean differences in the male BMI subgroups (p -value > 0.314). In the ethnicity/racial subgroups (Table 6), female Asians, blacks, and NHOPI subgroups had mean differences in total FM (MD = 0.64 kg, -0.81 kg, -1.55 kg, respectively), FFM (MD = -1.6 kg, 1.7 kg, and 3 kg, respectively), and %fat (MD = 1.38%, -1.11%, and -2.24%, respectively) (p -value < 0.017). Additionally, the male NHOPI subgroup had mean differences for total FM, FFM, and %fat (MD = -1.45 kg, 1.45 kg, and -1.88%, respectively, p -value < 0.038). If ethnicity/race was adjusted in the model, differences in ethnicity/race subgroups were no longer significant (p -value > 0.99). However, underweight females still had a mean difference (p -value = 0.029).

3DO body composition values were associated with blood biomarkers and thigh strength similarly to DXA (Supplemental Table 1). Although some associations were considered statistically

significant, the trend of the association were the same in all except for high strength in the underweight group.

DISCUSSION

In this study, 3DO body composition accuracy and precision was evaluated at the subgroup level of age, BMI, and ethnicity/race. Accuracy of subgroups were compared to DXA, while precision was an intra-group comparison. The analysis showed mean differences among underweight females, NHOPI females and males, and Asian and black females, while all other groups had no mean differences. However, most of these differences were considered small or moderate. There were no significant differences for precision among the subgroups. The overall analysis supports the use of 3DO body composition in most subgroups. Those who fall under those subgroups with differences should be cautioned before use. Specific equations may be needed for those groups.

As a whole, the accuracy and precision were similar to previous work done by Wong et al. (26). Methods to develop the statistical shape model and the body composition equations were the exact same. Due to the power needed in each subgroup, splitting the total sample in this analysis into a representative training and test set by subgroup was not possible due to the low representations in some subgroups (i.e., underweight and NHOPI). However, the previous work showed how these methods were robust and validated strongly in its accuracy (26).

In the female underweight group, there was a large difference for total FM and moderate difference for FFM (%MD = 12% and -3.4%, respectively). Since the mean total FM in the underweight group was low (approximately 10 kg), the %MD was proportionately higher even with a small difference. Although the models were adjusted for BMI, they were not adjusted for ethnicity. Since female Asians, blacks, and NHOPI had mean differences as well, the ethnic

differences could be driving some of the bias as 44% of the underweight group were either Asian or black. The remaining 56% of the underweight were either white or Hispanic, who did not observe mean differences. However, after adjustment for ethnicity/race, 3DO still overestimated total FM in underweight females, which means the model may not have seen enough underweight variance in the sample or other unique shape features from this group. The female subgroup with obesity also had a mean difference in %fat (-0.79%). However, this mean difference was very small especially in a group with the highest mean %fat (41%). Since the difference was small and the total FM and FFM were not significant, the %fat difference may have been due to chance. The largest differences were seen in the NHOPI group for both males and females. The differences may be driven by the low representation in comparison to other ethnic/racial groups. In addition, differences in shape can also be driving these differences. Certain shape characteristics in Asian, black, and NHOPI could be different from the majority of the group, which lead to under or overestimations.

In a previous paper that used descriptive shape characteristics by PCA, the authors showed that the PCs were correlated to metabolic blood serum markers (23). However, the prediction of the biomarkers with PCs had a low to moderate correlation. In the present analysis, 3DO predicted body composition values show similar correlations as DXA to metabolic blood serum markers (Supplemental Table 1). Although the strength of the association may differ, 3DO and DXA were within 5% for most of the correlations. In addition, the trend of the associations to blood serum biomarkers were the same. Even with mean differences between 3DO and DXA for certain subgroups (i.e., NHOPI and underweight), there can be confidence that 3DO body

composition estimates have similar physiological associations as DXA and can be used in place of DXA if DXA is unavailable.

The strength of the study was the scrutiny at the subgroup level. Many body composition studies focused on the entire sample, have a homogenous sample, or were not powered to evaluate accuracy and precision with these many strata. This work builds upon the previous 3DO literature and was the first to evaluate accuracy and precision from subgroups. In addition, only a single equation was needed for the majority of the subgroups that were explored. A subgroup-specific equation may be needed for those with mean differences.

However, there were also limitations. Some subgroups were underrepresented (i.e., NHOP and underweight). As a result, a representative split for a training and test set was not viable. The current analysis was completed with a healthy sample, so the results may not be applicable to patients with body composition altering diseases. Future work can focus on populations with diseases, younger populations (birth to 17 years), and more accessible 3DO methods such as apps from smartphones (35, 36).

Conclusion

3DO body composition has come a long way in a short amount of time. This work further justifies the use of 3DO as a reliable method for body composition. Although some subgroups had mean differences from DXA, the majority of the subgroups were accurate. Beyond clinical settings, the accessibility and safety of these devices are appealing for those that want to monitor body composition frequently.

Acknowledgements

We thank all the participants for graciously giving their time to be part of the studies, our collaborators at each site for their part in the study, Tyler Carter and Greg Moore at Fit3D for providing us the 3DO data, and Naureen Mahmood and Talha Zaman for providing us the application program interface to register and repose our 3DO data. The data underlying this study cannot be made publicly available because the data contains patient identifying information. Data is available from the Shape Up! Studies for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data. For details and to request an application, please contact John Shepherd johnshep@hawaii.edu or visit www.shapeup.shepherdresearchlab.org.

Funding

Phases of this study were funded by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIH R01 DK R01DK109008).

Conflicts of Interest

All other authors have no disclosures.

Author Contributions

MCW and JAS designed and conducted the research; MCW, BQ, and JAS were part of the data analysis; MCW, YEL, NNK, CM, AKG, GM, SBH, and JAS were in charge of their respective study recruitment and protocols; MCW and JAS drafted the manuscript and were responsible over the final content. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Bennett J, Wong MC, McCarthy C, Fearnbach N, Queen K, Shepherd J, et al. Emergence of the adolescent obesity epidemic in the United States: five-decade visualization with humanoid avatars. *International Journal of Obesity*. 2022;1-4.
2. Hales CD CM, Fryar CD, and Ogden CL. Prevalence of Obesity and Severe Obesity Among Adults: United States, 2017-2018 2020 [Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db360-h.pdf>.
3. Wong MC, McCarthy C, Fearnbach N, Yang S, Shepherd J, Heymsfield SB. Emergence of the obesity epidemic: six decade visualization with humanoid avatars. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2022.
4. Calle EE, Rodriguez C, Walker-Thurmond K, Thun MJ. Overweight, obesity, and mortality from cancer in a prospectively studied cohort of US adults. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2003;348(17):1625-38.
5. Després J-P, Lemieux I. Abdominal obesity and metabolic syndrome. *Nature*. 2006;444(7121):881.
6. Grundy SM. Obesity, metabolic syndrome, and cardiovascular disease. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*. 2004;89(6):2595-600.
7. Müller M, Lagerpusch M, Enderle J, Schautz B, Heller M, Bosity-Westphal A. Beyond the body mass index: tracking body composition in the pathogenesis of obesity and the metabolic syndrome. *Obesity Reviews*. 2012;2(13):6-13.
8. Heymsfield S, Wang Z, Baumgartner RN, Ross R. Human body composition: advances in models and methods. *Annual review of nutrition*. 1997;17(1):527-58.
9. Lukaski HC. Methods for the assessment of human body composition: traditional and new. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 1987;46(4):537-56.
10. Shepherd JA, Ng BK, Sommer MJ, Heymsfield SB. Body composition by DXA. *Bone*. 2017;104:101-5.
11. McCrory MA, Gomez TD, Bernauer EM, Molé PA. Evaluation of a new air displacement plethysmograph for measuring human body composition. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*. 1995;27(12):1686-91.
12. Abu Khaled M, McCutcheon M, Reddy S, Pearman P, Hunter G, Weinsier R. Electrical impedance in assessing human body composition: the BIA method. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 1988;47(5):789-92.
13. Kennedy S, Hwaung P, Kelly N, Liu YE, Sobhiyeh S, Heo M, et al. Optical imaging technology for body size and shape analysis: evaluation of a system designed for personal use. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2020;74(6):920-9.
14. Kennedy S, Smith B, Sobhiyeh S, Dechenaud ME, Wong M, Kelly N, et al. Digital anthropometric evaluation of young children: comparison to results acquired with conventional anthropometry. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. 2021:1-10.
15. Rumbo-Rodríguez L, Sánchez-SanSegundo M, Ferrer-Cascales R, García-D'Urso N, Hurtado-Sánchez JA, Zaragoza-Martí A. Comparison of Body Scanner and Manual Anthropometric Measurements of Body Shape: A Systematic Review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2021;18(12):6213.
16. Heymsfield SB, Bourgeois B, Ng BK, Sommer MJ, Li X, Shepherd JA. Digital anthropometry: a critical review. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2018;72(5):680.
17. Jaeschke L, Steinbrecher A, Pischon T. Measurement of waist and hip circumference with a body surface scanner: feasibility, validity, reliability, and correlations with markers of the metabolic syndrome. *PLoS one*. 2015;10(3):e0119430.

18. Bennett JP, Liu YE, Quon BK, Kelly NN, Leong LT, Wong MC, et al. Three-dimensional optical body shape and features improve prediction of metabolic disease risk in a diverse sample of adults. *Obesity*. 2022;30(8):1589-98.
19. Bennett JP, Liu YE, Quon BK, Kelly NN, Wong MC, Kennedy SF, et al. Assessment of clinical measures of total and regional body composition from a commercial 3-dimensional optical body scanner. *Clinical Nutrition*. 2022;41(1):211-8.
20. Ng B, Hinton B, Fan B, Kanaya A, Shepherd J. Clinical anthropometrics and body composition from 3D whole-body surface scans. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2016;70(11):1265.
21. Wong MC, Ng BK, Kennedy SF, Hwaung P, Liu EY, Kelly NN, et al. Children and Adolescents' Anthropometrics Body Composition from 3-D Optical Surface Scans. *Obesity*. 2019;27(11):1738-49.
22. Harty PS, Sieglinger B, Heymsfield SB, Shepherd JA, Bruner D, Stratton MT, et al. Novel body fat estimation using machine learning and 3-dimensional optical imaging. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2020;74(5):842-5.
23. Ng BK, Sommer MJ, Wong MC, Pagano I, Nie Y, Fan B, et al. Detailed 3-dimensional body shape features predict body composition, blood metabolites, and functional strength: the Shape Up! studies. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2019.
24. Sobhiyeh S, Borel N, Dechenaud M, Graham CA, Wong M, Wolenski P, et al., editors. Fully Automated Pipeline for Body Composition Estimation from 3D Optical Scans using Principal Component Analysis: A Shape Up Study. 2020 42nd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine & Biology Society (EMBC); 2020: IEEE.
25. Tian IY WM, Kennedy S, Kelly NN, Yong EL, Garber AK, Heymsfield SB, Curless B, Shepherd JA. A Device-Agnostic Shape Model for Automated Body Composition Estimates from 3D Optical Scans. *Medical Physics*. 2022.
26. Wong MC, Ng BK, Tian I, Sobhiyeh S, Pagano I, Dechenaud M, et al. A pose-independent method for accurate and precise body composition from 3D optical scans. *Obesity*. 2021;29(11):1835-47.
27. Tian IY, Ng BK, Wong MC, Kennedy S, Hwaung P, Kelly N, et al. Predicting 3D Body Shape and Body Composition from Conventional 2D Photography. *Medical Physics*. 2020.
28. Friedewald WT, Levy RI, Fredrickson DS. Estimation of the concentration of low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in plasma, without use of the preparative ultracentrifuge. *Clinical chemistry*. 1972;18(6):499-502.
29. Hangartner TN, Warner S, Braillon P, Jankowski L, Shepherd J. The Official Positions of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry: acquisition of dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry body composition and considerations regarding analysis and repeatability of measures. *Journal of Clinical Densitometry*. 2013;16(4):520-36.
30. Ng BK, Liu YE, Wang W, Kelly TL, Wilson KE, Schoeller DA, et al. Validation of rapid 4-component body composition assessment with the use of dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry and bioelectrical impedance analysis. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2018;108(4):708-15.
31. Loper M, Mahmood N, Romero J, Pons-Moll G, Black MJ. SMPL: A skinned multi-person linear model. *ACM transactions on graphics (TOG)*. 2015;34(6):248.
32. Gluer CC, Blake G, Lu Y, Blunt BA, Jergas M, Genant HK. Accurate assessment of precision errors: how to measure the reproducibility of bone densitometry techniques. *Osteoporos Int*. 1995;5(4):262-70.
33. DiCiccio TJ, Efron B. Bootstrap confidence intervals. *Statistical science*. 1996;11(3):189-228.
34. Bonferroni C. Teoria statistica delle classi e calcolo delle probabilita. *Pubblicazioni del R Istituto Superiore di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali di Firenze*. 1936;8:3-62.
35. Stark E, Haffner O, Kučera E. Low-Cost Method for 3D Body Measurement Based on Photogrammetry Using Smartphone. *Electronics*. 2022;11(7):1048.
36. Smith B, McCarthy C, Dechenaud ME, Wong MC, Shepherd J, Heymsfield SB. Anthropometric evaluation of a 3D scanning mobile application. *Obesity*. 2022.

Table 1. Overall sample characteristics

	Females (N=346)	Males (N=288)
Age (years)		
Mean (SD)	46.6 (15.9)	43.5 (15.8)
Median [Min, Max]	47.0 [18.0, 89.0]	42.0 [18.0, 79.0]
Ethnicity		
Asian	82 (23.7%)	73 (25.3%)
Black	72 (20.8%)	64 (22.2%)
Hispanic	48 (13.9%)	33 (11.5%)
NHOPI	29 (8.4%)	17 (5.9%)
White	115 (33.2%)	101 (35.1%)
Height (cm)		
Mean (SD)	162 (6.88)	176 (7.61)
Median [Min, Max]	162 [144, 190]	176 [147, 202]
Weight (kg)		
Mean (SD)	71.5 (20.3)	87.4 (20.5)
Median [Min, Max]	67.6 [35.4, 153]	84.1 [40.6, 174]
BMI (kg/m²)		
Mean (SD)	27.1 (7.35)	28.2 (5.94)
Median [Min, Max]	26.4 [14.2, 53.1]	27.8 [17.0, 52.6]
Total Fat Mass (kg)		
Mean (SD)	25.4 (11.9)	20.9 (10.0)
Median [Min, Max]	24.1 [6.30, 72.7]	19.5 [5.01, 66.5]
Total FFM Mass (kg)		
Mean (SD)	46.1 (9.54)	66.6 (12.4)
Median [Min, Max]	44.2 [28.6, 80.4]	65.5 [33.9, 108]
Percent Fat (%)		
Mean (SD)	34.1 (7.57)	22.9 (6.60)
Median [Min, Max]	34.4 [12.6, 53.3]	23.1 [9.03, 38.6]
VAT (kg)		
Mean (SD)	0.45 (0.30)	0.49 (0.28)
Median [Min, Max]	0.37 [0.05, 1.37]	0.42 [0.16, 1.64]
Glucose (mg/dL)		
Mean (SD)	93.0 (18.2)	94.8 (18.8)
Median [Min, Max]	89.0 [65.0, 230]	92.0 [64.0, 279]
Insulin (mg/dL)		
Mean (SD)	10.7 (7.41)	14.9 (33.6)
Median [Min, Max]	9.05 [2.10, 45.3]	10.3 [2.00, 515]
HOMA-IR (mg/dL)		
Mean (SD)	2.57 (2.09)	3.85 (11.3)
Median [Min, Max]	2.00 [0.39, 16.6]	2.43 [0.41, 174]
HbA1c (%)		
Mean (SD)	0.53 (0.12)	0.59 (0.15)

Median [Min, Max]	0.51 [0.28, 1.62]	0.55 [0.36, 1.88]
Triglycerides (mg/dL)		
Mean (SD)	92.9 (57.5)	106 (78.3)
Median [Min, Max]	76.0 [23.0, 417]	81.0 [29.0, 538]
LDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)		
Mean (SD)	115 (31.0)	112 (32.3)
Median [Min, Max]	113 [37.1, 210]	110 [44.2, 212]
HDL Cholesterol (mg/dL)		
Mean (SD)	63.5 (17.0)	52.9 (13.8)
Median [Min, Max]	60.7 [32.2, 141]	51.9 [17.6, 99.1]
Isokinetic Knee Extension (N m)		
Mean (SD)	87.0 (33.4)	153 (59.6)
Median [Min, Max]	82.5 [18.8, 223]	147 [22.2, 339]

Abbreviations: BMI (body mass index), HbA1c (glycated hemoglobin), HDL (high-density lipoprotein), HOMA-IR (Homeostatic Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance), LDL (low-density lipoprotein), NHOPI (Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders), VAT (visceral adipose tissue)

Body composition values measured from DXA.

Table 2. 3DO body composition models to estimate to DXA body composition

		PC-only				PC + Demographics									
Sex	Outcome	Variable	Coefficient	R ²	RMSE	Variable	Coefficient	R ²	RMSE						
Females	Total FM	Intercept	26.5689	0.94	2.91	Intercept	16.4494	0.94	2.88						
		PC1	0.1282			PC1	0.1108								
		PC2	2.0930			PC2	1.5903								
		PC3	-1.0575			PC3	-0.7970								
		PC4	0.7487			PC4	0.5483								
		PC5	0.5329			PC5	0.4035								
		PC6	-0.4188			PC6	-0.2978								
		PC7	-1.3200			PC7	-0.9192								
		PC9	-0.4824			PC9	-0.7256								
		PC10	1.6580			PC10	1.1085								
		PC11	1.8068			PC11	1.4661								
		PC13	-2.7090			PC13	-2.3351								
						BMI	0.3597								
		Total FFM	Total Mass - Total Fat Mass			0.92	2.76			Total Mass - Total Fat Mass	0.92	2.63			
		Percent Fat	Total Fat Mass / Total Mass			0.75	3.82			Total Fat Mass / Total Mass	0.75	3.76			
VAT	VAT	Intercept	0.4516	0.72	0.15	Intercept	0.3334	0.78	0.14						
		PC2	0.0408			PC2	0.0431								
		PC3	-0.0226			PC3	-0.0254								
		PC4	0.0151			PC4	0.0142								
		PC5	-0.0332			PC5	-0.0252								
		PC6	0.0554			PC6	0.0417								
		PC7	0.0349			PC7	0.0382								
		PC8	-0.0680			PC8	-0.0931								
		PC12	-0.0809			PC12	-0.0301								
		PC13	-0.0348			PC13	-0.0569								
		PC14	-0.0489			PC14	-0.0555								
		PC15	-0.0570			PC15	-0.0490								
						Age	0.0028								
		Arm FM	Arm FM			Intercept	1.6889			0.86	0.34	Intercept	0.6964	0.87	0.33
						PC1	0.0073					PC1	0.0058		
PC2	0.1508			PC2	0.1023										
PC3	-0.0723			PC3	-0.0508										
PC4	0.0354			PC4	0.0242										
PC7	-0.0391			PC7	-0.0176										
PC8	-0.0928			PC8	-0.0755										
PC10	0.0857			PC10	0.0553										
PC11	0.1248			PC11	0.0901										
PC13	-0.0635			PC13	-0.0259										
PC14	0.1282			PC14	0.0937										
				BMI	0.0356										

Arm FFM	Intercept	2.4555	0.81	0.27	Intercept	1.7392	0.81	0.27					
	PC1	0.0159			PC1	0.0141							
	PC2	0.0791			PC2	0.0423							
	PC4	-0.0283			PC4	-0.0308							
	PC5	0.0653			PC5	0.0427							
	PC6	-0.0587			PC6	-0.0469							
	PC7	0.0945			PC7	0.0748							
	PC8	-0.0871			PC8	-0.0601							
	PC9	0.0919			PC9	0.0999							
	PC11	-0.0678			PC11	-0.0745							
	PC12	0.1752			PC12	0.1223							
	PC13	0.1557			PC13	0.1900							
	PC14	0.1555			PC14	0.1657							
						BMI			0.0253				
Leg FM	Intercept	4.9806	0.89	0.77	Intercept	-0.7249	0.9	0.7					
	PC1	0.0301			PC1	0.0225							
	PC2	0.3257			PC2	0.0640							
	PC3	-0.1496			PC3	-0.0395							
	PC4	0.1742			PC4	0.0844							
	PC5	0.2336			PC5	0.1576							
	PC6	-0.3811			PC6	-0.3458							
	PC7	-0.6359			PC7	-0.5000							
	PC8	0.2286			PC8	0.3740							
	PC9	-0.1582			PC9	-0.1925							
	PC10	0.6106			PC10	0.3756							
	PC11	0.4500			PC11	0.2694							
	PC13	-0.6444			PC13	-0.4967							
						Age			0.0090				
			BMI	0.1886									
Leg FFM	Intercept	7.6220	0.86	0.69	Intercept	2.1961	0.88	0.61					
	PC1	0.0535			PC1	0.0432							
	PC2	0.2321			PC2	-0.0418							
	PC3	-0.0540			PC3	0.0506							
	PC4	-0.0477			PC4	-0.0836							
	PC5	0.2668			PC5	0.1021							
	PC6	-0.2926			PC6	-0.1679							
	PC12	0.5220			PC12	0.2473							
	PC13	0.2352			PC13	0.3576							
	PC14	0.4598			PC14	0.3194							
						Age			-0.0064				
						BMI			0.2051				
	Trunk FM	Intercept			12.2398	0.95			1.45	Intercept	12.2398	0.95	1.45
		PC1			0.0523					PC1	0.0523		
PC2		1.1211	PC2	1.1211									

		PC3	-0.6125			PC3	-0.6125		
		PC4	0.3434			PC4	0.3434		
		PC6	0.3615			PC6	0.3615		
		PC8	-0.7211			PC8	-0.7211		
		PC10	0.3308			PC10	0.3308		
		PC11	0.6288			PC11	0.6288		
		PC13	-1.3325			PC13	-1.3325		
		PC15	-0.5152			PC15	-0.5152		
	Trunk FFM	Intercept	23.3186	0.9	1.55	Intercept	15.7269	0.9	1.56
		PC1	0.1303			PC1	0.1205		
		PC2	0.7044			PC2	0.3419		
		PC3	-0.3264			PC3	-0.1800		
		PC4	-0.2970			PC4	-0.3386		
		PC5	0.3798			PC5	0.2091		
		PC6	0.1300			PC6	0.2489		
		PC7	0.6023			PC7	0.6429		
		PC8	-0.5750			PC8	-0.3958		
		PC11	0.4349			PC11	0.1498		
		PC12	0.7638			PC12	0.5748		
		PC13	0.2979			PC13	0.4630		
		PC14	0.7890			PC14	0.6475		
		PC15	0.5148			PC15	0.4326		
						BMI	0.2745		
Males	Total FM	Intercept	23.4226	0.94	3.04	Intercept	24.2945	0.94	2.85
		PC1	-0.1924			PC1	-0.1883		
		PC2	2.0747			PC2	1.9407		
		PC3	-1.4689			PC3	-1.3345		
		PC4	-1.2207			PC4	-1.2314		
		PC5	0.9020			PC5	0.9058		
		PC6	0.6394			PC6	0.5996		
		PC7	-2.3710			PC7	-1.8262		
		PC8	0.9488			PC8	0.8188		
		PC9	-1.5091			PC9	-1.6708		
		PC10	-1.4176			PC10	-0.6422		
		PC11	2.8085			PC11	2.6083		
		PC12	2.0674			PC12	1.5622		
		PC14	1.1338			PC14	1.1794		
		PC15	-1.2783			PC15	-1.1086		
						Age	-0.0311		
	Total FFM	Total Mass - Total Fat Mass		0.94	2.97	Total Mass - Total Fat Mass		0.95	2.63
	Percent Fat	Total Fat Mass / Total Mass		0.73	3.31	Total Fat Mass / Total Mass		0.77	3.17
	VAT	Intercept	0.5050	0.73	0.14	Intercept	0.3881	0.75	0.14
		PC1	-0.0025			PC1	-0.0024		
		PC2	0.0360			PC2	0.0382		

	PC3	-0.0256			PC3	-0.0280		
	PC4	-0.0489			PC4	-0.0390		
	PC5	0.0712			PC5	0.0616		
	PC6	0.0489			PC6	0.0401		
	PC7	0.0919			PC7	0.0633		
	PC9	-0.0505			PC9	-0.0340		
	PC10	0.0453			PC10	0.0206		
	PC11	0.0859			PC11	0.0641		
	PC13	-0.0786			PC13	-0.0813		
	PC14	0.0598			PC14	0.0437		
	PC15	0.0984			PC15	0.0930		
					Age	0.0030		
Arm FM	Intercept	1.4169	0.86	0.3	Intercept	1.4169	0.86	0.3
	PC1	-0.0109			PC1	-0.0109		
	PC2	0.1403			PC2	0.1403		
	PC3	-0.0888			PC3	-0.0888		
	PC4	-0.0633			PC4	-0.0633		
	PC5	0.0538			PC5	0.0538		
	PC7	-0.1132			PC7	-0.1132		
	PC8	0.0640			PC8	0.0640		
	PC11	0.1479			PC11	0.1478		
	PC12	0.1454			PC12	0.1454		
	PC15	-0.0818			PC15	-0.0818		
Arm FFM	Intercept	4.3909	0.79	0.43	Intercept	-2.2843	0.88	0.36
	PC1	-0.0246			PC1	-0.0089		
	PC2	0.1095			PC2	-0.1596		
	PC3	0.0468			PC3	0.1405		
	PC4	0.0861			PC4	0.2015		
	PC5	-0.2594			PC5	-0.1733		
	PC6	-0.1831			PC6	-0.1072		
	PC7	0.2161			PC7	0.1650		
	PC8	-0.1722			PC8	-0.2115		
	PC9	0.2050			PC9	0.3574		
	PC11	-0.3739			PC11	-0.4795		
	PC12	0.1182			PC12	-0.0916		
	PC14	-0.2356			PC14	-0.1463		
	PC15	0.1522			PC15	0.1853		
					Age	0.0070		
					BMI	0.2198		
Leg FM	Intercept	3.8794	0.88	0.7	Intercept	3.8794	0.88	0.7
	PC1	-0.0329			PC1	-0.0329		
	PC2	0.3032			PC2	0.3032		
	PC3	-0.2220			PC3	-0.2221		
	PC4	-0.1629			PC4	-0.1629		

	PC7	-0.8775			PC7	-0.8775		
	PC8	0.1725			PC8	0.1725		
	PC9	-0.3007			PC9	-0.3007		
	PC10	-0.4316			PC10	-0.4316		
	PC11	0.4213			PC11	0.4213		
	PC12	0.4360			PC12	0.4360		
	PC15	-0.6294			PC15	-0.6294		
Leg FFM	Intercept	11.0904	0.84	0.84	Intercept	6.5031	0.85	0.81
	PC1	-0.0678			PC1	-0.0537		
	PC2	0.2644			PC2	0.0743		
	PC4	0.0760			PC4	0.1364		
	PC5	-0.4727			PC5	-0.4295		
	PC6	-0.4029			PC6	-0.3450		
	PC11	-0.2748			PC11	-0.2650		
	PC12	0.4749			PC12	0.3277		
	PC14	-0.3186			PC14	-0.2001		
					BMI	0.1572		
Trunk FM	Intercept	11.6548	0.94	1.66	Intercept	12.2359	0.94	1.54
	PC1	-0.1024			PC1	-0.1009		
	PC2	1.1661			PC2	1.1352		
	PC3	-0.8335			PC3	-0.8090		
	PC4	-0.7817			PC4	-0.7977		
	PC5	0.8185			PC5	0.8424		
	PC6	0.5521			PC6	0.5651		
	PC7	-0.3729			PC7	-0.2483		
	PC8	0.4690			PC8	0.3791		
	PC9	-0.8747			PC9	-0.9111		
	PC10	-0.5862			PC10	-0.4334		
	PC11	1.6527			PC11	1.5991		
	PC12	0.9004			PC12	0.7377		
	PC14	0.8207			PC14	0.7938		
					Age	-0.0152		
Trunk FFM	Intercept	32.6704	0.91	1.86	Intercept	18.9138	0.91	1.83
	PC1	-0.1891			PC1	-0.1519		
	PC2	0.9060			PC2	0.3550		
	PC3	-0.2653			PC3	-0.0705		
	PC4	0.3630			PC4	0.5238		
	PC5	-0.5713			PC5	-0.3227		
	PC6	-0.7049			PC6	-0.4851		
	PC7	1.2259			PC7	1.1442		
	PC11	-0.6362			PC11	-0.6084		
	PC12	0.8325			PC12	0.1553		
	PC14	-0.6104			PC14	-0.4821		
					BMI	0.4737		

Abbreviations: BMI (body mass index), PC (principal component), VAT (visceral adipose tissue)

Table 3. Test-retest precision of 3DO and DXA in %CV (RMSE).

Variable	DXA Female	3DO Female	DXA Male	3DO Male
Total FM, kg	0.98 (0.24)	1.76 (0.44)	1.37 (0.28)	2.93 (0.60)
Total FFM, kg	0.59 (0.27)	0.96 (0.44)	0.55 (0.36)	0.91 (0.60)
Percent Fat, %	NA (0.33)	NA (0.66)	NA (0.31)	NA (0.74)
VAT, kg	8.08 (0.03)	4.40 (0.02)	6.88 (0.03)	4.78 (0.02)
Arm FM, kg	3.16 (0.05)	2.72 (0.04)	3.43 (0.04)	3.99 (0.05)
Arm FFM, kg	2.14 (0.05)	2.57 (0.06)	1.89 (0.08)	1.94 (0.08)
Leg FM, kg	1.47 (0.07)	2.90 (0.14)	2.34 (0.08)	4.29 (0.14)
Leg FFM, kg	1.13 (0.08)	1.95 (0.14)	1.18 (0.13)	1.22 (0.13)
Trunk FM, kg	2.04 (0.23)	1.55 (0.18)	2.42 (0.25)	3.03 (0.31)
Trunk FFM, kg	1.16 (0.26)	1.52 (0.34)	1.07 (0.34)	1.20 (0.38)

Abbreviations: %CV (percent coefficient of variation), FM (fat mass), FFM (fat-free mass), RMSE (root mean square error), VAT (visceral adipose tissue)

Table 4. 3D optical vs DXA body composition by age group.

Sex	Groups	n	Variable	Mean Difference	% Mean Difference	P-Value
Female	Young	126	Total FM	-0.28	N.S.	0.303
	Middle Aged	119	Total FM	0.05	N.S.	0.828
	Senior	89	Total FM	-0.03	N.S.	0.901
	Young	126	Total FFM	0.28	N.S.	0.303
	Middle Aged	119	Total FFM	-0.05	N.S.	0.828
	Senior	89	Total FFM	0.03	N.S.	0.901
	Young	126	%Fat	-0.23	N.S.	0.559
	Middle Aged	119	%Fat	0.19	N.S.	0.566
	Senior	89	%Fat	0.04	N.S.	0.932
Male	Young	126	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.204
	Middle Aged	119	VAT	0.02	N.S.	0.068
	Senior	89	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.438
	Young	127	Total FM	-0.01	N.S.	0.960
	Middle Aged	93	Total FM	0.25	N.S.	0.373
	Senior	61	Total FM	-0.36	N.S.	0.288
	Young	127	Total FFM	0.01	N.S.	0.960
	Middle Aged	93	Total FFM	-0.25	N.S.	0.373
	Senior	61	Total FFM	0.36	N.S.	0.288
Female	Young	127	%Fat	0.03	N.S.	0.923
	Middle Aged	93	%Fat	0.35	N.S.	0.261
	Senior	61	%Fat	-0.37	N.S.	0.384
	Young	127	VAT	-0.00	N.S.	0.893
	Middle Aged	93	VAT	0.01	N.S.	0.508
	Senior	61	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.589

Abbreviations: FM (fat mass), FFM (fat-free mass), N.S. (not significant), %Fat (percent fat), VAT (visceral adipose tissue)

Mean differences = 3DO - DXA

FM, FFM, and VAT are measured in kg.

Table 5. 3D optical vs DXA body composition by BMI.

Sex	Groups	n	Variable	Mean Difference	%Mean Difference	P-Value
Female	Underweight	24	Total FM	1.23	12	0.014
	Normal	119	Total FM	-0.01	N.S.	0.958
	Overweight	94	Total FM	-0.13	N.S.	0.610
	Obese	96	Total FM	-0.54	N.S.	0.099
	Underweight	24	Total FFM	-1.23	-3.4	0.014
	Normal	89	Total FFM	0.01	N.S.	0.958
	Overweight	94	Total FFM	0.13	N.S.	0.610
	Obese	96	Total FFM	0.54	N.S.	0.099
	Underweight	24	%Fat	3.12		0.010
	Normal	119	%Fat	-0.10	N.S.	0.785
	Overweight	94	%Fat	-0.18	N.S.	0.616
	Obese	96	%Fat	-0.79		0.023
	Underweight	24	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.772
	Normal	119	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.238
	Overweight	94	VAT	0.01	N.S.	0.286
	Obese	96	VAT	0.00	N.S.	0.988
Male	Underweight	3	Total FM	2.97	N.S.	0.155
	Normal	80	Total FM	0.11	N.S.	0.701
	Overweight	112	Total FM	-0.06	N.S.	0.779
	Obese	85	Total FM	-0.16	N.S.	0.633
	Underweight	3	Total FFM	-2.97	N.S.	0.155
	Normal	80	Total FFM	-0.11	N.S.	0.701
	Overweight	112	Total FFM	0.06	N.S.	0.779
	Obese	85	Total FFM	0.16	N.S.	0.633
	Underweight	3	%Fat	7.12	N.S.	0.168
	Normal	80	%Fat	0.21	N.S.	0.601
	Overweight	112	%Fat	-0.06	N.S.	0.804
	Obese	85	%Fat	-0.29	N.S.	0.356
	Underweight	3	VAT	-0.04	N.S.	0.407
	Normal	80	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.347
	Overweight	112	VAT	0.01	N.S.	0.380
	Obese	85	VAT	0.00	N.S.	0.936

Abbreviations: FM (fat mass), FFM (fat-free mass), N.S. (not significant), %Fat (percent fat), VAT (visceral adipose tissue)

Mean differences = 3DO - DXA

FM, FFM, and VAT are measured in kg.

Table 6. 3D optical vs DXA body composition by ethnic/racial group.

Sex	Groups	n	Variable	Mean Difference	%Mean Difference	P-Value
Female	Asian	80	Total FM	0.64	3.5	0.017
	Black	70	Total FM	-0.81	-2.6	0.015
	Hispanic	47	Total FM	0.36	N.S.	0.386
	NHOPI	28	Total FM	-1.55	-5.4	0.003
	White	107	Total FM	0.01	N.S.	0.980
	Asian	80	Total FFM	-0.64	-1.6	0.017
	Black	70	Total FFM	0.81	1.7	0.015
	Hispanic	47	Total FFM	-0.36	N.S.	0.386
	NHOPI	28	Total FFM	1.55	3	0.003
	White	107	Total FFM	-0.01	N.S.	0.980
	Asian	80	%Fat	1.38		0.006
	Black	70	%Fat	-1.11		0.010
	Hispanic	47	%Fat	0.63	N.S.	0.305
	NHOPI	28	%Fat	-2.24		0.002
	White	107	%Fat	-0.01	N.S.	0.979
	Asian	80	VAT	-0.00	N.S.	0.908
	Black	70	VAT	-0.02	N.S.	0.189
	Hispanic	47	VAT	0.01	N.S.	0.627
	NHOPI	28	VAT	-0.00	N.S.	0.942
	White	107	VAT	0.01	N.S.	0.362
Male	Asian	71	Total FM	0.29	N.S.	0.360
	Black	62	Total FM	0.42	N.S.	0.164
	Hispanic	32	Total FM	-0.65	N.S.	0.226
	NHOPI	16	Total FM	-1.45	-6.5	0.038
	White	98	Total FM	-0.01	N.S.	0.958
	Asian	71	Total FFM	-0.29	N.S.	0.360
	Black	62	Total FFM	-0.42	N.S.	0.164
	Hispanic	32	Total FFM	0.65	N.S.	0.226
	NHOPI	16	Total FFM	1.45	1.9	0.038
	White	98	Total FFM	0.01	N.S.	0.958
	Asian	71	%Fat	0.50	N.S.	0.258
	Black	62	%Fat	0.57	N.S.	0.093
	Hispanic	32	%Fat	-0.57	N.S.	0.374
	NHOPI	16	%Fat	-1.88		0.013
	White	98	%Fat	-0.08	N.S.	0.789
	Asian	71	VAT	-0.01	N.S.	0.421
	Black	62	VAT	-0.03	N.S.	0.105
	Hispanic	32	VAT	0.02	N.S.	0.159
	NHOPI	16	VAT	0.02	N.S.	0.669
	White	98	VAT	0.02	N.S.	0.159

Abbreviations: FM (fat mass), FFM (fat-free mass), N.S. (not significant), %Fat (percent fat), VAT (visceral adipose tissue)

Mean differences = 3DO - DXA

FM, FFM, and VAT are measured in kg.

