

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2

3 **Self-reported and measured anthropometric variables in association with**  
4 **cardiometabolic markers: a Danish cohort study**

5 Jie Zhang<sup>1\*</sup>, Anja Olsen<sup>1,2</sup>, Jytte Halkjær<sup>2</sup>, Kristina Elin Nielsen Petersen<sup>2</sup>, Anne Tjønneland<sup>2</sup>,  
6 Kim Overvad<sup>1</sup>, Christina C Dahm<sup>1</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark;

8 <sup>2</sup> Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark

9

10

11 Correspondence: Jie Zhang (jiezhang@ph.au.dk)

12 Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Bartholins Allé 2, DK-8000 Aarhus C,  
13 Denmark

14

15 Word count (abstract): 247 (300) /2964 (3000)

16

17 Main text: Tables: 2; Figures:3

18 Supplementary Material: Tables:11

19

20 Conflicts of interest: No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper

21

22

23 Key words: body mass index, waist circumference, cardiometabolic markers, validation

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 Self-reported measures of height and weight are widely used in epidemiological studies.  
28 However, misreporting may bias estimates of associations between anthropometry and health  
29 outcomes. Further, few validation studies have compared self-reported and measured waist  
30 circumference (WC). This study aimed to quantify the agreement between self-reported and  
31 measured height, weight, body mass index (BMI), WC, and waist-to-height ratio (WHtR),  
32 and to investigate associations of these anthropometric measures with cardiometabolic  
33 biomarkers.

34 Self-reported and measured anthropometric variables, as well as cardiometabolic biomarkers,  
35 were obtained from participants aged above 18 years at recruitment into the Diet, Cancer, and  
36 Health-Next Generation Cohort in 2015-19 (N=39,514). Pearson correlations ( $r$ ) and Lin's  
37 concordance correlations were applied to evaluate misreporting. Misreporting by age, sex and  
38 smoking status was investigated in linear regression models. Multivariable regression models  
39 and Receiver Operating Characteristic analyses assessed associations of self-reported and  
40 measured anthropometry with cardiometabolic biomarkers. Self-reported height was  
41 overreported by 1.07 cm, and weight was underreported by 0.32 kg on average. Self-reported  
42 BMI and WC were  $0.42 \text{ kg/m}^2$  and 0.2 cm lower than measured, respectively. Self-reported  
43 and measured height, weight, BMI, WC and WtHR were strongly correlated ( $r=0.98, 0.99,$   
44  $0.98, 0.88, 0.86$ , respectively). Age, sex, smoking, and BMI contributed to misreporting of all  
45 anthropometric measures. Associations between self-reported or measured anthropometric  
46 measures and cardiometabolic biomarkers were similar in direction and strength.  
47 Concordance between self-reported and measured anthropometric measures, including WC,  
48 was very high. Self-reported anthropometric measures were reliable when estimating  
49 associations with cardiometabolic biomarkers.



## 50 **Introduction**

51 In epidemiological studies, anthropometric variables are usually self-reported, especially in  
52 large study populations, as it is cost-effective and less burdensome compared to clinical  
53 measurements. However, data may be subject to systematic errors because of observer bias or  
54 recall bias[1]. These reporting errors may be related to age, sex, race, education, and level of  
55 BMI[1, 2]. Several observational studies have assessed the concordance between self-  
56 reported and measured height and weight indices, and found a tendency towards  
57 overestimated height and underestimated weight, which led to an underestimate of BMI[3, 4].  
58 The measurement error in self-reported BMI and other anthropometrics might bias estimates  
59 of associations with health outcomes, such as CVD, T2D, various types of cancer, and  
60 mortality[5-10]. However, only few cohorts have recorded both measured and self-reported  
61 anthropometrics at recruitment, and very little is known about how misreporting influences  
62 associations in different subgroups, for example whether there are discrepancies between  
63 younger and older participants. Furthermore, misreporting of central adiposity, as measured  
64 by waist circumference (WC) or waist-to-height ratio (WHtR), has generally not been  
65 investigated in validation studies, thus reliable comparison of self-reported and measured  
66 central adiposity-health outcome associations is lacking.

67 In this study, we examined the strength of association between measures and indices of  
68 general obesity, abdominal obesity, and metabolic profiles using data from the Danish Diet  
69 Cancer and Health-Next Generations (DCH-NG) cohort with adult participants. The  
70 objectives of this study were to investigate: (1) the extent of misreporting in self-reported  
71 height, weight, BMI, WC, and WHtR; (2) factors associated with misreporting; (3)  
72 comparisons of general obesity and abdominal obesity classification by self-reported and  
73 measured BMI and WC; (4) comparisons of associations of height, weight, BMI, WC, and

74 WHtR with cardiometabolic biomarkers for self-reported and measured anthropometric  
75 measures.

## 76 **Materials and methods**

### 77 *2.1 Study design and participants*

78 The DCH-NG was established between August 2015 and April 2019 as an extension of the  
79 Danish Diet, Cancer and Health (DCH) cohort. The DCH and DCH-NG study design and  
80 methods have been described elsewhere[11, 12]. Briefly, the DCH cohort included 57,053  
81 men and women who were born in Denmark, aged 50–64 years, had no cancer diagnosis  
82 registered in the Danish Cancer Registry and lived in the area of Copenhagen or Aarhus at the  
83 time of recruitment in 1993–1997[12]. In 2015-2019, children of DCH cohort members (G1),  
84 their spouses (G1P) and grandchildren (G2) were invited to participate in the DCH-NG study,  
85 which aimed to investigate associations between genes, diet, and lifestyle across generations.  
86 The inclusion criteria included: individuals were listed in the Danish Civil Registration  
87 System (registers all persons alive and having a valid address in Denmark)[13], alive at the  
88 date of recruitment, and were above 18 years of age at the time of recruitment (born before  
89 January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2000). If a woman was pregnant at the planned time of recruitment, she was  
90 invited to participate after giving birth. Grandchildren (G2) were only invited if their parent  
91 (G1) was alive and eligible for invitation. 255,608 descendants were identified and 197,639  
92 fulfilled the inclusion criteria. 13,875 descendants were excluded due to their status in the  
93 CPR (e.g. hidden address or inactive status in CPR). A total of 183,764 individuals were  
94 invited by letter and 44,869 agreed to participate in the DCH-NG (Fig 1). The Diet, Cancer  
95 and Health – Next Generations research project was approved by the Danish Data Protection  
96 Agency ((journal number 2013–41- 2043/2014–231-0094) and by the Committee on Health  
97 Research Ethics for the Capital Region of Denmark (journal number H-15001257)[11].  
98 Participants provided informed consent.

99 *2.2 Anthropometric measurements and biomarkers*

100 *Measured body weight, height, and WC*

101 Participants were invited to complete a physical examination in a study center in Copenhagen  
102 or Aarhus. Height, weight, and WC were measured by trained and certified health researchers.  
103 Anthropometric measurements were assessed with participants wearing underwear and being  
104 barefoot. Height was measured to the nearest 0.1 centimeter (cm) using a wireless  
105 stadiometer (Seca 264). Weight was measured to the nearest 0.01 kg using a body  
106 composition analyser (Seca 515/514). WC was measured midway at the midway between the  
107 lower rib and the iliac crest and recorded to the nearest 0.1 cm. WC was obtained in duplicate;  
108 a third measurement was taken if the first two measures exceeded pre-specified differences  
109 (1.0 cm). The mean of the two closest measures was used for analyses. BMI was calculated  
110 using the standard formula weight (kg) divided by height squared ( $m^2$ ), then classified into 4  
111 categories: underweight ( $<18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), normal weight ( $18.5\text{--}24.9 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), overweight ( $25\text{--}$   
112  $29.9 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ), and obese ( $\geq 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$ ) according to WHO recommendation[14]. WHtR was  
113 calculated by the formula WC in cm divided by standing height in cm. Abdominal obesity  
114 was defined by the National Institutes of Health cutoff points[15], as a WC of 102 cm or  
115 greater for men and 88 cm or greater for women. Discrepancies between self-reported and  
116 measured height of over 10 cm and between self-reported and measured weight of over 5 kg  
117 were checked for data-entry errors.

118

119 *Blood pressure and metabolic biomarkers*

120 Blood pressure was measured in a seated position after the participant had rested for at least 5  
121 min. After measurement of the circumference of the mid-upper arm, a cuff of suitable size  
122 was applied to the participant's upper arm, which was supported by the table at heart level.

123 Systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) were taken three times  
124 using the Omron M-10 IT, and the set with the lowest values of SBP and DBP was used.  
125 Participants were non-fasting, but were asked not to eat a fatty meal, consume alcohol, use  
126 chewing gum, brush teeth or similar within two hours before their visit to the study center.  
127 Whole blood and lithium-heparin blood samples were taken for upfront analyses performed  
128 after the visit in the study center. The following biomarkers were assessed: hemoglobin A1c  
129 (HbA1c, mmol/mol), total cholesterol (mmol/L), triglycerides (TG, mmol/L), HDL (mmol/L),  
130 low-density lipoprotein (LDL, mmol/L), C-reactive Protein (CRP, mg/L) and creatinine  
131 ( $\mu\text{mol/L}$ ).

132

### 133 *Definition of hypertension, dyslipidemia, and pre-diabetes*

134 Hypertension was defined as having a blood pressure of  $>140/90$  mmHg according to the  
135 WHO guidelines[16]. Dyslipidemia was defined as having TG  $>2.0$  mmol/l or HDL  $< 1.0$   
136 mmol/l based upon the recommendations by the National Heart Foundation[17] and the  
137 Australian Diabetes Society[18]. Pre-diabetes and diabetes was defined as HbA1c of  $>42$   
138 mmol/mol ( $>6.0\%$ )[19].

139

### 140 *Lifestyle questionnaire*

141 Self-reported anthropometric measures were obtained from a web-based lifestyle  
142 questionnaire (LSQ), which was provided to the participants shortly after recruitment.  
143 Respondents were asked: ‘How much do you weigh? Enter the nearest whole kg’, ‘How tall  
144 are you in cm’, and ‘What is your waist measurement in cm?’ Respondents were provided  
145 with guidance similar to that used in the study center on where to place a tape measure for  
146 WC measurement. Smoking status was categorized as current, former, and never smoker.

147

148 *2.3 Statistical analysis*

149 Continuous measures are presented as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) if normally distributed  
150 and median/interquartile range (IQR) if no normal distribution could be assumed. Categorical  
151 variables are shown as percentages.

152 Misreporting of anthropometric measures was calculated by subtracting measured from self-  
153 reported values. Bland-Altman analysis was used to compare the degree of agreement  
154 between self-reported and measured measurements, which gave the mean and 95% prediction  
155 interval of the difference between objective measurements and self-reported values[20].

156 Pearson's correlation coefficients ( $r$ ) between self-reported and measured anthropometrics  
157 were calculated. In addition, concordance was evaluated using Lin's concordance coefficient  
158 ( $\rho_c$ ), which is a reliability measure indicating the agreement between two measures of the  
159 same variable. To assess the agreement between measured and self-reported prevalence of  
160 general obesity and abdominal obesity, Gwet's agreement coefficient was applied.  
161 Coefficients greater than 0.81 were considered almost perfect[21]. Multiple regression  
162 analyses were used to evaluate which factors were associated with the misreporting between  
163 measured and self-reported anthropometrics (weight, height, BMI, WC, WHtR). The  
164 following variables were included in the regression models as independent variables: sex, age  
165 groups, measured BMI categories, and smoking status.

166

167 Correlation and multivariable regression analyses were conducted to examine the cross-  
168 sectional relationships of cardiometabolic biomarkers with self-reported and measured  
169 anthropometric indices (BMI, WC, WHtR). Outcome variables with skewed distributions  
170 (TG, HbA1c, CRP, and creatinine) were log-transformed for the analyses. Model 1 was  
171 unadjusted model and model 2 was adjusted for sex, age (continuous) and smoking status.



172 Analyses were repeated using standardized coefficients. We further stratified all the analyses  
173 by different age groups to explore potential effect modification.  
174 Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analyses were conducted to assess the diagnostic  
175 accuracy of disease conditions (hypertension, dyslipidemia, and pre-diabetes) by different  
176 anthropometric measures or indices. An area under the curve (AUC) of 1 is considered to  
177 have perfect discriminatory power, and an AUC of 0.5 indicates the predictive performance is  
178 no better than chance. AUCs of 0.6–0.7 were considered poor and 0.7–0.8 fair. Optimal cut-  
179 offs on the ROC curves were chosen to maximize sensitivity and specificity of the variables  
180 with each above 50%. Sensitivity in this report was defined as the proportion of people which  
181 were categorized as positive with the disease condition, while specificity was the proportion  
182 of people which were categorized as negative without the disease condition.

183

#### 184 *Sensitivity analyses*

185 In sensitivity analyses, we further assessed whether completing the LSQ before going to the  
186 study center or after made a difference to the results. The statistical software packages  
187 Stata/IC 16.0 (StataCorp)[22] and R (v4.0.2)[23] were used to conduct the analyses. All P-  
188 values were two-sided, and a  $P < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

189

## 190 **Results**

### 191 *Characteristics of the study subjects*

192 39,514 participants were included in the analyses (Fig 1). Descriptive statistics for  
193 demographic characteristics are presented in S1 Table. The median age of the cohort  
194 population was 48 years (IQR: 32-54 years). 42% of the participants were men (n=16,560).  
195 More than half of the participants reported never smoking, 32.5% of the participants were  
196 classified as being overweight and 11.9% as obese based on BMI derived from measured


197 heights and weights. Compared with women, a larger proportion of men were overweight or  
198 obese (overweight: 42.1% male vs 25.5% female; obese: 12.7% male vs 11.3% female).

199

200

201

202



203

204

**Fig 1. Flowchart illustrating the participant route into the study**

205

\*Status includes inactive and invalid vital status, hidden address and invalid address.

206

207 *Factors associated with misreporting of anthropometrics*

208 **Table 1** presents the summary statistics for self-reported and measured anthropometrics. Self-  
209 reported height was 1.07 cm (SD=1.71cm) higher than measured height, while weight was  
210 0.32 kg (SD=2.15kg) lower than measured. As a result, BMI calculated from self-reported  
211 values was 0.42 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (SD=0.89 kg/m<sup>2</sup>) lower than measured BMI. More than 77 percent of  
212 the deviations of self-reported BMI from measured BMI did not exceed values within 1 unit  
213 (data not shown). 33% of the participants did not report their WC, but answered ‘do not know’  
214 or ‘do not have a tape measure’. Participants who were male, of younger age, higher BMI and  
215 currently smoking were more likely to be missing self-reported WC. For those with available  
216 data, self-reported WC was underestimated by 0.20cm (SD=6.04cm). The variances of WC  
217 were larger for both self-reported and measured values, compared with other anthropometric  
218 measures. Men tended to overreport height (1.21cm for men and 0.97cm for women), while  
219 women tended to underreport weight (0.11kg for men and 0.47kg for women). Compared to  
220 women, men had relatively lower misreporting of WC (0.12cm for men and 0.25cm for  
221 women). However, there was no strong evidence that WHtR was different when calculated  
222 using self-reported and measured data (**Table 1**). Over-reporting of height and under-  
223 reporting of weight were present across all age subgroups, but the extent of misreporting was  
224 greater among older participants, especially for those above 55 years. Participants who were  
225 overweight or obese were more likely to misreport height, weight, and WC compared to  
226 participants of measured normal BMI. Underreporting of weight and BMI were more evident  
227 in former smokers, while WC variance was larger in current smokers (**S2 Table**). Multiple  
228 linear regression analyses indicated that age, sex, smoking and overweight/obese status all  
229 contributed to misreporting of all anthropometric indices (**S3 Table**).

230

231 *Reliability of self-reported anthropometric variables*

232 Comparably high correlations were found among all self-reported and measured  
233 anthropometric variables. The correlation coefficients for height, weight, BMI, WC, and  
234 WHtR were 0.98, 0.99, 0.98, 0.88, 0.86, respectively. Similarly, Lin's concordance  
235 correlations were 0.98, 0.99, 0.97, 0.88, 0.86. Bland-Altman analysis indicated no significant  
236 differences among self-reported and measured weight, height, BMI, and WC (Table 2).

237


238 BMI categories were calculated from both self-reported and measured values. The prevalence  
239 of overweight and obesity were 32.5% and 11.7% from measured BMI, but only 29.7% and  
240 9.8% from self-reported BMI, indicating underestimation of self-reported BMI (S4 Table).  
241 Using self-reported data, 80.4% and 79.7% were correctly classified as overweight and obese  
242 (S5 Table). Agreement in classification by self-reported and measured BMI and WC,  
243 assessed by Gwet's agreement coefficients, is shown in S6 Table. When BMI was  
244 categorized into 4 groups according to WHO's criteria, Gwet's agreement coefficient between  
245 self-reported and measured BMI categories was 0.86 (95%CI: 0.86, 0.87); the agreement was  
246 0.97 (95%CI: 0.96, 0.97) when BMI was categorized into 2 groups (normal vs overweight  
247 and obese). For WC, the agreement between self-reported and measured values was 0.84  
248 (95%CI: 0.83, 0.85).

249

#### 250 *Associations between anthropometric measures and cardiometabolic biomarkers*

251 The associations between anthropometric measures and metabolic biomarkers are presented  
252 as standardized (S7 Table) and unstandardized (S8 Table) linear coefficients. There were  
253 positive associations between the measures and TG, LDL, HbA1c, total cholesterol  
254 concentration, and blood pressure, respectively, and an inverse relationship with HDL  
255 concentration in both unadjusted and adjusted models. Using standardized coefficients, the  
256 associations with metabolic biomarkers did not vary substantially when comparing self-

257 reported and measured indices, although associations were stronger for measured WHtR and  
258 measured WC than for self-reported WHtR and WC (Fig 2). In stratified analyses, positive  
259 associations when examining central adiposity on total cholesterol, LDL, SBP and DBP were  
260 observed for early adulthood to middle-aged groups, whereas associations were weaker for  
261 participants above 55 years of age (S9 Table).



**Fig 2. Standardized coefficients of self-reported or measured anthropometrics and cardiometabolic biomarkers**

- a) self-reported(orange color) or measured (blue color) BMI associated with cardiometabolic biomarkers
- b) self-reported(orange color) or measured (blue color) WC associated with cardiometabolic biomarkers
- c) self-reported(orange color) or measured (blue color) WHtR associated with cardiometabolic biomarkers

Models were adjusted for age, sex, and smoking.


TG triglycerides; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; HbA1c, hemoglobin A1c; CRP, C-reactive Protein; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference; WHtR, waist-to-height ratio; CVD, cardiovascular diseases

262

263 The prevalence of hypertension, dyslipidemia, and pre-diabetes were 23.2%, 5.5%, and 1.7%,

264 respectively. The AUC for each anthropometric index with hypertension and dyslipidemia

265 indicated fair predictive performance, ranging between 0.7-0.8; prediction was excellent for  
266 pre-diabetes (above 0.8; Fig 3, S10 Table).



**Fig 3. ROC curves comparing measured and self-reported anthropometric indices with cardiometabolic biomarkers**

Green lines indicate measured anthropometrics, yellow lines indicate self-report anthropometrics, black lines indicate reference. Models were adjusted for age, sex, and smoking.

*ROC, Receiver Operating Characteristic*

267 In sensitivity analyses, the correlation between self-reported and measured height and weight  
268 was equal regardless of whether participants completed the LSQ before going to the study  
269 center or after, whereas the correlation between self-reported and measured WC was slightly  
270 higher among those completing the LSQ after going to the study center (0.93 vs 0.88) (S11  
271 Table).

272

273 **Discussion**

274 In this large contemporary cohort, we found high agreement between self-reported and  
275 measured anthropometrics, albeit slightly lower for WC and WHtR than for other measures.  
276 Older age, male sex, weight status, and smoking contributed to misreporting. We compared  
277 the associations between self-reported or measured anthropometric variables and  
278 cardiometabolic biomarkers, and found similar directions and magnitudes across all age  
279 groups. Our results extend previous validation studies that only included certain specific age,  
280 ethnic, or BMI groups[24-31], which may limit generalizability to general population studies.

281

282 Our findings are in agreement with previous European validation studies[32-35]. Self-  
283 reported BMI may bias associations with health outcomes, despite high correlations between  
284 self-reported and measured values[5]. A US cohort study compared associations between  
285 self-reported and measured BMI and cardiometabolic biomarkers in young adults, and found  
286 similar strengths of association[4], as have studies in US adults[3, 6]. However, other studies  
287 have reported poor performance for self-reported anthropometric indices in predicting  
288 cardiometabolic related diseases[8, 36]. These differences may be explained by study design,  
289 different age groups, and approaches in adjusting for confounders. We found that the strength  
290 of associations with cardiometabolic biomarkers did not vary substantially for measured and  
291 self-reported indices. While associations were stronger for measured indices compared with  
292 self-reported, the bias was small.

293

294 We observed greater misreporting among older age groups, as well as differences in strengths  
295 of association between both measured and self-reported anthropometrics and cardiometabolic  
296 biomarkers across age groups. These results are, however, comparable to results from the

297 WHO MONICA Project, which found that the association between BMI and  
298 hypercholesterolaemia (cholesterol  $\geq 6.5$  mmol/l) was weaker in higher age groups[37].  
299 Similar results were reported from a large scale Chinese study[38]. A possible explanation  
300 could be increasing fat mass and lower lean mass with increasing age[39].

301

302 Our study has several strengths. With self-reported and measured WC, we provide much  
303 needed assessment of central adiposity indices[40]. We included a wide age range, which  
304 allowed investigation of age on misreporting and associations. Finally, the DCH-NG cohort is  
305 a new cohort[11], and thus reflects contemporary trends in self-assessment of weight, height  
306 and WC.

307

308 The study also has limitations. Firstly, similar to the DCH cohort, participants in the DCH-  
309 NG cohort had a higher socioeconomic status relative to the nonparticipants[12]. Therefore, it  
310 is important to take into account the generalizability and representativeness of the current  
311 sample in regard to the general population when interpreting the results. Secondly, there was  
312 a higher proportion of missing data in self-reported WC than for other measures. Our  
313 sensitivity analyses suggested that younger people, those with greater BMI and who smoked  
314 tended not to report WC. However, the missingness was not related to measured WC values,  
315 and there was little missing data among those participants who completed the LSQ after  
316 having visited the study facility. It is likely that participants did not report WC values simply  
317 because they did not know their WC. Improving general knowledge about WC and related  
318 health outcomes may be useful from a public health perspective[41]. Lastly, some  
319 participants had a longer gap between filling in the questionnaires and the clinical  
320 appointments than others, which might influence the consistency of the measures. However,



321 the percentage of participants for whom this was the case was small and thus unlikely to bias  
322 the results.

323

### 324 **Conclusion**

325 This study found a high correlation between self-reported and measured anthropometric  
326 variables across a wide age range in the study population. The overall agreements with  
327 respect to the reporting of accurate values were reliable and acceptable. However, caution  
328 may need to be taken when generalizing the findings to other populations.

329

330

331

### 332 **Supporting information**

333 S1 Table. Description of demographic information of DCH-NG cohort

334 S2 Table. Misreporting on anthropometric variables with participant characteristics

335 S3 Table. Factors associated with misreporting on anthropometric variables in multivariable  
336 regression models

337 S4 Table. BMI Classification Based on measured and self-reported BMI

338 S5 Table. Cross-classification of measured and self-reported BMI classification

339 S6 Table. Agreement between self-reported indices compared to measured indices

340 S7 Table. Self-reported and measured anthropometric variables with CVD biomarkers\*  
341 (Standardised)

342 S8 Table. Self-reported and measured anthropometric variables with CVD biomarkers\*  
343 (Unstandardised)

344 S9 Table. Self-reported and measured anthropometric variables with CVD biomarkers  
345 stratified by age

346 S10 Table. ROC curve comparing measured and self-reported anthropometric indices with  
347 cardiovascular risk factors

348 S11 Table. Correlation between self-reported and measured anthropometrics stratified by  
349 visiting time

350

351

352

353

354

355

356 **Abbreviations**

357 **BMI:** Body mass index

358 **WC:** waist circumference

359 **WHtR:** waist-to-height ratio

360 **DCH:** Danish Diet Cancer

361 **DCH-NG:** Danish Diet Cancer and Health-Next Generations

362 **SBP:** Systolic blood pressure

363 **DBP:** diastolic blood pressure

364 **HbA1c:** hemoglobin A1c

365 **TG:** triglycerides

366 **HDL:** high-density lipoprotein

367 **LDL:** low-density lipoprotein

368 **CRP:** C-reactive Protein

369 **LSQ:** lifestyle questionnaire

370 **SD:** standard deviation

371 **IQR:** interquartile range

372 **ROC:** Receiver Operating Characteristic

373 **AUC:** area under the curve

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

382 **Funding information**

383 The authors thank the Danish Cancer Society and staff at the Diet, Cancer and Health study  
384 for the collection and administration of data.

385 ‘The Diet, Cancer and Health –Next generations cohort’ was established with funding from  
386 the Danish Cancer Society, ‘Knæk Cancer 2012’ and ‘Den A.P Møllerske støttestofond (grant  
387 no 10619)’.

388

389 No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

390

391 **Author contributions:** J.Z, C.C.D, and A.O contributed to study design, analysis, and  
392 methodology. J.H, K.E.N.P, A.T., K.O and A.O contributed to data collection. J.Z. K.E.N.P,  
393 and C.C.D wrote the paper; C.C.D, A.O, K.O, J.H., and A.T performed study oversight; All  
394 authors interpreted data and results, revised, and approved the final manuscript.

395

396

397

398

399

## Reference

1. Gosse M. How accurate is self-reported BMI? *Nutrition bulletin*. 2014;39(1):105-14.
2. Maukonen M, Männistö S, Tolonen H. A comparison of measured versus self-reported anthropometrics for assessing obesity in adults: a literature review. *Scandinavian journal of public health*. 2018;46(5):565-79.
3. Stommel M, Schoenborn CA. Accuracy and usefulness of BMI measures based on self-reported weight and height: findings from the NHANES & NHIS 2001-2006. *BMC public health*. 2009;9(1):421.
4. Lipsky LM, Haynie DL, Hill C, Nansel TR, Li K, Liu D, et al. Accuracy of self-reported height, weight, and BMI over time in emerging adults. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2019;56(6):860-8.
5. Flegal KM, Kit BK, Graubard BI. Bias in hazard ratios arising from misclassification according to self-reported weight and height in observational studies of body mass index and mortality. *American journal of epidemiology*. 2018;187(1):125-34.
6. McAdams MA, Van Dam RM, Hu FB. Comparison of self-reported and measured BMI as correlates of disease markers in US adults. *Obesity*. 2007;15(1):188-.
7. Xie YJ, Ho SC, Liu ZM, Hui SS-C. Comparisons of measured and self-reported anthropometric variables and blood pressure in a sample of Hong Kong female nurses. *PloS one*. 2014;9(9):e107233.
8. Oliveira A, Ramos E, Lopes C, Barros H. Self-reporting weight and height: misclassification effect on the risk estimates for acute myocardial infarction. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2009;19(5):548-53.
9. Faeh D, Roh L, Paccaud F, Chiolero A. Mortality risk of obesity and underweight is overestimated with self-reported body mass index. *Epidemiology*. 2014;25(1):156-8.
10. Cawley J, Maclean JC, Hammer M, Wintfeld N. Reporting error in weight and its implications for bias in economic models. *Economics & Human Biology*. 2015;19:27-44.
11. Petersen KE, Halkjær J, Loft S, Tjønneland A, Olsen A. Cohort profile and representativeness of participants in the Diet, Cancer and Health—Next Generations cohort study. *European journal of epidemiology*. 2022:1-11.
12. Tjønneland A, Olsen A, Boll K, Stripp C, Christensen J, Engholm G, et al. Study design, exposure variables, and socioeconomic determinants of participation in Diet, Cancer and Health: a population-based prospective cohort study of 57,053 men and women in Denmark. *Scandinavian journal of public health*. 2007;35(4):432-41.
13. Pedersen CB. The Danish civil registration system. *Scandinavian journal of public health*. 2011;39(7\_suppl):22-5.
14. WHO. World Health Organization. Obesity and overweight. 2015.
15. Identification EPot, Overweight To, Adults Oi, Heart N, Lung, Institute B, et al. Clinical guidelines on the identification, evaluation, and treatment of overweight and obesity in adults: the evidence report: National Institutes of Health, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; 1998.
16. Committee WE. World Health Organization International Society of hypertension guidelines for the management of hypertension. *J Hypertension*. 1999;17(2):151.
17. Atherton JJ, Sindone A, De Pasquale CG, Driscoll A, MacDonald PS, Hopper I, et al. National Heart Foundation of Australia and Cardiac Society of Australia and New Zealand: guidelines for the prevention, detection, and management of heart failure in Australia 2018. *Heart, Lung and Circulation*. 2018;27(10):1123-208.
18. Best JD, Jerums G, Newnham HH, O'BRIEN RC. Diabetic dyslipidaemia: Australian Diabetes Society position statement. *Medical journal of Australia*. 1995;162(2):91-3.
19. Gillett MJ. International expert committee report on the role of the A1c assay in the diagnosis of diabetes: diabetes care 2009; 32 (7): 1327–1334. *The Clinical Biochemist Reviews*. 2009;30(4):197.
20. Bland JM, Altman D. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *The lancet*. 1986;327(8476):307-10.
21. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *biometrics*. 1977:159-74.
22. LP SC. Stata Statistical Software Release 16: Stata Press Publication; 2019.

23. Team RDC, Team RDC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2013.
24. Attard SM, Herring AH, Howard AG, Gordon □ Larsen P. Longitudinal trajectories of BMI and cardiovascular disease risk: the national longitudinal study of adolescent health. *Obesity*. 2013;21(11):2180-8.
25. Gunnell D, Berney L, Holland P, Maynard M, Blane D, Frankel S, et al. How accurately are height, weight and leg length reported by the elderly, and how closely are they related to measurements recorded in childhood? *International journal of epidemiology*. 2000;29(3):456-64.
26. Bigaard J, Spanggaard I, Thomsen BL, Overvad K, Tjønneland A. Self-reported and technician-measured waist circumferences differ in middle-aged men and women. *The Journal of nutrition*. 2005;135(9):2263-70.
27. Jansen W, Van de Looij-Jansen P, Ferreira I, De Wilde E, Brug J. Differences in measured and self-reported height and weight in Dutch adolescents. *Annals of nutrition and metabolism*. 2006;50(4):339-46.
28. Dekkers JC, van Wier MF, Hendriksen IJ, Twisk JW, van Mechelen W. Accuracy of self-reported body weight, height and waist circumference in a Dutch overweight working population. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2008;8(1):69.
29. Ng SP, Korda R, Clements M, Latz I, Bauman A, Bambrick H, et al. Validity of self-reported height and weight and derived body mass index in middle-aged and elderly individuals in Australia. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health*. 2011;35(6):557-63.
30. Quick V, Byrd-Bredbenner C, Shoff S, White AA, Lohse B, Horacek T, et al. Concordance of self-report and measured height and weight of college students. *Journal of nutrition education and behavior*. 2015;47(1):94-8.
31. Richmond TK, Thurston I, Sonnevile K, Milliren CE, Walls CE, Austin SB. Racial/ethnic differences in accuracy of body mass index reporting in a diverse cohort of young adults. *International journal of obesity*. 2015;39(3):546-8.
32. Spencer EA, Appleby PN, Davey GK, Key TJ. Validity of self-reported height and weight in 4808 EPIC-Oxford participants. *Public health nutrition*. 2002;5(4):561-5.
33. Lassale C, Péneau S, Touvier M, Julia C, Galan P, Hercberg S, et al. Validity of web-based self-reported weight and height: results of the Nutrinet-Santé study. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2013;15(8):e152.
34. Skeie G, Mode N, Henningsen M, Borch KB. Validity of self-reported body mass index among middle-aged participants in the Norwegian Women and Cancer study. *Clinical epidemiology*. 2015;7:313.
35. Krul AJ, Daanen HA, Choi H. Self-reported and measured weight, height and body mass index (BMI) in Italy, the Netherlands and North America. *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2011;21(4):414-9.
36. Li Y, Zou Z, Luo J, Ma J, Ma Y, Jing J, et al. The predictive value of anthropometric indices for cardiometabolic risk factors in Chinese children and adolescents: A national multicenter school-based study. *PloS one*. 2020;15(1):e0227954.
37. Gostynski M, Gutzwiller F, Kuulasmaa K, Döring A, Ferrario M, Grafnetter D, et al. Analysis of the relationship between total cholesterol, age, body mass index among males and females in the WHO MONICA Project. *International journal of obesity*. 2004;28(8):1082-90.
38. Liu J, Tse LA, Liu Z, Rangarajan S, Hu B, Yin L, et al. Predictive values of anthropometric measurements for cardiometabolic risk factors and cardiovascular diseases among 44 048 Chinese. *Journal of the American Heart Association*. 2019;8(16):e010870.
39. Groessl EJ, Kaplan RM, Barrett-Connor E, Ganiats TG. Body mass index and quality of well-being in a community of older adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2004;26(2):126-9.
40. Blüher S, Molz E, Wiegand S, Otto K-P, Sergeev E, Tuschy S, et al. Body mass index, waist circumference, and waist-to-height ratio as predictors of cardiometabolic risk in childhood obesity depending on pubertal development. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*. 2013;98(8):3384-93.
41. Verweij LM, Terwee CB, Proper KI, Hulshof CT, van Mechelen W. Measurement error of waist circumference: gaps in knowledge. *Public health nutrition*. 2013;16(2):281-8.

Table 1. Description of self-reported and measured anthropometric variables in DCH-NG

		Measured values			Self-reported values			Mean difference*		
		Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n
Total	Height(cm)	173.36	9.17	39,465	174.45	9.25	39,403	1.07	1.71	39,366
	Weight(kg)	75.77	15.31	39,465	75.52	15.17	37,735	-0.32	2.15	37,701
	BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.12	4.24	39,464	24.68	4.03	37,662	-0.42	0.89	37,627
	WC(cm)	87.51	12.73	39,350	87.29	12.53	26,159	-0.20	6.04	26,054
	WHtR	0.50	0.07	39,329	0.50	0.07	26,106	-0.00	0.04	25,997
Male	Height(cm)	181.12	6.68	16,537	182.34	6.72	16,525	1.21	1.81	16,506
	Weight(kg)	84.96	13.37	16,537	84.85	13.00	16,148	-0.11	2.31	16,131
	BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.89	3.78	16,537	25.50	3.55	16,127	-0.38	0.89	16,110
	WC(cm)	93.38	11.75	16,480	93.70	11.12	10,521	-0.12	6.56	10,467
	WHtR	0.52	0.07	16,472	0.51	0.06	10,509	-0.00	0.04	10,454
Female	Height(cm)	167.75	6.15	22,928	168.75	6.11	22,878	0.97	1.62	22,860
	Weight(kg)	69.14	13.03	22,928	68.54	12.73	21,587	-0.47	2.01	21,570
	BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	24.57	4.47	22,927	24.07	4.24	21,535	-0.45	0.88	21,517
	WC(cm)	83.29	11.69	22,870	82.98	11.54	15,638	-0.25	5.67	15,587
	WHtR	0.50	0.07	22,857	0.49	0.07	15,597	-0.00	0.03	15,543

SD, standard deviation; BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference; WHtR, waist-to-height ratio; n, number; DCH-NG, Danish Diet, Cancer, and Health cohort-Next Generation

\*Difference was calculated by subtracting measured from self-reported values

Table 2. Correlation and Concordance between self-reported and measured anthropometrics

	obs n	r	pc	Bland-Altman		
				Average	95% CI	
Height(cm)	39,366	0.98	0.98	1.07	-2.28	4.42
Weight(kg)	37,701	0.99	0.99	-0.32	-4.53	3.90
BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	37,627	0.98	0.97	-0.42	-2.16	1.32
WC(cm)	26,054	0.88	0.88	-0.20	-12.05	11.65
WHtR	25,997	0.86	0.86	0.00	-0.07	0.07

BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference; WHtR, waist-to-height ratio; CI, confidence intervals; n, number  
r, pearson correlation  
pc, Lin's concordance