

TITLE PAGE

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

Jie Zhang^{1*}, Anja Olsen^{1,2}, Jytte Halkjær², Kristina Elin Nielsen Petersen², Anne Tjønneland², Kim Overvad¹, Christina C Dahm¹

¹ Department of Public Health, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark;

² Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark

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

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

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

Main text: Tables: 2; Figures:3

Supplementary Material: Tables:11

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

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

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 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.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

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 1st, 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--
 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.

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

Definition of hypertension, dyslipidemia, and pre-diabetes

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

Lifestyle questionnaire

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

2.3 Statistical analysis

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

Misreporting of anthropometric measures was calculated by subtracting measured from self-reported values. Bland-Altman analysis was used to compare the degree of agreement between self-reported and measured measurements, which gave the mean and 95% prediction interval of the difference between objective measurements and self-reported values[20]. Pearson's correlation coefficients (r) between self-reported and measured anthropometrics were calculated. In addition, concordance was evaluated using Lin's concordance coefficient (ρ_c), which is a reliability measure indicating the agreement between two measures of the same variable. To assess the agreement between measured and self-reported prevalence of general obesity and abdominal obesity, Gwet's agreement coefficient was applied. Coefficients greater than 0.81 were considered almost perfect[21]. Multiple regression analyses were used to evaluate which factors were associated with the misreporting between measured and self-reported anthropometrics (weight, height, BMI, WC, WHtR). The following variables were included in the regression models as independent variables: sex, age groups, measured BMI categories, and smoking status.

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

Analyses were repeated using standardized coefficients. We further stratified all the analyses by different age groups to explore potential effect modification.

Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analyses were conducted to assess the diagnostic accuracy of disease conditions (hypertension, dyslipidemia, and pre-diabetes) by different anthropometric measures or indices. An area under the curve (AUC) of 1 is considered to have perfect discriminatory power, and an AUC of 0.5 indicates the predictive performance is no better than chance. AUCs of 0.6–0.7 were considered poor and 0.7–0.8 fair. Optimal cut-offs on the ROC curves were chosen to maximize sensitivity and specificity of the variables with each above 50%. Sensitivity in this report was defined as the proportion of people which were categorized as positive with the disease condition, while specificity was the proportion of people which were categorized as negative without the disease condition.

Sensitivity analyses

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

Results

Characteristics of the study subjects

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

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




Fig 1. Flowchart illustrating the participant route into the study

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

Factors associated with misreporting of anthropometrics

Table 1 presents the summary statistics for self-reported and measured anthropometrics. Self-reported height was 1.07 cm (SD=1.71cm) higher than measured height, while weight was 0.32 kg (SD=2.15kg) lower than measured. As a result, BMI calculated from self-reported values was 0.42 kg/m² (SD=0.89 kg/m²) lower than measured BMI. More than 77 percent of the deviations of self-reported BMI from measured BMI did not exceed values within 1 unit (data not shown). 33% of the participants did not report their WC, but answered ‘do not know’ or ‘do not have a tape measure’. Participants who were male, of younger age, higher BMI and currently smoking were more likely to be missing self-reported WC. For those with available data, self-reported WC was underestimated by 0.20cm (SD=6.04cm). The variances of WC were larger for both self-reported and measured values, compared with other anthropometric measures. Men tended to overreport height (1.21cm for men and 0.97cm for women), while women tended to underreport weight (0.11kg for men and 0.47kg for women). Compared to women, men had relatively lower misreporting of WC (0.12cm for men and 0.25cm for women). However, there was no strong evidence that WHtR was different when calculated using self-reported and measured data (**Table 1**). Over-reporting of height and under-reporting of weight were present across all age subgroups, but the extent of misreporting was greater among older participants, especially for those above 55 years. Participants who were overweight or obese were more likely to misreport height, weight, and WC compared to participants of measured normal BMI. Underreporting of weight and BMI were more evident in former smokers, while WC variance was larger in current smokers (**S2 Table**). Multiple linear regression analyses indicated that age, sex, smoking and overweight/obese status all contributed to misreporting of all anthropometric indices (**S3 Table**).

Reliability of self-reported anthropometric variables

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

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

Associations between anthropometric measures and cardiometabolic biomarkers

The associations between anthropometric measures and metabolic biomarkers are presented as standardized (S7 Table) and unstandardized (S8 Table) linear coefficients. There were positive associations between the measures and TG, LDL, HbA1c, total cholesterol concentration, and blood pressure, respectively, and an inverse relationship with HDL concentration in both unadjusted and adjusted models. Using standardized coefficients, the 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

WHO MONICA Project, which found that the association between BMI and hypercholesterolaemia (cholesterol ≥ 6.5 mmol/l) was weaker in higher age groups[37].

Similar results were reported from a large scale Chinese study[38]. A possible explanation could be increasing fat mass and lower lean mass with increasing age[39].

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

Supporting information

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

S2 Table. Misreporting on anthropometric variables with participant characteristics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 støttfond (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 P, 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, Sergeyev 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 ²) | 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 ²) | 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 ²) | 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/m2) | 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