

1 **Accuracy and Precision of Multiple Laboratory and Field Methods to The Criterion *In***
2 ***Vivo* Five-Compartment Body Composition Model and Their Association with Muscle**
3 **Strength in Collegiate Athletes of Varying States of Hydration: The *Da Kine* Protocol**
4 **Study**

5 **Devon Cataldi^{a, b*}**, Jonathan P. Bennett^{a, c}, Michael C. Wong^{a, c}, Brandon K. Quon^a, Yong En
6 Liu^a, Nisa Kelly^a, Thomas Kelly^d, Dale A. Schoeller^c, Steven B. Heymsfield^f, John A. Shepherd^a
7 ^{b, c}

8 ^a Department of Epidemiology, University of Hawaii Cancer Center, 701 Ilalo Street, Honolulu,
9 HI, 96813 USA

10 ^b Department of Kinesiology and Rehabilitation Science, Human Performance Laboratory,
11 Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813, USA

12 ^c Graduate Program in Human Nutrition, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96822, USA

13 ^d Hologic Inc, 250 Campus Dr, Marlborough, MA 01752 USA

14 ^e Isotope Ratio Core Biotech Center and Nutritional Sciences, Henry Mall Madison, WI 53706

15 ^f Pennington Biomedical Research Center, 6400 Perkins Road, Baton Rouge, LA, 7080 USA

16 **Conflicts of Interest**

17 JS received an investigator-initiated grant from Hologic, Inc. to fund the larger study and other
18 grants on body composition from Hologic and GE Healthcare. SH is on the Medical Advisory
19 Board for Tanita Corporation. TK is a current employee at Hologic. The remaining authors
20 report no conflicts of interest.

21 **Funding Statement**

22 Hologic, Inc. Marlborough, MA, USA supported this work

23 ***Corresponding Author:** Devon Cataldi: Email - cataldi@hawaii.edu

Body Composition and Muscle Strength: The *Da Kine* Study

2

24 **Running Heading:** Body Composition and Muscle Strength: The *Da Kine* Study

25 **Word Count:** 3915

26 **Takeaways:**

- 27 1. Although the 5-compartment model is the most accurate estimate of *in vivo* body
28 composition, it is not practical for clinicians and coaches outside of laboratory settings.
29 More accessible assessment methods should provide reasonable accuracy to the criterion.
- 30 2. Commercially-available accessible methods produced considerable differences in fat
31 mass and fat-free mass compared to the criterion estimates ranging from substantial to
32 poor agreement to the criterion in both sexes. Air-displacement plethysmography and
33 DXA produced the highest agreement in all categories.
- 34 3. Accessible methods that showed substantial concordance (agreement) to 5-compartment
35 body composition tended to produce a more valid model of muscle strength in both males
36 and females of a cohort of athletes.

37 *Non-finding:* Skin temperature and moisture were not significant in improving body
38 composition or strength predictors.

39 **What is already known on this topic** – Body composition and muscle strength are significant
40 predictors of athletic performance.

41 **What this study adds** – An ideal body composition assessment approach would provide valid
42 estimates to the criterion and strongly link to a functional component such as muscle strength.
43 This study provides validations of assessment methods for fat and fat-free mass and evaluates
44 their associations with isokinetic and isometric muscle strength.

45 **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy** – This investigation provides
46 clinicians and coaches with information vital to identifying the optimal tool for monitoring body
47 composition and strength in laboratory and field settings.

48 **Objective** To compare multiple body composition analysis methods in athletes with varying
49 states of hydration to the criterion 5-compartment model(5CM) of body composition and assess
50 the relationships of technique-specific estimates of fat and fat-free mass(FM, FFM) to muscle
51 strength. **Methods** Body composition was assessed in 80(40-female) athletes with a mean age of
52 21.8 ± 4.2 years. All athletes underwent laboratory-based methods: air-displacement
53 plethysmography(ADP), deuterium-oxide dilution(D₂O), dual-energy X-ray
54 absorptiometry(DXA), underwater-weighing(UWW), and field-based: 3D-optical(3DO)
55 imaging, and three bioelectrical impedance(BIA) devices(S10/SFB7/SOZO). Participants'
56 muscular strength was assessed by isokinetic/isometric dynamometry. Accuracy was assessed by
57 Lin's concordance correlation coefficient(CCC) and precision by root-mean-square coefficient of
58 variation(RMS-CV%). **Results** Athletes' hydration status(total body water/FFM) was
59 significantly($p < 0.05$) outside of the normal range in both males(0.63-0.73%) and females(0.58-
60 0.78%). The most accurate techniques(ADP/DXA) showed moderate-substantial
61 agreement(CCC=0.90-0.95) in FM and FFM, whereas all field assessments had poor
62 agreement(CCC<0.90), except 3DO FFM in females(CCC=0.91). All measures of FFM
63 produced excellent <1.0% precision, whereas FM from ADP, DXA, D₂O, S10, and UWW had
64 <2.0%. The associations between muscle strength and the various devices' FFM estimates
65 differed. However, more accurate body composition compared to the criterion produced a better
66 determination of muscle strength by significant quartile p -trends($p < 0.001$). The 5CM exhibits
67 the highest determination for all categories of muscle strength which persisted across all
68 hydration measures. **Conclusion** To optimize accuracy in assessing body composition and
69 muscle strength, researchers and clinicians should prioritize selecting devices based on their
70 accuracy compared to the 5CM. Reliable approaches such as ADP and DXA yield accurate and

71 precise body composition estimates and thereby, better strength assessments, regardless of
72 hydration status. Future athlete studies should investigate the impact of changes in FFM on
73 functional measures compared to the criterion method.

74 **Summary Box:** This study compared various body composition analysis methods in athletes
75 with varying states of hydration to the criterion 5-compartment model(5CM) and assessed their
76 relationship to muscle strength. The results showed that accurate and precise estimates of body
77 composition can be determined in athletes, and a more accurate body composition measurement
78 produced better strength estimates. The best laboratory-based techniques were air displacement
79 plethysmography(ADP) and dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry(DXA), while field assessments
80 had moderate-poor agreement. Prioritize accurate body composition assessment devices
81 compared to the 5CM for better strength estimates in athletes.

82 **Key Words:** 3D optical imaging; muscle strength; DXA; bioelectrical impedance; body
83 composition; deuterium isotope dilution; sport performance; athlete; fat-free mass

84 **Abbreviations:** 3DO: 3-dimensional optical, BIA: bioelectrical impedance analysis, D₂O:
85 deuterium, TBW: total body water DXA: dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, BMC: bone mineral
86 content, ADP: air displacement plethysmography, BV: body volume, BM: body mass, M₀:
87 osseous mineral, M_s: soft tissue mineral, FFM: fat-free mass, FM: fat mass, kg: kilogram, L:
88 liter, NHOPI: Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, NH: non-Hispanic, SD: standard deviation,
89 CCC: Lin's concordance correlation coefficient, RMSE: root mean square error, root-mean-
90 square coefficient of variation(RMS-CV%)

91 **INTRODUCTION**

92 Fat-free mass(FFM) is a functional, metabolically active tissue that contributes to
93 strength and force production and plays a key role in sports performance¹. When fat mass(FM) is
94 in excess, it can hinder performance and adversely affect physiological systems, such as the
95 endocrine system by increasing the production of cortisol and leptin, which play crucial roles in
96 the nervous system for thermoregulation, as well as the immune system through heightened
97 inflammation, all of which collectively impact athletic performance². Several studies have
98 reported moderate correlations between FM and BMI when gender and age are considered^{3, 4}.
99 However, strong evidence suggests that athletic body types play a critical role in the relationship
100 between FM and BMI, leading athletes, clinicians, and coaches to shift away from solely using
101 BMI to assess performance⁵.

102 To adhere to sports criteria, many athletes use extreme weight-control methods that can
103 be detrimental to both health and performance due to continuous dieting, energy deficits, and/or
104 extreme weight-loss practices⁶. As such, errors in body composition assessments can lead to
105 improper conclusions on athletic programming, impacting health and performance⁷. Accurate
106 body composition assessments can also help identify and monitor relative energy
107 deficiency(RED-S) risk and other injuries or illnesses⁸, as well as enable athletes to adjust their
108 training and nutritional habits to the demands of their sport⁹.

109 The relationship between body composition and muscle strength is unclear due to FFM's
110 complex physiological composition(i.e. water, protein, minerals, and others) between
111 participants and populations, and potentially how the estimate is determined¹⁰. An ideal body
112 composition method would be accurate/precise and provide the highest muscle
113 strength/performance associations. Multiple studies have explored absolute or relative

114 proportions of body composition and their associations with muscle strength, though not
115 comprehensively comparing multiple systems, muscle groups, or other predictive factors in
116 athletes of varying states of hydration, as defined by total body water(TBW)/FFM. Furthermore,
117 Nickerson and Gudivaka emphasized the importance of considering skin hydration/temperature
118 status in athletic populations to obtain accurate measurements of body composition estimates¹¹,
119 ¹².

120 The reference method to assess body composition *in vivo* is the 5-compartment
121 model(5CM), which combines criterion assessments for each of the individual components of
122 TBW by deuterium-oxide dilution(D₂O), bone mineral content(BMC) by dual-energy X-ray
123 absorptiometry(DXA), total body volume(BV) by air displacement plethysmography(ADP) or
124 under-water weighing(UWW), and body mass(BM) to accurately quantify whole-body FM¹³.
125 Despite the well-known strengths of multicompartement modeling, it is often limited by the time
126 and expense necessary to produce them¹⁴. Few studies have examined a variety of clinical body
127 composition assessment techniques to the 5CM in athletics, where the sample sizes have been
128 small and device inclusion is limited^{15, 16}. Additionally, rapid field techniques such as
129 bioelectrical impedance analysis(BIA) and 3D-optical imaging(3DO) are becoming more
130 accessible in athletic training facilities^{15, 17-19}. In performance assessment studies, accuracy is
131 crucial, but the relationship between body composition measures and sport-specific performance
132 outcomes like muscle strength in athletes is not fully understood.

133 Therefore, this study aims to examine the accuracy of different laboratory and field-based
134 body composition methods to a criterion model and show their associations to muscle strength
135 within a collegiate athlete population. Additionally, we explored the impact of skin hydration
136 and temperature variations to create a more accurate 5CM to improve strength predictions. We

137 hypothesized that field-based methods, when evaluated, would offer similar accuracy and
138 precision of body composition estimates in their associations to muscle strength over the
139 laboratory-based methods.

140 **METHODS**

141 **Experimental design**

142 The *Da Kine* Study is a cross-sectional observational study of athletes to examine the
143 association of body composition estimates to muscle strength. This study was approved by the
144 University of Hawai'i Research Compliance and Institutional Review Board(IRB),
145 protocol#2018-01102. Participants provided written consent.

146 **Participate Involvement**

147 The patient-centered *Da Kine* study involved patients in the research process. Patient input was
148 obtained through focus group sessions and interviews to shape the research question, outcome
149 measures, and recruitment methods. A patient joined the trial steering committee. The University
150 of Hawaii Clinical Trials Department prioritized the study for cancer clinicians. Participants
151 received trial results via email and could access updates through a dedicated
152 website(<https://shepherdresearchlab.org/>) and a non-specialist study newsletter.

153 **Participants**

154 Between April2019-March2020, eighty healthy male and female collegiate and
155 intramural athletes(>18years) representing various BMI ranges were enrolled. Athletes were
156 recruited during their in-season or off-season strength and conditioning routines, with
157 investigators approaching coaches and trainers during practice. Exclusions included
158 pregnancy/breastfeeding, metal implants, or recent body composition-altering procedures.
159 Participants fasted and abstained from alcohol for at least eight hours before testing, and avoided

160 moderate-intense exercise for 24hours. On the testing day, participants arrived at the University
161 of Hawaii Cancer Center, adhered to pretesting protocols, and underwent anthropometry, thigh,
162 and trunk strength tests, and height and weight measurements on a stadiometer(Seca264, Chino,
163 CA). Ethnicity was self-reported. **Supplemental Table 1** shows all methods obtained and an
164 encompassing comparison of devices and their assumptions. All methods were taken in duplicate
165 to calculate precision.

166 *Laboratory-based methods*

167 **Air Displacement Plethysmography**

168 Measurements were taken using ADP in a BodPod(v5.4.1, COSMED, Concord, CA) to
169 providing BV measurements required for 5CM, along with the standard output of body
170 composition. Measurements were taken via the manufacturer's standard protocol, where
171 participants dressed in form-fitting attire, with a hair cap. The BodPod measures BV with
172 corrections for residual lung volume and surface area artifacts(SAA)²⁰. Thoracic gas
173 volume(TGV) was measured by breathing through a tube connected to a filter and reference
174 chamber, following the manufacturer's instructions, or estimated if participants could not obtain
175 a valid measurement directly due to the inability to achieve consistency over the three repeated
176 TGV measurements(n=26). The BodPod software automatically calculated the SAA. These two
177 adjustments(TGV and SAA) were factored into the overall BV calculation.

178 **Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry**

179 Whole-body DXA scans were performed using a Hologic Discovery/A system(Hologic,
180 Marlborough, MA) to provide BMC to calculate osseous mineral(Mo) for 5CM, along with
181 standard outputs of body composition. The scans were analyzed by a trained technologist using
182 Hologic Apex version 4.5. Whole-Body Fan Beam and the National Health and Nutrition

183 Examination Survey Body Composition Analysis(NHANES BCA) calibration option were
184 disabled. DXA systems were calibrated according to standard Hologic procedures and all scans
185 were taken by standard procedures²¹. DXA-derived BV was determined by Wilson et al in
186 2013²².

$$187 \quad BV_{DXA(L)}=(1.14*FM)+(0.95*LST)+(0.21*BMC)+0.01$$

188 **Deuterium Oxide Dilution**

189 TBW(for 5CM), FM, and FFM were determined using the D₂O protocol defined in the
190 International Atomic Energy Agency(IAEA) standards^{23, 24}. A high-precision scale was used for
191 D₂O dosing(Denver Instrument M-310). All study participants provided the required two post-
192 dose saliva samples. Based on previous research using multiple samples and technologies, saliva
193 was chosen as the criterion^{14, 25}. The saliva data was interrogated with a quality control method
194 of a 5% difference between time points of three and four hours. If the difference was higher than
195 5%, the saliva samples were deemed to not have reached equilibrium and were excluded.
196 Participants were provided with a measured dose of 30g(99.9%pure) D₂O(Cambridge Isotope
197 Laboratories, Tewksbury, MA) and 100ml local drinking water as a rinse to ensure the entire
198 dose was consumed. During the four-hour D₂O equilibration period, participants were allowed to
199 consume up to 500mL of water which was recorded.

200 **Underwater Weighting**

201 UWW measured BV and estimated body composition. On land, participants were weighed in
202 their form-fitting suit caps, then entered the temperature-stable water with a nose clip. Immersed
203 weight was measured using an electronic weighing system(EXERTECH, Dresbach, MN),
204 transmitting data to a computer and providing continuous recording. Trials were performed at
205 residual volume after maximal expiration. Participants sat on the UWW scale, slowly

206 submerged, fully exhaled, and remained still for underwater weight measurement. This
207 procedure was repeated three times and averaged.

208 **Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis/ Spectroscopy**

209 Body composition was estimated in participants by three different systems:
210 SOZO(ImpediMed, Carlsbad, CA), SFB7(ImpediMed, Carlsbad, CA), and S10(MF-BIA;
211 InBody, Cerritos, CA). Each method was performed as per their respective device manufactural
212 recommendations. The S10 and SFB7 scans were performed in an order of convenience
213 approaching a random order immediately following DXA to allow for proper fluid normalization
214 in the supine position²⁶. Before each scan, participants cleaned their ankles, hands, and feet with
215 alcohol wipes. For the SFB7 system, participants were tested using single-tab adhesive
216 electrodes after lying supine for 10 minutes.

217 **Three Dimensional Optical Scans**

218 Each participant underwent 3DO whole-body surface scans, with repositioning, on a
219 Fit3D Proscanner with software version 4.1(Fit3D, Inc., Redwood City, CA). The 3DO scanner
220 provided BV, FM, and FFM for analysis. The 3DO scanner is comprised of light-coding depth
221 sensors, a rotating platform, and analysis software¹⁹. Participants stood on the turntable with legs
222 separated and arms extended and holding the positioning handles following the protocol from the
223 manufacturer. During the scans, the platform rotates 360 degrees over a period of 30-40 seconds,
224 with the camera system emitting light and reflections being recorded by the camera.

225 **Skin Moisture and Temperature**

226 A moisture meter(Moisture-Meter-D, Delfin Technologies) assessed tissue hydration
227 using a control unit transmitting a 300MHz signal to a skin probe, functioning as an open-ended
228 co-axial transmission line^{27, 28}. The reflected wave depended on tissue dielectric constant, shown

229 on the unit(range:1-80, pure water \approx 80). Medium probes assessed tissue water at 1.5mm depth.
230 Skin temperature was recorded using an infrared temperature scanner(Dermatemp DT-1001,
231 Exergen, Newton, MA) before BIA scan. After BIA assessments and 10 minutes of supine
232 position, both measurements were taken twice at three sites on the right side(forehead, dorsal
233 hand, foot).

234 **Strength Assessments**

235 Whole-body muscle strength was evaluated using an isokinetic dynamometer(Humac
236 NORM, Computer Sports Medicine, Stoughton, MA). Participants were positioned at 95° trunk-
237 to-thigh angle and secured with straps to stabilize their lower leg, thigh, and waist. They
238 underwent warm-up, practice, and then performed five isometric and concentric repetitions of
239 knee extension/flexion. After resting, they completed five maximal effort repetitions of trunk
240 flexion/extension, followed by 15 consecutive repetitions. Data collection followed the Humac
241 NORM manual²⁹ protocol without gravity correction. Participants were instructed to exert
242 maximum force rapidly, receiving verbal encouragement but without real-time feedback. The
243 primary measure of strength was isokinetic leg and trunk extension, which maximized whole-
244 body muscle mass assessment, involving multiple muscles and producing a mean peak force of
245 Nm.

246 **Multicompartement Body Composition Models**

247 5CM body composition model described by Wang³⁰ was used as our criterion method.
248 The 5CM includes BV by ADP, TBW and soft tissue mineral(M_s) by D_2O ,(M_o) by DXA by
249 DXA, and BM, as shown in

$$250 \quad FM_{5CM}=2.748(BV)-0.71(TBW)+1.129(M_o)+1.222(M_s)-2.051(BM)$$

251 where M_o was calculated by total body BMC*1.0436, and M_s was calculated by TBW*0.0129³¹.
252 ³². For reporting $5CM_{FFM}$, BM was subtracted from $5CM_{FM}$ as outlined in
253 For clarity, all other methods from each device will be that of FFM(with BMC) and not lean soft
254 tissue(LST; without BMC)³³. FFM was calculated by subtracting FM from BM, while density of
255 FFM, total body density(Db), and hydration were calculated using the following equation. These
256 values were calculated to compare to the standard reference values³⁴.

$$257 \quad FFM_{5CM}Density = FFM_{5CM} / ((TBW/0.9937) + (M_o/2.982) + (M_s/3.317) + (pro/1.34))$$

$$258 \quad Db_{5CM} = BM / ((FM_{5CM}/0.9007) + (FFM_{5CM}/FFM_{density}))$$

$$259 \quad Hydration_{5CM} = (TBW_{D2O}/FFM_{5CM}) * 100$$

260 **Statistical Analysis**

261 Shapiro–Wilks’s test was used to test normality and analysis of variance with post-hoc
262 comparisons of participants with available data on all devices/testing methods to assess for
263 significant mean differences. Agreement between FM and FFM errors between technologies and
264 the $5CM$ were calculated using the root mean square error(RMSE), coefficient of
265 determination(R^2), intercept values, and Lin’s concordance correlation coefficient(CCC). The
266 CCC agreement cutoffs are defined as follows: poor(<0.90), moderate(0.90-0.95),
267 substantial(0.95-0.99), and almost perfect(>0.99)³⁵. Precision was calculated as root-mean-
268 square coefficient of variation(RMS-CV%). Stepwise linear regression was used for the predictor
269 variable methods of BIA-TBW, skin temperature, and moisture to the outcome of TBW and
270 strength estimates by using a $p < 0.10$ to enter the model $p < 0.05$ to stay in the model.
271 Bootstrapping($n=1000$) 95% confidence intervals for the R^2 of each model using the percentile
272 method were used to compare model performance. Additionally, Pearson’s correlation was

273 performed for each body composition method to strength. All statistical calculations were
274 performed using SAS 9.4(SAS, Cary, NC) and are consistent with the CHAMP-statement³⁶.

275 **Results**

276 In this study, 70 participants(35females) were included in the final analysis, where
277 **Supplemental Figure 1** provides details of the data that was included and excluded. Due to a
278 malfunction of the UWW device during data collection, only 24 participants(14 females)
279 completed the test. Necessitating the use of separate matched 5CM comparisons for all analyses
280 relating to the UWW device. Descriptive statistics are found in **Table 1** and determined to be
281 normally distributed, including the strength measures. Males' BMI ranged from 20.2-32.8 and
282 17.8-30.9 in females, whereas the FM ranged from 3.2-22.9kg in males to 3.4-26.4kg in females.
283 Compared to Brozek1963 reference body both sexes in the current study demonstrated
284 significant differences($p<0.05$) in density and percentage values.

285 **Table 2** outlines the different races, sports, and sports types, with the majority of the
286 population being white and equal distribution of sport type. Additionally, only participants with
287 values for each determination of FM and FFM were used for an analysis of variance test, which
288 is described in **Figure 1** and shows no statistical mean differences between all devices of FM or
289 FFM in either sex.

290 The hydration status(TBW/FFM) of the athletes was significantly outside of the normal
291 range($p=0.001$) for both males(0.63-0.73%) and females(0.58-0.78%). An attempt was made to
292 increase the accuracy of each BIA device's TBW estimation to the criterion by using measures
293 of skin temperature and moisture by using step-forward linear regression including each estimate
294 of TBW along with the skin temperature and moisture variables from all locations(head, hand,

295 and foot). However, none of the candidate variables of skin moisture or temperature were
296 selected in the final model to increase the performance of the BIA-reported TBW values.

297 **Table 3** presents the results of linear regression analysis for bivariate comparisons of FM,
298 FFM, and BV measurements using various methods, along with their agreement and precision
299 values of each method to the criterion 5CM. The results reveal that ADP and DXA demonstrated
300 the highest agreement in FM to the criterion(CCC=0.90-0.99), with ADP exhibiting substantial
301 agreement(CCC=0.96) in FM for males. ADP also showed substantial agreement in FFM both
302 sexes, while DXA and D₂O had moderate agreement. D₂O produced the lowest RMSE in
303 males(1.66kg) and females(1.70kg), which was lower than ADP or DXA. The 3DO method had
304 a moderate agreement in females FFM(CCC=0.91), the only field method to produce such an
305 agreement in body composition. However, the 3DO had the highest precision among all
306 methods, for both males(5.8%) and females(4.6%). Similarly, the SFB7(3.3-3.2%) and the
307 SOZO(2.3-4.5%) had high precision estimates in males and females. All measures of FFM had
308 excellent precision of <1.0%, whereas only ADP, DXA, D₂O, UWW, and S10 had <2.0%. The
309 lowest precision estimates were the S10(0.09%) in males and D₂O(0.06%) in females.
310 Ultimately, the 5CM had higher precision than most estimates(3.8-2.9% in males and females),
311 however similar performance to previously reported criterion models³⁷. This highlights the value
312 of this model for frequent monitoring of body composition change. All other methods(UWW and
313 BIA did not produce high equivalence in any category(CCC<0.90).

314 Despite a lack of a significant mean difference, **Figure 2** illustrates that devices show
315 large individual errors and some methods did not show equivalence to the criterion, showing
316 large 95% limits of agreement(LOA) present for each device and considerable offsets from the
317 line of identity. Although the S10, SFB, and SOZO methods all had a CCC=0.88-0.89, indicating

318 approaching moderate equivalence, the figure shows considerable underestimation of FM in
319 athletes, but less so for females. Specifically, D₂O tended to underestimate FM in almost all
320 cases, and to a lesser extent, the 3DO device. A similar divergence was present in the FM for
321 DXA males, where it tended to overestimate in the lower ranges and underestimate in the higher
322 ranges.

323 Interestingly, a near-moderate agreement(CCC=0.88-0.89) was observed in FFM for the
324 S10, SFB, and SOZO, as shown in **Figure 3**, which depicts the regression plots of each device-
325 reported FFM to the criterion, indicating tighter ranges of 95% confidence around the line of
326 identity. Lastly, all three volume methods using 3DO, DXA, and UWW produced nearly perfect
327 agreement of CCC=0.99 and precision(>1%) in both males and females. However, only DXA
328 produced high agreement and precision in body composition.

329 The estimated FFM values from each device in the determination of muscle strength via
330 isokinetic movements of the thigh and trunk are shown in **Table 4**. Height and weight were
331 chosen as the base model for comparison, derived using stepwise forward regression of
332 demographic information. Although skin temperature and moisture variables were considered,
333 they were not significant for the model. The different methods of FFM from each device
334 produced varying estimates of muscle strength, and no single predictor of strength was
335 significant over the other methods for males and females due to large confidence intervals and
336 overlapping effects including the base model. However, the 5CM had the highest overall
337 performance in each category of isokinetic leg and trunk strength for both sexes. The 5CM FFM
338 had moderately predictive R² in male and female leg strength(R²=0.46, 0.58, respectively), and
339 male and female trunk strength was best predicted by the 5CM FFM(R²=0.55, 0.71,
340 respectively). Devices such as ADP, DXA, and D2O all agreed the highest to the criterion 5CM

341 for body composition measures were in the highest end of muscle strength associations,
342 including the example of a high agreement(CCC=0.91) for 3DO in FFM to the 5CM in females
343 also showed one of the highest associations to muscle strength($R^2=0.69$).

344 Furthermore, knee isometric extension/flexion and trunk/knee isokinetic flexion
345 comparisons were conducted, and the Pearson's correlation of each FFM estimate result is
346 reported in **Supplemental Table 1**. Overall, females showed higher statistically
347 significant($p<0.05$) associations than males in all methods. The quartile p -trend was determined
348 using individual FFM and their association with leg and thigh muscle strength, as represented in
349 **Figure 4**. All FFM methods had significant p -trend associations($p=0.05$), but some were more
350 prominent than others, such as the 5CM in male leg strength, which had a more linear
351 distribution over SFB7, with each column consecutively built on the next.

352 **DISCUSSION**

353 This research aimed to compare various methods of body composition analysis in athletes
354 who exhibit different levels of hydration with the criterion 5CM and evaluate their relationship
355 with muscle strength. The findings of this study demonstrated that precise and accurate estimates
356 of body composition can be obtained in athletes, and a more precise measurement of body
357 composition led to better muscle strength estimates. The most reliable laboratory-based
358 techniques were ADP and DXA, while field assessments had moderate to poor agreement. The
359 5CM method exhibited the strongest correlation with muscle strength among all body
360 composition analysis techniques. Methods that showed significant agreement with body
361 composition tended to produce a more valid determination of muscle strength in both male and
362 female athletes. Accurate body composition estimates produce more precise muscle strength
363 estimates in athletes, irrespective of their hydration status. ADP and DXA are trustworthy

364 approaches for evaluating body composition and muscle strength compared to the criterion
365 approach.

366 Our study contrasts with Moon, Silva, and Kendall's research on the validity of different
367 laboratory methods(DXA, ADP, UWW) for estimating body composition in athletes using
368 criterion 5CM³⁸⁻⁴⁰. Unlike their separate studies, our study examined all devices together. Moon
369 found acceptable error ranges of percent fat for all devices(except DXA), while our study found
370 that ADP and DXA had better agreement with the line of identity in females, and UWW had the
371 least agreement. Silva concluded that DXA and ADP were imprecise and invalid for individual
372 body fat prediction in athletes, but our study found moderate to substantial agreement for both
373 sexes with DXA and ADP, and poor agreement with UWW. Kendall found poor
374 agreement(CCC=0.84) between ADP and 5CM estimates for FFM in male athletes, while our
375 study found substantial agreement(CCC=0.97) for ADP. All researchers agree that a
376 multicompartiment model criterion(4/5C) provides the most accurate assessment of body
377 composition in athletes, considering the wide range of hydration values found in our study. The
378 remaining devices, such as BIA and 3DO, had larger errors at the individual level, possibly due
379 to methodological assumptions that the criterion methods lack. Hence, further advancements are
380 necessary to improve their accuracy and clinical relevance. Our volume estimates align with
381 previous findings, except for the 3DO showing better precision than reported before⁴¹. Other
382 studies have also successfully utilized 3DO images for reliable predictions of body
383 composition⁴².

384 Our study agrees with other studies that estimate muscle strength using FFM such as
385 Buehring, Raymond-Pope, and Bourgeois⁴³⁻⁴⁵. However, considerable sex differences related to
386 body size are relevant when predicting muscle strength with body composition. In our study,

387 DXA FFM was associated with leg strength with $R^2=0.40$ males and $R^2=0.47$ females. Non-
388 significant relationships, or those with relatively low correlation, may become significant when
389 subgroups like sex are combined⁴⁶. The combined association for males and females for whole
390 body FFM and leg strength was $R^2=0.64$, virtually identical to Bourgeois. We recommend
391 reporting sex-specific muscle strength associations to avoid this type of correlation inflation and
392 to not generalize relationships across sexes.

393 **Clinical Implications**

394 The estimation of FM using BMI is inappropriate in heavily muscled males and females.
395 Certain equations to estimate body composition using BMI work reasonably well for a
396 population of normal aerobic fitness males and females, but generally, BMI cannot distinguish
397 the high FFM of FM component of individuals who exceeded a BMI of 30 kg/m². Athletes who
398 differ in height, weight, or body composition will oftentimes be incorrectly categorized by BMI
399 class of being ‘underweight’, ‘healthy’, ‘overweight’, or ‘obese’. This is highlighted in **Figure 5**
400 using 3D images from the current study comparing sex-based differences in five athletes with
401 similar body FM ranges(males=9-10kg, females=19-20kg) but varies in each BMI category. The
402 predictive values of BMI for estimating FM were poor in both males and females($R^2=0.42, 0.41$,
403 respectively), indicating a low level of accuracy in using BMI as a predictor of FM in both sexes.
404 Furthermore, BMI is not a better determinant of muscle strength than FFM. On the contrary,
405 those in the ~25 BMI range had the highest strength results over other BMI categories.
406 Potentially suggesting that an increase in FM may hinder strength performance.

407 To our knowledge, this is the first investigation evaluating the body composition agreement
408 between criterion 5CM and other laboratory and field methods, specifically the associations of
409 each device-reported FFM estimate to muscle strength in a collegiate athletic population.

410 Another strength of our study is that the criterion of muscle strength was measured in large
411 muscle groups like the legs and trunk in multiple movements of isokinetic and isometric. Lastly,
412 both males and females were separated in this analysis to more accurately report expected
413 correlations by sex.

414 **Limitations**

415 Although we feel that measurement of the thigh and abdominal/back muscles are more
416 functionally relevant than grip strength, we were unable to directly compare our results to much
417 of the muscle strength literature. Due to the small sample size, we were unable to withhold a
418 subset of participants for model testing. Increasing the sample size should improve our ability to
419 discern statistically significant differences by technique to strength.

420 **Conclusion**

421 From this investigation, we conclude that, when assessing body composition and
422 estimates of muscle strength, researchers and clinicians should evaluate which device is to be
423 used based on its accuracy in comparison to a criterion method, such as the 5CM. This is due to
424 the results demonstrating that the more advanced methods of body composition analysis tend to
425 demonstrate higher agreement and thus support a stronger association with muscle strength than
426 the more commonly used methods. Furthermore, the 5CM is particularly effective in estimating
427 isokinetic and isometric muscle strength, further compounding its utility. Future research in
428 athletes should examine the effects of changes in FFM due to training, weight loss, and/or gain
429 on functional measures when compared to a criterion method.

430 **Acknowledgment**

431 We gratefully acknowledge En Liu and Nisa Kelly for subject recruitment and
432 implementation of the study protocol. We would also like to acknowledge Timothy

433 Shriver(University of Wisconsin), and Valery Hymel(Pennington Biomedical Research
434 Laboratory) for processing and analyzing all D₂O specimens. This study was funded by Hologic
435 Inc. grant # 2018-01102.

436 **Author Contributions**

437 **John Shepherd, Steven B. Heymsfield, and Thomas Kelly:** Conceptualization, Funding
438 acquisition **Brandon Quon and Devon Cataldi:** Data curation, Formal analysis **John A**
439 **Shepherd:** Investigation, Validation, Visualizations **Devon Cataldi, Jonathan Bennett,**
440 **Michael Wong, Nisa Kelly, and Yong En Liu:** Methodology, Project administration,
441 Resources, Software, Supervision **Devon Cataldi, John Shepherd, Steven B. Heymsfield, Dale**
442 **A. Schoeller and Jonathan Bennett:** Roles/Writing - Original draft, review & editing

443 **Data Share Statement:** Data described in the manuscript, codebook, and analytic code will be
444 made available upon request pending an application and approval, payment, and or other.

445

446 **Table Legend**

447 *Table 1 – Descriptive Statistics of Demographics, Whole Body Composition and Muscle Strength*
448 *in Male and Female Athletes*

449 *Table 2 – Sport played, race, and Anaerobic / aerobic sport Distribution(n=75)*

450 *Table 3 – Body Composition Agreement between Methodologies to the Criterion 5 Compartment*
451 *Model(n=75)*

452 *Table 4 – Highest Ranking Determination of Leg and Trunk Strength by Body Composition*
453 *Methods of Males and Females(n=75)*

454 **Figures Legend**

455 *Figure 1 – Fat and Fat-Free Mass Mean Difference in all Methods(n=75)*

456 *Figure 2 – Fat Mass Agreement to the 5-Compartment Model(n=75)*

457 *Figure 3 – Fat-Free Mass Agreement to the 5-Compartment Model(n=75)*

458 *Figure 4 – Quartile p-trend Associations of FFM Estimates Leg to Trunk Strength in Males and*
459 *Females(n=75)*

460 *Figure 5 – A Comparative Analysis of Sex-Based Differences in Fat Mass and BMI among Five*
461 *Athletes with a Fat Mass Range of 9 – 10kg for Males and 19-20kg for Females*

462 **Supplemental**

463 *Supplemental Table 1 – Description of Body Composition Methods*

464 *Supplemental Table 2 – Pearson’s Correlation of Differing Body Composition Methods to Leg*
465 *and Trunk Isokinetic and Isometric, Flexion and Extension Strength(n=75)*

466 *Supplemental Figure 1 – Consort Statement*

467

Table 1 – Descriptive Statistics of Demographics, Whole Body Composition and Muscle Strength in Male and Female Athletes

	Variable	Units	Male (N=35)		Female (N=35)	
			Mean (SD)	Min (Max)	Mean (SD)	Min (Max)
Demographics	Weight	kg	*82.27±10.09	61.9-102.5	62.97±10.44	43.9-92.4
	Height	cm	*180.99±10.26	159.3-203	168.04±8.86	154.7-188.1
	Age	years	24.43±5.11	18-37	21.86±4.19	18-35
	BMI	kg/m ²	*25.2±3.21	20.15-32.79	22.25±2.89	17.79-30.94
Skin	Temperature	deg.	34.17±0.83	32.5-35.6	33.97±1.14	31.1-35.6
	Moisture	F/m	*42.17±7.75	31-53.4	37.16±4.84	27.6-46.1
ISOK Strength	LEG Ext	Nm	*139.08±34.44	67-200	94.11±27.94	54-155
	TRK Ext	Nm	*188.14±61.68	75-306	93.09±38.2	40-214
Whole Body	ADP BV	L	*77.42±10.16	57.31-96.94	60.11±10.44	40.26-88.27
	D ₂ O TBW	L	*49.94±6.42	36.3-60	34.14±6.01	22.8-49.03
	BMC	kg	*3.09±0.38	2.38-3.91	2.33±0.4	1.7-3.53
5C Model	5C FM	kg	11.58±5.9	3.18-22.87	14.36±5.66	3.39-26.36
	5C FFM	kg	*71.25±8.53	54.79-84.33	48.87±7.92	33.87-69.48
	Mo	kg	*3.23±0.39	2.48-4.08	2.44±0.41	1.78-3.68
	Ms	kg	*0.64±0.08	0.47-0.77	0.44±0.08	0.29-0.63
	Protein	kg	*17.43±2.35	13.03-22.41	11.86±2.1	7.61-16.14
	FFM Density	g/cm ³	†1.104±0.007	1.094-1.129	†1.107±0.01	1.081-1.15
	TBW/FFM	%	†70.04±2.08	62.69-73.16	†69.75±2.92	58.22-78.12
	Pro/FFM	%	†*24.51±2.11	21.52-31.6	†24.35±2.88	16.09-35.03
	BMC/FFM	%	†4.36±0.37	3.61-5.31	†4.79±0.45	3.89-5.75

Abbreviations: 5C – 5 Compartment model, D₂O – deuterium dilution total body water, ISOK – isokinetic, Ext – extension, ADP BV – BodPod body volume, Db – body density

* sex differences

† differs significantly from the value calculated if 73.2% hydration is assumed.

Note: The reference body is based on Broek's 1963 cadaver values.

Table 2 – Sport Played, Race, and Anaerobic / Aerobic Sport Distribution (n=75)

	Male	Female
Race	Frequency	Frequency
Asian	11	6
Black	1	5
Hispanic	1	3
NHOPI	3	5
White	24	21
Sport		
Basketball	1	1
Beach Volleyball	0	4
Cheerleading	2	2
Diving	4	1
Gymnastics	0	1
MMA	5	2
Power Lifting	5	2
ROTC	6	2
Soccer	1	2
Softball	2	0
Swimming	7	2
Tennis	0	1
Track	3	16
Volleyball	4	0
Water Polo	0	4
Sport Type		
Anaerobic	17	11
Aerobic	23	29

Abbreviations: MMA – mixed martial arts NH – non-Hispanic, NHOPI – native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, ROTC – reserve officers' training corps
 Anaerobic (Without O₂) = Beach Volleyball, Cheerleading, Diving, Gymnastics, Power Lifting, Softball, Tennis, Volleyball
 Aerobic (With O₂) = Basket Ball, MMA, ROTC, Running, Soccer, Swimming, Track, Water Polo

Table 3 –Agreement between Different Body Composition Methodologies to the Criterion 5 Compartment Model (n=75)

Method	Precision		Male Accuracy						Precision		Female Accuracy					
	Mean	RMS-CV	CCC	R ²	RMSE	Slope	Int	Slope Int=0	Mean	RMS-CV	CCC	R ²	RMSE	Slope	Int	Slope Int=0
Criterion 5C FM	11.58	3.80							14.36	2.99						
ADP	11.87	1.58	^b 0.96	0.91	1.73	1.01	-0.37	0.98	13.98	1.05	^c 0.93	0.87	2.03	0.93	0.97	0.99
D ₂ O	14.61	1.39	0.86	0.92	1.66	0.87	-1.24	0.80	16.60	0.58	0.89	0.90	1.70	0.95	-1.29	0.88
DXA	11.42	1.43	^c 0.90	0.88	2.01	1.24	-2.59	1.04	13.68	1.26	^c 0.91	0.87	2.08	1.08	-0.81	1.03
Fit3D	14.92	5.82	0.66	0.64	3.56	0.98	-3.35	0.78	15.04	4.57	0.86	0.78	2.70	1.02	-1.50	0.93
S10	13.22	0.94	0.72	0.55	3.95	0.50	5.37	0.83	14.97	1.10	0.80	0.64	3.40	0.72	2.78	0.87
SFB	12.34	3.33	0.56	0.28	4.99	0.61	4.71	0.86	15.00	3.19	0.80	0.64	3.39	0.86	1.38	0.95
SOZO	15.07	2.32	0.57	0.44	4.43	0.68	1.36	0.76	15.56	4.45	0.80	0.65	3.32	0.88	0.53	0.91
UWW	9.01	1.25	0.89	0.84	1.91	0.70	2.22	0.88	10.74	1.49	0.68	0.53	3.89	0.79	4.80	1.15
Criterion 5C FFM	48.87	0.10							71.25	0.11						
ADP	49.05	0.07	^b 0.97	0.95	1.95	0.96	3.64	1.00	70.66	0.07	^b 0.96	0.93	2.12	0.93	3.47	0.99
D ₂ O	46.64	0.07	^c 0.92	0.95	1.84	0.95	6.28	1.04	68.22	0.08	^c 0.94	0.95	1.74	0.95	4.21	1.04
DXA	49.72	0.05	^b 0.96	0.92	2.37	1.01	-0.80	0.99	71.50	0.10	^b 0.96	0.93	2.14	0.98	0.80	0.98
Fit3D	47.89	1.02	0.81	0.82	3.59	1.02	2.90	1.06	67.42	1.02	^c 0.91	0.85	3.03	1.02	0.76	1.03
S10	48.22	0.04	0.86	0.76	4.22	0.85	12.43	1.01	69.59	0.12	0.88	0.78	3.70	0.86	7.87	1.01
SFB	48.33	0.04	0.78	0.62	5.23	0.84	12.47	1.01	70.20	0.34	0.89	0.81	3.48	0.94	3.53	1.00
SOZO	47.66	0.12	0.78	0.71	4.56	0.84	14.45	1.05	67.76	0.52	0.88	0.82	3.36	1.02	0.53	1.02
UWW	75.30	0.41	0.79	0.58	2.32	0.74	19.87	1.00	53.84	0.44	0.82	0.74	3.58	0.77	10.03	0.95
Criterion ADP Volume	61.10	0.04							77.42	0.04						
DXA	49.72	0.03	^a 0.99	1.00	0.52	0.01	0.44	0.98	78.66	0.04	^a 0.99	1.00	0.68	0.01	0.86	1.03
Fit3D	58.33	0.03	^a 0.99	1.00	0.78	0.01	0.64	0.98	76.08	0.08	^a 0.99	0.99	1.19	0.02	1.49	1.02
UWW	60.89	0.41	^a 0.99	1.00	0.86	1.01	-0.49	1.00	78.48	0.44	^a 0.99	0.99	0.86	0.92	6.30	1.00

Abbreviations: 5C – 5 Compartment model, D₂O – deuterium dilution total body water.

Note: R² is adjusted, RMSE is in liters for volume measures, whereas all other measurements are in kg. Int – intercept, (Slope Int=0) is the slope, when the intercept is equal to zero. UWW was calculated on a separate sample with matched 5CM comparisons where n=24.

^a = >0.99 ‘almost perfect’ equivalence

^b = 0.95 to 0.99: ‘substantial’ equivalence

^c = 0.90 to 0.95: ‘moderate’ equivalence

Otherwise unmarked is considered <0.90 poor equivalence

Bolded text indicates Significant Intercept

471

Table 4 – Highest Ranking Determination of Leg and Trunk Strength by FFM and Body Composition Methods of Males and Females (n=75)

				Male			
FFM	Leg ISOK Ex			FFM	Trunk ISOK Ex		
	R ²	95% CI	RMSE		R ²	95% CI	RMSE
5C	0.46	0.23-0.69	25.5	5C	0.55	0.35-0.77	47.2
D ₂ O	0.42	0.18-0.67	26.3	DXA	0.53	0.3-0.74	45.2
DXA	0.40	0.15-0.62	29.3	S10	0.51	0.29-0.73	47.4
ADP	0.40	0.18-0.64	26.9	D ₂ O	0.49	0.22-0.74	50.0
UWW	0.40	0.18-0.64	27.8	ADP	0.48	0.23-0.73	48.8
SFB	0.35	0.14-0.63	30.5	UWW	0.48	0.23-0.73	49.2
SOZO	0.32	0.12-0.61	30.3	SOZO	0.46	0.22-0.71	48.8
S10	0.31	0.11-0.61	30.4	Fit3D	0.46	0.19-0.73	48.1
Fit3D	0.31	0.14-0.68	29.7	SFB	0.40	0.16-0.68	54.6
<i>Base Model</i>	<i>0.25</i>	<i>0.05-0.54</i>	<i>31.3</i>	<i>Base Model</i>	<i>0.38</i>	<i>0.13-0.66</i>	<i>49.1</i>
				Female			
FFM	Leg ISOK Ex			FFM	Trunk ISOK Ex		
	R ²	95% CI	RMSE		R ²	95% CI	RMSE
5C	0.58	0.33-0.75	21.3	5C	0.71	0.43-0.87	23.7
D ₂ O	0.56	0.31-0.78	21.4	ADP	0.69	0.43-0.88	22.7
Fit3D	0.50	0.23-0.76	21.2	DXA	0.69	0.43-0.88	18.3
DXA	0.47	0.05-0.57	24.2	Fit3D	0.69	0.29-0.91	18.9
ADP	0.46	0.24-0.7	21.9	D ₂ O	0.66	0.39-0.86	25.0
UWW	0.46	0.24-0.7	25.1	S10	0.64	0.33-0.88	25.4
SOZO	0.45	0.19-0.72	22.1	SOZO	0.64	0.32-0.86	25.8
SFB	0.39	0.11-0.68	23.6	SFB	0.62	0.3-0.85	28.5
S10	0.38	0.1-0.69	24.1	UWW	0.61	0.36-0.8	17.4
<i>Base Model</i>	<i>0.18</i>	<i>0.02-0.49</i>	<i>24.4</i>	<i>Base Model</i>	<i>0.49</i>	<i>0.2-0.73</i>	<i>19.7</i>

Abbreviations: 5C – 5 Compartment model, D₂O – deuterium dilution total body water, FFM – fat-free mass, ADP BV – BodPod body volume, ISOK – isokinetic, Ext – extension

Note: R² is adjusted. The base model was derived using demographic information on height and weight. All RMSE are in Nm. UWW was calculated on a separate sample with matched 5C comparisons where n=24.

472 References


- 473 1. Lukaski H, Raymond-Pope CJ. New frontiers of body composition in sport. *International Journal of Sports*
474 *Medicine*. 2021;42(07):588-601.
- 475 2. Jagim AR, Fields JB, Magee M, Kerksick C, Luedke J, Erickson J, Jones MT. The influence of sport
476 nutrition knowledge on body composition and perceptions of dietary requirements in collegiate athletes. *Nutrients*.
477 2021;13(7):2239.
- 478 3. Gallagher D, Visser M, Sepulveda D, Pierson RN, Harris T, Heymsfield SB. How useful is body mass
479 index for comparison of body fatness across age, sex, and ethnic groups? *American journal of epidemiology*.
480 1996;143(3):228-39.
- 481 4. Deurenberg P, Deurenberg Yap M, Wang J, Lin F, Schmidt G. The impact of body build on the relationship
482 between body mass index and percent body fat. *International Journal of Obesity*. 1999;23(5):537-42.
- 483 5. Jäger R, Kerksick CM, Campbell BI, Cribb PJ, Wells SD, Skwiat TM, Purpura M, Ziegenfuss TN,
484 Ferrando AA, Arent SM. International society of sports nutrition position stand: protein and exercise. *Journal of the*
485 *International Society of Sports Nutrition*. 2017;14(1):20.
- 486 6. Sundgot-Borgen J, Garthe I. Elite athletes in aesthetic and Olympic weight-class sports and the challenge of
487 weight and body composition. *Food, Nutrition and Sports Performance III*. 2013:109-22.
- 488 7. Thomas DT, Erdman KA, Burke LM. Position of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Dietitians of
489 Canada, and the American College of Sports Medicine: nutrition and athletic performance. *Journal of the Academy*
490 *of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2016;116(3):501-28.
- 491 8. Turocy PS, DePalma BF, Horswill CA, Laquale KM, Martin TJ, Perry AC, Somova MJ, Utter AC.
492 National Athletic Trainers' Association position statement: safe weight loss and maintenance practices in sport and
493 exercise. *Journal of athletic training*. 2011;46(3):322-36.
- 494 9. Ackerman KE, Stellingwerff T, Elliott-Sale KJ, Baltzell A, Cain M, Goucher K, Fleshman L, Mountjoy
495 ML. # REDS(Relative Energy Deficiency in Sport): time for a revolution in sports culture and systems to improve
496 athlete health and performance. *BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and British Association of Sport and Exercise Medicine*;
497 2020. p. 369-70.
- 498 10. Matias CN, Campa F, Cavaca M, Paoli A, Teixeira FJ. Fat-free mass estimation in male elite futsal players:
499 Development and validation of a new bioelectrical impedance-based predictive equation. *Nutrition*.
500 2023;107:111931.
- 501 11. Nickerson BS, Esco MR, Bishop PA, Kliszczewicz BM, Williford HN, Park K-S, Welborn BA, Snarr RL,
502 Toluoso DV. Effects of heat exposure on body water assessed using single-frequency bioelectrical impedance
503 analysis and bioimpedance spectroscopy. *International Journal of Exercise Science*. 2017;10(7):1085.
- 504 12. Gudivaka R, Schoeller D, Kushner RF. Effect of skin temperature on multifrequency bioelectrical
505 impedance analysis. *Journal of Applied Physiology*. 1996;81(2):838-45.
- 506 13. Lohman T, Wang Z, Going SB. *Human body composition: Human Kinetics*; 2005.
- 507 14. Cataldi D, Bennett JP, Quon BK, Liu YE, Heymsfield SB, Kelly T, Shepherd JA. Agreement and Precision
508 of Deuterium Dilution for Total Body Water and Multicompartment Body Composition Assessment in Collegiate
509 Athletes. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2022.
- 510 15. Moon J. Body composition in athletes and sports nutrition: an examination of the bioimpedance analysis
511 technique. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2013;67(1):S54-S9.
- 512 16. Campa F, Toselli S, Mazzilli M, Gobbo LA, Coratella G. Assessment of body composition in athletes: A
513 narrative review of available methods with special reference to quantitative and qualitative bioimpedance analysis.
514 *Nutrients*. 2021;13(5):1620.
- 515 17. Bennett J, Quon B, Liu YE, Kelly N, Smith B, FTOS SHM. 3-Dimensional Optical Imaging Improves the
516 Prediction of Metabolic Syndrome Over Body Mass Index. *Obesity*. 2021;29:48-.
- 517 18. Cataldi D, Bennett J, Quon B, Liu EY, FTOS SHM, FTOS DSP, Kelly T. Approaches at Increasing the
518 Accuracy of Bioelectrical Impedance-Derived Total Body Water. *Obesity*. 2021;29:58-.
- 519 19. Wong MC, Ng BK, Tian I, Sobhiyeh S, Pagano I, Dechenaud M, Kennedy SF, Liu YE, Kelly NN, Chow
520 D. A pose-independent method for accurate and precise body composition from 3D optical scans. *Obesity*.
521 2021;29(11):1835-47.
- 522 20. Fields DA, Goran MI, McCrory MA. Body-composition assessment via air-displacement plethysmography
523 in adults and children: a review. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2002;75(3):453-67.

- 524 21. Lu Y, Mathur AK, Blunt BA, Glüer CC, Will AS, Fuerst TP, Jergas MD, Andriano KN, Cummings SR,
525 Genant HK. Dual X-ray absorptiometry quality control: Comparison of visual examination and process control
526 charts. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 1996;11(5):626-37.
- 527 22. Wilson JP, Strauss BJ, Fan B, Duewer FW, Shepherd JA. Improved 4-compartment body-composition
528 model for a clinically accessible measure of total body protein. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*.
529 2013;97(3):497-504.
- 530 23. Assessment of Body Composition and Total Energy Expenditure in Humans Using Stable Isotope
531 Techniques. Vienna: INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY; 2009.
- 532 24. Agency IAE. Introduction to Body Composition Assessment Using the Deuterium Dilution Technique with
533 Analysis of Urine Samples by Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometry: IAEA Human Health Series No. 13: International
534 Atomic Energy Agency; 2011.
- 535 25. Cataldi D, Bennett J, Liu EY, Quon B, Heymsfield S, Shepherd J. Deuterium Dilution Accuracy &
536 Precision of Total Body Water in Multiple Laboratories and Techniques. *Obesity*. 2020:75-6.
- 537 26. Lozano-Nieto A, Turner AA. Effects of orthostatic fluid shifts on bioelectrical impedance measurements.
538 *Biomedical instrumentation & technology*. 2001;35(4):249-58.
- 539 27. Mayrovitz H. Assessing local tissue edema in postmastectomy lymphedema. *Lymphology*. 2007;40(2):87-
540 94.
- 541 28. Czerniec SA, Ward LC, Kilbreath SL. Assessment of breast cancer-related lymphedema: A comparison of
542 moisture meter and spot bioimpedance measurement. *Lymphatic research and biology*. 2015;13(1):10-9.
- 543 29. Humac C. Norm™ Testing & Rehabilitation System User Guide Model 770. Stoughton, MA. 2003.
- 544 30. Wang Z, Pi-Sunyer FX, Kotler DP, Wielopolski L, Withers RT, Pierson Jr RN, Heymsfield SB.
545 Multicomponent methods: evaluation of new and traditional soft tissue mineral models by in vivo neutron activation
546 analysis. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*. 2002;76(5):968-74.
- 547 31. Heymsfield SB, Ebbeling CB, Zheng J, Pietrobelli A, Strauss BJ, Silva AM, Ludwig DS.
548 Multi-component molecular level body composition reference methods: evolving concepts and future directions.
549 *Obesity Reviews*. 2015;16(4):282-94.
- 550 32. Wang Z, Deurenberg P, Guo SS, Pietrobelli A, Wang J, Pierson Jr R, Heymsfield SB. Six-compartment
551 body composition model: inter-method comparisons of total body fat measurement. *International journal of obesity*.
552 1998;22(4):329-37.
- 553 33. Prado CM, Heymsfield SB. Lean tissue imaging: a new era for nutritional assessment and intervention.
554 *Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition*. 2014;38(8):940-53.
- 555 34. Brožek J, Grande F, Anderson JT, Keys A. Densitometric analysis of body composition: revision of some
556 quantitative assumptions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 1963;110(1):113-40.
- 557 35. McBride G. A proposal for strength-of-agreement criteria for Lin's concordance correlation coefficient.
558 NIWA client report: HAM2005-062. 2005;62.
- 559 36. Mansournia MA, Collins GS, Nielsen RO, Nazemipour M, Jewell NP, Altman DG, Campbell MJ. A
560 Checklist for statistical Assessment of Medical Papers (the CHAMP statement): explanation and elaboration. *British
561 journal of sports medicine*. 2021;55(18):1009-17.
- 562 37. Elia M. Body composition analysis: an evaluation of 2 component models, multicomponent models and
563 bedside techniques. *Clin Nutr*. 1992;11(3):114-27.
- 564 38. Moon JR, Eckerson JM, Tobkin SE, Smith AE, Lockwood CM, Walter AA, Cramer JT, Beck TW, Stout
565 JR. Estimating body fat in NCAA Division I female athletes: a five-compartment model validation of laboratory
566 methods. *European journal of applied physiology*. 2009;105(1):119-30.
- 567 39. Silva A, Minderico C, Teixeira P, Pietrobelli A, Sardinha L. Body fat measurement in adolescent athletes:
568 multicompartment molecular model comparison. *European journal of clinical nutrition*. 2006;60(8):955-64.
- 569 40. Kendall KL, Fukuda DH, Hyde PN, Smith-Ryan AE, Moon JR, Stout JR. Estimating fat-free mass in elite-
570 level male rowers: a four-compartment model validation of laboratory and field methods. *Journal of sports sciences*.
571 2017;35(7):624-33.
- 572 41. Wilson JP, Fan B, Shepherd JA. Total and regional body volumes derived from dual-energy X-ray
573 absorptiometry output. *Journal of Clinical Densitometry*. 2013;16(3):368-73.
- 574 42. Akoglu H. User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turkish journal of emergency medicine*. 2018;18(3):91-
575 3.
- 576 43. Bourgeois B, Fan B, Johannsen N, Gonzalez MC, Ng BK, Sommer MJ, Shepherd JA, Heymsfield SB.
577 Improved strength prediction combining clinically available measures of skeletal muscle mass and quality. *Journal
578 of cachexia, sarcopenia and muscle*. 2019;10(1):84-94.

- 579 44. Buehring B, Siglinsky E, Krueger D, Evans W, Hellerstein M, Yamada Y, Binkley N. Comparison of
580 muscle/lean mass measurement methods: correlation with functional and biochemical testing. *Osteoporosis*
581 *International*. 2018;29(3):675-83.
- 582 45. Raymond-Pope CJ, Dengel DR, Fitzgerald JS, Bosch TA. Association of compartmental leg lean mass
583 measured by dual X-ray absorptiometry with force production. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*.
584 2020;34(6):1690-9.
- 585 46. Makin TR, de Xivry J-JO. Ten common statistical mistakes to watch out for when writing or reviewing a
586 manuscript. *Elife*. 2019;8.
- 587




Males





Fat











Females





Fat-Free




ADP Fat Mass**D2O Fat Mass****DXA Fat Mass****UWW Fat Mass**

S10 Fat Mass**SFB7 Fat Mass****SOZO Fat Mass****Fit3D Fat Mass**


ADP Fat-Free Mass**D2O Fat-Free Mass****DXA Fat-Free Mass****UWW Fat-Free Mass**

S10 Fat-Free Mass**SFB7 Fat-Free Mass****SOZO Fat-Free Mass****Fit3D Fat-Free Mass**


Male Leg Strength



Male Trunk Strength



Female Leg Strength



Female Trunk Strength

