> **Title page** 1 2 3 Prevalence and factors associated with sarcopenia among older adults in a 4 post-acute hospital in Singapore 5 6 Tan You Mei Charmaine MMED (Fam Med)<sup>1,2</sup>, Sharna Seah Si Ying Ph.D. (Public Health)<sup>3</sup>, Lim Yanshan Doris Msc AdvPT<sup>4</sup>, Koh Siew Van BAppSc (OT)<sup>4</sup>, Ganeshan 7 8 Karthikeyan BPT<sup>4</sup>, Xia Jiawen Olivia MSA (Data and Analytics)<sup>3</sup>, Low Xuan Lin DPHM<sup>5</sup>, 9 Quek Hui Yi GCE-A<sup>6</sup>, Ong Shuyi Andrea MD<sup>1</sup>, A/Prof Low Lian Leng (Fam Med) FCFP(S)<sup>1,2</sup>, Aw Junjie MMED (Fam Med) FCFP(S)<sup>1,2</sup> 10 11 12 <sup>1</sup> Post-Acute and Continuing Care Department, Outram Community Hospital, 13 SingHealth Community Hospitals, Singapore 14 <sup>2</sup> SingHealth Duke-NUS Family Medicine Academic Clinical Program, Singapore <sup>3</sup> Research and Translational Innovation Office, SingHealth Community Hospitals, 15 16 Singapore 17 <sup>4</sup> Rehabilitation Department, Outram Community Hospital, SingHealth Community 18 Hospitals, Singapore 19 <sup>5</sup> Department of Health and Social Science, Singapore Institute of Technology, 20 Singapore <sup>6</sup> Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, Singapore 21 22 23 Corresponding author: Dr. Aw Junjie. aw.junjie@singhealth.com.sg 24 Word count abstract: 213

NOTE: This & print Works new used to guide clinical practice.

#### 26

#### 27 Funding source:

- 28 This study was funded by the 2021 SingHealth Regional Health System (RHS):
- 29 Population-based, Unified, Learning System for Enhanced and Sustainable Health
- 30 (PULSES) Grant ID: CGOCt21S06.
- 31

Impact statement: Our study found that 1 in 2 older adults are sarcopenic and 1 in 3 older adults are severely sarcopenia in the post-acute settings with associations to increased age, male sex, low physical activity, cognitive impairment and inverse associations with higher BMI and hip circumference.

36

### 37 Key points:

- 1) One in two older adults are sarcopenic and one in three older adults are severely
- 39 sarcopenic in a post-acute setting, indicating a high prevalence of sarcopenia and
- 40 underscoring the urgency to address sarcopenia now.
- 41 2) Age, sex, physical activity, hip circumference and BMI are associations with
- 42 sarcopenia. In addition, cognition is also associated with severe sarcopenia.
- 43 3) This is the first inpatient study in Singapore looking at sarcopenia associations and
- 44 it lends support to global literature on associations of sarcopenia and allows for
- 45 possible interventions to target modifiable risk factors in sarcopenia.
- 46
- 47 Word count "key points": 93
- 48
- 49 Abstract

#### 50 Background:

- 51 Sarcopenia is common in older adults worldwide, but its prevalence varies widely
- 52 owing to differences in diagnostic criteria, population sampled, and care setting. We
- 53 aimed to determine the prevalence and factors associated with sarcopenia in
- 54 patients aged 65 and above admitted to a post-acute hospital in Singapore.
- 55

#### 56 Methods:

- 57 This was a cross-sectional study of 400 patients recruited from a community hospital
- 58 in Singapore. Data including socio-demographics, physical activity, nutritional status,
- 59 cognition, clinical and functional status, as well as anthropometric measurements
- 60 were collected. Sarcopenia was defined using the Asian Working Group for
- 61 Sarcopenia 2019 criteria (AWGS2019).
- 62

#### 63 Results:

- 64 Of the 383 patients with complete datasets, overall prevalence of sarcopenia was
- 54% while prevalence of severe sarcopenia was 38.9%. Participants with increased
- age, male gender and a low physical activity level were more likely to be sarcopenic,
- 67 while those with higher hip circumference and higher BMI of  $\geq$  27.5m/kg2 were less
- 68 likely to be sarcopenic. Other than the above-mentioned variables, cognitive
- 69 impairment was also associated with severe sarcopenia.
- 70

#### 71 Conclusions:

- 72 There is a high prevalence of sarcopenia in older patients admitted to a post-acute
- 73 hospital in Singapore. There is an urgent need to address this important clinical
- syndrome burden and to identify patients at higher risk of sarcopenia in post-acute
- 75 settings in Singapore for early intervention.
- 76 Word count "abstract": 213

#### 77 Main text

78

# 79 Introduction

80 The proportion of older adults worldwide is rapidly growing, with projected doubling 81 by 2050.(1) 16.6% of Singapore's residents were aged 65 and above in 2022, and this 82 is rising 4-5.6% year on year.(2) Increased life expectancy globally is not equitable with 83 healthy life expectancy.(3) Echoing this, the United Nations General Assembly has 84 declared 2021-2030 the Decade of Healthy Ageing.(4) Increased age is associated with 85 frailty and sarcopenia.(5-8) These geriatric syndromes herald increased healthcare utilization and costs from associated morbidity and mortality.(9-12) Among inpatients 86 87 undergoing rehabilitation, sarcopenia had been reported to be associated with worse 88 recovery of function and lower rate of home discharge in hospitalized adults 89 undergoing rehabilitation.(13)

90

Sarcopenia is common in older adults worldwide, but it's prevalence varies widely
owing to differences in diagnostic criteria, population sampled, and care setting.(14)
Sarcopenia prevalence reported in overseas studies was 26.9 – 58% in inpatient postacute and rehabilitation wards and 50.9 - 60.2% in daycare facilities.(11, 15-18)
Sarcopenia has been reported to be associated with age, gender, marital status,
comorbidities, smoking, physical activity, BMI, waist circumference, hip
circumference, nutrition, and cognition.(13, 15-24)

98

99 Several studies in Singapore had reported sarcopenia prevalence among varying100 population groups in the community.

101

> 102 For example, sarcopenia prevalence in a community sample of individuals aged 21-90 103 years old compared to those aged 60 years and above was 13.6% and 32.2% 104 respectively.(21) Another study reported sarcopenia prevalence of 76% among 105 community ambulant adults aged 65 and above who were at medium or high risk of 106 malnutrition.(22) The prevalence of sarcopenia in primary care and specialist 107 outpatient clinics ranged from 27.4% in patients aged 60-89 years old with Type 2 108 Diabetes Mellitus using AWGS criteria, to 44% in patients aged 65 and above based 109 on SARC-F questionnaire only.(19, 25)

110

However, till date there is none investigating sarcopenia prevalence using established recommended criteria in the inpatient setting. We aim to determine the prevalence of sarcopenia, severe sarcopenia and their associations in an inpatient post-acute hospital setting in Singapore.

115

123

# 116 Materials and Methods

#### 117 Setting

This cross-sectional study was conducted from May to November 2022 at OutramCommunity Hospital (OCH).

120 A community hospital in Singapore is a purpose built hospital to provide medical,

121 nursing and rehabilitation care for patients who require a short period of continuation

122 of care after their stay in the acute hospitals i.e. post-acute care before being

124 Admissions into OCH come from the Singapore General Hospital (SGH), the largest co-

discharged into the community.(26)

located acute tertiary hospital in Singapore servicing the southeastern region ofSingapore.

127

#### 128 Study participants and recruitment

129 All patients aged 65 years old and above admitted to OCH under subacute or 130 rehabilitation service from 17 May to 16 November 2022 were consecutively screened 131 based on eligibility criteria. Participants who were unable to understand English or 132 Mandarin, refused to participate, or unable to give informed consent or follow 133 instructions due to conditions such as neuropsychiatric or neurocognitive disease 134 were excluded. Additional excluded participants included those who were terminally 135 ill; medically unstable; had conditions which precluded sarcopenia assessment such 136 as anyone with a cardiac pacemaker, an implantable defibrillator, amputation of 137 limb(s), intravenous hydration, fluid overload and had temporary restrictions in 138 weightbearing status of upper or lower limbs.

139

Eligible participants were then recruited after written informed consent was obtained.
All participants recruited were assigned to a unique serial number in order to delink
and deidentify them. All data was collected during the inpatient stay in OCH, with no
further follow-up or contact after discharge.

144

This study was approved by SingHealth Centralized Institutional Review board (CIRBRef 2021/2817).

147

#### 148 Data Collection

All interviewers received standardized training on interview techniques with trial interviews held with trainer to ensure fidelity. Face-to-face interviews with the patients were conducted in Mandarin and English.

152

153 Data collected included 1) demographics (age, sex, race, marital status, living setup, 154 type of dwelling and highest educational qualification); 2) physical activity and 155 sedentary time; 3) nutritional status; 4) cognition; and 5) other clinical parameters 156 (weight, height, smoking history, Modified Barthel Index (MBI) scores on admission, 157 Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI); history of COVID-19 infection; waist circumference (WC); hip circumference (HC) and Rehabilitation Diagnostic Groups (RDGs) 158 159 classification, an administrative framework to group patients admitted for 160 rehabilitation so as to facilitate transition and collaboration across the stakeholders 161 in the care spectrum.

162

Physical activity level and sedentary time were assessed using the Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ), which was developed by WHO with standardized approach and question guide available both in English and Mandarin translations, and used in multiple Singapore studies including the National Health Survey 2010 and 2019.(21, 27-32) As per the GPAQ, participants' sedentary time in minutes per day and their physical activity level (low and moderate or high) were collected.(33)

169

The 3-Minute Nutritional Screening (3-MinNS) tool, developed in Singapore and validated for medical and surgical inpatients in a Singapore hospital, was used to screen nutritional status.(34, 35) Participants were grouped into low (0-2), moderate (3-4), or severe (5-9) malnutrition risk.(34)

174

Cognitive assessment was done using the Chinese Mini Mental State Examination
(CMMSE), which was also validated locally in English and Mandarin.(36) Those with
CMMSE scores of 23 and below were considered as having impaired cognition.(37)

178

- 179 The participants' inpatient medical records were accessed to retrieve information
- regarding the following: MBI on admission; CCI; history of COVID-19 infection; RDGs;
- 181 weight (in kilogrammes) and height (in metres) on admission.
- 182
- 183 Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as body weight divided by square of height
- 184 (kg/m<sup>2</sup>). Cut-offs were based on WHO BMI risk categories for cardiovascular disease
- 185 and diabetes in Asian populations.(38)
- 186

#### 187 Anthropometry

Waist circumference (WC) was measured using a stretch-resistant tape at the midpoint between the lower margin of the least palpable rib and the top of the iliac crest. Waist circumference cut-offs were determined as per The International Diabetes Federation (IDF) consensus worldwide definition for metabolic syndrome.(39)

193

Hip circumference (HC) was measured around the widest portion of the buttocks.(40)
Waist-hip ratio (WHR) was calculated by dividing WC over HC. Cut-offs for WHR were
based on World Health Organization (WHO), redefining obesity - the Asia-Pacific
perspective.(41)

198

#### 199 Sarcopenia assessment

There have been several proposed diagnostic algorithms for sarcopenia. In 2010, the
 European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People (EWGSOP) proposed the first
 practical clinical definition and diagnostic criteria for sarcopenia based on assessment

of muscle mass, muscle strength and physical performance.(42) This was revised in 204 2018 to EWSOP2, which used low muscle strength as the primary parameter of 205 sarcopenia.(10) To address differences in cut-off values of measurements in Asian 206 populations from Europeans, an Asian consensus was derived by the Asian Working 207 Group for Sarcopenia (AWGS) in 2014 and revised in 2019.(43, 44)

208

In our study, sarcopenia was assessed and diagnosed using criteria as per
AWGS2019(44). Sarcopenia was diagnosed in the presence of low muscle mass, with
either low muscle strength or low physical performance (PP). Those with low muscle
mass, low muscle strength, and low PP, were further subclassified as "severe
sarcopenia" for sub-group analyses.(44)

214

#### 215 Muscle mass

Appendicular skeletal muscle mass (ASM) was determined using a multifrequency bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) InBody S10 Body Composition Monitor. ASMI was calculated by dividing ASM by height squared (kg/m<sup>2</sup>). BIA measurements were conducted under standardised protocols i.e. before therapy sessions, in supine position with limbs abducted and ensuring no contact with metal frame of bed.(45) Low muscle mass was defined as appendicular skeletal muscle mass index (ASMI) <7kg/m2 in males and <5.7kg/m2 in females.

223

#### 224 Muscle strength

Muscle strength was assessed via handgrip strength (HGS) which was measured using a dynamometer (BASELINE 12-0240 standard hydraulic hand dynamometer) in seated posture, with shoulder adducted and elbow flexed to 90 degrees and forearm in neutral as recommended by American Society of Hand Therapists.(46) The maximum

- reading from at least two trials using either hand in a maximum-effort isometric
- 230 contraction was used for analysis.(44) Low muscle strength was defined as handgrip
- 231 strength (HGS) <28kg in males and <18kg in females.
- 232
- 233 Physical Performance

Low PP was defined as gait speed <1.0m/s over 6-metre walk (6mGS), or 5-time chair</li>
 stand test (5CST) requiring ≥12s, or Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB) score
 of ≤9.

237

6mGS was measured as time taken to walk 6m at a normal pace from a moving start, without deceleration, with average of two trials taken as the recorded speed (m/s)(44). Walking aids were permitted if necessary and documented if it was used. SCST was measured as the time taken to rise and sit five times as quickly as possible with no contact against the back of the chair and maximal extension of knees(47). SPPB is a 3-part performance-based test of balance, gait speed, and 5CST, with a score of 0 to 12.

245

#### 246 Statistical analyses

Categorical variables were presented as proportions and continuous variables summarized as means+/- SD or medians with interquartile ranges [IQR (25th percentile, 75th percentile)] as appropriate. Pearson chi-square test was used to compare categorical variables and logistic regression to compare continuous variables as appropriate for univariate analyses.

252 Multivariate logistics regression was done on all variables investigated to arrive at 253 adjusted odds ratio with 95% confidence interval (CI) associated with sarcopenia

- 254 outcomes. Similarly multinomial regression was done on all variables to calculate
- adjusted odds ratio associated with severe sarcopenia outcomes.
- All analyses were two-tailed and p value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.
- 257 Statistical analysis was performed using Stata Version 17 (StataCorp, College Station,
- 258 TX, USA).
- 259
- 260 Results

A total of 400 patients were recruited, of which 17 (4%) had incomplete data due to discharge or transfer to acute hospital for acute medical issues. Hence, 383 (96%) patients with complete data were analysed in this study. Figure 1 shows the process of identifying sarcopenia in our study population using AWGS2019 diagnostic algorithm.

- 266
- 267 Prevalence of sarcopenia and severe sarcopenia

268 Prevalence of sarcopenia using AWGS 2019 criteria in our study population was 54.0%

269 (n=207) with 66.4% of males being sarcopenic and 45.9% of females being sarcopenic.

270 Prevalence of severe sarcopenia in our cohort was 38.9% (n=149).

271

272 Characteristics of study population and unadjusted odds ratio

Table 1 illustrates the characteristics of our participants with corresponding
unadjusted odds ratios of sarcopenia. The median age of participants was 75 years
old (IQR: 70-81), with more females (60.3%) than male participants, and majority (93%)
were Chinese. Slightly more than half (56.1%) were currently married. Majority (91.9%)
live in public governmental housing (Housing Development Board (HDB) apartments).
About two thirds (60.4%) of our cohort have less than secondary school education and

- 279 only 20% of participants were smokers or ex-smokers. 2/3 of our participants had CCI
- 280 more than "0". 62% of participants were not known to be infected by COVID-19 prior
- to recruitment into study.
- 282

Slightly more than half (56.4%) were at moderate or high risk of malnutrition. Physical activity level was evenly distributed with half (50.9%) of the participants assessed to have low physical activity level. Approximately half of our participants (49.9%) had CMMSE 23 or less. Slightly over half (57.4%) of participants had BMI of 23kg/m<sup>2</sup> or more, while approximately 2/3 had an elevated waist circumference and waist-hip ratio.

289

Half (54.1%) of the participants had an MBI score of 0-60 on admission, indicating
severe to total dependency in activities of daily living. Participants were mostly
admitted for rehabilitation (RDG) due to musculoskeletal conditions (48.8%), followed

- by deconditioning (18.5%), others (14.4%), hip fracture (11.5%), and stroke (5.1%).
- 294

295 Table 1: Characteristics of study population and factors associated with sarcopenia on univariate analysis

Characteristic	Total	Non-Sarcopenic	Sarcopenia (n - 208)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)
	(n= 384)	(n = 176)	-208)	
Age in years, median (IQR)	75 (70, 81)	74 (69, 78)	77 (72, 82)	1.09 (1.06-1.13)
Sex, n (%)				
Male	152 (39.6)	51 (29.0)	101 (48.8)	2.34 (1.53-3.57)
Female	231 (60.3)	125 (71.0)	106 (51.2)	1
Race, n (%)				
Chinese	356 (93)	160 (90.9)	196 (94.7)	1
Malay	16 (4.2)	11 (6.25)	5 (2.4)	0.37 (0.13-1.09)

Indian	8 (2.1)	4 (2.27)	4 (1.9)	0.82 (0.20-3.32)
Others (2 Eurasians, 1 Sikh)	3 (0.8)	1 (0.6)	2 (1.0)	1.63 (0.15-18.17)
Current Marital Status, n (%)				
Single / Widowed / Divorced / Separated	168 (43.9)	67 (38.1)	101 (48.8)	1.55 (1.03-2.33)
Currently married	215 (56.1)	109 (61.9)	106 (51.2)	1
Living Setup, n (%)				
Alone	85 (22.2)	33 (18.8)	52 (25.1)	1.45 (0.89-2.38)
With someone	298 (77.8)	143 (81.3)	155 (74.9)	1
Housing Type, n (%)				
HDB (public housing)	352 (91.9)	163 (92.6)	189 (91.3)	0.89 (0.42-1.88)
Condominium/Landed (private housing)	30 (7.8)	13 (7.4)	17 (8.2)	1
Others (overseas property)	1 (0.3)	0 (0)	1 (0.5)	-
Highest Educational Qualification, n (%)*				
Below GCE "N" or "O" levels	230 (60.4)	100 (56.8)	130 (63.4)	1.32 (0.87-1.99)
GCE "N" or "O" level and above	151 (39.6)	76 (43.2)	75 (36.6)	1
Smoking history, n (%)				
Never smoker	308 (80.4)	148 (84.1)	160 (77.3)	1
Ex or Current smoker	75 (19.6)	28 (15.9)	47 (22.7)	1.55 (0.92-2.61)
Charlson Comorbidity Index, n (%)				
0	130 (33.9)	72 (40.9)	58 (28.0)	1
1 and 2	173 (45.2)	74 (42.1)	99 (47.8)	1.66 (1.05-2.63)
3 and more	80 (20.9)	30 (17.1)	50 (24.2)	2.07 (1.17-3.66)
Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study, n (%)				
No	237 (61.9)	113 (64.2)	124 (59.9)	1
Yes	146 (38.1)	63 (35.8)	83 (40.1)	1.20 (0.79-1.82)
Malnutrition Risk n (%)*				

No risk	170 (44.6)	112 (64.0)	58 (28.2)	1
Moderate risk	124 (32.6)	40 (22.9)	84 (40.8)	4.06 (2.48-6.63)
Severe risk	87 (22.8)	23 (13.1)	64 (31.1)	5.37 (3.03-9.52)
Physical Activity, n (%)				
Low	195 (50.9)	78 (44.3)	117 (56.5)	1.63 (1.09-2.45)
Moderate to high	188 (49.1)	98 (55.7)	90 (43.5)	1
Sedentary Time in minutes/day, median (interquartile range 25 <sup>th</sup> centile, 75 <sup>th</sup> centile)	800 (690-895)	800 (685-890)	810 (710-900)	1.00 (0.9997-1.0022)
Cognition, n (%)				
CMMSE Score 22 and loss	101 (40 0)	72 (11 5)	118 (57 0)	1 97 (1 25 2 91)
	191 (49.9)	75 (41.5)	118 (57.0)	1.07 (1.25-2.01)
CMMSE Score 24 and more	192 (50.1)	103 (58.5)	89 (43.0)	1
BMI <sup>a</sup> , kg/m <sup>2</sup> (%)				
Less than 18.5	56 (14.6)	3 (1.7)	53 (25.6)	4.31 (1.23-15.17)
18.5-22.9	107 (27.9)	21 (11.9)	86 (41.6)	1
23-27.4	133 (34.7)	74 (42.1)	59 (28.5)	0.19 (0.11-0.35)
27.5 and above	87 (22.7)	78 (44.3)	9 (4.4)	0.03 (0.01-0.07)
Waist Circumference <sup>b</sup> , cm (%)				
Males ≤90;	128 (33.4)	20 (11.4)	108 (51.2)	8.51 (4.96-14.59)
Females ≤80				
Males >90;	255 (66.6)	156 (88.6)	99 (47.8)	1
Females >80				
Hip Circumference in cm, mean (SD)	94.2 (8.9)	99.6 (7.9)	89.6 (6.9)	0.83 (0.79-0.86)
Waist-Hip Ratio (WHR) <sup>c</sup> , n (%)				
Males 1.0 and below	119 (31.1)	35 (19.9)	84 (40.6)	2.75 (1.73-4.37)
Females 0.85 and below				
Males more than 1.0	264 (68.9)	141 (80.1)	123 (59.4)	1
Females more than 0.85				
MBI score on admission, n (%)				

MBI 0-60	207 (54.1)	80 (45.5)	127 (61.4)	1.91 (1.27-2.86)
(severe to total dependency)				
MBI 61-100 (moderate dependency to functional independence)	176 (46.0)	96 (54.6)	80 (38.7)	1
Admission RDG, n (%)				
Deconditioning	71 (18.5)	16 (9.1)	55 (26.6)	5.25 (2.80-9.85)
Others (e.g. IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)	55 (14.4)	16 (9.1)	39 (18.8)	3.72 (1.94-7.14)
Stroke	26 (6.8)	9 (5.1)	17 (8.2)	2.88 (1.22-6.81)
Hip fracture	44 (11.5)	22 (12.5)	22 (10.6)	1.53 (0.79-2.95)
Musculoskeletal conditions	187 (48.8)	113 (64.2)	74 (35.8)	1

296 <sup>a</sup> Cut-offs as per WHO BMI risk categories for cardiovascular disease and diabetes in Asian populations

297 <sup>b</sup> Cut-offs as per IDF

298 <sup>c</sup> Cut-offs as per WHO

299 \* p-value required for significance after Bonferroni correction is 0.0083

300 \*missing data n=2

301

#### 302 Factors associated with sarcopenia

- 303 Older age [OR 1.06 (1.01-1.12)], male sex [OR 2.80 (1.12-7.02)] and low physical
- 304 activity [OR 2.13 (1.17-3.89)] were associated with sarcopenia. Higher BMI more than
- 305 or equal to 27.5 [OR 0.16 (0.05-0.52)] and greater hip circumference [OR 0.86 (0.81-
- 306 0.92)] are inversely associated with sarcopenia (Table 2).

307 Table 2: Multivariable analysis on variables associated with sarcopenia

Characteristic	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Age, years	1.06 (1.01-1.12)
Sex	
Male	2.80 (1.12-7.02)*
Female	1
BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	
<18.5	2.34 (0.56-9.67)
18.5-22.9	1
23-27.4	0.53 (0.24-1.16)
27.5 and above	0.16 (0.05-0.52)***
HC, cm	0.86 (0.81-0.92)***
Physical Activity level	
Low	2.13 (1.17-3.89)*
Moderate to High	1

309

- 310 Factors associated with severe sarcopenia
- 311 Among the variables investigated, severe sarcopenia in our setting is associated with
- age [OR 1.10 (1.03-1.16)], males [OR 4.35 (1.5-12.64)], low physical activity [OR 2.78
- 313 (1.34-5.79)], and cognitive impairment with MMSE 23 or less [OR 2.26 (1.01-5.02)].
- Higher BMI more than or equal to 27.5 [OR 0.20 (0.05-0.75)] and greater hip
- 315 circumference [OR 0.84 (0.78-0.91)] are inversely associated with sarcopenia (Table
- 316 3).
- 317 Table 3 Multinomial regression on association factors with sarcopenia and severe sarcopenia

Variables	Sarcopenia		
	Adjusted OR (95% C.I.)	p-value	
Age	0.99 (0.93-1.06)	0.829	
Sex			
Male	1.57 (0.45-5.43)	0.476	
Female	Reference		
Race			
Chinese	-		
Malay	-		
Indian	Reference		
Others (2 Eurasians, 1 Sikh)	-		
Current Marital Status			
Single/Widowed/Divorced/Separated	1.46 (0.60-3.56)	0.405	
Married	Reference		
Living Setup			
Alone	-		
With Tenant / Friend	Reference		
With Family / Caregiver	-		
Highest Educational Qualification*			
Below GCE "N" or "O" levels	1.81 (0.76-4.33)	0.182	
GCE "N" or "O" level and above	Reference		
Smoking history			
Never smoker	Reference		
Ex or Current smoker	1.09 (0.38-3.12)	0.877	
BMI			
Less than 18.5	2.37 (0.42-13.34)	0.329	
18.5-22.9	Reference		
23-27.4	0.52 (0.20-1.41) 0.2		
27.5 and above	0.08 (0.01-0.50)	0.007	
Waist Circumference <sup>a</sup> , cm			

females 280         Reference           Hip Circumference in cm         0.86 (0.78-0.94)         0.001           Walet-Hip Ratio (WHR) <sup>IP</sup> 1.69 (0.45-6.31)         0.432           Females 308 ableow         Interference         Interference           Males more than 1.0         Reference         Interference           Females 308 ableow         Interference         Interference           Males more than 0.85         Physical Activity         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference         Interference           Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Males more than 0.85         Reference         Interference           Moderate to high         Reference         Interference           Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Secore 734 and more         0.50 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Secore 24 and more         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         0.603         MMSE           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever Infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         64	Males ≤90;	0.39 (0.11-1.37)	0.142
Males >90;         Reference           Females >80         0.001           Hip Circumference in cm         0.36 (0.78-0.94)         0.001           Waltst Hip Ratio (WHRP)*	Females ≤80		
females >80         0.86 (0.78-0.94)         0.001           Waist-Hip Ratio (WHR) <sup>h</sup>	Males >90;	Reference	
Hip Circumference in cm         0.86 (0.78-0.94)         0.001           Waist-Lip Ratio (WHRP <sup>b</sup> )         0.432           Males 10 and below         1.69 (0.45-6.31)         0.432           Females 0.85 and below         0.85         0.85           Hysical Activity-         0.001 (0.45-6.31)         0.432           Ermales 0.85 and below         0.86 (0.78-0.34)         0.263           Moderate to high         0.86 (0.77-1.3-48)         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference         0.360           Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malhoutition Risk         Reference         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         0.579         0.579           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference         0           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         0.931 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.935 (0.30-3.00)         0.928         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference         Yes           No         Reference         7         7         7	Females >80		
Waist-Hip Ratio (WHR) <sup>b</sup> 1.69 (0.45-6.31)         0.432           Females 0.85 and below         Males more than 1.0         Reference           Females more than 0.85         1.57 (0.71-3.48)         0.263           Physical Activity*         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Moderate to high         Reference         Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malutrition Risk         Reference         No risk         Reference           Moderate risk         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.57 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         Score 24 and more         Reference           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         Score 24 and more         0.579           Score 24 and more         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642         3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever Infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference         Yes         0.041           No         Reference         Visit (0.41-1.94)         0.778         RDG group4         0.041           No         Reference         Yes         0.83 (0.41-1.94)         0.778         RDG group4         0.041         Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)	Hip Circumference in cm	0.86 (0.78-0.94)	0.001
Males 1.0 and below         1.69 (0.45-6.31)         0.432           Females 0.85 and below         Reference         Emales more than 0.85           Physical Activity*         0.263           Low         1.57 (0.71.3.48)         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference         155           Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malnutrition Risk         Reference         100 (1.00-1.00)         0.603           Malnutrition Risk         Reference         105 (0.44.2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference         128 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference           No         Reference         136         0.431           Score 24 and more         0.89 (0.41.1.94)         0.778           RDG group <sup>4</sup> Others (W antibiolics, wound car	Waist-Hip Ratio (WHR) <sup>b</sup>		
Females 0.85 and below         Reference           Physical Activity:	Males 1.0 and below	1.69 (0.45-6.31)	0.432
Males more than 0.0         Reference           Females more than 0.85         Physical Activity*           Low         1.57 (0.71-3.48)         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference         Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malnutrition Risk         No risk         Reference         Moderate to high         Sever risk         0.57 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         Score 23 and less         0.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579         Score 24 and more         Reference           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         Reference         1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928         Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No           No         Reference         1         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928         Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No           No         Reference         1         1         778         EDG group?         0.41         3           Ubers (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041         3         3         0.095         1         1         1<	Females 0.85 and below		
Females more than 0.85           Physical Activity's           Low         1.57 (0.71-3.48)         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malnutrition Risk         Reference         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malnutrition Risk         Reference         0.91         0.575 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603         0.579         0.500 (0.272)         0.603           MMSE         0.500 (2.6-2.20)         0.603         0.579         0.500 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         0.550 (2.6-2.20)         0.603         0.579         0.500 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         0.500 (2.6-2.20)         0.603         0.579         0.500 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         0.550 (2.6-2.20)         0.603         0.579         0.500 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579         0.579         0.500 (0.26-2.00)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference         0         0.642         3 and more         0.958         0.542           1 and 2         0.600 (0.20-5.0)         0.959 (0.30-3.00)         0	Males more than 1.0	Reference	
Physical Activity?         1.57 (0.71-3.48)         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference           Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malnutrition Risk         Reference            No risk         Reference            Moderate risk         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference              Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928            Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study              No         Reference              Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778            BDG group <sup>4</sup> Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778            BDG group <sup>4</sup> Others (IV antibiotics,	Females more than 0.85		
Low         1.57 (D.71-3.48)         0.263           Moderate to high         Reference	Physical Activity <sup>c</sup>		0.000
Note at a Dingit         Reference           Sedentary Time in minutes/day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.136           Malnutrition Risk         Reference         Moderate risk         0.51 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603         MMSE           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference         Charlson Comorbidity Index           0         Reference         1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928         Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference           Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778         RDG group <sup>4</sup> 0.041           Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)         0.095           Hip fracture         Reference         Musculoskeletal conditions         2.57 (0.71-9.28)         0.149           Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959         MBI score on admission         0.959           MBI 61-100         Reference         1.47 (0.67-	LOW	1.57 (U.71-3.48)	0.263
Secentary rime in minutesy day         1.00 (1.00-1.00)         0.138           Malnutrition Risk         Reference         0.91           Severe risk         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         0.579         0.579           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference         0           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference         1           No         Reference         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778           RDG group <sup>4</sup> Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)         0.095         1           Hip fracture         Reference         Musculoskeletal conditions         2.57 (0.71-9.28)         0.149           Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959         MBI score on admission         0.959           MBI 61-100         Reference         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342			0.126
Mainutrition Risk         Reference           Moderate risk         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE		1.00 (1.00-1.00)	0.136
No risk         Reference           Moderate risk         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE	Malnutrition Risk		
Moderate risk         1.05 (0.44-2.53)         0.91           Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.0)         0.603           MMSE	No risk	Reference	
Severe risk         0.75 (0.26-2.20)         0.603           MMSE         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference         1           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         Reference           1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference           Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778           RDG group <sup>d</sup> 0         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)         0.095           Hip fracture         Reference         Musculoskeletal conditions         2.57 (0.71-9.28)         0.149           Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959         MBI score on admission         MBI 0-60         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342           MBI 6-100         Reference         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342         MBI 0-60         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342	Moderate risk	1.05 (0.44-2.53)	0.91
MMSE         Score 23 and less       1.28 (0.54-3.04)       0.579         Score 24 and more       Reference         Charlson Comorbidity Index       0       Reference         1 and 2       0.81 (0.34-1.96)       0.642         3 and more       0.95 (0.30-3.00)       0.928         Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study       No       Reference         Yes       0.89 (0.41-1.94)       0.778         RDG group <sup>d</sup> 0       0.95 (1.07-22.03)       0.041         Stroke       4.39 (0.77-23.83)       0.095         Hip fracture       Reference       1.04 (0.20-5.42)       0.959         MBI score on admission       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 61-100       Reference       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342	Severe risk	0.75 (0.26-2.20)	0.603
Score 23 and less         1.28 (0.54-3.04)         0.579           Score 24 and more         Reference           Charlson Comorbidity Index         0         Reference           1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         No         Reference           Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778           RDG group <sup>4</sup> Uhers (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)         0.095         Hip fracture           Musculoskeletal conditions         2.57 (0.71-9.28)         0.149           Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959           MBI 6-60         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342           MBI 61-100         Reference         1.47 (0.67-3.22)	MMSE		
Score 24 and moreReferenceCharlson Comorbidity Index00Reference1 and 20.81 (0.34-1.96)0.6423 and more0.95 (0.30-3.00)0.928Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into studyNoNoReferenceYes0.89 (0.41-1.94)0.778RDG group <sup>4</sup> 0Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)4.84 (1.07-22.03)0.041Stroke4.39 (0.77-23.83)0.095Hip fractureReferenceMusculoskeletal conditions2.57 (0.71-9.28)0.149Deconditioning1.04 (0.20-5.42)0.959MBI 6-601.47 (0.67-3.22)0.342MBI 61-100Reference1.47 (0.67-3.22)	Score 23 and less	1.28 (0.54-3.04)	0.579
Charlson Comorbidity Index         Reference           1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study         0         Reference           Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778           RDG group <sup>d</sup> 0         0.958           Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)         0.095           Hip fracture         Reference         0.149           Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959           MBI score on admission         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342           MBI 0-60         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342	Score 24 and more	Reference	
0         Reference           1 and 2         0.81 (0.34-1.96)         0.642           3 and more         0.95 (0.30-3.00)         0.928           Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study             No         Reference            Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778           RDG groupd         0.484 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)         4.84 (1.07-22.03)         0.041           Stroke         4.39 (0.77-23.83)         0.095           Hip fracture         Reference            Musculoskeletal conditions         2.57 (0.71-9.28)         0.149           Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959           MBI 6-60         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342           MBI 61-100         Reference	Charlson Comorbidity Index		
1 and 2       0.81 (0.34-1.96)       0.642         3 and more       0.95 (0.30-3.00)       0.928         Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study       Reference       1         No       Reference       0.89 (0.41-1.94)       0.778         RDG group <sup>d</sup> 0.89 (0.41-1.94)       0.778         Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)       4.84 (1.07-22.03)       0.041         Stroke       4.39 (0.77-23.83)       0.095         Hip fracture       Reference       1.04 (0.20-5.42)       0.959         MBI score on admission       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 0-60       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342	0	Reference	
3 and more0.95 (0.30-3.00)0.928Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into studyReferenceNoReferenceYes0.89 (0.41-1.94)0.778RDG groupd0.484 (1.07-22.03)0.041Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)4.84 (1.07-23.83)0.095Hip fractureReferenceMusculoskeletal conditions2.57 (0.71-9.28)0.149Deconditioning1.04 (0.20-5.42)0.959MBI score on admission1.47 (0.67-3.22)0.342MBI 0-601.47 (0.67-3.22)0.342MBI 61-100Reference	1 and 2	0.81 (0.34-1.96)	0.642
Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into studyNoReferenceYes0.89 (0.41-1.94)0.778RDG groupd0thers (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)4.84 (1.07-22.03)0.041Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)4.84 (1.07-23.83)0.095Hip fractureReferenceMusculoskeletal conditions2.57 (0.71-9.28)0.149Deconditioning1.04 (0.20-5.42)0.959MBI score on admission1.47 (0.67-3.22)0.342MBI 61-100Reference	3 and more	0.95 (0.30-3.00)	0.928
No         Reference           Yes         0.89 (0.41-1.94)         0.778           RDG group <sup>d</sup>	Ever infected by COVID-19 before recruitment into study		
Yes       0.89 (0.41-1.94)       0.778         RDG group <sup>d</sup>	No	Reference	
RDG groupd       0.041         Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)       4.84 (1.07-22.03)       0.041         Stroke       4.39 (0.77-23.83)       0.095         Hip fracture       Reference         Musculoskeletal conditions       2.57 (0.71-9.28)       0.149         Deconditioning       1.04 (0.20-5.42)       0.959         MBI score on admission       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 61-100       Reference	Yes	0.89 (0.41-1.94)	0.778
Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)       4.84 (1.07-22.03)       0.041         Stroke       4.39 (0.77-23.83)       0.095         Hip fracture       Reference         Musculoskeletal conditions       2.57 (0.71-9.28)       0.149         Deconditioning       1.04 (0.20-5.42)       0.959         MBI score on admission       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 61-100       Reference       0.342	RDG group <sup>d</sup>		
Stroke       4.39 (0.77-23.83)       0.095         Hip fracture       Reference         Musculoskeletal conditions       2.57 (0.71-9.28)       0.149         Deconditioning       1.04 (0.20-5.42)       0.959         MBI score on admission       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 61-100       Reference       0.149	Others (IV antibiotics, wound care, malignancy)	4.84 (1.07-22.03)	0.041
Hip fractureReferenceMusculoskeletal conditions2.57 (0.71-9.28)0.149Deconditioning1.04 (0.20-5.42)0.959MBI score on admission1.47 (0.67-3.22)0.342MBI 0-601.47 (0.67-3.22)0.342MBI 61-100Reference	Stroke	4.39 (0.77-23.83)	0.095
Musculoskeletal conditions       2.57 (0.71-9.28)       0.149         Deconditioning       1.04 (0.20-5.42)       0.959         MBI score on admission       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 61-100       Reference       1.47	Hip fracture	Reference	
Deconditioning         1.04 (0.20-5.42)         0.959           MBI score on admission	Musculoskeletal conditions	2.57 (0.71-9.28)	0.149
MBI score on admission           MBI 0-60         1.47 (0.67-3.22)         0.342           MBI 61-100         Reference	Deconditioning	1.04 (0.20-5.42)	0.959
MBI 0-60       1.47 (0.67-3.22)       0.342         MBI 61-100       Reference	MBI score on admission		
MBI 61-100 Reference	MBI 0-60	1.47 (0.67-3.22)	0.342
	MDL 61 100		

318

319 <sup>a</sup>cut-offs for waist circumference as per HPB Asia Pacific Consensus and International Diabetes Federation

320 <sup>b</sup>cut-offs for WHC as per WHO classification of abdominal fatness

- 321 cas assessed using WHO GPAQ
- dRehab Diagnostic Groups
- 323 \*missing data n=2
- 324

# 325 Discussion

326 We found a high prevalence of sarcopenia in an inpatient post-acute rehabilitation 327 setting in Singapore. In addition, what is worrisome is that severe sarcopenia is highly 328 prevalent with 1 in 3 inpatients having severe sarcopenia. Our sarcopenia prevalence 329 is in keeping with worldwide literature where such post-acute units have the highest 330 prevalence of sarcopenia followed by nursing home residents, then hospitalized older 331 adults and lowest in community dwelling older adults.(48) This confirms the burden 332 of disease in units performing rehabilitation and suggests that patients should be 333 intervened earlier upstream even before they are being referred or admitted to such 334 settings. There is also a certain urgency to identify this group of patients for further 335 study and conduct interventions with the aim to reverse the sarcopenia.

336

337 Like many studies, we found that ageing is associated with sarcopenia. (21-23, 49) This 338 is in keeping with the observation where older adults lose muscle mass with increasing 339 age with intramuscular and intermuscular fat infiltration.(50-53) Many underlying 340 hypotheses for this had been proposed including role of chronic inflammation, 341 intracellular biochemical pathways, concurrent metabolic chronic diseases more 342 prevalent in older adults leading to the onset of sarcopenia.(54, 55) However, 343 interesting developments looking at birth weights and later onset sarcopenia seem to 344 hint at other factors that go beyond ageing as contributory factors for sarcopenia, 345 setting the stage for a comprehensive review at reversing sarcopenia at all levels. (56, 346 57)

> 347 Most global literature found a significant association between males and sarcopenia 348 like our study although there are some studies showed an association between 349 females and sarcopenia instead.(18, 19, 21, 22) Nonetheless, this highlights likely 350 unique gender differences in developments of sarcopenia.(21, 58) It has been 351 postulated that myostatin causing catabolism in males and reduced IGF-1 leading to 352 anabolic decline in females have a role in the sex differences in sarcopenia 353 development.(59, 60) Other clinical parameters such as men losing muscle strength 354 and testosterone faster than women also support the association of men being at 355 higher odds of sarcopenia than women. (61-65) Future trials are needed to formulate 356 sex specific interventions tailored to reverse sarcopenia so as to conclusively 357 determine the causal effects of these associations.

358

Consistent with literature, low physical activity has an inverse association with muscle mass and higher odds of sarcopenia.(66-68) What remains debatable is designing an evidence-based exercise regime to reverse sarcopenia. The differential role of aerobic, resistance training and a combination of the types of physical activity may play different roles in preventing or reversing sarcopenia.(69) Incorporating the right mix for the best effect is currently a knowledge gap worth studying in the future.

365

Higher hip circumference being a surrogate measure of gluteal musculature is understandably inversely associated with sarcopenia.(19, 70-72) In addition, our study finds that a higher BMI is also protective of sarcopenia similar to other studies.(18, 73-75)

There may be a few explanations for the above. Firstly, a higher BMI may translate to
increased load-bearing requirements during daily activities increasing muscle
mass.(76) Secondly, a higher BMI may be due to better nutritional intake with a study

#### Page **20** of **30**

373 showing associations between BMI and total protein intake.(77) Thirdly, BMI is likely 374 an inadequate surrogate measure of adiposity in older adults.(78, 79) In fact, 375 sarcopenic obesity (SO) prevalence defined with BMI underestimates those defined 376 by body fat percentages in the same cohort in a study.(74) Interestingly, a higher BMI 377 range, confers a paradoxical survival benefit in older adults. (80, 81) A study comparing 378 all-cause mortality within the same cohort between groups with BMI v.s. body fat 379 percentage measurements showed no increased mortality risk in apparently obese 380 category of BMI while those defined obese with body fat percentage measurements 381 did.(82)

Perhaps it is time to reconsider the utility of previously accepted BMI range predefined in Asians older adults. Despite the limitations of BMI as a surrogate measure of body fat composition, it is undeniably an easily obtainable measure in a busy setting with limited resources. However, there is a research gap in defining what is a normal BMI range correlating to sarcopenic outcomes in long term prospective prognosis studies.

388

It may also be timely to standardise the definition of sarcopenic obesity using body fat percentages norms in future Delphi consensus studies among content experts. However more studies need to be done to correctly classify obesity using body fat percentage adjusted for sex, age and race. Aligning sarcopenic obesity diagnostic criteria will stimulate further research in this area and allow for confident synthesis of data outcomes across different studies. This will pave the way for interventional trials.

In our study, cognitively impaired participants have a higher odd of severe sarcopeniaalthough not to sarcopenia while global literature found an association between

398 cognitive impairment and sarcopenia.(83) We believe the loss of association of

cognitive impairment with sarcopenia could be due to type 2 error.

400 Our study did not find an association between categories of nutritional risks and 401 sarcopenia on multivariate analysis although there was a statistically significant 402 association on univariate analysis. Again, this could be due to type 2 error. An 403 alternative explanation is because of the inherent differential property of a screening 404 tool and a full diagnostic assessment of nutritional state. For example, a study showed 405 GLIM assessment of nutrition predicted sarcopenia among malnourished participants 406 while a screening tool failed to do so.(84)

407

408 To our knowledge, this is the first inpatient study in Singapore to report sarcopenia 409 prevalence using AWGS diagnostic criteria. Our study affirms some of the common 410 associations associated with sarcopenia in line with global literature. This 411 foundational evidence will provide the possibility of developing technology or artificial 412 intelligence driven case finding for sarcopenia in an inpatient setting via a risk 413 calculator. This is especially important as clinicians face challenges with equipment 414 and manpower investiture with current diagnostic criteria of sarcopenia. Our study 415 will also provide the basis for future intervention targeted at risk factors in our 416 population to modify sarcopenic outcomes.

Some other strengths of our study include a reasonably large number of recruitments
with low dropouts and missing data, as well as the consecutive sampling methodology
for all patients admitted to OCH to achieve a more representative sample of the
population.

421

422 Limitations

This study has several limitations. Our single site study participants may not be reflective of inpatients in other post-acute settings in other countries. Our findings cannot be generalized to those with participants characteristics that were excluded as per study protocol. Additionally, causal relationship of the associated factors cannot be established as it is a cross-sectional study.

Our study estimated appendicular lean mass using the InBody S10 BIA which was not validated locally. However, the use of a multifrequency BIA is an accepted method of measurement by AWGS2019 with gender-specific cut-offs. The team utilised the InBody S10 for its ability to perform measurements in a supine position, enabling assessment among participants with functional limitations. Additionally, utilisation of a BIA machine will allow for comparative data in future interventional studies spanning across inpatient to the community, where access to DXA may be difficult.

The Jamar hydraulic hand dynamometer is the recommended brand for assessing handgrip strength, however this study utilised the Baseline hydraulic hand dynamometer instead for logistical reasons as multiple sets were readily available and routinely used by the rehabilitation department therapists, who were the assessors of handgrip for this study. The Baseline dynamometer has been validated against the Jamar dynamometer to measure equivalently and hence can be used interchangeably(85).

442

# 443 Conclusions

Our study found a high level of sarcopenia among inpatient older adults. We also found that participants with increased age, male gender, and a lower physical activity level were more likely to be sarcopenic, while those who had a higher hip circumference and higher BMI of 27.5 and above were less likely to be sarcopenic. In

addition, cognitively impaired participants were more likely to be severely sarcopenic.
There is an urgent need to address the burgeoning burden with sarcopenia and
identify patients at higher risk of sarcopenia in post-acute settings in Singapore for
early intervention.

452

453 Acknowledgements: Nil

454 Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

455

456 Author's contributions: Charmaine Tan was the study's principal investigator. J Aw

457 and Charmaine Tan were responsible for the conception of the study. J Aw, SSYS,

458 Doris L., Ganeshan K and LL Low were the co-investigators. J Aw and Charmaine Tan

459 were responsible for the study design. Charmaine Tan and SSYS were responsible

460 mainly in the coordination of the training of the interviewers. J Aw, Charmaine Tan,

461 XL Low, HY Quek and Andrea Ong took consent from the participants. XL Low, HY

462 Quek and Andrea Ong were responsible for double checking data collected. Doris L.,

463 SV Koh and Ganeshan K. were responsible for the measurement of participants for

sarcopenia. J Aw, Charmaine Tan, SSYS and Olivia Xia cleaned the data and double

465 checked the data output to ensure validity of the data. J Aw and Charmaine Tan

466 provided the initial draft of the manuscript. J Aw, Charmaine Tan, LL Low, SSYS and

467 Olivia Xia played a role in the interpretation of the data and revision of manuscript

468 critically for important intellectual content and agreed to the final submission.

469

464

470 Financial disclosure:

- 471 This study was funded by the 2021 SingHealth Regional Health System (RHS),
- 472 Population-based, Unified, Learning System for Enhanced and Sustainable Health
- 473 (PULSES) Grant ID: CGOCt21S06. Funds were used to recruit interns for coordinating
- administrative duties of the study on a day to day basis with oversight from the P.I.
- and Co-Is. Part of the fund was used to purchase the BIA InBody S10 and also a
- 476 laptop that is encrypted to perform data analysis together with acquisition of Stata
- 477 software licence.
- 478

## 479 **References**

480 Ageing and Health: World Health Organization; 2021 [14th Oct 2021]. 1. 481 Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-482 health. 2. 483 Elderly, Youth and Gender Profile: Department of Statistics, Singapore; 2021 484 [Available from: https://www.singstat.gov.sg/find-data/search-by-485 theme/population/elderly-youth-and-gender-profile/latest-data. Cao X, Hou Y, Zhang X, Xu C, Jia P, Sun X, et al. A comparative, correlate 486 3. 487 analysis and projection of global and regional life expectancy, healthy life 488 expectancy, and their GAP: 1995-2025. J Glob Health. 2020;10(2):020407. 489 4. Decade of Healthy Ageing: Plan of Action. World Health Organization; 2020. 490 p. 1-26. 491 5. Lauretani F, Russo CR, Bandinelli S, Bartali B, Cavazzini C, Di Iorio A, et al. 492 Age-associated changes in skeletal muscles and their effect on mobility: an 493 operational diagnosis of sarcopenia. J Appl Physiol (1985). 2003;95(5):1851-60. 494 Mitchell WK, Williams J, Atherton P, Larvin M, Lund J, Narici M. Sarcopenia, 6. 495 dynapenia, and the impact of advancing age on human skeletal muscle size and 496 strength; a quantitative review. Front Physiol. 2012;3:260. 497 Buch A, Carmeli E, Boker LK, Marcus Y, Shefer G, Kis O, et al. Muscle function 7. 498 and fat content in relation to sarcopenia, obesity and frailty of old age--An overview. 499 Exp Gerontol. 2016;76:25-32. 500 Aw J, Lee ES, Chiang G, Tan BY. A study on prevalence and associations of 8. 501 non-robustness in older adults aged 65 years and above attending a general 502 practitioner clinic in Ang Mo Kio. Singapore Med J. 2021;62(6):311-4. 503 9. Beaudart C, Zaaria M, Pasleau F, Reginster JY, Bruyère O. Health Outcomes 504 of Sarcopenia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PLoS One. 505 2017;12(1):e0169548. 506 10. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyère O, Cederholm T, et al. 507 Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing. 508 2019;48(1):16-31. 509 11. Xu J, Reijnierse EM, Pacifico J, Wan CS, Maier AB. Sarcopenia is associated 510 with 3-month and 1-year mortality in geriatric rehabilitation inpatients: RESORT. Age 511 Ageing. 2021;50(6):2147-56.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

12. 512 Janssen I, Shepard DS, Katzmarzyk PT, Roubenoff R. The healthcare costs of 513 sarcopenia in the United States. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2004;52(1):80-5. Yoshimura Y, Wakabayashi H, Bise T, Nagano F, Shimazu S, Shiraishi A, et al. 514 13. 515 Sarcopenia is associated with worse recovery of physical function and dysphagia and 516 a lower rate of home discharge in Japanese hospitalized adults undergoing 517 convalescent rehabilitation. Nutrition. 2019;61:111-8. 518 Pagotto V, Silveira EA. Methods, diagnostic criteria, cutoff points, and 14. 519 prevalence of sarcopenia among older people. ScientificWorldJournal. 2014;2014:231312. 520 521 15. Yoshimura Y, Wakabayashi H, Bise T, Tanoue M. Prevalence of sarcopenia 522 and its association with activities of daily living and dysphagia in convalescent 523 rehabilitation ward inpatients. Clin Nutr. 2018;37(6 Pt A):2022-8. 524 Sánchez-Rodríguez D, Marco E, Miralles R, Guillén-Solà A, Vázquez-Ibar O, 16. 525 Escalada F, et al. Does gait speed contribute to sarcopenia case-finding in a 526 postacute rehabilitation setting? Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2015;61(2):176-81. 527 17. Sawaya Y, Ishizaka M, Kubo A, Shiba T, Hirose T, Onoda K, et al. The Asian 528 working group for sarcopenia's new criteria updated in 2019 causing a change in 529 sarcopenia prevalence in Japanese older adults requiring long-term care/support. J 530 Phys Ther Sci. 2020;32(11):742-7. 531 18. Chang CF, Yeh YL, Chang HY, Tsai SH, Wang JY. Prevalence and Risk Factors 532 of Sarcopenia among Older Adults Aged  $\geq$ 65 Years Admitted to Daycare Centers of 533 Taiwan: Using AWGS 2019 Guidelines. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(16). 534 Fung FY, Koh YLE, Malhotra R, Ostbye T, Lee PY, Shariff Ghazali S, et al. 19. 535 Prevalence of and factors associated with sarcopenia among multi-ethnic 536 ambulatory older Asians with type 2 diabetes mellitus in a primary care setting. BMC 537 Geriatr. 2019;19(1):122. 538 Lu Y, Karagounis LG, Ng TP, Carre C, Narang V, Wong G, et al. Systemic and 20. Metabolic Signature of Sarcopenia in Community-Dwelling Older Adults. J Gerontol A 539 540 Biol Sci Med Sci. 2020;75(2):309-17. 541 Pang BWJ, Wee SL, Lau LK, Jabbar KA, Seah WT, Ng DHM, et al. Prevalence 21 542 and Associated Factors of Sarcopenia in Singaporean Adults-The Yishun Study. J Am 543 Med Dir Assoc. 2021;22(4):885.e1-.e10. 544 Chew STH, Tey SL, Yalawar M, Liu Z, Baggs G, How CH, et al. Prevalence and 22. 545 associated factors of sarcopenia in community-dwelling older adults at risk of 546 malnutrition. BMC Geriatr. 2022;22(1):997. 547 Keng BMH, Gao F, Teo LLY, Lim WS, Tan RS, Ruan W, et al. Associations 23. 548 between Skeletal Muscle and Myocardium in Aging: A Syndrome of "Cardio-549 Sarcopenia"? J Am Geriatr Soc. 2019;67(12):2568-73. 550 24. Gao Q, Hu K, Yan C, Zhao B, Mei F, Chen F, et al. Associated Factors of 551 Sarcopenia in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-552 Analysis. Nutrients. 2021;13(12). 553 25. Tan LF, Lim ZY, Choe R, Seetharaman S, Merchant R. Screening for Frailty 554 and Sarcopenia Among Older Persons in Medical Outpatient Clinics and its 555 Associations With Healthcare Burden. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2017;18(7):583-7. 556 26. Ministry of Health S. Community Hospital Care - Handbook for Patients. 557 2017. 27. 558 Bull FC, Maslin TS, Armstrong T. Global physical activity questionnaire 559 (GPAQ): nine country reliability and validity study. J Phys Act Health. 2009;6(6):790-560 804.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.06.23295117; this version posted September 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

561 28. Chu AH, Ng SH, Koh D, Müller-Riemenschneider F. Reliability and Validity of 562 the Self- and Interviewer-Administered Versions of the Global Physical Activity 563 Questionnaire (GPAQ). PLoS One. 2015;10(9):e0136944. 564 29. Win AM, Yen LW, Tan KH, Lim RB, Chia KS, Mueller-Riemenschneider F. 565 Patterns of physical activity and sedentary behavior in a representative sample of a 566 multi-ethnic South-East Asian population: a cross-sectional study. BMC Public 567 Health. 2015;15:318. 568 30. Chu AHY, Ng SHX, Koh D, Müller-Riemenschneider F. Domain-Specific Adult 569 Sedentary Behaviour Questionnaire (ASBQ) and the GPAQ Single-Item Question: A 570 Reliability and Validity Study in an Asian Population. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 571 2018;15(4). 572 31. National Health Survey 2010. Epidemiology & Disease Control Division 573 Ministry of Health, Singapore National Population Health Survey 2019. Household Interview: Epidemiology 574 32. 575 & Disease Control Division and Policy, Research & Surveillance Group 576 Ministry of Health and Health Promotion Board, Singapore. 577 33. Global Physical Activity Questionnaire (GPAQ) Analysis Guide. World Health 578 Organization. 579 34. Lim SL, Tong CY, Ang E, Lee EJ, Loke WC, Chen Y, et al. Development and 580 validation of 3-Minute Nutrition Screening (3-MinNS) tool for acute hospital patients 581 in Singapore. Asia Pac J Clin Nutr. 2009;18(3):395-403. 582 Lim SL, Ang E, Foo YL, Ng LY, Tong CY, Ferguson M, et al. Validity and 35. 583 reliability of nutrition screening administered by nurses. Nutr Clin Pract. 584 2013;28(6):730-6. 585 Sahadevan S, Lim PP, Tan NJ, Chan SP. Diagnostic performance of two 36. 586 mental status tests in the older chinese: influence of education and age on cut-off 587 values. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2000;15(3):234-41. 588 Ng TP, Niti M, Chiam PC, Kua EH. Ethnic and educational differences in 37. 589 cognitive test performance on mini-mental state examination in Asians. Am J Geriatr 590 Psychiatry. 2007;15(2):130-9. 591 38. Appropriate body-mass index for Asian populations and its implications for 592 policy and intervention strategies. Lancet. 2004;363(9403):157-63. 593 Alberti KG, Zimmet P, Shaw J. Metabolic syndrome--a new world-wide 39. 594 definition. A Consensus Statement from the International Diabetes Federation. 595 Diabet Med. 2006;23(5):469-80. 596 Organization WH. Waist circumference and waist-hip ratio: report of a WHO 40. 597 expert consultation. Geneva8-11 December 2008. 598 41. World Health Organization, Regional Office for the Western Pacific. The 599 Asia-Pacific perspective : redefining obesity and its treatment. Sydney: Health 600 Communications Australia 2000. 601 42. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, Boirie Y, Cederholm T, Landi F, et al. 602 Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis: Report of the 603 European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. Age Ageing. 604 2010;39(4):412-23. 605 43. Chen LK, Liu LK, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung TW, Bahyah KS, et al. 606 Sarcopenia in Asia: consensus report of the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia. J 607 Am Med Dir Assoc. 2014;15(2):95-101. 608 44. Chen LK, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung TW, Chou MY, Iijima K, et al. Asian 609 Working Group for Sarcopenia: 2019 Consensus Update on Sarcopenia Diagnosis and 610 Treatment. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2020;21(3):300-7.e2.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

611 45. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Manuel Gómez J, 612 et al. Bioelectrical impedance analysis-part II: utilization in clinical practice. Clin Nutr. 2004;23(6):1430-53. 613 614 46. Fess EE, Moran CA. American Society of Hand Therapists Clinical Assessment 615 Recommendations. United States of AmericaAugust 1981. 17 p. 616 47. Prosthetists AAoOa. Five Time Sit to Stand Test (FTSST). 2017. p. 617 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v= jPl-luRJ5A. 618 48. Lardiés-Sánchez B, Sanz-Paris A, Boj-Carceller D, Cruz-Jentoft AJ. Systematic 619 review: Prevalence of sarcopenia in ageing people using bioelectrical impedance 620 analysis to assess muscle mass. European Geriatric Medicine. 2016;7(3):256-61. 621 49. Yuan S, Larsson SC. Epidemiology of sarcopenia: Prevalence, risk factors, and 622 consequences. Metabolism. 2023;144:155533. 623 50. Wilkinson DJ, Piasecki M, Atherton PJ. The age-related loss of skeletal 624 muscle mass and function: Measurement and physiology of muscle fibre atrophy 625 and muscle fibre loss in humans. Ageing Res Rev. 2018;47:123-32. 626 51. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Saver AA. Sarcopenia. Lancet. 2019;393(10191):2636-46. Marcus RL, Addison O, Kidde JP, Dibble LE, Lastayo PC. Skeletal muscle fat 627 52. 628 infiltration: impact of age, inactivity, and exercise. J Nutr Health Aging. 629 2010;14(5):362-6. 630 53. Verdijk LB, Snijders T, Drost M, Delhaas T, Kadi F, van Loon LJ. Satellite cells 631 in human skeletal muscle; from birth to old age. Age (Dordr). 2014;36(2):545-7. 632 54. Dalle S, Rossmeislova L, Koppo K. The Role of Inflammation in Age-Related 633 Sarcopenia. Front Physiol. 2017;8:1045. 634 55. Biolo G, Cederholm T, Muscaritoli M. Muscle contractile and metabolic dysfunction is a common feature of sarcopenia of aging and chronic diseases: From 635 636 sarcopenic obesity to cachexia. Clinical Nutrition. 2014;33(5):737-48. 637 Sayer AA, Syddall HE, Gilbody HJ, Dennison EM, Cooper C. Does sarcopenia 56. 638 originate in early life? Findings from the Hertfordshire cohort study. J Gerontol A 639 Biol Sci Med Sci. 2004;59(9):M930-4. 640 57. Patel HP, Syddall HE, Martin HJ, Stewart CE, Cooper C, Sayer AA. 641 Hertfordshire sarcopenia study: design and methods. BMC Geriatr. 2010;10:43. Ren X, Zhang X, He Q, Du L, Chen K, Chen S, et al. Prevalence of sarcopenia in 642 58. 643 Chinese community-dwelling elderly: a systematic review. BMC Public Health. 644 2022;22(1):1702. 645 59. Tay L, Ding YY, Leung BP, Ismail NH, Yeo A, Yew S, et al. Sex-specific differences in risk factors for sarcopenia amongst community-dwelling older adults. 646 647 Age (Dordr). 2015;37(6):121. 648 Sattler FR, Castaneda-Sceppa C, Binder EF, Schroeder ET, Wang Y, Bhasin S, 60. 649 et al. Testosterone and growth hormone improve body composition and muscle 650 performance in older men. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2009;94(6):1991-2001. 651 Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, Kritchevsky SB, Nevitt M, Schwartz AV, 61. 652 et al. The Loss of Skeletal Muscle Strength, Mass, and Quality in Older Adults: The 653 Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. The Journals of Gerontology: Series A. 654 2006;61(10):1059-64. 655 62. Shimokata H, Ando F, Yuki A, Otsuka R. Age-related changes in skeletal 656 muscle mass among community-dwelling Japanese: a 12-year longitudinal study. 657 Geriatr Gerontol Int. 2014;14 Suppl 1:85-92. Gallagher D, Visser M, De Meersman RE, Sepúlveda D, Baumgartner RN, 658 63. 659 Pierson RN, et al. Appendicular skeletal muscle mass: effects of age, gender, and 660 ethnicity. J Appl Physiol (1985). 1997;83(1):229-39.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

661 64. Mouser JG, Loprinzi PD, Loenneke JP. The association between physiologic 662 testosterone levels, lean mass, and fat mass in a nationally representative sample of 663 men in the United States. Steroids. 2016;115:62-6. 664 65. LeBlanc ES, Wang PY, Lee CG, Barrett-Connor E, Cauley JA, Hoffman AR, et 665 al. Higher Testosterone Levels Are Associated with Less Loss of Lean Body Mass in 666 Older Men. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2011;96(12):3855-667 63. 66. 668 Steffl M, Bohannon RW, Sontakova L, Tufano JJ, Shiells K, Holmerova I. 669 Relationship between sarcopenia and physical activity in older people: a systematic 670 review and meta-analysis. Clin Interv Aging. 2017;12:835-45. 671 67. Hughes VA, Roubenoff R, Wood M, Frontera WR, Evans WJ, Fiatarone Singh MA. Anthropometric assessment of 10-y changes in body composition in the elderly. 672 673 Am J Clin Nutr. 2004;80(2):475-82. 674 68. Shephard RJ, Park H, Park S, Aoyagi Y. Objectively measured physical activity 675 and progressive loss of lean tissue in older Japanese adults: longitudinal data from 676 the Nakanojo study. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2013;61(11):1887-93. Yoo SZ, No MH, Heo JW, Park DH, Kang JH, Kim SH, et al. Role of exercise in 677 69. 678 age-related sarcopenia. J Exerc Rehabil. 2018;14(4):551-8. 679 70. Janghorbani M, Momeni F, Dehghani M. Hip circumference, height and risk of type 2 diabetes: systematic review and meta-analysis. Obes Rev. 680 681 2012;13(12):1172-81. 682 Jayedi A, Soltani S, Zargar MS, Khan TA, Shab-Bidar S. Central fatness and 71. 683 risk of all cause mortality: systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of 72 684 prospective cohort studies. Bmj. 2020;370:m3324. 685 Snijder MB, Dekker JM, Visser M, Bouter LM, Stehouwer CD, Kostense PJ, et 72. 686 al. Associations of hip and thigh circumferences independent of waist circumference with the incidence of type 2 diabetes: the Hoorn Study. Am J Clin Nutr. 687 688 2003;77(5):1192-7. 689 73. Curtis M, Swan L, Fox R, Warters A, O'Sullivan M. Associations between Body 690 Mass Index and Probable Sarcopenia in Community-Dwelling Older Adults. 691 Nutrients. 2023;15(6). Liu C, Cheng KY, Tong X, Cheung WH, Chow SK, Law SW, et al. The role of 692 74. 693 obesity in sarcopenia and the optimal body composition to prevent against 694 sarcopenia and obesity. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne). 2023;14:1077255. 695 Linge J, Heymsfield SB, Dahlqvist Leinhard O. On the Definition of Sarcopenia 75. 696 in the Presence of Aging and Obesity-Initial Results from UK Biobank. J Gerontol A 697 Biol Sci Med Sci. 2020;75(7):1309-16. 698 76. Abramowitz MK, Hall CB, Amodu A, Sharma D, Androga L, Hawkins M. 699 Muscle mass, BMI, and mortality among adults in the United States: A population-700 based cohort study. PLoS One. 2018;13(4):e0194697. 701 77. Moon K, Krems C, Heuer T, Hoffmann I. Association between body mass 702 index and macronutrients differs along the body mass index range of German adults: 703 results from the German National Nutrition Survey II. J Nutr Sci. 2021;10:e8. 704 78. Xu Z, Liu Y, Yan C, Yang R, Xu L, Guo Z, et al. Measurement of visceral fat and 705 abdominal obesity by single-frequency bioelectrical impedance and CT: a cross-706 sectional study. BMJ Open. 2021;11(10):e048221. 707 79. Batsis JA, Mackenzie TA, Bartels SJ, Sahakyan KR, Somers VK, Lopez-Jimenez 708 F. Diagnostic accuracy of body mass index to identify obesity in older adults: 709 NHANES 1999-2004. Int J Obes (Lond). 2016;40(5):761-7. 710 80. Winter JE, MacInnis RJ, Wattanapenpaiboon N, Nowson CA. BMI and all-711 cause mortality in older adults: a meta-analysis. Am J Clin Nutr. 2014;99(4):875-90.

712 81. Donini LM, Pinto A, Giusti AM, Lenzi A, Poggiogalle E. Obesity or BMI
713 Paradox? Beneath the Tip of the Iceberg. Front Nutr. 2020;7:53.

714 82. Padwal R, Leslie WD, Lix LM, Majumdar SR. Relationship Among Body Fat

Percentage, Body Mass Index, and All-Cause Mortality: A Cohort Study. Ann Intern
 Mod. 2016;164(8):522.41

716 Med. 2016;164(8):532-41.

717 83. Ohta T, Sasai H, Osuka Y, Kojima N, Abe T, Yamashita M, et al. Age- and sex-

718 specific associations between sarcopenia severity and poor cognitive function

among community-dwelling older adults in Japan: The IRIDE Cohort Study. Frontiersin Public Health. 2023;11.

721 84. Lengelé L, Bruyère O, Beaudart C, Reginster J-Y, Locquet M. Malnutrition,

722 assessed by the Global Leadership Initiative on Malnutrition (GLIM) criteria but not

- by the mini nutritional assessment (MNA), predicts the incidence of sarcopenia over
- a 5-year period in the SarcoPhAge cohort. Aging Clinical and Experimental Research.
  2021;33(6):1507-17.

726 85. Mathiowetz V, Vizenor L, Melander D. Comparison of Baseline Instruments

- to the Jamar Dynamometer and the B&L Engineering Pinch Gauge. The Occupational
- 728 Therapy Journal of Research. 2000;20(3):147-62.

729



Figure 1: Process of identifying sarcopenia in our study population using Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia (AWGS) 2019 criteria

(ASMI: appendicular skeletal muscle mass index; HGS: handgrip strength; PP: physical performance)

# Figure