1	Handgrip strength as a screening tool for diabetes in
2	resource-constrained settings: a potential solution to
3	overcome barriers to diagnosis
4	
5 6	Lekan Sheriff Ojulari ^{1*¶} , Swabirah Enimire Sulaiman ^{1¶} , Taofeek Olanrewaju Ayinde ^{1&} , Eniola Riskat Kadir ^{2&}
7	¹ Department of Physiology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
8	² Department of Anatomy, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
9	
10	* Corresponding author
11	Email: Ojulari.ls@unilorin.edu.ng LS
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

30 Abstract

31

32 Background Information

Diabetes mellitus is an escalating global health concern, especially in low and middle-income countries. The high cost and inaccessibility of diagnostic tools in resource-constrained settings have heightened the need for alternative screening methods. Handgrip strength (HGS), a measure of muscle strength, emerges as a potential non-invasive and affordable screening tool for diabetes, particularly in areas with limited healthcare access.

38 **Objective**

To investigate the relationship between handgrip strength and blood glucose regulation in nondiabetic young adults and to provide valuable insights into the potential of handgrip strength as a preventive and affordable approach to managing diabetes.

42 Methods

A cross-sectional study was conducted involving 59 students (aged 18-21) from the University of
Ilorin, Nigeria. Handgrip strength was measured using a dynamometer, and its relationship with
blood glucose regulatory markers, such as fasting blood glucose, 2-hour post-prandial glucose, and
HbA1c, was analyzed. Multiple regression models were utilized to examine the potential
associations.

48 **Results**

Findings revealed significant associations between HGS and glucose regulation markers, particularly FBS, among males. In females, the relationship was evident only after adjusting for body mass index (BMI). Furthermore, a notable relationship between HGS and 2-hour postprandial glucose levels was observed in females but not in males. However, no significant associations were found between HGS and serum insulin levels across genders.

54 Conclusion

Our study introduces HGS as a practical and cost-effective screening tool for blood glucose regulation disorders, aligning with existing literature and offering a personalized approach to management. In resource-constrained settings, HGS becomes significant, addressing diagnostic barriers and potentially revolutionizing diabetes management. However, limitations include a small sample size of 59 students and restrictions to specific demographics, emphasizing the need for future studies in diverse populations to validate HGS's efficacy in real-world, resourceconstrained settings.

62 **Keywords**: Handgrip strength, blood glucose regulatory markers, diabetes screening tool

- 63
- 64
- 65
- 66
- 67
- 68
- 69
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- , s 74
- 75
- / 5
- 76
- 77
- 78
- 79

80 Introduction

Diabetes mellitus has emerged as one of the most pervasive health issues worldwide, driven by its global prevalence (1). Characterized by elevated blood sugar levels resulting from genetic factors, acquired deficiency, or insulin malfunction, diabetes significantly burdens healthcare systems. The number of diagnosed individuals with diabetes has been rapidly increasing, with a rise of 314 million cases from 1980 to 2014, reaching 415 million in 2014 (2). This alarming trend is projected to continue, with an estimated 625 million adults expected to be affected by diabetes by 2045, predominantly in low and middle-income countries, including several African nations (3).

Uncontrolled diabetes impairs patients' quality of life and imposes substantial healthcare costs on 88 countries (2). Data from the National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey (NHANES) 89 reveal that the average lifetime medical costs for individuals with diabetes amount to as much as 90 \$85,200, with a significant portion dedicated to managing complications (4). Predictions highlight 91 Africa as the region with the highest projected increase in the burden of diabetes and associated 92 complications, despite contributing the least to global annual healthcare expenses for diabetes care. 93 In 2017, the International Diabetes Federation (IDF) estimated the total health expenditure due to 94 diabetes at \$3.3 billion. In Nigeria alone, the national annual direct costs of diabetes were estimated 95 to range from \$1.071 billion to \$1.639 billion (5). 96

97 Diabetes and its associated complications are responsible for more than 3 million deaths worldwide 98 each year. In the United States of America, diabetes is the seventh leading cause of death, 99 contributing to 69,091 deaths and playing a role in an additional 234,051 deaths (6). In Africa, 100 more than 298,160 deaths, accounting for 6% of all mortality, were attributed to diabetes in 2017, 101 with the highest proportion of all-cause mortality due to diabetes occurring in the age group of 30-

39. Additionally, 77.0% of all deaths attributable to diabetes occurred in individuals under 60 yearsold, marking the highest proportion worldwide (5).

Diabetes is associated with numerous life-threatening complications and adverse health outcomes
 that develop gradually. These include neuropathy, skin complications, eye complications, diabetic
 ketoacidosis, gastroparesis, and macrovascular diseases (7).

In resource-constrained settings, access to primary or preventative healthcare is hindered by 107 various barriers, such as a shortage of trained physicians and prohibitively high transportation 108 costs. As a result, individuals often receive treatment once their conditions have reached a 109 dangerously severe stage. Subsequently, many developing regions have implemented Community 110 Health Worker (CHW) programs to bridge the gap between communities and healthcare providers. 111 112 CHWs, typically volunteers, are trained to provide pre-primary healthcare and basic health information to rural communities lacking access to trained healthcare professionals. These 113 dedicated individuals serve as trusted community leaders, mentors, and educators, working 114 towards improving the health of their communities (8). 115

While CHWs have made significant strides in improving community health, their ability to effectively screen and diagnose diseases is limited by the need for more contextually appropriate tools and devices. Biomedical devices must therefore be affordable, ruggedized, and user-friendly. However, only some existing devices meet these criteria. For instance, current blood glucometers used to diagnose diabetes are expensive, requiring blood samples that pose health hazards. These devices often remain unused due to financial constraints faced by patients and healthcare professionals' inability to afford test strip upkeep (4).

An alternative screening tool that shows promise in resource-constrained settings is handgrip strength, a simple measure of muscle strength that correlates well with other strength measures, such as quadriceps strength (8). Handgrip strength has been associated with metabolic syndrome, type 2 diabetes mellitus, and overall mortality (9); (10); (11). It indicates overall strength and physical activity level, as it measures the force produced by the muscles controlling the hand using a hand dynamometer (12).

Although the underlying mechanism is not completely understood, studies have explored the role of muscle resistance exercises in glucose metabolism and reported that such activities improve muscle function and glucose deposition, favouring insulin-mediated glucose uptake in skeletal muscle (13). Considering its relevance to various diseases like diabetes, malnutrition, and functional disability, handgrip strength testing with affordable and durable hand dynamometers has gained prominence (4).

Handgrip strength emerges as a promising and easy-to-measure health indicator suitable for 135 136 screening diabetes in resource-constrained settings. Unlike expensive and hazardous diagnostic tests, handgrip strength testing avoids health risks associated with chemicals or bodily fluids. It 137 offers a preventive and cost-effective approach to managing diabetes mellitus, particularly in 138 developing countries like Nigeria, where access to healthcare is limited (4). By utilizing handgrip 139 strength as a screening tool, barriers to diagnosis, such as high costs and limited access to 140 healthcare professionals, can be overcome, facilitating early identification and intervention in 141 high-risk populations. 142

143 Therefore, this article aims to investigate the relationship between handgrip strength and blood 144 glucose regulation in non-diabetic young adults. By establishing this connection, the study intends 145 to provide valuable insights into the potential of handgrip strength as a preventive and affordable

approach to managing diabetes, ultimately reducing the economic implications of the disease,

147 particularly in resource-constrained settings.

148 Materials and methods

149 **Participants**

One hundred students from the University of Ilorin, Nigeria, were initially recruited for this study. The recruitment process started on the 29th of March to the 5th of July, 2023, and was conducted through advertisements on social platforms, and participants were selected on a "first come" basis. All samples were collected and procedures carried out on the 15th and 16th of July, 2023. Due to incomplete data, information from only fifty-nine of the recruited students were used for the final computation and analysis of results.

156 Inclusion criteria

The data collected for this study included currently enrolled students aged 18-30 years who exhibited normoglycemia with fasting blood glucose levels ranging from 70-100 mg/dL. Participants were also required to have no significant health conditions or physical impairments that could affect their grip strengths or fasting blood glucose levels.

161 Exclusion criteria

Students with missing information, a history of elevated blood glucose or a diagnosis of diabetes,
and those who were unwilling or unable to undergo handgrip strength measurements as part of the
study protocol were excluded from the analysis.

165 Ethical considerations

Self-reported questionnaires were used to assess baseline socio-demographic and lifestyle characteristics, existing medical conditions and use of medications. Ethical approval was collected from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, Ilorin Kwara state, with the reference number: UITH/CAT/189/VOL.21B /486.The research protocol was reviewed and approved by the relevant institutional review board. Informed and signed consent was obtained from all participants before their inclusion in the study."

Dependent variables

In this study, the dependent variables were glycaemic control and insulin resistance among nondiabetic students. As indicators, glycaemic control was assessed using HbA1c, fasting blood glucose, and 2-hour postprandial blood glucose. HbA1c is a marker for hyperglycaemia and provides information about blood plasma glucose levels over 2–3 months. An HbA1c above 7% and a 2-hour postprandial plasma glucose greater than 140 mg/dL were considered indicators of poor glycaemic control (14).

179 Glycaemic control

HbA1c, also known as glycated haemoglobin, is formed when haemoglobin is exposed to plasma glucose through non-enzymatic pathways. It serves as a marker for hyperglycaemia and monitors blood plasma glucose levels over a prolonged period. Several factors, such as a high-fat diet, smoking (15), and body fat (16), can influence HbA1c levels. Two-hour postprandial blood glucose, measured two hours after a meal, is an essential indicator of postprandial plasma glucose levels, which play a significant role in overall glycaemic control.

186 Insulin resistance

A fasting serum insulin above 10 µIU/mL was diagnostic of insulin resistance (17). In addition to
serum insulin, fasting venous blood samples were collected to measure plasma glucose, C-peptide,
and glycated haemoglobin levels. Plasma glucose was measured using a modified hexokinase
enzymatic method, serum insulin was measured by radioimmunoassay, and glycated haemoglobin
was measured using high-performance liquid chromatography (18).

192 Independent variables

193 Handgrip strength

Handgrip strength (HGS) was measured as an indicator of muscle strength and functional capacity
in daily activities. It was assessed using a dynamometer and is associated with various chronic
diseases (19), cognitive decline (20), length of hospital stays, and mortality. Before measuring
handgrip strength, participants were given instructions and a warm-up for their hands and fingers.
The measurements were taken while participants stood with their feet hip-width apart and arms
straight, slightly away from the body. Each hand was tested thrice, with a rest period between trials
(21).

201 Relative handgrip strength

Relative HGS was calculated by dividing absolute HGS (kg) by BMI (reported as kg/BMI). This measure was used to adjust for the relationship between mass and force, considering both muscle quality and the combined effect of fat mass and muscle mass (22).

205 Height and body weight

Height and body weight were measured using standardized procedures (23). Participants' standing
height was measured with a stadiometer, and body weight was measured using a digital scale.

Body mass index (BMI) was calculated by dividing the body weight (kilograms) by the square of
height (meters) (kg/m²).

210 Waist/hip ratio

Waist circumference and hip circumference were measured using tape. Waist circumference was measured between the narrowest point between the ribs and hips, while hip circumference was measured at the point where the buttocks extended the most (24). Two consecutive recordings were made for each site.

215 **Co-variates**

The covariates in this study included sociodemographic characteristics, lifestyle factors, and selfreported family history of diseases. Sociodemographic characteristics covered age (years, continuous), gender (male/female), country, and ethnicity. Lifestyle factors included self-reported, exercise, drinking and smoking status.

220 Statistical analysis

A cross-sectional analysis was conducted and recorded as means (standard deviations) for continuous variables and frequencies for categorical variables. Differences between groups were assessed using ANOVAs or chi-square tests for continuous or categorical variables. Multiple linear regression models were used to examine the association between glucose regulation and grip strength. IBM SPSS Statistics Version 25.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, New York, USA) was used for all statistical analyses.

227 **Results**

Overall, data of 59 subjects (male 30 = 50.8 % and female 29 = 49.2 %) were used for this study

with a mean age of 18 to 21 years. Dominant HGS ranged from 11.5 - 29.8 kg with interquartile

- range (IQR) of 18.4 25.1 kg (6.7 kg) in females and from 15.0 33.2 kg with IQR of 21.6 27.4
- 231 kg (5.8 kg) in males (Table 1).

Table 1: Sample Clinical Characteristics and biomarkers showing Mean, Quartiles, Interquartile Range
 & Standard deviation of Continuous variables and Percent (%) of Categorical variables (N = 59)

	Mean	Median	Min	Max	25%	75%	Interquartile Range (%)	Std Dev
HGS Right Hand (kg)	22.95	22.70	11.50	33.2	20.1	26.2	6.1	4.534
HGS Left Hand (kg)	21.46	21.20	13.80	31.80	18.2	24.9	6.7	4.543
Absolute HGS (kg)	46.22	45.60	28.40	67.80	41.4	52.4	11.0	8.706
Relative HGS (m ²)	2.13	2.12	0.98	3.81	1.82	2.39	0.57	0.520
BMI (Kg/m ²)	22.32	22.00	15.40	38.6	19.4	23.8	4.4	4.304
Waist/Hip Ratio	0.79	0.80	0.70	1.1	0.7	0.80	0.1	0.078
Pulse Pressure (mmHg)	49.34	49.00	30.0	68	43.0	57.0	14.0	9.278
Fasting Blood Glucose (mmol/L)	4.86	4.80	3.60	6.4	4.5	5.3	0.8	0.560
HBA1c (%)	3.73	3.42	0.51	8.58	2.87	4.59	1.72	1.396
2-hour Postprandial Glucose (mmol/L)	5.20	5.20	3.90	7.6	4.5	5.7	1.2	0.779
Serum Insulin (μIU/L)	18.86	14.09	5.88	158.55	10.58	19.59	9.01	20.522
	Ν	(%)						
Gender								
Male	30	50.8						
Female	29	49.2						
Age								
18-21	19	32.2						
22-25	38	64.4						
26-30	2	3.4						
Smokes								
Yes	0	0.0						
No	59	100.0						
Alcohol Intake								
Yes	6	10.2						
No	53	89.8						
Does Exercise								
Yes	29	49.2						
No	30	50.8						
Hand Dominance								
Right	51	86.4						
Left	8	13.6						
BMI denotes body mass index								
HBA1c denotes glycated haemo	globin							
HGS denotes Handgrip strengt	h							

234	In this study HGS < 18kg was defined as low while HGS >18kg was defined as normal, fasting
235	blood sugar between $3.9-5.9$ mmom/l and 2 HPG < 7.8 mmol/l was defined as normal range of
236	blood glucose levels. HGS values recorded from study subjects were within normal range with a
237	mean of 21.07kg and 18.70kg for dominant and non-dominant hands respectively
238	The dominant HGS in females (mean = 21.4 ± 4.53) was significantly reduced (p = 0.005) when
239	compared to males (mean = 24.6 ± 4.06). (Table 2). Non-Dominant HGS ranged from 13.8 - 25.8
240	kg with interquartile range (IQR) of $15.7 - 21.2$ kg (5.5 kg) in females and from $14.7 - 31.8$ kg
241	with IQR of 20.5 – 26.1 kg (5.6 kg) in males. The non-dominant HGS in females (mean = $18.9 \pm$
242	3.61) was significantly reduced (p = 0.001) when compared to males (mean = 24.0 ± 4.09). (Table
243	2)
244	
245	
246	
247	
248	
249	
250	
251	
252	
253	
254	

255 Table 2: Clinical (Characteristics	and	biomarkers	by	sex /
-------------------------	-----------------	-----	------------	----	-------

	Males		Females		
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	p value
HGS Right Hand (kg)	24.62	4.06	21.37	4.53	0.008
HGS Left Hand (kg)	24.01	4.09	18.97	3.61	0.000
Absolute HGS (kg)	4975	8.27	42.87	7.99	0.003
Relative HGS (m ²)	2.37	0.61	1.93	0.40	0.003
BMI (Kg/m ²)	21.59	3.47	22.85	5.13	0.357
Waist/Hip Ratio	0.82	0.06	0.77	0.09	0.020
Pulse Pressure (mmHg)	53.65	8.02	44.55	8.14	0.000
Fasting Blood Glucose (mmol/L)	4.69	0.64	5.01	0.44	0.042
HBA1c (%)	3.81	1.24	3.61	1.56	0.519
2-hour Postprandial Glucose (mmol/L)	5.15	0.75	5.22	0.83	0.818
Serum Insulin (µIU/L)	17.40	8.76	15.65	9.01	0.449
	N = 30	%	N = 29	%	
Age					
18-21	6	20.0	13	44.83	
22-25	23	77.0	15	51.72	
26-30	1	3.0	1	3.45	
Smokes					
Yes	0	0.0	0	0.00	
No	30	100.0	29	100.00	
Alcohol Intake					
Yes	1	3.3	5	17.24	
No	28	93.4	24	82.76	
Missing	1	3.3	0	0.00	
Does Sports					
Yes	19	63.3	10	34.48	
No	11	36.7	19	65.52	
Hand Dominance					
Right	27	90.0	25	86.21	
Left	3	10.0	4	13.79	

BMI denotes body mass index

HBA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

HGS denotes handgrip strength

Values of absolute handgrip strength were calculated by summation of dominant and non-dominant handgrip strength.

Values of relative handgrip strength were calculated from absolute handgrip strength divided by body mass index.

In both sexes, there was significant difference (female p = 0.03 & male p = 0.04) (Fig 1) in HGS

between both hands suggesting that hand dominance could be a relevant factor in this study. As

- such, the results of dominant and non-dominant HGS were also considered independently (Table
- 260 3).
- 261 Fig 1:

Table 3: Results of Multiple linear regression of handgrip strength (dominant and non-dominant) onblood glucose regulation biomarkers

	Male Handgrip	gth	Female Handgrip strength					
	Dominant		Non-dominant		Dominant		Non-dominant	
	Estimate	р	Estimate	р	Estimate	Р	Estimate	Р
	(SE)		(SE)		(SE)		(SE)	
Fasting Blood	0.3758	0.04	0.3941	0.07	0.3218 (0.42)	0.09	0.2330 (3.58)	0.22
Glucose	(0.59)		(0.61)					
2-hour Post Prandial	0.1117	0.55	0.1049	0.57	0.3407 (0.78)	0.07	0.3887 (3.39)	0.04
	(0.76)		(0.76)					
HBA1c	0.0184	0.92	0.1277	0.57	0.0587(1.58)	0.76	0.2090 (3.60)	0.28
	(1.26)		(1.25)					
Serum Insulin	0.2303	0.22	0.2226	0.22	0.0846 (9.14)	0.66	0.0678	0.73
	(8.82)		(8.83)				(28.48)	

264

Multiple regression analysis was employed to examine the relationships between handgrip strength and the blood glucose regulatory markers, specifically fasting blood glucose, 2 hours postprandial glucose, HBA1c and serum insulin levels. Four different models were tested to account for potential confounders: Model 1 (no adjustments), Model 2 (adjusted for WHR), Model 3 (adjusted for BMI), and Model 4 (adjusted for both WHR and BMI) (Tables 4, 5 and 6).

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277 Table 4: Results of Multiple regression of absolute handgrip strength and relative handgrip strength on

blood glucose regulation biomarkers 278

	Absolute Hand	rength		Relative Handgrip strength				
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Estimate p		Estimate	р	Estimate	Р	Estimate	Р
	(SE)	-	(SE)	-	(SE)		(SE)	
Fasting Blood	0.322 (0.62)	0.09	0.319 (0.42)	0.08	0.139 (0.64)	0.46	0.08 (0.45)	0.68
Glucose								
2-hour Post	0.067 (0.76)	0.72	0.396 (0.77)	0.03	0.287 (0.73)	0.12	0.284 (0.80)	0.14
Prandial								
HBA1c	0.088 (1.25)	0.64	0.085 (1.58)	0.66	0.335 (1.19)	0.07	0.303 (1.51)	0.11
Serum Insulin	0.232 (8.67)	0.21	0.102 (9.12)	0.59	0.227 (8.68)	0.22	0.079 (9.14)	0.68

SE denotes standard error. HbA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

279

280
Table 5: Adjusted Relationships of Handgrip Strength With blood glucose regulatory markers (males
 n=29)

281

	Fasting blood glucose		2-hour post prandial		HBA1c		Serum Insulin	
Absolute HGS	Estimate (SE)	Р	Estimate	Р	Estimate	Р	Estimate	Р
Model 1 ^a	0.3755 (0.59)	0.04	0.1133 (0.76)	0.55	0.0560 (1.26)	0.77	0.2318 (8.82)	0.22
Model 2 ^b	0.4543 (0.58)	0.04	0.2511 (0.75)	0.42	0.2165 (1.26)	0.52	0.3694 (8.58)	0.14
Model 3 ^c	0.5311 (0.56)	0.01	0.4231 (0.70)	0.07	0.3239 (1.22)	0.22	0.2435 (8.95)	0.44
Model 4 ^d	0.5465 (0.56)	0.03	0.4311 (0.71)	0.14	0.3392 (1.23)	0.36	0.3707 (8.74)	0.27
Relative HGS								
Model 1 ^a	0.0436 (0.64)	0.82	0.2223 (0.74)	0.24	0.2947 (1.21)	0.11	0.2408 (8.79)	0.20
Model 2 ^b	0.2408 (0.64)	0.45	0.2769 (0.75)	0.34	0.3248 (1.22)	0.22	0.3406 (8.68)	0.19

Note: Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).

SE denotes standard error. HBA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

- ^a Multiple Linear regression analysis
- ^b Adjusted for Waist hip ratio (WHR)
- ^c Adjusted for Body mass index (BMI)
- ^d Adjusted for WHR and BMI

282			
283			
284			
285			
286			
287			
288			
289			
290			
291			

292	Table 6. Adjusted Relationships of Handgrip Strength With blood glucose regulatory markers (females
293	n=30)

255 11.
793 n=
793 n-
/ 4 - 1 - 1
/ ~ ~ … —
/ -/ .

	Fasting blood glucose		2-hour post prandial		HBA1c		Serum Insulin	
Absolute HGS	Estimate (SE)	Р	Estimate	Р	Estimate	Р	Estimate	Р
Model 1 ^a	0.319 (0.42)	0.08	0.396 (0.77)	0.03	0.085 (1.58)	0.66	0.102 (9.12)	0.59
Model 2 ^b	0.3683 (0.42)	0.15	0.4243 (0.77)	0.08	0.1553 (1.59)	0.73	0.1671 (9.21)	0.69
Model 3 ^c	0.4641 (0.40)	0.04	0.4336 (0.77)	0.07	0.4801 (1.42)	0.03	0.1037 (9.29)	0.87
Model 4 ^d	0.4872 (0.41)	0.08	0.4541 (0.78)	0.12	0.4866 (1.44)	0.08	0.1672 (9.39)	0.87
Relative HGS								
Model 1 ^a	0.0800 (0.45)	0.68	0.2840 (0.80)	0.14	0.3030 (1.51)	0.11	0.0790 (9.14)	0.68
Model 2 ^b	0.1626 (0.45)	0.71	0.3291 (0.81)	0.23	0.3176 (1.53)	0.25	0.1567 (9.23)	0.72

Note: Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).

SE denotes standard error. HBA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

^a Multiple Linear regression analysis

^b Adjusted for Waist hip ratio (WHR)

^c Adjusted for Body mass index (BMI)

^d Adjusted for WHR and BMI

294

295

Findings in males and females 296

While still maintaining normal ranges in the blood regulatory markers (FBS, 2-hour Postprandial 297

298 and HBA1c) serum insulin levels were slightly elevated in both sexes (male 17.40±8.76 female

15.65±9.01). 299

Fasting blood glucose 300

301 In males, a notable finding emerged as absolute handgrip strength was consistently linked to

fasting blood glucose levels across all models (P<0.05), irrespective of adjustments made for WHR 302

and BMI (Table 5). This association persisted, highlighting the robustness of the relationship. In 303

contrast, among females, absolute HGS was only found to be associated to blood glucose levels 304

following adjustments to BMI (Model 3) (Table 6). 305

2-hour post-prandial glucose

The investigation into the relationships between handgrip strength and 2-hour post-prandial glucose levels showed a significant (p<0.05) association in females. Notably, no significant relationships were observed in males, regardless of the adjustments made for potential confounding factors.

311 **HBA1c**

For females, an interesting finding emerged in Model 3, where adjustments were made for BMI. In this scenario, a significant positive relationship was observed between absolute HGS and HBA1c levels. This indicates that higher HGS may be associated with higher HBA1c levels when considering BMI as a confounding factor. However, it is important to note that this association was not observed in males or in other models.

317 Serum insulin

Irrespective of gender, our analyses found no significant associations between HGS and serum insulin levels across all models tested. These results suggest that HGS may not be a strong predictor of serum insulin levels in our study cohort.

321

322

323

324

325

326 **Discussion**

The primary findings of our study reveal nuanced relationships between handgrip strength and various blood markers related to diabetes, including fasting blood glucose, 2-hour post-prandial glucose, HBA1c, and serum insulin levels. The results are particularly compelling in the context of elevated serum insulin levels observed in both male and female participants, despite other blood regulatory markers remaining within normal ranges.

Our study presents intriguing findings regarding the correlation between handgrip strength and fasting blood glucose levels in males and females. In males, the association remained robust and statistically significant across all models, even after adjusting for waist-hip ratio and body mass index. This suggests that handgrip strength could be a reliable marker for glucose metabolism in this demographic. Contrastingly, in females, the relationship became evident only after adjusting for BMI, indicating that body composition plays a significant role in mediating this relationship.

Several mechanisms could explain these associations. For males, the findings align with previous 338 research emphasizing the role of enhanced muscle metabolism and higher testosterone levels in 339 340 insulin sensitivity (25); (26). Other studies have further elucidated the role of testosterone in promoting muscle glucose uptake and improving muscle function, thereby reinforcing its 341 importance in glucose metabolism (27). Muscles are a significant site for glucose uptake, and 342 efficient neuromuscular junctions may facilitate more effective muscle contractions, thereby 343 demanding more glucose (28) This suggests that a more substantial handgrip indicates better 344 neuromuscular junction efficiency, which could affect metabolic processes like glucose regulation. 345

For females, the role of body composition is more complex. Our findings imply that the relationship between HGS and glucose metabolism might be confounded by factors like body fat

percentage, which is generally higher in females (29). This corresponds to studies that have 348 indicated that increased adiposity can lead to insulin resistance and consequently disrupt glucose 349 homeostasis (30). The fact that the relationship became significant only after BMI adjustments 350 suggests that body composition, particularly fat mass, may be a critical mediator of this 351 relationship in females. Indeed, adipose tissue is not just an energy storage organ but also an active 352 endocrine organ that releases various factors, including adipokines, which can affect insulin 353 sensitivity and glucose metabolism (31). These adipokines have been implicated in the 354 pathogenesis of insulin resistance, particularly in females, where the balance between different 355 356 adipokines can be more easily perturbed. The interplay between muscle and fat tissue in females could be more complex, given the roles of adipokines and other hormones that influence insulin 357 sensitivity (31). This likely reflects a more intricate physiological interaction that warrants further 358 investigation. 359

Our study found no correlation between handgrip strength and serum insulin levels in line with 360 Niemann et al. findings (32), while another study led by Lazarus et al. in 1997 (33) reported a 361 modest correlation between these variables. Our findings highlight that the relationship between 362 muscle strength and insulin levels can vary based on specific populations or experimental 363 methodologies. Since skeletal muscles are primary sites for insulin-stimulated glucose uptake, it 364 is logical to assume that stronger muscles could be more efficient in glucose uptake, influencing 365 insulin levels. However, our results suggest that different physiological mechanisms might 366 367 modulate muscle strength and insulin functions. Skeletal muscle mass balance is a function of protein synthesis and breakdown. Factors like fasting, trauma, or specific disease states can 368 accelerate muscle protein breakdown, as shown in various studies. Insulin, a pivotal hormone, 369

370 regulates muscle protein breakdown by affecting the transcription of crucial proteins, as evidenced
371 by studies on FOXO transcription factors (34).

Thus, while there are clear links between muscle strength and the efficiency of skeletal muscle in using glucose, and muscle mass and insulin, it seems that muscle strength might not directly affect insulin secretion or function, which involves a more complex interplay of factors.

We identified a notable association between handgrip strength and 2-hour post-prandial glucose levels, but this was evident only in females and not males. A similar study by Huang in 2023 emphasized that the effect of handgrip strength on Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) could be influenced by factors such as BMI and gender (35). This gender divergence in results underlines the need to consider gender-specific physiological pathways when using handgrip strength as a diabetes screening tool.

For females, the significant correlation may be attributed to the role of estrogen, which is known to modulate muscle function and insulin sensitivity. Studies by Chidi-Ogbolu & Baar (36), and Camporez et al., (37), support this assertion, indicating estrogen's potential to enhance insulinstimulated glucose uptake in muscles (38).

On the other hand, the relationship in males is more intricate due to testosterone's fluctuating effects on insulin sensitivity. While testosterone's influence on muscle strength is welldocumented, its impact on insulin sensitivity can vary based on age and general health. This observation aligns with findings by Dhindsa et al., 2016 (39), complicating the establishment of a direct link between handgrip strength and post-prandial glucose levels in males.

Our study's salient observation is the link between handgrip strength and HbA1c levels, especiallywhen considering BMI. This association sheds light on the intricate interplay of hormonal and

metabolic factors in the human body. Similarly, Mainous III et al., 2015, highlighted that handgrip
strength negatively correlated with HbA1c levels (40) strengthening the credibility of HbA1c as a
marker for prolonged glucose control.

The association between muscle, fat tissue, and glucose regulation is persistent, indicating the importance of handgrip strength as a potential indirect indicator of long-term glycemic control in areas with limited resources. This assertion is consistent with the findings of Jang et al., 2020, who explored the relationship between relative handgrip strength and prediabetes based on HbA1c levels and emphasized the significance of sex differences (38).

The influence of hormones like testosterone and estrogen on body fat distribution and muscle metabolism plays a pivotal role in understanding this association. While testosterone generally promotes abdominal fat storage and muscle growth, estrogen affects fat storage in the hips and thighs, alongside its distinct role in muscle metabolism. These hormonal influences underline the complexities of long-term glucose regulation, as manifested by HbA1c levels.

Muscle and fat tissues have unique metabolic contributions. While muscle tissue, being metabolically active, is crucial for glucose uptake, fat tissue releases adipokines that might alter insulin sensitivity. Together with hormones such as insulin and thyroid hormone, these factors intricately shape the observed relationship between handgrip strength and HbA1c levels.

409

410 Conclusion

411 Summary of Key Findings

Our study has introduced an innovative perspective on handgrip strength as a screening tool for managing blood glucose regulation disorders. This pioneering approach aligns with existing literature, establishing a solid association between HGS and blood glucose regulatory markers. Importantly, our research reveals the potential of HGS assessments as practical and cost-effective means to identify individuals at risk of blood glucose irregularities, including diabetes. By incorporating HGS assessments into healthcare protocols, timely interventions, including exercisebased programs, can be initiated, offering a personalized approach to blood glucose management.

419 Implications for Resource-Constrained Settings

In resource-constrained settings, the utility of HGS as an accessible, non-invasive, and cost-420 effective screening tool becomes particularly significant. This approach addresses the barriers to 421 diagnosis, enabling Community Health Workers to conduct HGS tests using inexpensive and 422 readily available hand dynamometers. Our study has the potential to revolutionize diabetes 423 management in developing countries, providing a viable solution to overcome diagnostic 424 limitations and reduce the economic burden associated with the disease. However, it is vital to 425 acknowledge the need for tailored interventions, considering the complexity of hormonal and 426 427 metabolic factors in diverse populations.

428 Study Limitations

429 While our findings are promising, acknowledging the study's limitations is crucial. The sample size of 59 students may not fully represent the broader population, potentially affecting the study's 430 statistical power. A more extensive and diverse sample would strengthen the results and minimize 431 the risk of overlooking potential relationships (type II errors). Furthermore, the study's restriction 432 to students may limit its applicability to various age groups, occupations, and demographic factors. 433 Additionally, lifestyle, nutritional status, and other determinants may differ significantly from the 434 student cohort in resource-constrained settings. Therefore, caution is necessary when generalizing 435 these findings to broader contexts. Future studies with more diverse and larger participant groups 436 must validate these findings and ensure the screening tool's efficacy in real-world, resource-437 438 constrained settings.

439

Acknowledgements

440

We thank all the participants and research staffs of the Physiology Laboratory of the Universityof Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria, for their helpful cooperation in this study.

443

444

445

446

447

448

449 **References**

450	1.	Laukkanen JA, Voutilainen A, Kurl S, Araujo CGS, Jae SY, Kunutsor SK. Handgrip
451		strength is inversely associated with fatal cardiovascular and all-cause mortality events.
452		Ann Med. 2020;52(3–4):109.
453	2.	Kunutsor SK, Voutilainen A, Laukkanen JA. Handgrip strength improves prediction of
454		type 2 diabetes: a prospective cohort study. Ann Med. 2020 Nov 16;52(8):471-8.
455	3.	Cho NH, Shaw JE, Karuranga S, Huang Y, da Rocha Fernandes JD, Ohlrogge AW, et al.
456		IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2017 and projections for
457		2045. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2018 Apr;138:271-81.
458	4.	Eckman M, Gigliotti C, Sutermaster S, Butler PJ, Mehta K. Using handgrip strength to
459		screen for diabetes in developing countries. J Med Eng Technol. 2016 Jan 2;40(1):8–14.
460	5.	Mapa-Tassou C, Katte JC, Mba Maadjhou C, Mbanya JC. Economic Impact of Diabetes
461		in Africa. Curr Diab Rep. 2019 Jan 24;19(2):5.
462	6.	Kunutsor SK, Laukkanen JA. Serum zinc concentrations and incident hypertension: new
463		findings from a population-based cohort study. J Hypertens. 2016 Jun;34(6):1055-61.
464	7.	Jacobson B, Conchola E, Thompson B, Glass R. A comparison of absolute, ratio and
465		allometric scaling methods for normalizing strength in elite american football players. J
466		Athl Train. 2013 Apr 4;2.
467	8.	Newman AB, Kupelian V, Visser M, Simonsick EM, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, et
468		al. Strength, but not muscle mass, is associated with mortality in the health, aging and body

469 composition study cohort. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2006 Jan;61(1):72–7.

470	9.	Kawamoto R, Ninomiya D, Kasai Y, Kusunoki T, Ohtsuka N, Kumagi T, et al. Handgrip
471		strength is associated with metabolic syndrome among middle-aged and elderly
472		community-dwelling persons. Clin Exp Hypertens N Y N 1993. 2016;38(2):245–51.

- 10. Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Avezum A, Orlandini A, et al.
- 474 Prognostic value of grip strength: findings from the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology

475 (PURE) study. Lancet Lond Engl. 2015 Jul 18;386(9990):266–73.

- Celis-Morales CA, Welsh P, Lyall DM, Steell L, Petermann F, Anderson J, et al.
 Associations of grip strength with cardiovascular, respiratory, and cancer outcomes and all
 cause mortality: prospective cohort study of half a million UK Biobank participants. BMJ.
 2018 May 8;361:k1651.
- Chang HY, Chou KY, Lin JJ, Lin CF, Wang CH. Immediate effect of forearm Kinesio
 taping on maximal grip strength and force sense in healthy collegiate athletes. Phys Ther
 Sport Off J Assoc Chart Physiother Sports Med. 2010 Nov;11(4):122–7.
- Reichkendler MH, Auerbach P, Rosenkilde M, Christensen AN, Holm S, Petersen MB, et
 al. Exercise training favors increased insulin-stimulated glucose uptake in skeletal muscle
 in contrast to adipose tissue: a randomized study using FDG PET imaging. Am J Physiol
 Endocrinol Metab. 2013 Aug 15;305(4):E496-506.
- 487 14. Bell DS. Importance of postprandial glucose control. South Med J. 2001 Aug;94(8):804–
 488 9.
- Bawadi H, Alkhatib D, Abu-Hijleh H, Alalwani J, Majed L, Shi Z. Muscle Strength and
 Glycaemic Control among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. Nutrients. 2020 Mar
 14;12(3):771.

- 492 16. Evangelista LS, Heber D, Li Z, Bowerman S, Hamilton MA, Fonarow GC. Reduced body
 493 weight and adiposity with a high-protein diet improves functional status, lipid profiles,
 494 glycemic control, and quality of life in patients with heart failure: a feasibility study. J
- 495 Cardiovasc Nurs. 2009;24(3):207–15.
- 496 17. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes
 497 Care. 2014 Jan;37 Suppl 1:S81-90.
- Ruhl CE, Everhart JE. Association of diabetes, serum insulin, and c-peptide with
 gallbladder disease. Hepatology. 2000;31(2):299–303.
- 500 19. Rantanen T, Guralnik JM, Sakari-Rantala R, Leveille S, Simonsick EM, Ling S, et al.
- 501 Disability, physical activity, and muscle strength in older women: the Women's Health and
 502 Aging Study. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 1999 Feb;80(2):130–5.
- 20. Alfaro-Acha A, Snih SA, Raji MA, Kuo YF, Markides KS, Ottenbacher KJ. Handgrip
 Strength and Cognitive Decline in Older Mexican Americans. J Gerontol A Biol
 Sci Med Sci. 2006 Aug;61(8):859–65.
- Lee SH, Gong HS. Measurement and Interpretation of Handgrip Strength for Research on
 Sarcopenia and Osteoporosis. J Bone Metab. 2020 May;27(2):85–96.
- Manda CM, Hokimoto T, Okura T, Isoda H, Shimano H, Wagatsuma Y. Handgrip strength
 predicts new prediabetes cases among adults: A prospective cohort study. Prev Med Rep.
- 510 2020 Jan 23;17:101056.

- 511 23. Ogden CL, Carroll MD, Lawman HG, Fryar CD, Kruszon-Moran D, Kit BK, et al. Trends
 512 in Obesity Prevalence Among Children and Adolescents in the United States, 1988-1994
 513 Through 2013-2014. JAMA. 2016 Jun 7;315(21):2292–9.
- Welborn TA, Dhaliwal SS, Bennett SA. Waist-hip ratio is the dominant risk factor
 predicting cardiovascular death in Australia. Med J Aust. 2003 Dec 1;179(11–12):580–5.
- Srikanthan P, Karlamangla AS. Relative muscle mass is inversely associated with insulin
 resistance and prediabetes. Findings from the third National Health and Nutrition
 Examination Survey. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2011 Sep;96(9):2898–903.
- 519 26. Pitteloud N, Mootha VK, Dwyer AA, Hardin M, Lee H, Eriksson KF, et al. Relationship
 520 Between Testosterone Levels, Insulin Sensitivity, and Mitochondrial Function in Men.
 521 Diabetes Care. 2005 Jul 1;28(7):1636–42.
- 522 27. Griggs RC, Kingston W, Jozefowicz RF, Herr BE, Forbes G, Halliday D. Effect of
 523 testosterone on muscle mass and muscle protein synthesis. J Appl Physiol Bethesda Md
 524 1985. 1989 Jan;66(1):498–503.
- 525 28. Deschenes MR. Motor unit and neuromuscular junction remodeling with aging. Curr
 526 Aging Sci. 2011 Dec;4(3):209–20.
- 527 29. Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, Kritchevsky SB, Nevitt M, Schwartz AV, et al. The
 528 loss of skeletal muscle strength, mass, and quality in older adults: the health, aging and
 529 body composition study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2006 Oct;61(10):1059–64.
- 30. Petersen AMW, Pedersen BK. The anti-inflammatory effect of exercise. J Appl Physiol
 Bethesda Md 1985. 2005 Apr;98(4):1154–62.

- Grøntved A, Ried-Larsen M, Møller NC, Kristensen PL, Froberg K, Brage S, et al. Muscle
 strength in youth and cardiovascular risk in young adulthood (the European Youth Heart
 Study). Br J Sports Med. 2015 Jan;49(2):90–4.
- 32. Niemann MJ, Tucker LA, Bailey BW, Davidson LE. Strength Training and Insulin
 Resistance: The Mediating Role of Body Composition. J Diabetes Res. 2020 May
 8;2020:7694825.
- 538 33. Lazarus R, Sparrow D, Weiss ST. Handgrip strength and insulin levels: cross-sectional and
 prospective associations in the Normative Aging Study. Metabolism. 1997
 540 Nov;46(11):1266–9.
- 34. O'Neill ED, Wilding JPH, Kahn CR, Van Remmen H, McArdle A, Jackson MJ, et al.
 Absence of insulin signalling in skeletal muscle is associated with reduced muscle mass
 and function: evidence for decreased protein synthesis and not increased degradation. Age.
 2010 Jun;32(2):209–22.
- 545 35. Huang Q, Chen X, Shen HY, Zhou JM, Zhang HQ, Wang L, et al. Gender-Specific
 546 Association of Handgrip Strength with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Chinese Han Older
 547 Adults. Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes Targets Ther. 2023;16:913–23.
- 548 36. Chidi-Ogbolu N, Baar K. Effect of Estrogen on Musculoskeletal Performance and Injury
 549 Risk. Front Physiol. 2019 Jan 15;9:1834.
- So 37. Camporez JPG, Jornayvaz FR, Lee HY, Kanda S, Guigni BA, Kahn M, et al. Cellular
 Mechanism by Which Estradiol Protects Female Ovariectomized Mice From High-Fat
 Diet-Induced Hepatic and Muscle Insulin Resistance. Endocrinology. 2013 Mar
 1;154(3):1021–8.

554	38.	Jang BN, Nari F, Kim S, Park EC. Association between relative handgrip strength and		
555		prediabetes among South Korean adults. PLoS ONE. 2020 Oct 1;15(10):e0240027.		
556	39.	Dhindsa S, Ghanim H, Batra M, Dandona P. Hypogonadotropic Hypogonadism in Men		
557		With Diabetes and Obesity. Diabetes Care. 2018 Jun 14;41(7):1516–25.		
558	40.	Mainous AG, Tanner RJ, Anton SD, Jo A. Grip Strength as a Marker of Hypertension and		
559		Diabetes in Healthy Weight Adults. Am J Prev Med. 2015 Dec;49(6):850-8.		
560				
561 562	Supporting information			
563	S1 Fig 1 Title			
564	Boxple	Boxplots comparing handgrip strength in both dominant and non-dominant hands in both male		
565	and female subjects			
566	Si Fig 1 Legend			
567	Figure	e 1: Boxplots comparing handgrip strength in both dominant and non-dominant hands in		
568	both male (a) and female (b) subjects. Mean HGS in males was 24.47 ± 4.05 and 23.86 ± 4.07 in			
569	both right and left hands, respectively; and in females was 21.37 ± 4.53 and 18.97 ± 3.61 in both			
570	right a	nd left hands, respectively. The difference was statistically significant at p-value 0.03 and		
571	0.04 b	etween hands in females and males, respectively. HGS – handgrip strength		
572				
573				
574				

575 Ethical approval

- 577 Ethical approval was collected from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Ilorin
- **Teaching Hospital,** Ilorin Kwara state, with the reference number: UITH/CAT/189/VOL.21^B
- 579 /486. An informed consent was also obtained from the research subjects.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.19.23297260; this version posted October 20, 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.

Figure 1: Boxplots comparing handgrip strength in both dominant and non-dominant hands in both male (a) and female (b) subjects. Mean HGS in males was 24.47 ± 4.05 and 23.86 ± 4.07 in both right and left hands, respectively; and in females was 21.37 ± 4.53 and 18.97 ± 3.61 in both right and left hands, respectively. The difference was statistically significant at p-value 0.03 and 0.04 between hands in females and males, respectively. HGS – handgrip strength

