

1 Exploring the associations between skeletal muscle echogenicity and
2 physical function in aging adults: A systematic review with meta-analyses

3
4 *Dustin J Oranchuk¹, Stephan G Bodkin^{1,2}, Katie L Boncella¹, Michael O Harris-Love¹

5
6 1. Muscle Morphology, Mechanics, and Performance Laboratory, Department of Physical
7 Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora,
8 CO, United States

9 2. Department of Physical Therapy and Athletic Training, University of Utah, Salt Lake City,
10 UT, United States

11

12 ***Corresponding author:**

13 Dustin J Oranchuk

14 +1-303-886-4056

15 Denver, Colorado, United States of America

16

17 **Tables:** 1

18 **Figures:** 7

19 **Word count:** 4102

20 **Funding disclosure:** None

21 **Conflict of interest:** None

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** Assessment and quantification of skeletal muscle within the aging population is vital
26 for diagnosis, treatment, and injury/disease prevention. The clinical availability of assessing
27 muscle quality through diagnostic ultrasound presents an opportunity to be utilized as a screening
28 tool for function-limiting diseases. However, relationships between muscle echogenicity and
29 clinical functional assessments require authoritative analysis. Thus, we aimed to 1) synthesize the
30 literature to assess the relationships between skeletal muscle echogenicity and physical function
31 in older (≥ 60 years) adults, 2) perform pooled analyses of relationships between skeletal muscle
32 echogenicity and physical function, and 3) perform sub-analyses to determine between-muscle
33 relationships.

34 **Methods:** CINAHL, Embase, MEDLINE, PubMed, and Web of Science databases were
35 systematically searched to identify articles relating skeletal muscle echogenicity to physical
36 function in older adults. Meta-analyses with and without sub-analysis for individual muscles were
37 performed utilizing Fisher's Z transformation for the most common measures of physical function.
38 Fisher's Z was back-transformed to Pearson's r for interpretation.

39 **Results:** Fifty-one articles (N=5095, female= ~ 2759 , male= ~ 2301 , 72.5 ± 5.8 years [one study did
40 not provide sex descriptors]) were extracted for review, with previously unpublished data obtained
41 from the authors of 12 studies. The rectus femoris (n=32) and isometric knee extension strength
42 (n=22) were the most accessed muscle and physical qualities, respectively. The relationship
43 between quadriceps echogenicity and knee extensor strength was moderate (n=2924, $r=-0.36$
44 [95%CI: -0.38 to -0.32], $p < 0.001$), with all other meta-analyses (grip strength, walking speed, sit-
45 to-stand, timed up-and-go) resulting in slightly weaker correlations ($r=-0.34$ to -0.23 , all $p < 0.001$).
46 Sub-analyses determined minimal differences in predictive ability between muscle groups,

47 although combining muscles (e.g., rectus femoris+vastus lateralis) often resulted in stronger
48 correlations with maximal strength.

49 **Conclusions:** While correlations were modest, the affordable, portable, and noninvasive ultrasonic
50 assessment of muscle quality was a consistent predictor of physical function in older adults.
51 Minimal between-muscle differences suggest that echogenicity estimates of muscle quality are
52 systemic. Therefore, practitioners may be able to scan a single muscle to assess full-body skeletal
53 muscle quality/composition, while researchers should consider combining multiple muscles to
54 strengthen the model.

55 **Registration:** The original protocol was prospectively registered at the National Institute of Health
56 Research PROSPERO (CRD42020201841).

57

58 **Highlights:**

- 59 • Relationships between skeletal muscle echogenicity and physical function were small to
60 moderate, but highly consistent.
- 61 • Sub-analyses determined minimal between-muscle differences in predictive ability.
- 62 • Ultrasonic echogenicity should be considered part of early detection screens for sarcopenia
63 and other diseases.
- 64 • Combining muscles tended to strengthen the model, although muscle quality appears
65 systemic, allowing for a single scan to represent the total body.

66

67 **Keywords:** correlations, echo intensity, elderly, intramuscular fat, muscle health, musculoskeletal,
68 strength

69

70 **1. Introduction**

71 Assessment and quantification of skeletal muscle morphology and function within the
72 aging population is vital for diagnosis, treatment, and injury/disease prevention. Sarcopenia,
73 defined as the reduction in muscle mass and strength,¹ is a growing concern, with up to 25% of
74 individuals over 70 years receiving the diagnosis.² Early identification of the decline in skeletal
75 muscle morphology and function can lead to appropriate therapies, such as exercise or nutritional
76 interventions, that may improve patient outcomes.³ To date, screening measures to identify patients
77 at risk for sarcopenic-related disability include patient-reported outcomes (such as the SARC-F),
78 objective measurement of grip or strength, and functional tasks such as the chair stand or 6-meter
79 walk tests.^{1,4} In addition to the size and strength of skeletal muscle, recent literature has proposed
80 the addition of skeletal muscle quality due to its relationship with patient outcomes and clinical
81 accessibility.^{5,6}

82
83 Muscle quality provides information on the morphology of the muscle, such as adipogenic,
84 fibrotic, or contractile tissue.⁷ Literature has demonstrated increases in quadriceps intramuscular
85 adipose and fibrous tissue with concurrent skeletal muscle atrophy with age, suggesting the
86 potential replacement of contractile tissue.⁸ Fibrotic activity increases within aging muscle, which
87 inhibits the ability to repair and regenerate.⁹ Clinical decisions made dependent solely on muscle
88 size may fail to consider morphological characteristics of the muscle that impair physical function.

89
90 Changes in skeletal muscle morphology are traditionally assessed through invasive
91 laboratory techniques – specifically by obtaining skeletal muscle biopsy to quantify the fibrotic or
92 adipogenic tissue.¹⁰ Clinically accessible techniques to quantify intramuscular adipose tissue can

93 be obtained through MRI and CT imaging. Though common, these techniques are time-
94 consuming, cost-restrictive, and expose patients to radiation (CT scans). Diagnostic ultrasound
95 quantifies muscle quality through echogenicity,⁷ which is defined as the pixel intensity of an
96 image. Assessed through brightness mode (B-mode) ultrasound, the greyscale value (range: 0-255
97 arbitrary units [AU]) represents the “quality” of the muscle, with a higher number representing a
98 greater distribution of lighter pixels. A brighter pixel (higher greyscale value) represents lighter
99 tissue, such as intramuscular adipocytes and fibrous tissue,¹¹ while lower greyscale values have
100 been related to greater lean body mass (e.g., contractile tissue, water).¹¹

101
102 The clinical availability of assessing echogenicity also presents an opportunity to be
103 utilized as a screening tool for function-limiting diseases including sarcopenia, cachexia, and
104 muscular dystrophy. Lower muscle quality assessed through echogenicity has been associated with
105 lower measures of muscle strength.¹² However, results are not uniform within the aging population
106 as assessments and techniques to quantify muscle function are inconsistent. Compiling research
107 findings on the functional associates of echogenicity can further progress the clinical utility of
108 ultrasound with aging individuals.

109
110 Early detection of muscle loss and strength is vital for early clinical diagnosis and
111 treatment. Intramuscular adiposity has been shown to precede and accelerate the onset of
112 sarcopenic functional impairments.¹³ As such, accessible clinical tools like diagnostic ultrasound
113 may play an essential role in assessing muscle size and quality to predict loss of function. To date,
114 relationships between muscle echogenicity and clinical and functional assessments are unclear due
115 to the large variability in scanning location and assessment procedures. Therefore, the purpose of

116 this systematic review was to 1) qualitatively synthesize the literature assessing the relationships
117 between skeletal muscle echogenicity and physical function in older adults, 2) perform a
118 quantitative pooled analyses of relevant correlations where possible, and 3) examine between-
119 muscle relationships to determine differences in predictive ability.

120

121 **2. Methods**

122 *2.1. Registration of systematic review protocol*

123 A systematic literature review was performed according to the guidelines in the Cochrane
124 Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (version 6.0) and following the 2020 checklist
125 for the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. The original
126 protocol was prospectively registered at the National Institute of Health Research PROSPERO
127 (CRD42020201841).

128

129 *2.2. Eligibility criteria*

130 Studies evaluating the relationship of ultrasound echogenicity to assessments of skeletal
131 muscle function were included. All studies had to include an older population (≥ 60 years),
132 quantified skeletal muscle echogenicity through diagnostic ultrasound, quantified clinical
133 measures of patient function, and analyze the relationship between skeletal muscle echogenicity
134 and patient function. For studies that included multiple age populations (i.e., a younger and older
135 cohort,) only the data for the older cohort were extracted. Studies must have reported relationships
136 between echogenicity and function performed through linear regression or correlation coefficients.
137 Exclusion criteria included pathologic study populations, echogenicity outcomes on non-skeletal
138 muscle tissue, animal or cadaver studies, or review articles. Studies including participants from a

139 pathologic population (i.e., Parkinson’s, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, etc.) were
140 excluded. Participants with age-related conditions, such as sarcopenia or osteoarthritis, were
141 included.

142

143 *2.3. Information sources and search strategy*

144 Research articles were systematically searched through CINAHL, Embase, MEDLINE,
145 PubMed, and Web of Science databases. Studies were searched up to June 2023. The current
146 manuscript was a subsection of larger systematic search on relationships between diagnostic
147 ultrasound echogenicity and metabolic, imaging, and functional outcomes (PROSPERO ID
148 CRD42020201841). Search keywords were: (echogenicity OR echo intensity OR greyscale) AND
149 (muscle OR musculature) AND (ultrasound OR ultrasonography) AND (old OR older OR elderly).
150 The current studies’ outcomes of interest were relationships between skeletal muscle echogenicity
151 and objective functional assessments (i.e., strength, gait, functional testing, patient-reported
152 outcomes, etc.). Secondary searches included: a) screening the reference lists of included studies;
153 b) examining studies that cited the included studies (forward citation tracking through Google
154 Scholar); c) search alerts to monitor any new search results; and d) contacting the most common
155 authors of the included outputs. The database search was re-run in November 2023.


156

157 *2.4. Study appraisal and synthesis methods*

158 Database results were downloaded and transferred to the Zotero reference manager (v6.0;
159 Corporation for Digital Scholarship, Virginia, USA). Covidence (v2627; Melbourne, AUS) was
160 used to import all selected articles from the initial search. Duplicate articles were removed for
161 appraisal. Two authors independently screened the articles by titles and abstracts. The two

162 reviewers met and discussed disagreements of the initial review to determine inclusion, with a
163 third reviewer being consulted if needed. Both assessors then independently screened the full-text
164 studies based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria using the same methodologies for
165 disagreements. The PRISMA flowchart of article inclusion can be found in **Figure 1**. Data were
166 extracted and were stratified on the following functional assessment categories: strength, rate of
167 force development, gait speed, timed up-and-go, sit-to-stand, postural stability, and others. The
168 reviewers assessed outcome measures to determine if inter-study data could be pooled for a meta-
169 analysis.

170



171

172 **Figure 1.** PRISMA flow chart

173

174 2.5. Data extraction

175 Functional assessments, methods of collection and objective measures of the tests were
176 extracted from each selected article. The transducer type, scanning plane, and muscle of interest
177 were extracted for measures of muscle quality. Demographics, sample size, and relationship
178 estimates (Pearson's r correlation coefficients) were extracted for data synthesis.

179

180 2.6. *Statistical analysis*

181 2.6.1. *Correlation extraction and calculation*

182 Raw data, reported correlation coefficients, and *p*-values were extracted and entered into
183 an Excel spreadsheet. When correlations were not provided in-text, extracted data were used to
184 calculate Pearson's correlation coefficients (*r*) using the following formula (*r*=Pearson's
185 correlation, *n*=number of pairs, $\sum xy$ = sum of the pairs, $\sum x$ = sum of the *x* scores, $\sum y$ = sum of the
186 *y* scores, $\sum x^2$ = sum of the squared *x* scores, $\sum y^2$ = sum of the squared *y* scores:

187
$$r = \frac{n(\sum(xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y))}{\sqrt{[n \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][n \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}$$

188
189 However, the above formula (and online calculators) often resulted in exceptionally strong
190 correlations. Therefore, calculated correlations were not included in the meta-analyses. In several
191 cases,¹⁴⁻²⁴ contacted authors kindly provided de-identified raw data which allowed us to calculate
192 exact correlations using SPSS (Version 29.0, IBM Corp; Armonk, NY, USA).

193
194 2.6.2. *Meta-analytical synthesis*

195 As Pearson's *r* correlation coefficients are a non-continuous variable (can never be greater
196 than 1.0), all extracted and calculated correlations and standard errors were transformed to Fisher's
197 *Z* so that confidence intervals could be properly processed by the meta-analytical software. This
198 transformation was completed using the following formula (*Z*=Fisher's *z*, LN=natural log,
199 *r*=Pearson's *r* correlation coefficient:

200
$$Z = LN((1 + r))/((1 - r))/2$$

201

202 A random-effects model with restricted maximum likelihood was chosen due to inter-study
203 variability regarding age, sex, racial/ethnic composition, and testing procedures. Pooled Fisher's
204 Z and 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) were back-transformed to Pearson's r correlation
205 coefficients and interpreted as: trivial ± 0.10 , small $\pm 0.11-0.30$, moderate $\pm 0.31-0.50$, large $\pm 0.51-$
206 0.70 , very large $\pm 0.71-0.90$, and nearly perfect $\pm 0.91-0.99$.²⁵ Including multiple effects from a
207 single study violates the assumption of independence, as effects from the same study are likely to
208 be more similar than effects from others and would influence statistical power. Therefore, effects
209 from a single study examining several regions of the same muscle (e.g., vastus lateralis, rectus
210 femoris), or both sexes were averaged and entered the statistical software as a single comparison.
211 Sub-analyses were run to compare different muscles. To avoid superfluous results, meta-analyses
212 focused on muscle groups and highly relevant functional assessments (e.g., knee extensor strength
213 and quadriceps echogenicity). However, several commonly reported functional assessments were
214 not accompanied by clearly relevant echogenicity measures (e.g., grip strength and wrist flexor
215 echogenicity). Similarly, we avoided performing meta-analyses with fewer than five studies.
216 Finally, only correlations with non-corrected echogenicity were analyzed since most studies did
217 not utilize subcutaneous fat correction. Similar tests (i.e., time to target repetitions versus
218 repetitions in a set time) can result in dichotomous (i.e., positive versus negative) correlational
219 directions. Thus, the correlation direction was switched when required to represent 'performance'.

220

221 *2.6.2. Meta-analytical heterogeneity*

222 The I^2 statistic was used to evaluate heterogeneity and was interpreted as low (<50%),
223 moderate (50–75%), and high heterogeneity (>75%). The statistical significance threshold was set
224 at $p < 0.05$. Funnel plots were used to examine publication bias potential.

225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247

3. Results

3.1. Study characteristics

The summary of studies selected for inclusion and their quality assessments are presented in Table 1. Fifty-one identified studies conformed to the inclusion criteria.^{7,11,12,14–24,26–62} However, 17 studies did not report the relevant correlations.^{14–18,20,22,24,26,40,48,49,52,57,59,61,62} 12 contacted authors provided previously unpublished de-identified raw data or relevant correlations.^{14–20,22–24,40,48} In comparison, we calculated correlations for the remaining five studies using data supplied in published tables or supplementary information. The 51 included studies included 5095 (~2759 females, ~2301 males) participants, aged 72.5 ± 5.8 years of age.^{7,11,12,14–24,26–62} Twenty-seven studies included males and females,^{14,17,20,23,24,26,28–30,32,33,36–38,40,42,45–47,49,54,57–62} while 16 included only males,^{7,11,15,16,18,19,21,22,31,34,39,41,48,50,52,56} seven included only females,^{27,35,43,44,51,53,55} a single study did not report sex,¹² while another did not delineate sex when reporting age or participant numbers;⁶¹ explaining the approximate values in the previous sentence. Two studies included participants with ‘metabolic syndrome’ or diabetes,^{20,33} and single studies included participants with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,⁴² USA Veterans,¹¹ ‘frail’,²⁴ outpatients,⁶³ nursing home residents,²³ or regularly participated in competitive tennis.⁵⁹

Table 1. Summary of studies reporting correlations between skeletal muscle echogenicity and functional measures in older (Mean \geq 63 years) adults

Study	Demographics	Plane	Muscle(s)	Functional Measures	Relationship Estimates
Akagi et al., 2018 ¹	Elderly N=33 (14 F, 19 M) F: 72 \pm 7 yrs M: 73 \pm 5 yrs	Transverse Snap-shot	Plantar-flexors (avg LG, soleus) Non-corrected EI	ISO plantar-flexion force	Female: r=-0.74, p<0.05* χ Male: r=-0.35, p<0.05* χ
Akazawa et al., 2017 ²	Unable to walk 66-101 yrs N=25 F	Transverse Snap-shot	Quadriceps (avg RF, VL, VI, VM) Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension force 2) Functional independence measure gait score	1) r=-0.64, p=0.001 2) r=-0.34, p=0.03
Akima et al., 2017 ³	Healthy 72.9 \pm 4.5 yrs N=64 (37 F, 27 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VL, Quadriceps (avg RF, VL) Non-corrected EI	1) Sit-up \times 30s 2) Supine-to-stand 3) Sit-to-stand \times 10 4) 5-meter maximal walk 5) 6-min walk	RF (F): 1) r=-0.11, p>0.05 2) r=0.06, p>0.05 3) r=0.51, p<0.001* 4) r=0.26, p>0.05 5) r=-0.16, p>0.05 RF (M): 1) r=-0.07, p>0.05 2) r=0.47, p<0.05* 3) r=0.40, p<0.05* 4) r=0.16, p>0.05 5) r=-0.36, p>0.05 VL (F): 1) r=-0.23, p>0.05 2) r=-0.03, p>0.05 3) r=0.17, p>0.05 4) r=0.23, p>0.05 5) r=0.01, p>0.05 VL (M): 1) r=-0.25, p>0.05 2) r=0.53, p<0.05* 3) r=0.52, p<0.05* 4) r=0.48, p<0.05* 5) r=-0.52, p<0.01* Quadriceps (F): 1) r=-0.17, p>0.05 2) r=0.02, p>0.05 3) r=0.39, p<0.05* 4) r=0.27, p>0.05 5) r=-0.09, p>0.05 Quadriceps (M): 1) r=-0.17, p>0.05 2) r=0.54, p<0.05* 3) r=0.49, p<0.05* 4) r=0.34, p<0.05* 5) r=-0.47, p<0.05*
Akima et al., 2020 ⁴	'Pre-old' 69.3 \pm 2.7 yrs n=96 (51 F, 45 M) 'Old' 79 \pm 2.9 yrs n=36 (19 F, 17 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VL, Quadriceps (avg RF, VL) Non-corrected EI	1) Grip strength 2) Sit-up reps 3) Supine-to-stand 4) Sit-to-stand \times 10 5) 5-meter maximal walk 6) 6-min walk	RF: Pre-old 1) r=-0.26, p<0.05* 2) r=-0.13, p>0.05 3) r=0.23, p<0.05* 4) r=0.27, p<0.01* 5) r=0.13, p>0.05 6) r=-0.18, p>0.05 Old 1) r=-0.22, p>0.05 2) r=-0.01, p>0.05 3) r=0.11, p>0.05 4) r=0.13, p>0.05 5) r=0.43, p<0.05* 6) r=-0.24, p>0.05 VL: Pre-old 1) r=-0.28, p<0.01* 2) r=-0.13, p>0.05 3) r=0.13, p>0.05 4) r=0.10, p>0.05 5) r=-0.05, p>0.05 6) r=-0.12, p>0.05 Old 1) r=-0.30, p>0.05 2) r=-0.21, p>0.05 3) r=0.34, p>0.05 4) r=0.18, p>0.05 5) r=0.39, p<0.05* 6) r=-0.18, p<0.05 Quadriceps: Pre-old 1) r=-0.30, p<0.05* 2) r=-0.14, p>0.05 3) r=0.20, p>0.05 4) r=0.20, p<0.05* 5) r=0.04, p>0.05 6) r=-0.17, p>0.05 Old 1) r=-0.31, p>0.05 2) r=-0.15, p>0.05 3) r=0.29, p>0.05 4) r=0.19, p>0.05 5) r=0.47, p<0.01* 6) r=-0.24, p>0.05
Bali et al., 2020 ⁵	71 \pm 5 yrs N=25 (15 F, 10 M)	Transverse Panoramic	Quadriceps (avg RF, VL) Corrected & non-corrected EI	1) CON (120 $^{\circ}$.s $^{-1}$) knee extension torque 2) Specific torque 3) % Δ torque (fatigue)	Non-corrected EI: 1) r=-0.53, p<0.001* 2) r=-0.34, p=0.014* 3) r=-0.08, p=0.565 Corrected EI: 1) r=-0.45, p<0.001* 2) r=-0.34, p=0.014* 3) r=0.02, p=0.864
Cadore et al., 2012 ⁶	65.5 \pm 5 yrs N=31 M	Not specified	RF Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) CON knee extension (a: 60 $^{\circ}$.s $^{-1}$, b: 180 $^{\circ}$.s $^{-1}$, c: 360 $^{\circ}$.s $^{-1}$)	1) r=-0.51, p<0.01* 2a) r=-0.48, p<0.01* 2b) r=-0.64, p<0.001* 2c) r=-0.67, p<0.001*

Chang et al., 2018 ⁷	71.6±5.3 yrs N=140 (79 F, 61 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, MG, BB, TB Non-corrected EI	1) Grip strength 2) Gait speed	RF: 1) $r=-0.35, p<0.05^*$ 2) $r=-0.13, p>0.05$	MG: 1) $r=-0.10, p>0.05$ 2) $r=-0.07, p>0.05$	BB: 1) $r=-0.25, p<0.05^*$ 2) $r=-0.14, p>0.05$	TB: 1) $r=-0.31, p<0.05^*$ 2) $r=-0.02, p>0.05$
Chang et al., 2019 ⁸	Non-metabolic syndrome 71.1±5.2 yrs N=103 (51F, 52 M) Metabolic syndrome 72.1±4.7 yrs N=26 (18 F, 8 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, MG, BB, TB Non-corrected	1) Grip strength 2) Gait speed	RF: Combined 1) $r=-0.32, p<0.001^*$ 2) $r=-0.18, p=0.045^*$	MG: Combined 1) $r=-0.04, p=0.588$ 2) $r=-0.11, p=0.202$	BB: Combined 1) $r=-0.30, p<0.001^*$ 2) $r=-0.12, p=0.197$	TB: Combined 1) $r=-0.30, p<0.001^*$ 2) $r=-0.08, p=0.353$
Farrow & Palmer, 2021 ⁹	73±4 yrs N=15 M	Transverse Panoramic	RF Non-corrected EI	1) ISO hip flexion torque 2) RTD 0-100 ms (a: absolute; b: relative) 3) RTD 100-200 ms (a: absolute; b: relative)			1) $r=-0.26, p>0.05$ 2a) $r=0.25, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=0.40, p>0.05$ 3a) $r=-0.42, p>0.05$ 3b) $r=-0.42, p>0.05$	
Fukumoto et al., 2012 ¹⁰	70.4±5.5 yrs N=92 F	Transverse Snap-shot	RF Non-corrected EI	ISO knee extension force			$r=-0.40, p<0.01^*$	
Fukumoto et al., 2023 ¹¹	75.3±6.7 yrs N=92 (50 F, 42 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) Grip strength 3) Walking speed	Female: 1) $r=-0.43, p=0.003 \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.23, p=0.110 \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.22, p=0.133 \Phi$	Male: 1) $r=-0.15, p=0.339 \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.32, p=0.044^* \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.22, p=0.18 \Phi$	Combined: 1) $r=-0.44, p<0.001^* \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.46, p<0.001^* \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.31, p=0.003^* \Phi$	
Gerstner et al., 2017a ¹²	69.5±3.1 yrs N=20 M	Transverse Panoramic	MG, LG Corrected and non-corrected Φ EI	1) ISO plantar-flexion torque 2) CON plantar-flexion torque (a: 30°·s ⁻¹ ; b: 120°·s ⁻¹) 3) CON plantar-flexion peak power (a: 30°·s ⁻¹ ; b: 120°·s ⁻¹) 4) CON plantar-flexion mean power (a: 30°·s ⁻¹ ; b: 120°·s ⁻¹)	Non-corrected: MG: 1) $r=-0.50, p=0.030^* \Phi$ 2a) $r=-0.62, p=0.005^* \Phi$ 2b) $r=-0.38, p=0.114 \Phi$ 3a) $r=-0.62, p=0.005^* \Phi$ 3b) $r=-0.38, p=0.114 \Phi$ 4a) $r=-0.67, p=0.002^* \Phi$ 4b) $r=-0.43, p=0.066 \Phi$	Corrected: MG: 1) $r=-0.36, p=0.132 \Phi$ 2a) $r=-0.45, p=0.054 \Phi$ 2b) $r=-0.40, p=0.087 \Phi$ 3a) $r=-0.45, p=0.053 \Phi$ 3b) $r=-0.40, p=0.087 \Phi$ 4a) $r=-0.57, p=0.012^* \Phi$ 4b) $r=-0.43, p=0.065 \Phi$	LG: 1) $r=0.15, p=0.530 \Phi$ 2a) $r=-0.28, p=0.251 \Phi$ 2b) $r=-0.39, p=0.098 \Phi$ 3a) $r=-0.28, p=0.253 \Phi$ 3b) $r=-0.39, p=0.098 \Phi$ 4a) $r=-0.23, p=0.335 \Phi$ 4b) $r=-0.27, p=0.273 \Phi$	
Gerstner et al., 2017b ¹³	Recreationally Active 69.5±3.3 yrs N=20 M	Transverse Panoramic	MG Corrected and non-corrected Φ EI	1) ISO plantar-flexion a) peak torque; b) torque at 50 ms; c) torque at 100 ms; d) torque at 200 ms) 2) Peak RFD Φ	Non-corrected Φ: 1a) $r=-0.46, p<0.001^* \Phi$ 1b) $r=-0.04, p=0.779 \Phi$ 1c) $r=-0.22, p=0.125 \Phi$ 1d) $r=-0.39, p=0.005^* \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.34, p=0.014^* \Phi$	Corrected: 1a) $r=-0.36, p=0.008^* \Phi$ 1b) $r=0.00, p=0.976 \Phi$ 1c) $r=-0.20, p=0.161 \Phi$ 1d) $r=-0.36, p=0.008^* \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.34, p=0.013^* \Phi$		

Guadagnin et al., 2019 ¹⁴	75.4±5 yrs N=15 (9 F, 6 M)	Transverse	RF, VL, BF, TA, MG	1) Preferred walking speed (a: overground; b: obstacle) 2) Maximal walking speed (a: overground; b: obstacle) 3) Preferred walking step length 4) Maximal walking step length	RF: 1a) r=-0.07, p>0.05 1b) r=-0.03, p>0.05 2a) r=-0.07, p>0.05 2b) r=-0.01, p>0.05 3) r=-0.004, p>0.05 4) r=-0.05, p>0.05	TA: 1a) r=-0.40, p>0.05 1b) r=-0.31, p>0.05 2a) r=-0.44, p>0.05 2b) r=-0.35, p>0.05 3) r=-0.31, p>0.05 4) r=-0.36, p>0.05		
		Snap-shot	Non-corrected EI		BF: 1a) r=0.17, p>0.05 1b) r=0.02, p>0.05 2a) r=0.15, p>0.05 2b) r=0.08, p>0.05 3) r=-0.06, p>0.05 4) r=-0.07, p>0.05	MG: 1a) r=-0.08, p>0.05 1b) r=-0.11, p>0.05 2a) r=-0.13, p>0.05 2b) r=-0.07, p>0.05 3) r=-0.02, p>0.05 4) r=-0.07, p>0.05		
Harris-Love et al., 2018 ¹⁵	US Veterans 62.5±9.2 N=30 M	Sagittal	RF	1) Absolute and body-mass normalized CON knee extension torque (a: 60°s ⁻¹ ; b: 180°s ⁻¹) 2) Grip strength	Absolute: 1a) r=-0.38, p=0.038* 1b) r=-0.41, p=0.025* 2) r=-0.41, p=0.026*	Normalized: 1a) r=-0.47, p=0.008* 1a) r=-0.49, p=0.006* 2) r=-0.50, p=0.005*		
		Snap-shot	Non-corrected					
Harris-Love et al., 2019 ¹⁶	65.1±6.5 N=17 (10 F, 7 M)	Sagittal	RF	Grip strength (body-mass normalized)		r=-0.48, p=0.031*		
		Snap-shot	Non-corrected					
Hill et al., 2021 ¹⁷	Healthy community-dwelling 69.9±4.3 yrs N=21 (9 F, 12 M)	Transverse	VL, gluteus medius	1) Timed-up-and-go 2) Sit-to-stand×5 reps 3) Postural control (a: anteriorposterior eyes open; b: anteriorposterior eyes closed; c: mediolateral eyes open; d: mediolateral eyes closed; e: velocity eyes open; f: velocity eyes closed)	Right VL: 1) r=0.49, p<0.05* 2) r=0.57, p<0.001* 3a) r=0.26, p>0.05 3b) r=0.32, p>0.05 3c) r=0.22, p>0.05 3d) r=0.29, p>0.05 3e) r=0.09, p>0.05 3f) r=0.13, p>0.05	Left VL: 1) r=0.52, p<0.05* 2) r=0.64, p<0.001* 3a) r=0.36, p>0.05 3b) r=0.20, p>0.05 3c) r=0.04, p>0.05 3d) r=0.06, p>0.05 3e) r=0.30, p>0.05 3f) r=0.06, p>0.05	Right gluteus medius: 1) r=0.46, p<0.05* 2) r=0.48, p<0.05* 3a) r=0.52, p<0.05* 3b) r=0.51, p<0.05* 3c) r=0.15, p>0.05 3d) r=0.19, p>0.05 3e) r=0.22, p>0.05 3f) r=0.08, p>0.05	Left gluteus medius: 1) r=0.52, p<0.05* 2) r=0.59, p<0.05* 3a) r=0.53, p<0.05* 3b) r=0.45, p<0.05* 3c) r=0.10, p>0.05 3d) r=0.11, p>0.05 3e) r=0.27, p>0.05 3f) r=0.02, p>0.05
		Snap-shot	Non-corrected EI					
Hirata et al., 2022 ¹⁸	74±6 yrs N=32 M	Transverse	RF, VL	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) ISO knee extension specific strength 3) CON isotonic peak power (a: absolute; b: relative) 4) CON isotonic RPD 0-50 ms (a: absolute; b: relative) 5) CON isotonic RVD	RF: 1) r=0.13, p=0.476 2) r=-0.02, p=0.922 3a) r=-0.23, p=0.221 3b) r=0.01, p=0.952 4a) r=-0.21, p=0.272 4b) r=-0.36, p=0.050 5) r=-0.42, p=0.022*	VL: 1) r=0.13, p=0.494 2) r=0.08, p=0.673 3a) r=0.33, p=0.074 3b) r=0.42, p=0.020* 4a) r=0.25, p=0.183 4b) r=0.32, p=0.089 5) r=0.24, p=0.207		
		Snap-shot	Non-corrected EI					
Kawai et al., 2018 ¹⁹	Community-dwelling 72.8±5.3 yrs N=1239 (728 F, 511 M)	Transverse	RF	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) Timed-up-and-go 3) Fast gait speed 4) Normal gait speed 5) One-leg balance	Female: 1) r=-0.27, p<0.01* 2) r=0.16, p<0.001* Φ 3) r=-0.14, p<0.001* Φ 4) r=-0.10, p=0.006* Φ 5) r=-0.17, p<0.001* Φ	Male: 1) r=-0.31, p<0.01* 2) r=0.19, p<0.001* Φ 3) r=-0.20, p<0.001* Φ 4) r=-0.19, p<0.001* Φ 5) r=-0.26, p<0.001* Φ	Combined: 1) r=-0.35, p<0.001* Φ 2) r=0.19, p<0.001* Φ 3) r=-0.20, p<0.001* Φ 4) r=-0.13, p<0.001* Φ 5) r=-0.18, p<0.001* Φ	
		Snap-shot	Non-corrected EI					
Komforti et al., 2021 ²⁰	Community-dwelling 74±6 yrs N=90 (57 F, 33 M)	Transverse	RF, VL, MG, LG	1) Grip strength Φ 2) Sit-to-stand×30s Φ 3) Fast gait speed 4) Normal gait speed Φ 5) Heel-rise endurance Φ	RF: Non-corrected Φ 1) r=-0.03, p=0.754 2) r=-0.16, p=0.134 3) r=0.08, p=0.457	VL: Non-corrected Φ 1) r=-0.05, p=0.668 2) r=-0.23, p=0.028* 3) r=0.14, p=0.192	MG: Non-corrected Φ 1) r=-0.03, p=0.757 2) r=-0.15, p=0.154 3) r=0.17, p=0.121	LG: Non-corrected Φ 1) r=0.03, p=0.766 2) r=-0.11, p=0.296 3) r=0.06, p=0.579
		Snap-shot	Corrected & non-corrected EI					

				6) Functional reach test Φ	4) $r=0.07, p=0.497$ 5) $r=-0.19, p=0.081$ 6) $r=0.11, p=0.285$	4) $r=0.16, p=0.145$ 5) $r=-0.22, p=0.042^*$ 6) $r=0.13, p=0.227$	4) $r=0.15, p=0.156$ 5) $r=-0.19, p=0.081$ 6) $r=0.23, p=0.032^*$	4) $r=0.05, p=0.655$ 5) $r=-0.10, p=0.370$ 6) $r=0.19, p=0.079$
					Corrected 1) $r=-0.31, p=0.003^*$ 2) $r=-0.27, p=0.010^*$ 3) $r=-0.29, p=0.006^*$ 4) $r=0.21, p=0.051$ 5) $r=-0.29, p=0.006^*$ 6) $r=0.07, p=0.491$	Corrected 1) $r=-0.41, p<0.001^*$ 2) $r=-0.25, p=0.018$ 3) $r=-0.25, p=0.018$ 4) $r=0.21, p=0.051$ 5) $r=-0.24, p=0.022^*$ 6) $r=0.09, p=0.376$	Corrected 1) $r=-0.28, p=0.008^*$ 2) $r=-0.33, p=0.002^*$ 3) $r=-0.35, p<0.001^*$ 4) $r=0.27, p=0.011^*$ 5) $r=-0.30, p=0.005^*$ 6) $r=0.18, p=0.086$	Corrected 1) $r=-0.22, p=0.040^*$ 2) $r=-0.22, p=0.040^*$ 3) $r=-0.18, p=0.086$ 4) $r=0.09, p=0.404$ 5) $r=-0.17, p=0.103$ 6) $r=0.20, p=0.055$
Lopez et al., 2016 ²¹	Sedentary 66±5.4 yrs N=50 M	Transverse Snap-shot	avg: RF, VL, VM, VI Non-corrected EI	1) Sit-to-stand×30s			1) $r=-0.56, p<0.001^*$	
Maddocks et al., 2014 ²²	Healthy 63±10 yrs N=18 (9 F, 9 M) COPD 68±10 yrs N=17 (7 F, 10 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	TA Non-corrected EI	1) ISO dorsiflexion force			$r=-0.46, p=0.0004^*$	
Magrini et al., 2018 ²³	74.9±5.8 yrs N=18 F	Transverse Panoramic	RF Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) Sit-to-stand×60s (a: peak power; b: mean power; c: peak velocity; d: mean velocity)		1) $r=-0.34, p>0.05$		2a) $r=-0.48, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=-0.37, p>0.05$ 2c) $r=-0.38, p>0.05$ 2d) $r=0.02, p>0.05$
Masaki et al., 2016 ²⁴	72.9±7.4 yrs N=35 F	Transverse (multifidus) Sagittal (erector spinae, psoas major)	Multifidus, erector spinae, psoas major Non-corrected EI	1) Maximal gait speed 2) Normal gait speed	Multifidus: 1) $r=-0.01, p>0.05$ 2) $r=0.09, p>0.05$		Erector spinae: 1) $r=0.10, p>0.05$ 2) $r=0.06, p>0.05$	Psoas major: 1) $r=-0.30, p>0.05$ 2) $r=0.02, p>0.05$
Mateos-Angulo et al., 2021 ²⁵	85±7 yrs N=20 (15 F, 5 M)	Sagittal Snap-shot	UL: avg: BB, wrist flexors LL: avg: RF, VL, TA, MG Non-corrected EI	1) CON knee extension force 2) Grip strength 3) Timed-up-and-go 4) Gait speed 5) Short physical performance battery 6) Tinetti performance-oriented mobility test	UL: 1) $r=-0.52, p<0.05^*$ 2) $r=-0.04, p>0.05$ 3) $r=0.21, p>0.05$ 4) $r=-0.14, p>0.05$ 5) $r=-0.32, p>0.05$ 6) $r=-0.05, p>0.05$		LL: 1) $r=-0.68, p<0.01^*$ 2) $r=-0.27, p>0.05$ 3) $r=0.34, p>0.05$ 4) $r=-0.56, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.58, p<0.01^*$ 6) $r=-0.44, p<0.05^*$	
Mirón Mombiela et al., 2017 ²⁶	Outpatients 63 ±15.8 yrs N=112 (51 F, 61 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF Non-corrected EI	Grip strength		Female: $r=-0.52, p<0.01^*$		Male: $r=-0.36, p<0.01^*$
Mota et al., 2018 ²⁷	Recreationally active 69±3 yrs N=22 M	Transverse Panoramic	MG Φ , LG Φ , avg: MG, LG Corrected and non-corrected Φ EI	1: ISO Plantar-flexion peak torque Φ 2: 30°·s ⁻¹ CON Plantar-flexion (a: peak torque; b) RVD) Φ 3: 120°·s ⁻¹ CON Plantar-flexion (a: peak torque Φ ; b) RVD)	MG: Non-corrected: 1) $r=-0.05, p=0.834 \Phi$ 2a) $r=-0.10, p=0.658 \Phi$ 2b) $r=-0.01, p=0.953 \Phi$ 3a) $r=-0.09, p=0.683 \Phi$ 3b) $r=-0.44, p=0.043^* \Phi$	LG: Non-corrected: 1) $r=-0.26, p=0.243 \Phi$ 2a) $r=0.01, p=0.970 \Phi$ 2b) $r=0.05, p=0.823 \Phi$ 3a) $r=-0.07, p=0.755 \Phi$ 3b) $r=-0.53, p=0.012^* \Phi$	MG+LG: Corrected: 1) $r=-0.04, p=0.0861 \Phi$ 2a) $r=0.01, p=0.988 \Phi$ 2b) $r=-0.13, p=0.562 \Phi$ 3a) $r=-0.12, p=0.587 \Phi$ 3b) $r=-0.49, p=0.020^* \Phi$	

				Corrected:	Corrected:
				1) $r=-0.13, p=0.580 \Phi$	1) $r=-0.16, p=0.466 \Phi$
				2a) $r=0.01, p=0.975 \Phi$	2a) $r=0.00, p=0.998 \Phi$
				2b) $r=-0.20, p=0.365 \Phi$	2b) $r=-0.03, p=0.895 \Phi$
				3a) $r=-0.16, p=0.469 \Phi$	3a) $r=-0.05, p=0.822 \Phi$
				3b) $r=-0.33, p=0.139 \Phi$	3b) $r=-0.48, p=0.026^* \Phi$
Mota & Stock, 2017 ²⁸	74±6 yrs N=13 M	Sagittal Snap-shot	RF Corrected & non-corrected Φ EI	Non-corrected: Φ 1a) $r=-0.49, p=0.093 \Phi$ 1b) $r=-0.10, p=0.745 \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.47, p=0.102 \Phi$	Corrected: 1a) $r=-0.52, p=0.068$ 1b) $r=-0.58, p=0.038^*$ 2) $r=-0.35, p=0.246$
Nishihara et al., 2014 ²⁹	73±3.2 yrs N=19 (5 F, 14 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VI Non-corrected EI	RF: 1) $r=-0.08, p>0.05$ 2) $r=-0.26, p>0.05$ 3) $r=-0.18, p>0.05$ 4) $r=-0.19, p>0.05$	VI: 1) $r=-0.12, p>0.05$ 2) $r=0.16, p>0.05$ 3) $r=-0.04, p>0.05$ 4) $r=0.06, p>0.05$
				Healthy:	Diabetic:
				RF:	RF:
				1) $r=-0.31, p<0.001^* \Phi$	1) $r=-0.37, p<0.001^* \Phi$
				2) $r=-0.22, p<0.001^* \Phi$	2) $r=-0.39, p<0.001^* \Phi$
				3) $r=-0.29, p<0.001^* \Phi$	3) $r=-0.29, p=0.005^* \Phi$
				4) $r=-0.31, p<0.001^* \Phi$	4) $r=-0.23, p=0.027^* \Phi$
				5) $r=-0.26, p<0.001^* \Phi$	5) $r=-0.29, p=0.004^* \Phi$
				6) $r=-0.21, p<0.001^* \Phi$	6) $r=-0.23, p=0.080 \Phi$
				VI:	VI:
				1) $r=-0.34, p<0.001^* \Phi$	1) $r=-0.43, p<0.001^* \Phi$
				2) $r=-0.25, p<0.001^* \Phi$	2) $r=-0.40, p<0.001^* \Phi$
				3) $r=-0.26, p<0.001^* \Phi$	3) $r=-0.26, p<0.001^* \Phi$
				4) $r=-0.28, p<0.001^* \Phi$	4) $r=-0.21, p=0.043^* \Phi$
				5) $r=-0.24, p<0.001^* \Phi$	5) $r=-0.29, p=0.003^* \Phi$
				6) $r=-0.20, p<0.001^* \Phi$	6) $r=0.012, p=0.928 \Phi$
				Non-corrected EI Φ:	Corrected EI:
				MG:	MG:
				1) $r=-0.10, p=0.734 \Phi$	1) $r=-0.03, p=0.908 \Phi$
				2a) $r=-0.48, p=0.073 \Phi$	2a) $r=-0.49, p=0.065 \Phi$
				2b) $r=-0.31, p=0.261 \Phi$	2b) $r=-0.39, p=0.146 \Phi$
				3) $r=-0.48, p=0.073 \Phi$	3) $r=-0.56, p=0.029^* \Phi$
				LG:	LG:
				1) $r=0.05, p=0.864 \Phi$	1) $r=0.11, p=0.704 \Phi$
				2a) $r=-0.09, p=0.753 \Phi$	2a) $r=-0.20, p=0.482 \Phi$
				2b) $r=-0.04, p=0.902 \Phi$	2b) $r=-0.26, p=0.353 \Phi$
				3) $r=-0.10, p=0.737 \Phi$	3) $r=-0.07, p=0.807 \Phi$
Olmos et al., 2019 ³¹	Un-trained 65.3±3.2 yrs N=15 M	Transverse Panoramic	MG, LG Corrected and non-corrected Φ EI	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) CON knee extension ($60^\circ \cdot s^{-1}$) (a: peak torque; b: peak power) 3) Grip strength	
Olmos et al., 2020 ³²	65.3±3.3 yrs N=15 M	Transverse Snap-shot	avg: MG, LG Corrected EI	ISO plantar-flexion 1) Absolute torque (a: 50 ms; b: 100 ms; c: 200 ms) 2) Normalized torque (a: 50 ms; b: 100 ms; c: 200 ms) 3) Specific torque (a: peak; b: 50 ms; c: 100 ms; d: 200 ms)	1a) $r=-0.30, p>0.05$ 1b) $r=-0.22, p>0.05$ 1c) $r=-0.14, p>0.05$ 2a) $r=-0.44, p<0.05^*$ 2b) $r=-0.38, p<0.05^*$ 2c) $r=-0.38, p<0.05^*$ 3a) $r=0.01, p>0.05$ 3b) $r=-0.25, p>0.05$ 3c) $r=-0.19, p>0.05$ 3d) $r=-0.15, p>0.05$ 4a) $r=-0.31, p>0.05$ 4b) $r=0.00, p>0.05$ 5a) $r=-0.45, p<0.05^*$ 5b) $r=-0.06, p>0.05$ 6a) $r=-0.25, p>0.05$ 6b) $r=-0.06, p>0.05$ 7a) $r=-0.34, p>0.05$ 7b) $r=-0.18, p>0.05$

				4) Absolute RTD (a: 0-50 ms; b: 100-200 ms) 5) Normalized RTD (a: 0-50 ms; b: 100-200 ms) 6) Specific RTD (a: 0-50 ms; b: 100-200 ms) 7) Absolute impulse (a: 0-50 ms; b: 100-200 ms)			
Osawa et al., 2017 ³³	88-92 yrs N=108 (45 F, 52 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	avg: RF, VI Non-corrected EI	1) Timed-up-and-go 2) Sit-to-stand×30s		1) $r=-0.51, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=0.95, p<0.05^* \chi$	
Palmer et al., 2020 ³⁴	73±4 yrs N=19 M	Transverse Panoramic	avg: BF, semitendinosus, semimembranosus Corrected EI	1) Eyes closed postural stability (Sway Index)		1) $r=0.47, p=0.040^*$	
Palmer & Farrow, 2022 ³⁵	Healthy 67±4 yrs N=20 F	Transverse Panoramic	VL Corrected & non-corrected EI	1) Timed-up-and-go 2) 6 min walk test	Non-corrected EI: 1) $r=0.55, p=0.012^*$ 2) $r=-0.46, p=0.040^*$	Corrected EI: 1) $r=0.43, p=0.105$ 2) $r=-0.37, p=0.126$	
Palmer & Thompson 2017 ³⁶	Active 72±5 yrs N=15 M	Transverse Panoramic	avg: BF, semitendinosus, semimembranosus Non-corrected EI	ISO knee flexion torque (a: maximal; b: RFD)		1a) $r=-0.81, p<0.05^* \chi$ 1b) $r=-0.95, p<0.05^* \chi$	
					RF: 1) $r=-0.41, p=0.038^*$ 2) $r=-0.55, p=0.001^* \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.53, p=0.002^* \Phi$ 4) $r=-0.53, p=0.002^* \Phi$ 5a) $r=-0.47, p=0.025^*$ 5b) $r=-0.48, p=0.028^*$ 6) $r=-0.36, p=0.046^* \Phi$ 7) $r=-0.11, p=0.16 \Phi$ 8) $r=-0.17, p=0.34 \Phi$ LG: 1) $r=-0.05, p=0.804 \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.05, p=0.798 \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.16, p=0.387 \Phi$ 4) $r=-0.20, p=0.265 \Phi$ 5a) $r=0.04, p=0.828 \Phi$ 5b) $r=0.04, p=0.848 \Phi$ 6) $r=-0.08, p=0.685 \Phi$ 7) $r=-0.25, p=0.323 \Phi$ 8) $r=-0.03, p=0.859 \Phi$	Tibialis anterior: 1) $r=-0.38, p= \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.45, p= \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.53, p= \Phi$ 4) $r=-0.47, p= \Phi$ 5a) $r=-0.26, p= \Phi$ 5b) $r=-0.27, p= \Phi$ 6) $r=-0.50, p= \Phi$ 7) $r=-0.25, p= \Phi$ 8) $r=-0.16, p= \Phi$ BB: 1) $r=-0.08, p= \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.40, p= \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.44, p= \Phi$ 4) $r=-0.49, p=0.040^*$ 5a) $r=-0.11, p= \Phi$ 5b) $r=-0.14, p= \Phi$ 6) $r=-0.31, p= \Phi$ 7) $r=-0.15, p= \Phi$ 8) $r=-0.08, p= \Phi$	TB: 1) $r=-0.28, p=0.035^* \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.47, p=0.009^* \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.59, p=0.002^* \Phi$ 4) $r=-0.57, p=0.007^* \Phi$ 5a) $r=-0.27, p=0.146 \Phi$ 5b) $r=-0.27, p=0.139 \Phi$ 6) $r=-0.53, p=0.004^* \Phi$ 7) $r=-0.30, p=0.244 \Phi$ 8) $r=-0.22, p=0.380 \Phi$ Rectus abdominis: 1) $r=-0.28, p=0.120 \Phi$ 2) $r=-0.20, p=0.270 \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.07, p=0.708 \Phi$ 4) $r=-0.38, p=0.033^* \Phi$ 5a) $r=-0.21, p=0.250 \Phi$ 5b) $r=-0.21, p=0.260 \Phi$ 6) $r=-0.15, p=0.404 \Phi$ 7) $r=-0.47, p=0.005^* \Phi$ 8) $r=-0.30, p=0.097 \Phi$
Paris et al., 2022 ³⁷	Community dwelling 75.4±7.9 yrs N=32 M	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, LG, TA, BB, TB, rectus abdominis Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) ISO knee flexion torque 3) ISO elbow extension torque 4) ISO elbow flexion torque 5) CON knee extension peak power (a: 60°·s ⁻¹ ; b: 180°·s ⁻¹) 6) Grip strength 7) Sit-to-stand×30s 8) 6-min walk distance			
Rech et al., 2014 ³⁸	Healthy, Active 70.3±6.2 yrs N=45 F	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VI, VL, VM, Quadriceps (avg: RF, VI, VL, VM)	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) RTD (a: 0-50 ms; b: 0-100 ms; c: 0-250 ms; d: 0-300 ms) 3) Grip strength	RF: 1) $r=-0.31, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.27, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=-0.31, p<0.05^*$	VI: 1) $r=-0.45, p<0.01^*$ 2a) $r=-0.20, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=0.30, p>0.05$ Quadriceps: 1) $r=-0.41, p<0.01^*$ 2a) $r=-0.29, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=-0.35, p<0.05^*$	

			Non-corrected EI	4) Sit-to-stand×30s 5) Usual gait speed	2c) $r=-0.31, p<0.05^*$ 2d) $r=-0.31, p<0.05^*$ 4) $r=-0.51, p<0.01^*$ 5) $r=-0.35, p<0.05^*$	2c) $r=0.36, p<0.05^*$ 2d) $r=0.38, p<0.05^*$ 4) $r=-0.28, p>0.05$ 5) $r=-0.15, p>0.05$	2c) $r=-0.39, p<0.05^*$ 2d) $r=-0.39, p<0.05^*$ 3) $r=-0.33, p<0.05^*$ 4) $r=-0.49, p<0.01^*$ 5) $r=-0.27, p>0.05$	
					VL: 1) $r=-0.40, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.43, p<0.01^*$ 2b) $r=-0.44, p<0.01^*$ 2c) $r=-0.42, p<0.01^*$ 2d) $r=-0.64, p<0.01^*$ 4) $r=-0.41, p<0.01^*$ 5) $r=-0.21, p>0.05$	VM: 1) $r=-0.39, p<0.01^*$ 2a) $r=-0.24, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=0.30, p>0.05$ 2c) $r=0.36, p<0.05^*$ 2d) $r=0.38, p<0.05^*$ 4) $r=-0.43, p<0.01^*$ 5) $r=-0.20, p>0.05$	*Correlations with grip strength not reported for individual quadriceps muscle echogenicity*	
Stock et al., 2018 ³⁹	74±7 yrs N=23 (12 F, 11 M)	Transverse Panoramic	RF Corrected & non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extensor normalized torque 2) RTD 0-200 ms 3) 10 m gait speed 4) 400 m gait speed	Non-corrected EI: 1) $r=-0.12, p=0.593$ 2) $r=-0.21, p=0.349$ 3) $r=-0.05, p=0.844$ 4) $r=0.06, p=0.787$		Corrected EI: 1) $r=-0.50, p=0.018^*$ 2) $r=-0.43, p=0.049^*$ 3) $r=-0.41, p=0.066$ 4) $r=-0.41, p=0.065$	
Strasser et al., 2013 ⁴⁰	67.8±4.8 yrs N=26 (participant sex not provided)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VL, VI, VM Non-corrected EI	ISO knee extension force	RF: $r=0.30, p>0.05$	VL: $r=-0.27, p>0.05$	VI: $r=-0.34, p>0.05$	VM: $r=-0.10, p>0.05$
Taniguchi et al., 2017 ⁴¹	74.1±4.9 yrs N=179 F	Transverse Snap-shot	RF Non-corrected EI	ISO knee extension force			$r=-0.32, p<0.05^*$	
Watanabe et al., 2013 ⁴²	74.4±5.9 yrs N=184 M	Transverse Snap-shot	RF Non-corrected EI	ISO knee extension torque			$r=-0.33, p<0.001^*$	
Wearing et al., 2019 ⁴³	Nursing Home Residents 85.6±7.1 yrs N=30 (23 F, 7 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, BB Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension torque Φ 2) ISO elbow flexion torque Φ 3) Grip strength Φ 4) Sit-to-stand Φ	RF: 1) $r=-0.16, p=0.434$ 2) $r=-0.47, p=0.11^*$ 3) $r=-0.26, p=0.169$ 4) $r=0.01, p=0.976$		BB: 1) $r=-0.19, p=0.355$ 2) $r=-0.24, p=0.221$ 3) $r=-0.16, p=0.411$ 4) $r=0.15, p=0.598$	
Wilhelm et al., 2014 ⁴⁴	Sedentary Healthy 66.1±4.5 yrs N=50 M	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VL, VI, VM, Quadriceps (avg: RF, VL, VI, VM) Non-corrected	1) ISO knee extension torque 2) RTD (a: 0-50 ms; b: 0-200 ms) 3) CON knee extension (a: 1-RM; b: peak power; c: average power) 4) Jump (a: peak power; b: average power) 5) Sit-to-stand reps×30s	RF: 1) $r=-0.46, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.45, p<0.05^*$ 2b) $r=-0.23, p>0.05$ 3a) $r=-0.50, p<0.05^*$ 3b) $r=-0.29, p<0.05^*$ 3c) $r=-0.29, p<0.05^*$ 4a) $r=-0.51, p<0.05^*$ 4b) $r=-0.57, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.30, p<0.05^*$	VI: 1) $r=-0.48, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.19, p>0.05$ 2b) $r=-0.28, p<0.05^*$ 3a) $r=-0.50, p<0.05^*$ 3b) $r=-0.34, p<0.05^*$ 3c) $r=-0.43, p<0.05^*$ 4a) $r=-0.59, p<0.05^*$ 4b) $r=-0.59, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.43, p<0.05^*$	Quadriceps: 1) $r=-0.63, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.32, p<0.05^*$ 2b) $r=-0.50, p<0.05^*$ 3a) $r=-0.66, p<0.05^*$ 3b) $r=-0.41, p<0.05^*$ 3c) $r=-0.50, p<0.05^*$ 4a) $r=-0.75, p<0.05^*$ 4b) $r=-0.74, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.50, p<0.05^*$	
					VL: 1) $r=-0.55, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.30, p<0.05^*$ 2b) $r=-0.39, p<0.05^*$ 3a) $r=-0.56, p<0.05^*$ 3b) $r=-0.36, p<0.05^*$ 3c) $r=-0.52, p<0.05^*$	VM: 1) $r=-0.64, p<0.05^*$ 2a) $r=-0.39, p<0.05^*$ 2b) $r=-0.57, p<0.05^*$ 3a) $r=-0.66, p<0.05^*$ 3b) $r=-0.44, p<0.05^*$ 3c) $r=-0.52, p<0.05^*$		

					4a) $r=-0.73, p<0.05^*$ 4b) $r=-0.69, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.41, p<0.05^*$	4a) $r=-0.64, p<0.05^*$ 4b) $r=-0.65, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.60, p<0.05^*$	
Wilson et al., 2019 ⁴⁵	Healthy F: 71 yrs; M: 76 yrs N=39 (27 F, 13M) Frail F: 85.5 yrs; M: 77.5 yrs N=31 (17 F, 14 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	RF Non-corrected EI	1) Grip strength (body-mass normalized) 2) Walk time 3) Short Physical Performance Battery	Healthy (n=31 Φ): 1) $r=-0.24, p=0.194 \Phi$ 2) $r=0.03, p=0.882 \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.11, p=0.558 \Phi$	Frail (n=16 Φ): 1) $r=0.21, p=0.436 \Phi$ 2) $r=0.69, p=0.003^* \Phi$ 3) $r=0.15, p=0.584 \Phi$	Combined (n=47 Φ): 1) $r=-0.33, p=0.025^* \Phi$ 2) $r=0.42, p=0.004^* \Phi$ 3) $r=-0.31, p=0.031^* \Phi$
Yamada et al., 2017 ⁴⁶	F: 79.7 \pm 6.9 yrs M: 81.6 \pm 7.4 yrs N=347 (247 F, 100 M) 'Normal' n=126 'Presarcopenia' n=38 'Dynapenia' n=102 'Sarcopenia' n=81	Transverse Snap-shot	RF, VI, Quadriceps (avg; RF, VI) Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extension torque (a: absolute, b: normalized) 2) Grip strength 3) Timed-up-and-go 4) Sit-to-stand \times 5 5) Maximal walking speed 6) One-leg balance	Female: RF: 1a) $r=-0.27, p<0.05^* \chi$ 1b) $r=-0.94, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=-0.88, p<0.05^* \chi$ 3) $r=-0.91, p<0.05^* \chi$ 4) $r=-0.91, p<0.05^* \chi$ 5) $r=-0.94, p<0.05^* \chi$ 6) $r=-0.73, p<0.05^* \chi$ VI: 1a) $r=-0.47, p<0.05^* \chi$ 1b) $r=-0.86, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=-0.58, p<0.05^* \chi$ 3) $r=-0.76, p<0.05^* \chi$ 4) $r=-0.75, p<0.05^* \chi$ 5) $r=-0.86, p<0.05^* \chi$ 6) $r=-0.36, p<0.05^* \chi$	Quadriceps: 1a) $r=-0.13, p<0.05^* \chi$ 1b) $r=-0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=-0.83, p<0.05^* \chi$ 3) $r=-0.90, p<0.05^* \chi$ 4) $r=-0.88, p<0.05^* \chi$ 5) $r=-0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$ 6) $r=-0.61, p<0.05^* \chi$ Male: RF: 1a) $r=-0.13, p>0.05 \chi$ 1b) $r=0.95, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=-0.81, p<0.05^* \chi$ 3) $r=-0.91, p<0.05^* \chi$ 4) $r=-0.92, p<0.05^* \chi$ 5) $r=-0.95, p<0.05^* \chi$ 6) $r=-0.73, p<0.05^* \chi$	VI: 1a) $r=-0.54, p<0.05^* \chi$ 1b) $r=-0.86, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=-0.31, p<0.05^* \chi$ 3) $r=-0.74, p<0.05^* \chi$ 4) $r=-0.75, p<0.05^* \chi$ 5) $r=-0.86, p<0.05^* \chi$ 6) $r=-0.41, p<0.05^* \chi$ Quadriceps: 1a) $r=-0.37, p<0.05^* \chi$ 1b) $r=0.94, p<0.05^* \chi$ 2) $r=-0.71, p<0.05^* \chi$ 3) $r=-0.81, p<0.05^* \chi$ 4) $r=-0.90, p<0.05^* \chi$ 5) $r=-0.94, p<0.05^* \chi$ 6) $r=-0.61, p<0.05^* \chi$
Yamaguchi et al., 2019 ⁴⁷	Community dwelling ~75 \pm 9 yrs N=139 (74 F, 65 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	Masseter Non-corrected EI	1) Grip strength 2) Normal walking speed		1) $r=-0.42, p<0.05^*$ 2) $r=-0.27, p<0.05^*$	
Yoshiko et al., 2018 ⁴⁸	78 \pm 8 yrs N=22 (14 F, 8 M)	Transverse Snap-shot	Appendicular (avg; RF, BF, TB), Axial (multifidus) Non-corrected EI	1) ISO knee extensor torque 2) Grip strength 3) Timed-up-and-go 4) Sit-to-stand 5) 5 m normal speed walk 6) 5 m maximal speed walk 7) Functional reach	Appendicular: 1) $r=-0.19, p>0.05$ 2) $r=-0.11, p>0.05$ 3) $r=0.38, p>0.05$ 4) $r=-0.31, p>0.05$ 5) $r=-0.04, p>0.05$ 6) $r=-0.16, p>0.05$ 7) $r=-0.32, p>0.05$	Axial: 1) $r=-0.59, p<0.05^*$ 2) $r=-0.44, p<0.05^*$ 3) $r=0.57, p<0.05^*$ 4) $r=-0.50, p<0.05^*$ 5) $r=-0.27, p>0.05$ 6) $r=-0.42, p<0.05^*$ 7) $r=-0.44, p<0.05^*$	
Yoshiko et al., 2019 ⁴⁹	Community dwelling 73.7 \pm 2.8 yrs N=209 F & M	Transverse Snap-shot	avg: RF, VL Non-corrected EI	1) Grip strength 2) Sit-to-stand 3) Timed-up-and-go 4) Stand from floor 5) Fast walking speed	Low EI: 1) $r=-0.84 \chi$ 2) $r=-0.99 \chi$ 3) $r=-0.99 \chi$ 4) $r=-0.99 \chi$	Medium EI: 1) $r=-0.93 \chi$ 2) $r=-0.99 \chi$ 3) $r=-0.99 \chi$ 4) $r=-0.99 \chi$	High EI: 1) $r=-0.97 \chi$ 2) $r=-0.99 \chi$ 3) $r=-0.99 \chi$ 4) $r=-0.99 \chi$

				6) Normal walking speed	5) $r=-0.99$ χ	5) $r=-0.99$ χ	5) $r=-0.99$ χ
				7) 6-min walk distance	6) $r=-0.99$ χ	6) $r=-0.99$ χ	6) $r=-0.99$ χ
					7) $r=-0.98$ χ	7) $r=-0.98$ χ	7) $r=-0.97$ χ
					RF:	VL:	Quadriceps:
				1) Grip strength	1) $r=-0.91, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.91, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.92, p<0.05^* \chi$
				2) Sit-to-stand (a: time 10 reps; b: chair rise time; c: ground reaction force; d: RFD)	2a) $r=-0.12, p>0.05$	2a) $r=-0.21, p>0.05$	2a) $r=-0.19, p>0.05$
					2b) $r=-0.03, p>0.05$	2b) $r=-0.09, p>0.05$	2b) $r=-0.07, p>0.05$
					2c) $r=-0.12, p>0.05$	2c) $r=-0.15, p>0.05$	2c) $r=-0.15, p>0.05$
					2d) $r=-0.09, p>0.05$	2d) $r=-0.14, p>0.05$	2d) $r=-0.13, p>0.05$
				3) 5 m maximal speed walk	3) $r=-0.98, p<0.05^* \chi$	3) $r=-0.98, p<0.05^* \chi$	3) $r=-0.99, p<0.05^* \chi$
					Corrected RF:	Corrected VL:	Corrected quadriceps:
					Tennis	Tennis	Tennis
					1) $r=-0.58, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.68, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.64, p<0.05^* \chi$
					2) $r=0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$
					Control	Control	Control
				1) ISO knee extension torque	1) $r=-0.38, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.59, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.49, p<0.05^* \chi$
				2) Sit-to-stand \times 30s	2) $r=0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.91, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.93, p<0.05^* \chi$
					Non-corrected RF:	Non-corrected VL:	Non-corrected quadriceps:
					Tennis	Tennis	Tennis
					1) $r=-0.77, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.78, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.78, p<0.05^* \chi$
					2) $r=0.78, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.89, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.90, p<0.05^* \chi$
					Control	Control	Control
					1) $r=-0.69, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.76, p<0.05^* \chi$	1) $r=-0.73, p<0.05^* \chi$
					2) $r=0.89, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.87, p<0.05^* \chi$	2) $r=0.89, p<0.05^* \chi$

Abbreviations: Δ =change, yrs=years old, m=meter, min=minute, s=second, ISO=isometric, CON=concentric, BB=biceps brachii, TB=triceps brachii, RF=rectus femoris, MG=medial gastrocnemius, LG=lateral gastrocnemius, VL=vastus lateralis, VI=vastus intermedius, VM=vastus medialis, UL=upper limb, LL=lower limb, EI=echo intensity, RFD=rate of force development, RTD=rate of torque development, RVD=rate of velocity development, TA=tibialis anterior.

Data are presented as mean \pm standard deviation. *=statistically significant ($p<0.05$) correlation. Φ =Unpublished data provided by authors upon request. χ =calculated from mean, SD and n data (p -values are based on 95% confidence intervals).

248

249

250

251 Scans were collected in the transverse plane in 46 studies,^{7,12,14–17,19–24,26–30,32–36,38–44,46–62}
252 with four obtaining sagittal plane images,^{11,18,37,44} one study utilized both transverse and sagittal
253 scanning planes.⁴⁴ Snap-shot images were collected in 39 studies,^{7,11,12,14,17,18,20–24,26–29,32,33,35–42,44–}
254 ^{47,49,53,55–62} with 11 using panoramic/extended field-of-view technologies.^{15,16,19,30,34,43,48,50–52,54} The
255 scanning plane and scanning method could not be deduced in a single study.³¹ Non-corrected
256 echogenicity was used in 49 studies,^{7,11,12,14–20,22–24,26–49,51–62} while subcutaneous fat-correction was
257 reported or obtained in 12 studies.^{15,16,18,19,21,30,40,48,50,51,54,59} Both non-corrected and corrected
258 values and/or correlations were found or obtained from 10 studies.^{15,16,18,19,30,40,48,51,54,59}

259
260 The rectus femoris was the most common (n=33) isolated muscle included in
261 correlations,^{7,11,12,14,17,18,20,22–24,28,29,31–37,39–41,43,46,47,53–57,59–62} followed by the vastus lateralis
262 (n=11),^{12,28,29,36,38,39,51,53,56,59,62} medial gastrocnemius (n=7),^{15,16,32,33,36,40,48} vastus intermedius
263 (n=7),^{12,20,41,47,53,56,57} lateral gastrocnemius (n=4),^{15,22,40,48} biceps brachii (n=4),^{22,23,32,33} vastus
264 medialis (n=3),^{12,53,56} tibialis anterior (n=3),^{22,36,42} and triceps brachii (n=3).^{22,32,33} Single studies
265 reported correlations with the multifidus,⁴⁴ erector spinae,⁴⁴ gluteus medius,³⁸ masseter,⁵⁸ psoas
266 major,⁴⁴ or rectus abdominis²² muscles. Several studies also pooled multiple muscles including all
267 four quadriceps muscles (n=4),^{27,41,53,56} rectus femoris and vastus lateralis (n=7),^{28–30,57,59,61,62}
268 rectus femoris and vastus intermedius (n=2),^{49,57} biceps brachii and the wrist flexors (n=1),⁴⁵ lateral
269 gastrocnemius and soleus (n=1),²⁶ rectus femoris, biceps femoris and triceps brachii (n=1),⁶⁰ rectus
270 femoris, vastus intermedius, medial gastrocnemius and lateral gastrocnemius (n=1),¹⁹ and rectus
271 femoris, vastus lateralis, tibialis anterior and medial gastrocnemius (n=1).⁴⁵

272


273 The most common functional test was peak force or torque during isometric knee extension
274 (n=22)^{7,12,14,17,18,20,22,23,27,31,35,39,43,47,48,53–57,59,60} or flexion (n=2),^{22,52} followed by measures of grip
275 strength (n=20),^{11,14,20,22–24,28,32,33,37,40,45,46,48,53,57,58,60–62} walking speed
276 (n=16),^{14,17,20,32,33,36,40,44,45,47,53,54,57,58,60,61} sit-to-stand (n=16),^{22,23,28,29,38,40,41,43,49,53,56,57,59–62} timed
277 up-and-go (n=10),^{17,20,38,45,47,49,51,57,60,61} concentric knee extension force or power,
278 (n=8)^{11,22,30,31,39,45,48,56} isometric or concentric plantar-flexion (n=5) strength, power or velocity,
279 ^{15,16,19,26,48} single leg balance or posture (n=5),^{17,20,38,50,57} isometric elbow flexion (n=2)^{22,23} or
280 extension (n=1),²² sit-up (n=2),^{28,29} supine to stand (n=2),^{28,29} ‘functional reach’ score (n=2),^{40,60}
281 or short physical performance battery (n=2).^{24,45} Single studies reported correlations between
282 echogenicity and the ‘functional independence measure gait score’,²⁷ heel-rise repetitions,⁴⁰ dorsi-
283 flexion,⁴² or hip flexion force,³⁴ jump height or power,⁵⁶ knee extension fatigue,³⁰ stand from
284 floor,⁶¹ or the Tinetti performance test.⁴⁵ Ten studies included at least one measure of rapid
285 force/torque/velocity production.^{16,19,21,34,39,52–54,56,62}

286

287 3.2. Knee extension strength

288 Twenty studies, including 2924 participants, reported or later provided correlations
289 between quadriceps echogenicity and maximal isometric or concentric knee extension force or
290 torque.^{7,12,17,18,20,22,23,23,27,30,31,35,37,39,43,45,47,54–56} Meta-analysis determined a moderate ($r=-0.36$
291 [95%CI: -0.38 to -0.32], $p<0.001$) negative correlation between quadriceps echogenicity and knee
292 extension strength in older adults (**Figure 2A**). Sub-group analyses revealed no significant
293 differences between correlations between knee extension strength and individual quadriceps
294 muscles (**Figure 2B**). However, despite relatively few studies for comparison, the vastus medialis
295 muscle holds larger correlations ($r=-0.41$ [95%CI: -0.65 to -0.10], $p=0.01$) when compared to

296 vastus intermedius ($r=-0.35$ [95%CI: -0.41 to -0.30], $p<0.001$), vastus lateralis ($r=-0.30$ [95%CI:
 297 -0.55 to -0.02], $p=0.04$), or rectus femoris ($r=-0.34$ [95%CI: -0.37 to -0.30], $p<0.001$) muscles.
 298 Interestingly, combining the rectus femoris with vastus lateralis echogenicity ($r=-0.60$ [95%CI: -
 299 0.77 to -0.36], $p<0.001$) outperformed combining all four quadriceps muscles ($r=-0.48$ [95%CI: -
 300 0.72 to -0.13], $p=0.01$). Additionally, the rectus femoris and vastus intermedius combination
 301 (Fisher's Z lower 95%CI: -0.38) was superior to rectus femoris in isolation (Fisher's Z upper
 302 95%CI: -0.39).
 303




304
 305 **Figure 2.** Meta-analytical forest plot of Fisher's Z correlations between quadriceps echogenicity
 306 and maximal isometric or concentric force or torque (**panel A**) with sub-group analysis for
 307 individual quadriceps muscles (**panel B**). *=studies where multiple muscles and correlations were
 308 averaged.

310 **3.3. Grip strength**

311 Sixteen studies, including 1912 participants, reported or provided correlations between
 312 muscle echogenicity and grip strength.^{11,14,20,22–24,28,32,33,37,40,45,46,48,53,58} Meta-analysis determined
 313 a moderate ($r=-0.31$ [95%CI: -0.37 to -0.24], $p<0.001$) negative correlation between echogenicity
 314 and grip strength (**Figure 3**). No significant differences were found when comparing correlations
 315 between different individual muscles via sub-group analyses.


It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



316
317 **Figure 3.** Meta-analytical forest plot of Fisher’s Z correlations between echogenicity and grip
318 strength. *=studies where multiple muscles and correlations were averaged.
319

320 3.4. Walking speed

321 Within study comparison demonstrated that preferred or normal walking speed ($r=-0.11$.
322 range: -0.46 to 0.17) held smaller correlations ($p=0.015$) with muscle echogenicity when compared
323 to maximal walking speed ($r=-0.17$, range: -0.51 to 0.15).^{20,36,40,44,47,60,61} Therefore, the meta-
324 analysis only included maximal walking speed where possible. The meta-analysis included 17
325 studies, including 2972 participants.^{14,17,20,22,24,28,29,33,36,40,44,45,51,53,54,58,60} Meta-analysis determined
326 a small ($r=-0.23$ [95% CI: -0.29 to -0.16], $p<0.001$) negative correlation between echogenicity and
327 walking speed (**Figure 4**). Not enough between-study consistency existed to examine sub-analysis
328 of individual muscle groups.




329
330 **Figure 4.** Meta-analytical forest plot of Fisher's Z correlations between echogenicity and walking
331 speed. *=studies where multiple muscles and correlations were averaged.
332

333 3.5. Sit-to-stand

334 A total of 12 studies with 666 elderly participants were included in the meta-analysis
335 determining a moderate ($r=-0.34$ [95%CI: -0.44 to -0.23], $p<0.001$) negative correlation between
336 echogenicity and sit-to-stand performance (**Figure 5A**).^{22,23,28,29,38,40,41,43,53,56,60,62} When examining
337 individual muscles (**Figure 5B**), the combination of all four quadriceps muscles ($r=-0.61$ [95%CI:
338 -0.74 to -0.43], $p<0.001$) appears to have superior correlations when compared to rectus femoris
339 ($r=-0.25$ [95%CI: -0.37 to -0.14], $p<0.001$), vastus lateralis ($r=-0.38$ [95%CI: -0.51 to -0.21],
340 $p<0.001$), rectus femoris with vastus lateralis ($r=-0.28$ [95%CI: -0.45 to -0.10], $p=0.03$), or vastus
341 intermedius ($r=-0.45$ [95%CI: -0.70 to -0.10], $p<0.001$). While only incorporating two studies,
342 vastus medialis ($r=-0.55$ [95%CI: -0.73 to -0.37], $p<0.001$) outperformed all other individual
343 quadriceps muscles when correlating to sit-to-stand performance.

344



345

346

347

348


349

Figure 5. Meta-analytical forest plot of Fisher’s Z correlations between quadriceps echogenicity and sit-to-stand performance (**panel A**) with sub-group analysis for individual quadriceps muscles (**panel B**). *=studies where multiple muscles and correlations were averaged.

350 **3.6. Timed up-and-go**

351 Seven studies, incorporating 2172 participants, were included in a meta-analysis. The
 352 meta-analysis determined a small ($r=-0.26$ [95% CI: -0.35 to -0.18], $p<0.001$) negative correlation
 353 between echogenicity and timed up-and-go performance (**Figure 6**).^{17,20,38,45,47,51,60} Sub-group
 354 analyses could not be confidently performed. However, it seems plausible that vastus lateralis ($r=-$
 355 0.55 to -0.51) echogenicity is a better predictor of timed up-and-go performance than the rectus
 356 femoris ($r=-0.29$ to -0.19) or vastus intermedius ($r=-0.26$ to 0.06). Interestingly, the largest single
 357 correlations with timed up-and-go performance were multifidus ($r=-0.57$) and gluteus medius ($r=-$
 358 0.49) echogenicity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



359
360 **Figure 6.** Meta-analytical forest plot of Fisher’s Z correlations between echogenicity and timed
361 up-and-go performance. *=studies where multiple muscles and correlations were averaged.
362

363 *3.7. Rapid force production*

364 Ten studies report measures of rapid force,^{16,52,62} torque,^{21,34,53,54,56} or velocity^{19,39}
365 development. Correlations with echogenicity were generally small and highly variable ($r=-0.15$;
366 range: -0.42 to 0.25). Methods were too variable for meta-analyses to be confidently performed.


367
368 *3.8. Additional considerations*

369 Other physical performance measures (e.g., sit-up, functional batteries, balance tasks) did
370 not exist in large enough quantities to warrant data pooling. However, correlations were trivial to
371 large ($r=-0.58$ to 0.23) and highly variable. Funnel plots illustrate minimal risk of publication bias

372 **Figure 7.**

373

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



374
 375 **Figure 7.** Funnel plots representing echogenicity correlations with knee extension strength (panel
 376 A), grip strength (panel B), walking speed (panel C), sit-to-stand (panel D), and timed up-and-go
 377 (panel E) performances, respectively
 378

379 **4. Discussion**

380 Early identification of skeletal muscle weakness or dysfunction is imperative for early
 381 diagnosis and treatment for older individuals. Ultrasound-derived echogenicity is one potential
 382 method to detect and track changes in muscle composition and loss of function. Therefore, this
 383 systematic review with meta-analyses aimed to compile available research that evaluates the
 384 relationships between muscle echogenicity and measures of muscle functional assessments in older
 385 adults. The meta-analyses, consisting of 7-20 studies, consistently found moderate, negative

386 relationships, demonstrating higher measures of echogenicity (lower muscle quality) associated
387 with lower physical function. However, results were not uniform across all studies.

388

389 This study's primary and largest meta-analysis examined the relationships between quadriceps
390 muscle echogenicity and knee extension strength. This pooled analysis included 20 studies and 2924 older
391 adults^{7,12,17,18,20,22,23,23,27,30,31,35,37,39,43,45,47,54-56} and demonstrated a modest, negative relationship, with
392 relatively narrow confidence intervals ($r=-0.36$ [95%CI: -0.38, -0.32], $p<0.001$). Quadriceps strength has
393 demonstrated moderate to strong relationships to functional tasks,²³ with lower quadriceps strength
394 increasing the odds (OR=3 [95% CI, 1.78 to 5.05]) of falls within older adults.⁶⁴ Further, quadriceps strength
395 relates to mortality, demonstrating a high utility for patient prognoses.⁶⁵ The current review demonstrated
396 that skeletal muscle quality quantified through ultrasound echogenicity might explain a relatively small
397 variance of knee extensor torque. Prior research has found that echogenicity and muscle volume predict
398 greater variances of knee extensor torque compared to muscle volume alone,⁶⁶ which may suggest that
399 morphological components of skeletal tissue contribute to the muscle's functionality. The small to moderate
400 pooled estimates within the current review may support echogenicity as a supplementary outcome to muscle
401 volume in predicting strength or function. However, quadriceps echogenicity may be an appropriate
402 surrogate to quantify knee extensor torque and total-body physical function as a stand-alone measure. The
403 consistent findings of negative relationships may propose the utility of such measures within a screening
404 protocol in a battery of other assessments. Greater intramuscular adipose tissue is associated with an 8%
405 risk of mortality⁶⁷ and has thus been suggested as a time-efficient and noninvasive sarcopenia screen.⁶⁸
406 Finally, it should be noted that sub-analysis, which including a limited number of studies excluding the
407 rectus femoris, demonstrated relatively minimal differences in correlations with knee extensor strength over
408 different quadriceps muscles. However, the studies combining multiple quadriceps muscles (rectus
409 femoris+vastus lateralis; rectus femoris+vastus lateralis+vastus intermedius+vastus medialis) demonstrated
410 the strongest correlations.

411

412 Like quadriceps strength, the meta-analysis of grip strength demonstrated a modest negative
413 correlation ($r=-0.31$ [95%CI: -0.37 to -0.24], $p<0.001$) with echogenicity. When examining non-meta
414 data, lower tissue quality in other muscle groups was also negatively related to knee extensor torque. For
415 example, the multifidus and gastrocnemius echogenicity demonstrated weak to moderate negative
416 relationships to knee extensor torque.⁶⁰ Prior research has shown lower muscle quality present across
417 multiple muscle groups with older individuals – suggesting global changes in muscle morphology, a finding
418 supported by the present meta-analyses. Mateos-Angulo et al.⁴⁵ found that the scanning location for muscle
419 quality is important in collecting different strength measures. Muscle echogenicity contained in the upper
420 extremity (biceps brachii and superficial wrist flexors) and lower extremity (rectus femoris, vastus lateralis,
421 medial gastrocnemius, and tibialis anterior) were found to have moderate relationships to knee extensor
422 torque, but not to hand grip strength.⁴⁵ Hand-grip strength is a commonly collected measure within older
423 adults to screen for sarcopenia.^{1,69} The current review demonstrates its relationship to skeletal muscle
424 quality to be inconsistent across and within muscle groups ($r=-0.52$ to -0.02). Chang et al.³² found
425 significant, negative relationships to hand grip strength when muscle quality was assessed within the biceps
426 brachii, triceps brachii, and rectus femoris, but not to the medial gastrocnemius. Yoshiko et al.⁶⁰ averaged
427 four scanning locations (rectus femoris, biceps femoris, and triceps brachii) and found no significant
428 relationships to hand-grip strength.

429

430 Relationships to dynamic performance (walking speed: $r=-0.23$ [95%CI: -0.29 to -0.16],
431 $p<0.001$; sit-to-stand: $r=-0.34$ [95%CI: -0.44 to -0.23], $p<0.001$; timed up-and-go: $r=-0.26$
432 [95%CI: -0.35 to -0.18], $p<0.001$) were similar, but slightly weaker and less homogenous than
433 quadriceps strength. Intermuscular adipose fat has been demonstrated to be associated with annual declines
434 in gait speed, a relationship independent from total body adiposity in men.⁷⁰ Maximal gait speed in older
435 adults are influenced by numerous neuromuscular factors, which may limit the predictability of such task

436 from quality assessment of a single muscle.⁷¹ Also, the number of individual muscles needed to be recruited
437 and activated for walking tasks may explain the inconsistencies or lack of relationships between a single
438 muscle group and gait speed. Nevertheless, the relatively similar between-variable pooled correlations,
439 combined with the sub-analyses, suggest that muscle echogenicity is systemic; thus, poor muscle quality in
440 one muscle is likely representative of total-body skeletal muscle composition.

441
442 In addition to strength, the current review extracted ten studies that assessed the relationship
443 between muscle echogenicity and rapid force, torque, or velocity production.^{16,19,21,34,39,52–54,56,62} Rate of
444 force/torque/velocity development quantifies the time frame at which these qualities are expressed and often
445 hold stronger relationships to sport-specific and functional daily tasks than strength alone.^{72,73} Rapid
446 strength expression is limited in older, active men compared to a younger cohort.⁷⁴ Negative, but highly
447 variable relationships were observed between muscle echogenicity and rapid force expression, though the
448 methods by which rapid force expression was measured may influence these clinical relationships. Olmos
449 et al.²¹ assessed the rate of torque development in terms of absolute (non-normalized), normalized
450 (normalized to peak torque), or specific (normalized to muscle cross-sectional area) and only found weak,
451 negative relationships to exist between gastrocnemius echogenicity and plantar-flexion rate of torque
452 development when normalized to peak torque.²¹ Additionally, the time domain in calculating rapid force
453 expression may contribute to the relationships to clinical outcomes. Studies extracted in this review
454 calculated rapid force from 0-50 ms to 0-200 ms, demonstrating weak to moderate relationships to
455 echogenicity with each.^{21,56}

456

457 *4.1. Limitations and future research directions*

458 While a substantial number of studies, participants, muscles, functional tests, and analyses
459 were examined, this systematic review with meta-analyses has limitations. While this review
460 focused on older adults, ultrasonic muscle quality and composition estimations are potentially

461 valuable to various populations, including development through adulthood, athletes, and people
462 with neuromuscular conditions. Due to general differences in muscle fiber type and body fat
463 amount and distribution, the effects of sex on the relationships between skeletal muscle
464 echogenicity is another exciting topic, especially considering the lack of studies reporting
465 correlations with subcutaneous fat thickness corrected values despite correction resulting in greater
466 inter-session reliability.⁷⁵ While one of the strengths of meta-analysis is to balance out studies with
467 extreme findings, it should be noted that Kawai et al.,¹⁷ (N=1239), and Nishihara et al.,²⁰ (N=831)
468 included the largest sample sizes by a substantial magnitude. Thus, these two studies affected the
469 knee extension strength, grip strength (only Kawai et al., 2018), walking speed, and timed up-and-
470 go analyses more than others. However, these two studies were never ‘outliers’ compared to the
471 other relevant studies. Finally, this review included only cross-sectional correlational studies.
472 Therefore, future meta-analytical reviews may wish to examine the relationships between
473 longitudinal changes in echogenicity and physical function.

474

475 **5. Conclusions**

476 The results of this systematic review with meta-analyses demonstrate a consistent yet
477 modest association between skeletal muscle echogenicity and physical function in ageing adults.
478 Additionally, sub-analyses show minimal between-muscle differences in correlations between
479 echogenicity and physical function, suggesting that ultrasound-estimated muscle quality and
480 composition are systemic. However, including multiple muscles tends to improve the predictive
481 ability of muscle strength measures. Researchers and practitioners should, therefore, understand
482 echogenicity screenings for muscle-related issues should be supplemented with additional
483 assessments, such as muscle thickness. Additionally, while researchers could consider combining

484 multiple muscles to improve correlational strength, time-poor practitioners can choose to scan a
485 single, easily accessible muscle to estimate total body muscle composition.

486

487 **Acknowledgements**

488 We thank Dr's Daisy Wilson, Eric Ryan, Garret Hester, Gena Gerstner, Hisashi Kawai,
489 Jacob Mota, Julia Wearing, Matt Stock, Michael Paris, and Yoshihiro Fukumoto for providing
490 additional findings from their publications.

491

492 **Authors' contributions**

493 MHL provided salary support for all other authors. MHL and SGB conceived the initial
494 topic. SGB, KLB and DJO performed literature searches and study evaluations. DJO, SGB, and
495 KLB extracted the study data. DJO performed the statistical analyses and created the figures. DJO
496 and SGB wrote the introduction and discussion sections, while DJO wrote the abstract, methods,
497 and results. All authors edited and approved the submitted manuscript.

498

499 **Conflict of interest**

500 None of the authors have any conflicts of interest to disclose.

501 **References**

- 502 1. Cruz-Jentoft, A. J. *et al.* Sarcopenia: Revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis.
503 *Age Ageing* **48**, 601–601 (2019).
- 504 2. Bijlsma, A. Y. *et al.* Defining sarcopenia: The impact of different diagnostic criteria on the
505 prevalence of sarcopenia in a large middle aged cohort. *Age* **35**, 871–881 (2013).
- 506 3. Cruz-Jentoft, A. J. *et al.* Prevalence of and interventions for sarcopenia in ageing adults: A
507 systematic review. Report of the International Sarcopenia Initiative (EWGSOP and IWGS). *Age*
508 *Ageing* **43**, 748–759 (2014).
- 509 4. Malmstrom, T. K., Miller, D. K., Simonsick, E. M., Ferrucci, L. & Morley, J. E. SARC-F: a
510 symptom score to predict persons with sarcopenia at risk for poor functional outcomes: SARC-
511 F. *Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle* **7**, 28–36 (2016).
- 512 5. Akazawa, N., Okawa, N., Tamura, K. & Moriyama, H. Relationships between intramuscular
513 fat, muscle strength and gait independence in older women: A cross-sectional study:
514 Intramuscular fat in older women. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* **17**, 1683–1688 (2017).
- 515 6. Isaka, M. *et al.* The usefulness of an alternative diagnostic method for sarcopenia using
516 thickness and echo intensity of lower leg muscles in older males. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* **20**,
517 1185.e1-1185.e8 (2019).
- 518 7. Watanabe, Y. *et al.* Echo intensity obtained from ultrasonography images reflecting muscle
519 strength in elderly men. *Clin Interv Aging* **9**, 993 (2013) doi:10.2147/CIA.S47263.
- 520 8. Engelke, K. *et al.* The effect of ageing on fat infiltration of thigh and paraspinal muscles in men.
521 *Aging Clin Exp Res* **34**, 2089–2098 (2022).
- 522 9. Wood, L. K. *et al.* Intrinsic stiffness of extracellular matrix increases with age in skeletal
523 muscles of mice. *Journal of Applied Physiology* **117**, 363–369 (2014).

- 524 10. Wilson, D., Breen, L., Lord, J. M. & Sapey, E. The challenges of muscle biopsy in a
525 community based geriatric population. *BMC Res Notes* **11**, 830 (2018).
- 526 11. Harris-Love, M. *et al.* The comparative associations of ultrasound and computed
527 tomography estimates of muscle quality with physical performance and metabolic parameters
528 in older men. *J Clin Med* **7**, 340 (2018).
- 529 12. Strasser, E. M., Draskovits, T., Praschak, M., Quittan, M. & Graf, A. Association between
530 ultrasound measurements of muscle thickness, pennation angle, echogenicity and skeletal
531 muscle strength in the elderly. *Age* **35**, 2377–2388 (2013).
- 532 13. Cesari, M. *et al.* Sarcopenia, obesity, and inflammation—results from the Trial of
533 Angiotensin Converting Enzyme Inhibition and Novel Cardiovascular Risk Factors study. *Am*
534 *J Clin Nutr* **82**, 428–434 (2005).
- 535 14. Fukumoto, Y. *et al.* Association of Regional Muscle Thickness and Echo Intensity with
536 Muscle Volume, Intramuscular Adipose Tissue, and Strength of the Quadriceps Femoris. *CIA*
537 **Volume 18**, 1513–1521 (2023).
- 538 15. Gerstner, G. R., Giuliani, H. K., Mota, J. A. & Ryan, E. D. Age-related reductions in muscle
539 quality influence the relative differences in strength and power. *Exp Gerontol* **99**, 27–34 (2017).
- 540 16. Gerstner, G. R. *et al.* Neural and muscular contributions to the age-related reductions in
541 rapid strength. *Med Sci Sports Exer* **49**, 1331–1339 (2017).
- 542 17. Kawai, H. *et al.* Morphological and qualitative characteristics of the quadriceps muscle of
543 community-dwelling older adults based on ultrasound imaging: Classification using latent class
544 analysis. *Aging Clin Exp Res* **30**, 283–291 (2018).
- 545 18. Mota, J. A. & Stock, M. S. Rectus femoris echo intensity correlates with muscle strength,
546 but not endurance, in younger and older men. *Ultrasound Med Biol* **43**, 1651–1657 (2017).

- 547 19. Mota, J. A., Giuliani, H. K., Gerstner, G. R. & Ryan, E. D. The rate of velocity development
548 associates with muscle echo intensity, but not muscle cross-sectional area in older men. *Aging*
549 *Clin Exp Res* **30**, 861–865 (2018).
- 550 20. Nishihara, K. *et al.* Comparisons of muscle thicknesses, echo intensities, and motor
551 functions between community-dwelling older Japanese adults with and without diabetes. *Arch*
552 *Gerontol Geriatr* **97**, 104516 (2021).
- 553 21. Olmos, A. A. *et al.* Early and late rapid torque characteristics and select physiological
554 correlates in middle-aged and older males. *PLoS ONE* **15**, e0231907 (2020).
- 555 22. Paris, M. T., Bell, K. E., Avrutin, E. & Mourtzakis, M. Association of strength, power, and
556 function with muscle thickness, echo intensity, and lean tissue in older males. *Appl Physiol Nutr*
557 *Metab* **47**, 521–528 (2022).
- 558 23. Wearing, J., Stokes, M. & De Bruin, E. D. Quadriceps muscle strength is a discriminant
559 predictor of dependence in daily activities in nursing home residents. *PLoS ONE* **14**, e0223016
560 (2019).
- 561 24. Wilson, D. V. *et al.* Bilateral anterior thigh thickness: A new diagnostic tool for the
562 identification of low muscle mass? *J Am Med Dir Assoc* **20**, 1247-1253.e2 (2019).
- 563 25. Hopkins, W. G., Marshall, S. W., Batterham, A. M. & Hanin, J. Progressive statistics for
564 studies in sports medicine and exercise science. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* **41**, 3–12 (2009).
- 565 26. Akagi, R. *et al.* Muscle size-strength relationship including ultrasonographic echo intensity
566 and voluntary activation level of a muscle group. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* **75**,
567 185–190 (2018).

- 568 27. Akazawa, N., Okawa, N., Tamura, K. & Moriyama, H. Relationships between
569 intramuscular fat, muscle strength and gait independence in older women: A cross-sectional
570 study. *Geriatrics Gerontology Int* **17**, 1683–1688 (2017).
- 571 28. Akima, H. *et al.* Quadriceps echo intensity can be an index of muscle size regardless of
572 age in 65 or more years old. *Exp Gerontol* **138**, 111015 (2020).
- 573 29. Akima, H. *et al.* Relationship between quadriceps echo intensity and functional and
574 morphological characteristics in older men and women. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* **70**, 105–111
575 (2017).
- 576 30. Bali, A. U. *et al.* Muscle strength, not age, explains unique variance in echo intensity. *Exp*
577 *Gerontol* **139**, 111047 (2020).
- 578 31. Cadore, E. L. *et al.* Echo intensity is associated with skeletal muscle power and
579 cardiovascular performance in elderly men. *Exp Gerontol* **47**, 473–478 (2012).
- 580 32. Chang, K.-V., Wu, W.-T., Huang, K.-C., Jan, W. H. & Han, D.-S. Limb muscle quality
581 and quantity in elderly adults with dynapenia but not sarcopenia: An ultrasound imaging study.
582 *Exp Gerontol* **108**, 54–61 (2018).
- 583 33. Chang, K.-V., Yang, K.-C., Wu, W.-T., Huang, K.-C. & Han, D.-S. Association between
584 metabolic syndrome and limb muscle quantity and quality in older adults: A pilot ultrasound
585 study. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* **Volume 12**, 1821–1830 (2019).
- 586 34. Farrow, A. C. & Palmer, T. B. Age-related differences in hip flexion maximal and rapid
587 strength and rectus femoris muscle size and composition. *J Appl Biomech* **37**, 311–319 (2021).
- 588 35. Fukumoto, Y. *et al.* Skeletal muscle quality assessed from echo intensity is associated with
589 muscle strength of middle-aged and elderly persons. *Eur J Appl Physiol* **112**, 1519–1525 (2012).

- 590 36. Guadagnin, E. C., Priario, L. A. A., Carpes, F. P. & Vaz, M. A. Correlation between lower
591 limb isometric strength and muscle structure with normal and challenged gait performance in
592 older adults. *Gait Posture* **73**, 101–107 (2019).
- 593 37. Harris-Love, M. O. *et al.* Association between muscle strength and modeling estimates of
594 muscle tissue heterogeneity in young and old adults. *J Ultrasound Med* **38**, 1757–1768 (2019).
- 595 38. Hill, M. W., Roberts, M., Price, M. J. & Kay, A. D. Association between knee extensor
596 and ankle plantarflexor muscle thickness and echo intensity with postural sway, mobility and
597 physical function in older adults. *Experimental Gerontology* **150**, 111385 (2021).
- 598 39. Hirata, K. *et al.* Muscle quality indices separately associate with joint-level power-related
599 measures of the knee extensors in older males. *Eur J Appl Physiol* **122**, 2271–2281 (2022).
- 600 40. Komforti, D. *et al.* Does skeletal muscle morphology or functional performance better
601 explain variance in fast gait speed in older adults? *Aging Clin Exp Res* **33**, 921–931 (2021).
- 602 41. Lopez, P. *et al.* Echo intensity independently predicts functionality in sedentary older men.
603 *Muscle Nerve* **55**, 9–15 (2017).
- 604 42. Maddocks, M. *et al.* Ankle dorsiflexor muscle size, composition and force with ageing and
605 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Exp Physiol* **99**, 1078–1088 (2014).
- 606 43. Magrini, M. A. *et al.* Muscle size, strength, power, and echo intensity, but not specific
607 tension, are affected by age in physically active adults. *Isokin Exerc Sci* **26**, 95–103 (2018).
- 608 44. Masaki, M. *et al.* Association of walking speed with sagittal spinal alignment, muscle
609 thickness, and echo intensity of lumbar back muscles in middle-aged and elderly women. *Aging*
610 *Clin Exp Res* **28**, 429–434 (2016).

- 611 45. Mateos-Angulo, A., Galán-Mercant, A. & Cuesta-Vargas, A. I. Muscle thickness and echo
612 intensity by ultrasonography and cognitive and physical dimensions in older adults. *Diagnostics*
613 **11**, 1471 (2021).
- 614 46. Mirón Mombiela, R., Facal De Castro, F., Moreno, P. & Borrás, C. Ultrasonic echo
615 intensity as a new noninvasive in vivo biomarker of frailty. *J Am Geriatr Soc* **65**, 2685–2690
616 (2017).
- 617 47. Nishihara, K. *et al.* Frequency analysis of ultrasonic echo intensities of the skeletal muscle
618 in elderly and young individuals. *Clin Interv Aging* 1471 (2014) doi:10.2147/CIA.S67820.
- 619 48. Olmos, A. A. *et al.* Neuromuscular function of the plantar flexors and predictors of peak
620 power in middle-aged and older males. *Exp Gerontol* **125**, 110677 (2019).
- 621 49. Osawa, Y. *et al.* Relationships of muscle echo intensity with walking ability and physical
622 activity in the very old population. *J Aging Phys Act* **25**, 189–195 (2017).
- 623 50. Palmer, T. B., Farrow, A. C. & Palmer, B. M. Relationships between hamstring
624 morphological characteristics and postural balance in elderly men. *J Musculoskelet Neuronal*
625 *Interact* **20**, 88–93 (2020).
- 626 51. Palmer, T. B. & Farrow, A. C. Correcting for subcutaneous fat: Does it improve the
627 correlation between vastus lateralis echo intensity and physical performance in older women?
628 *Clin Physio Funct Imaging* **42**, 372–379 (2022).
- 629 52. Palmer, T. B. & Thompson, B. J. Influence of age on passive stiffness and size, quality,
630 and strength characteristics. *Muscle Nerve* **55**, 305–315 (2017).
- 631 53. Rech, A. *et al.* Echo intensity is negatively associated with functional capacity in older
632 women. *Age* **36**, 9708 (2014).

- 633 54. Stock, M. S. *et al.* Echo intensity versus muscle function correlations in older adults are
634 influenced by subcutaneous fat thickness. *Ultrasound Med Biol* **44**, 1597–1605 (2018).
- 635 55. Taniguchi, M. *et al.* Increase in echo intensity and extracellular-to-intracellular water ratio
636 is independently associated with muscle weakness in elderly women. *Eur J Appl Physiol* **117**,
637 2001–2007 (2017).
- 638 56. Wilhelm, E. N. *et al.* Relationship between quadriceps femoris echo intensity, muscle
639 power, and functional capacity of older men. *Age* **36**, 9625 (2014).
- 640 57. Yamada, M. *et al.* Differential characteristics of skeletal muscle in community-dwelling
641 older adults. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* **18**, 807.e9-807.e16 (2017).
- 642 58. Yamaguchi, K. *et al.* Factors associated with masseter muscle quality assessed from
643 ultrasonography in community-dwelling elderly individuals: A cross-sectional study. *Arch*
644 *Gerontol Geriatr* **82**, 128–132 (2019).
- 645 59. Yoshiko, A., Beppu, M., Chosa, N. & Watanabe, K. Unique characteristics of quadriceps
646 muscle morphology and function in older tennis players. *Aging Phys Act* 1–8 (2021)
647 doi:10.1123/japa.2021-0074.
- 648 60. Yoshiko, A. *et al.* Muscle quality characteristics of muscles in the thigh, upper arm and
649 lower back in elderly men and women. *Eur J Appl Physiol* **118**, 1385–1395 (2018).
- 650 61. Yoshiko, A. *et al.* Higher and lower muscle echo intensity in elderly individuals is
651 distinguished by muscle size, physical performance and daily physical activity. *Ultrasound Med*
652 *Biol* **45**, 2372–2380 (2019).
- 653 62. Yoshiko, A. *et al.* Chair sit-to-stand performance is associated with diagnostic features of
654 sarcopenia in older men and women. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* **96**, 104463 (2021).

- 655 63. Mirón Mombiela, R. *et al.* Quantitative muscle ultrasound as an imaging biomarker for
656 frailty syndrome. *Skelet. Radiol.* **46**, 869 (2017).
- 657 64. Ahmadiyahangar, A. *et al.* The role of quadriceps muscle strength in the development of
658 falls in the elderly people, a cross-sectional study. *Chiropr Man Therap* **26**, 31 (2018).
- 659 65. Newman, A. B. *et al.* Strength and muscle quality in a well-functioning cohort of older
660 adults: The health, aging and body composition study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* **51**, 323–330 (2003).
- 661 66. Bourgeois, B. *et al.* Improved strength prediction combining clinically available measures
662 of skeletal muscle mass and quality. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* **10**, 84–94 (2019).
- 663 67. Reinders, I. *et al.* Muscle quality and myosteatosis: Novel associations with mortality risk:
664 The Age, Gene/Environment Susceptibility (AGES)-Reykjavik study. *Am J Epidemiol* **183**, 53–
665 60 (2016).
- 666 68. Perkisas, S. *et al.* Application of ultrasound for muscle assessment in sarcopenia: 2020
667 SARCUS update. *Eur Geriatr Med* **12**, 45–59 (2021).
- 668 69. Bahat, G. *et al.* Cut-off points to identify sarcopenia according to European Working Group
669 on Sarcopenia in Older People (EWGSOP) definition. *Clin Nutr* **35**, 1557–1563 (2016).
- 670 70. Beavers, K. M. *et al.* Associations between body composition and gait-speed decline:
671 results from the Health, Aging, and Body Composition study. *Am J Clin Nutr* **97**, 552–560
672 (2013).
- 673 71. Clark, D. J., Manini, T. M., Fielding, R. A. & Patten, C. Neuromuscular determinants of
674 maximum walking speed in well-functioning older adults. *Exp Gerontol* **48**, 358–363 (2013).
- 675 72. Maffiuletti, N. A. *et al.* Rate of force development: physiological and methodological
676 considerations. *Eur J Appl Physiol* **116**, 1091–1116 (2016).

- 677 73. Maffiuletti, N. A., Bizzini, M., Widler, K. & Munzinger, U. Asymmetry in quadriceps rate
678 of force development as a functional outcome measure in TKA. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* **468**,
679 191–198 (2010).
- 680 74. Varesco, G., Espeit, L., Feasson, L., Lapole, T. & Rozand, V. Rate of force development
681 and rapid muscle activation characteristics of knee extensors in very old men. *Experimental*
682 *Gerontology* **124**, 110640 (2019).
- 683 75. Oranchuk, D. J., Stock, M. S., Nelson, A. R., Storey, A. G. & Cronin, J. B. Variability of
684 regional quadriceps echo intensity in active young men with and without subcutaneous fat
685 correction. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* **45**, 745–752 (2020).
- 686