

1 RESEARCH ARTICLE

2 Estimation equation of limb lean soft tissue mass in Asian  
3 athletes using bioelectrical impedance analysis

4 Yeong-Kang Lai<sup>1</sup>, Chu-Ying Ho<sup>1</sup>, Ai-Chun Huang<sup>2</sup>, Hsueh-Kuan Lu<sup>3</sup> and Kuen-Chang Hsieh<sup>4,5,\*</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> College of Electrical Engineering, National Chung Hsing University, Taichung City, Taiwan, <sup>2</sup>

7 Department of Oral Hygiene, Tzu-Hui Institute of Technology, Pingtung County, Taiwan, <sup>3</sup>

8 General Education Center, National Taiwan University of Sport, Taichung City, Taiwan, <sup>4</sup> Big

9 Data Center, National National Chung Hsing University, Taichung City, Taiwan, <sup>5</sup> Department of

10 research & Development, StarBIA Meditek Co., Ltd., Taichung City, Taiwan

11

12 Correspondence: Kuen-Chang Hsieh

13 Big Data Center, National National Chung Hsing University, Taichung City, Taiwan

14 Tel +886-4-2406-3766 ext 297

15 Fax +886-4-24065612

16 Email [abaqus0927@yahoo.com.tw](mailto:abaqus0927@yahoo.com.tw)

17

18 **Abstract**

19 **Background:** The lean soft tissue mass (LSTM) of the limbs is approximately 63% of total  
20 skeletal muscle mass. For athletes, measurement of limb LSTM is the basis for rapid estimation  
21 of skeletal muscle mass. This study aimed to establish the estimation equation of LSTM in Asian  
22 athletes using bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA).

23 **Methods:** A total of 198 athletes (121 males, 77 females; mean age  $22.04 \pm 5.57$  years) from  
24 different sports in Taiwan were enrolled. A modeling group (MG) of 2/3 (n = 132) of subjects and  
25 a validation group (VG) of 1/3 (n = 68) were randomly assigned. Resistance (R) and reactance

26 (Xc) were measured using 50KHz current measurement in whole-body mode. Predictor variables  
27 were height (h), weight (W), age, gender, Xc, resistance index (RI;  $RI = h^2 / R$ ). LSTM of arms  
28 and legs measured by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) was the response variable.  
29 Multivariate stepwise regression analysis method was used to establish BIA estimation equations  
30 as  $ArmsLSTM_{BIA-Asian}$  and  $LegsLSTM_{BIA-Asian}$ . Estimation equations performance was confirmed by  
31 cross-validation.  
32 **Results:** Estimation equation " $ArmsLSTM_{BIA-Asian} = 0.096 h^2/R - 1.132 \text{ gender} + 0.030 \text{ Weight} +$   
33  $0.022 Xc - 0.022 h + 0.905$ ,  $r^2 = 0.855$ ,  $SEE = 0.757 \text{ kg}$ ,  $n = 132$ " and " $LegsLSTM_{BIA-Asian} =$   
34  $0.197h^2/R + 0.120 h - 1.242 \text{ gender} + 0.055 \text{ Weight} - 0.052 \text{ Age} + 0.033 Xc - 16.136$ ,  $r^2 = 0.916$ ,  
35  $SEE = 1.431 \text{ kg}$ ,  $n = 132$ " were obtained from MG. Using DXA measurement results of VG for  
36 correlation analysis and Limit of Agreement (LOA) of Bland-Altman Plot,  $ArmsLST$  is 0.924, -1.53  
37 to 1.43 kg, and  $LegsLST$  is 0.957, -2.68 to 2.90 kg.  
38 **Conclusion:** The established single-frequency BIA hand-to-foot estimation equation quickly and  
39 accurately measures LSTM of the arms and legs of Asian athletes.  
40 **Keywords:** dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, resistance index, skeletal muscle mass, gender

## 41 Introduction

42 In the field of sports science, research on the body composition of athletes has developed  
43 vigorously in recent years. Many studies have classified athletes by different phenotypes,  
44 including shape, weight, body fat percentage, fat mass, fat-free mass (FFM), lean soft tissue  
45 mass (LSTM), muscle mass (MM) and other body components. Due to different sports  
46 categories, genders, and competitive levels, early research focused on body fat percentage [1].  
47 Current related research has been extended to total and regional skeletal muscle mass in  
48 athletes. More recently, these measurements, especially LSTM, are related to improving athletic  
49 performance and reducing the risk of injury [2]. However, assessments of body composition in  
50 individual athletes still need to be targeted as factors for problem-solving among athletes. In this  
51 way, individual athletes can obtain corresponding personal benefits when measuring body  
52 composition [3]. This innovative approach goes beyond previous fundamental issues of body

53 composition and emphasizes movement-specific performance. For example, the characteristics  
54 of the body composition of arms, legs and torso are directly related to training progress [4].

55 Coaches and athletes know that skeletal muscle mass and fat mass are both important  
56 aspects of athletic ability. Skeletal muscle mass has traditionally been measured by FFM, and  
57 recently it has been focused on LSTM. LSTM represents the positive relationship and contribution  
58 of muscle function and strength, thereby improving sports performance [5]. Conversely, fat mass  
59 (FM) is considered a non-functional component in the field of exercise biomechanics. As FM  
60 increases, it impedes exercise performance and adversely affects thermoregulation [6]. The latest  
61 development of body composition technology divides the body into three-components, namely  
62 LSTM, FM and bone mineral content (BMC). LSTM includes whole body water, protein,  
63 carbohydrates, non-fat lipids, and soft tissue minerals [7]. The three-component body composition  
64 model can be used with dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), magnetic resonance imaging  
65 (MRI), and computerized tomography (CT). Although CT and MRI provide information on cross-  
66 sectional areas (CSA) of muscle and muscle volume (MV), these methods are costly, require  
67 relatively in-depth research expertise, and analysis of the results can be difficult. Therefore, these  
68 methods are not practical in the sports performance setting. Compared with the above methods,  
69 although the cost of DXA is lower, it still has limitations in application fields. Another  
70 measurement method used commonly in the three-component model is bioelectrical impedance  
71 analysis (BIA). Because BIA is convenient, safe, non-penetrating, and fast, it provides athletes  
72 with instant information on body composition measurements, and LSTM changes can be tracked  
73 conveniently during athlete training.

74 In women's softball [8], men's hockey [9] and soccer [10], the variability of the whole body  
75 and limb segment was the least. Among male college basketball players, centers players reflect  
76 that their arms and legs have the highest LSTM and FM compared to players in all other positions  
77 (with the exception of power forwards) [11]. American football players also have the same body  
78 composition as men's basketball, with significant differences between the different positions [12,  
79 13]. Results of these studies suggest that there may be a relationship between limb segments,  
80 body composition and exercise programs, positions, and specific functional needs (e.g., shooting,

81 kicking, and speed). This is a research direction that needs to be further explored. In a  
82 competitive season of hockey (and likely in football and other sports), the LSTM of the legs of  
83 excellent players will increase significantly as the season time increases [14]. For football players,  
84 the LSTMs on the legs and torso are also noted to increase significantly as the season  
85 progresses [15]. These studies have shown that body composition changes over time.

86 Since 1990, several important studies have been published on the use of BIA for body  
87 composition measurement in athletes [16, 17]. The measurement, comparison and validation  
88 studies of commercial BIA devices in LSTM or FFM for the whole body and limbs of athletes have  
89 been proposed and have gradually captured increasing attention [18-20]. The physical  
90 characteristics of athletes are different from those of the general population based on long-term  
91 trends in specific sports [21]. Therefore, special mechanisms must be applied or dedicated  
92 regression equations to accurately measure body composition [22]. Recently, body composition  
93 estimation equations have been proposed to measure the body composition of athletes using BIA  
94 to distinguish gender differences [23, 24]. A recent study by Sardinha *et al.* [25] proposed a BIA  
95 estimation equation for athletes using LSTM for upper and lower limbs, although the subjects of  
96 this study were Europeans and Americans. Published research has already shown racial  
97 differences in the estimation of body composition by BIA [26]. In the past, there were some  
98 research on the measurement equation of FFM in athletes [27-30], and recently there was  
99 research on the establishment of equations of LSTM in Caucasian athletes [25]. For athletes in  
100 the Asian region, the relevant research was very limited [31]. There are certain differences in the  
101 physiological quality of different races. Therefore, it is necessary to establish and verify the  
102 measurement equations of LSTM and BIA for Asian athletes. Therefore, the LSTM estimation  
103 equation of the upper and lower limbs of athletes established by BIA is applied to measure the  
104 body composition of athletes in Asia. Whether applicable or not, it is still necessary to further  
105 explore or establish a suitable LSTM estimation equation. Therefore, this study aimed to establish  
106 and verify the estimation equation of limb lean soft tissue mass by using BIA in Asian athletes. A  
107 single-frequency BIA hand-to-foot estimation equation was established to quickly and accurately  
108 measure the lean soft tissue mass of the arms and legs of Asian athletes.

109

## 110 **Material and methods**

### 111 ***Study Design and Sample***

112 The subjects of this prospective observational study were all active high-level athletes in Taiwan.  
113 Eligible participants engaged in at least 12 hours of physical or specialty training activities per  
114 week. Professional training time was  $9.6 \pm 2.5$  years and received high-intensity or professional  
115 training for  $12.3 \pm 4.5$  hours per week. They were all active players at the highest level in Taiwan  
116 and in the Asian or Olympic Games (except for dance specialties). Subjects did not drink  
117 alcoholic beverages 48 hours before the test, did not use diuretics for 7 days before the test, and  
118 did not participate in intense training 24 hours before the test. Females with menstrual periods  
119 were excluded [32]. All subjects had no history of nutritional, endocrine or growth disorders and  
120 had no more than 5 kg body weight change before the six experiments (Figure 1.).

### 121 ***Ethical Considerations***

122 This study was conducted in the Department of Radiology, Dali Jen-Ai Hospital, Taichung City.  
123 Before the six experiments, the research protocol and experimental procedure were approved by  
124 the Human Experiment Committee of Taso-Tun Psychiatric Center, Ministry of Health and  
125 Welfare (IRB-11001). Before the tests began, the research assistant explained the experimental  
126 precautions to the subjects. Once the subjects understood the experimental process and their  
127 rights, they agreed to participate in the experiment and each subject provided signed informed  
128 consent. Informed consent was obtained from each participant and/or guardian if under the age of  
129 legal consent prior to testing. We conducted experiments in accordance with relevant guidelines  
130 and regulations.

## 131 ***Procedure and Anthropometry***

132 Three days before the experiment, the subjects were informed of the precautions. The subjects  
133 reported to the experimental site at 1:00 p.m. on the day of the experiment, filled out the  
134 questionnaire on basic personal information and training process, and changed into cotton robes  
135 for testing. The bladder of each subject was emptied 20 minutes before the experiment. Subjects  
136 were measured using Tanita BC-418MA (Tanita Co., Tokyo, Japan) with an accuracy of 0.1 kg. A  
137 height ruler (Holtain, Crosswell, Wales, UK) was used to measure the subjects' height without  
138 shoes, providing accuracy of 0.5 cm. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated by dividing the  
139 subjects' individual body weight by the square of the height in kg/m<sup>2</sup>. A cloth tape measure was  
140 used to measure subjects' waist and hip circumferences. When measuring waist circumference,  
141 subjects placed feet together, relaxed the abdominal muscles, placed arms naturally at each side  
142 of the body, breathed normally, and allowed measurement of the narrowest position of the body  
143 below the ribs and above the navel. Hips were measured at the widest point. Waist and hip  
144 circumferences were measured twice, and the average values were recorded.

## 145 ***Impedance Measurement***

146 Right hand to right foot resistance and reactance measurements were performed using a  
147 bioimpedance analyzer S-10 (InBody Co., Ltd., Souel, Korean) at a frequency of 50 KHz.  
148 Resistors supplied by the manufacturer were used for calibration every day before the  
149 experiment. Bioimpedance measurement is done after confirming that accuracy of the  
150 bioimpedance measuring instrument meets the requirements. The subject lies on his/her back on  
151 a hospital bed. The right wrist and the back of the right foot were connected with silver electrode  
152 patches, which were the pair of receiving and transmitting electrodes, respectively. Subjects lay  
153 on their backs calmly for five minutes before the measurement was taken. The resistance index  
154 (RI) was defined as the ratio of the square of the height to the measured resistance at a  
155 frequency of 50 KHz ( $h^2/R$ ). For 5 male and 5 female subjects, impedance measurements were  
156 repeated 10 times within one hour of the day. Impedance measurements were performed by 5  
157 subjects for each of the same male and female subjects in the same period for 4 consecutive

158 days. The coefficient of variation (CV = standard deviation/mean × 100%) of impedance,  
159 resistance, reactance, and phase angle measurements was evaluated for within-day and  
160 between-day results, respectively. CVs were 0.2%-0.7%, 0.1%-0.8, 0.3-1.2%, 0.3-1.4% and  
161 0.8%-1.6%, 0.9%-2.1%, 0.8%-1.7%, 1.0%-2.2% respectively.

## 162 ***Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry***

163 Body composition was measured by DXA (Lunar Prodigy; GE Medical Systems, Madison, WI,  
164 USA) and the Microsoft software, Encore 2003 Version 7.0. The subjects performed the DXA  
165 measurement within thirty minutes immediately after the impedance measurement was  
166 completed. Each subject wore a light cotton robe and lay on the measuring bed in a relaxed  
167 supine position. The upper limbs were stretched and placed on both sides of the body, with toes  
168 facing upward and feet slightly side by side. The procedure took about 20 minutes for each test  
169 subject. Complete DXA measurement of body composition included LSTM, FM (fat mass), BMC  
170 (bone mineral content) on the whole body, left and right upper limbs, left and right lower limbs,  
171 trunk and other parts.

## 172 ***Statistical Analysis***

173 All data were expressed as means ± SDs, and range. Data were tested for normal distribution  
174 using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS Ver.20  
175 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, IBM SPSS statistics for Windows; IBM Corp.,  
176 Armonk, NY, USA). The significance level was set at  $p < 0.05$  (two-tailed). Given that a sample  
177 size of 124 participants was calculated considering a type 1 error of 5% and a power of 80% to  
178 achieve a moderate effect size for the  $R^2$  increases in the prediction equation with the inclusion of  
179 five predictors, our sample size of 198 athletes was sufficient for assuring an adequate power  
180 analysis in model development.

181 Paired-t tests were used to compare DXA and BIA on ArmsLSTM and LegsLSTM. The  
182 correlation between BIA estimates and DXA-measured ArmsLSTM and LegsLSTM was  
183 performed using Pearson's correction and Lin's concordance correlation coefficient (CCC). Bland-

184 Altman plots were used to represent the mean difference and limit of agreement (LOA). The  
185 regression line was used to represent the trend.

186 Two-thirds ( $n = 132$ ) and one-third ( $n = 66$ ) of the total subjects were randomly divided  
187 into a modeling group (MG) and a validation group (VG), respectively. Height, weight, age,  
188 gender, resistance index, and reactance were used as predictor variables, and the LSTM of  
189 upper limbs (arms) and lower limbs (legs) measured by DXA were used as response variables,  
190 which were expressed as ArmsLSTM<sub>DXA</sub> and LegsLSTM<sub>DXA</sub>, respectively. Stepwise regression  
191 analysis was performed with MG. Set parameters - forward ( $F_{in} = 4.00$ ), backward ( $F_{out} = 3.99$ ) to  
192 obtain the selected predictor variable. The resulting equations were ArmsLSTM<sub>BIA-Asian</sub>,  
193 LegsLSTM<sub>BIA-Asian</sub> and their corresponding regression coefficients, standard estimate error (SEE),  
194 coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ), and predictor variables removed with VIF (variance inflation  
195 factor)  $> 4$ . The ArmsLSTM<sub>BIA-Asian</sub> and LegsLSTM<sub>BIA-Asian</sub> obtained by the VG data were brought  
196 into the MG, and were analyzed by correlation and Bland-Altman Plots, respectively, to evaluate  
197 the effectiveness of the LSTM estimation equation.

## 198 Results

199 A total of 198 male and female athletes participated in this study, including 121 male athletes  
200 (basketball: 11, swimming: 18, powerlifting: 8, judo: 10, long-distance running: 4, football: 26,  
201 wrestling: 37, track and field: 7), and 77 female athletes (basketball: 7, dance: 10, judo: 15, long-  
202 distance running: 2, tug-of-war: 9, soccer: 17, wrestling: 2, track and field: 15). The age, height,  
203 weight and body fat percentage of male athletes were  $22.67 \pm 5.82$  years,  $174.87 \pm 8.25$  cm,  $74.9$   
204  $\pm 11.87$  kg and  $15.26 \pm 6.83\%$ , respectively. For female athletes, mean age, height, weight, and  
205 body fat percentage were  $21.02 \pm 5.00$  years,  $161.64 \pm 6.86$  cm,  $58.15 \pm 9.35$  kg and  $27.15 \pm$   
206  $8.06\%$ , respectively. For all subjects, MG and VG personal characteristics parameters and body  
207 composition data are shown in Table 1.

208 In the present study, all subjects' data were entered into the arms LSTM equation of  
209 Sardhina *et al.* [25] and compared with the present DXA measurement results. The distribution  
210 plots and regression line are shown in Figure 1a. The LOA and trend line of the two Bland-Altman



211 Plots are shown in Figure 1b. The same procedure and data were entered into the lower limb  
212 LSTM equation and compared with the present DXA measurement results. The distribution plots  
213 and regression line are shown in Figure 1c. The LOA and trend line of the two Bland-Altman Plots  
214 are shown in Figure 1d.

215 Sequentially selected variables entered into the measurement equation using multivariate  
216 regression analysis were resistance index ( $h^2/R$ ), gender (female = 0, male = 1), W (weight), Xc  
217 (resistance), and h (height). The increase in predictor variables and the corresponding coefficient  
218 of determination, standard error of the estimate (SEE), standardized coefficient ( $\beta$ ), and variance  
219 inflation factor (VIF) are shown in Table 2. The best estimation equation for ArmsLSTM is as  
220 follows:

$$\text{ArmsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}} = 0.096 h^2/R - 1.132 \text{ Gender} + 0.030 W + 0.022 Xc - 0.022 h + 0.905, (r^2 = 0.855, \text{SEE} = 0.757 \text{ kg}, n = 132, p < 0.01) \quad (1)$$

where:  $h^2/R$ , resistance index; W, weight; Xc, reactance; h, height;

221 Using the same measurement variables as for MG, LegsLSTM was the response variable,  
222 and applying multivariate stepwise regression analysis, the sequentially selected variables  
223 entered the measurement equation were  $h^2/R$ , h, Gender, W, Age, and Xc. The corresponding  
224 coefficients of determination, SEE, VIF, and  $\beta$  are shown in Table 3. The optimal estimation  
225 equation of LegsLSTM is as follows:

$$\text{LegsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}} = 0.197 h^2/R + 0.120 h - 1.242 \text{ Gender} + 0.055 W - 0.052 \text{ Age} + 0.033 Xc - 16.136, (r^2 = 0.916, \text{SEE} = 1.431 \text{ kg}, n = 132; p < 0.001) \quad (2)$$

where:  $h^2/R$ , resistance index; W, weight; Xc, reactance; h, height; Age, age; h, height; Gender (female = 0, male = 1);

226 VG data are entered into the formula (1) to obtain  $\text{ArmsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}}$ , and compared with  
227 the  $\text{ArmsLSTM}_{\text{DXA}}$ . The scatter diagram of  $\text{ArmsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}}$ ,  $\text{ArmsLSTM}_{\text{DXA}}$ , regression line,  
228 Bland-Altman Plots and LOA calculation, were drawn, respectively, as Figure 2a, Figure 2b. VG

229 data entered into equation (2) to obtain  $\text{LegsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}}$ , and its scatter and Bland-Altman Plots  
230 are shown in Figure 2c and Figure 2d, respectively.

231 For males, females, and overall subjects, the resistance, reactance, and anthropometric  
232 parameters corresponded to the equations by Sardhina *et al.* [25]. The data of  $\text{ArmsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}}$ ,  
233  $\text{LegsLSTM}_{\text{BIA-Asian}}$  and DXA in this study are shown in Table 4.

234 Shown in the Table 5, the correlation between  $\text{ArmsLSTM}$  and estimated variables was  
235  $h^2/R$  ( $r = 0.895$ ), Weight ( $r = 0.794$ ), Height ( $r = 0.725$ ), R ( $r = -0.836$ ), Gender ( $r = -0.795$ )  
236 according to the level of correlation.  $\text{LegsLSTM}$  was  $h^2/R$  ( $r = 0.929$ ), height ( $r = 0.864$ ), Weight ( $r$   
237  $= 0.839$ ), R ( $r = -0.777$ ), and Gender ( $r = -0.757$ ). The estimates of error of  $\text{ArmsLSTM}$  and  
238  $\text{LegsLSTM}$  were 0.171 and 0.582 kg. Reproducibility was 0.98, 0.99 respectively.

## 239 Discussion

240 The present study established BIA estimation equations of LSTM for arms and legs for Asian  
241 athletes in Taiwan. Accordingly, this study is the first to compare the differences and applicability  
242 of BIA to LSTM estimation equations for Asian and European athletes. Cross-validation results  
243 showed that the BIA estimation equation established for athletes' LSTM in this study has good  
244 performance and can be applied practically to the limb LSTM measurement of Asian athletes.

245 Through the measurement of limb LSTM, measuring whole-body skeletal muscle mass can  
246 be estimated indirectly, overcoming the difficulty associated with other whole-body measurement  
247 methods. Accurately measuring the LSTM of the limbs is exceptionally important for measuring  
248 the whole-body skeletal muscle mass of athletes [33].

249 Therefore, some scholars have conducted validation studies on the LSTM or FFM  
250 measurements of athletes' limbs for commercial BIA devices. Brewer *et al.* [18] used DXA as a  
251 standard for comparison among male athletes at Division I College in the United States. The  
252 results showed that the LOA of Inbody770 measured by FFM (free fat mas, FFM) of the arms and  
253 legs of male athletes was -3.1 to 0.5 kg, -15.3 kg to 2.2 kg, respectively. Female athletes were  
254 -1.5 to 0.5 kg, -5.9 to 0.4 kg [18]. Raymond *et al.* [19] also compared the DXA of male college  
255 football players, and the correlation coefficients between the LOA and the FFM of the upper and

256 lower extremities of the men's athletes in Inbody770 were  $-0.43$  to  $3.23$  kg ( $r = 0.82$ ),  $0.73$  to  $9.97$   
257 kg ( $r = 0.78$ ) [19]. The results of Esco *et al.* [20] showed that the LOA of Inbody720 in upper and  
258 lower extremity FFM of female college athletes was  $-0.74$  to  $0.84$  kg ( $r = 0.89$ ) and  $-3.03$  to  $2.21$   
259 kg ( $r = 0.83$ ), respectively [20]. Almost all of the above studies have expressed that the current  
260 commercial BIA multi-limb body composition analyzer has errors and limited correlation in the  
261 measurement results of bone mineral content of upper and lower extremities and FFM of LSTM  
262 for athletes of different sports. Therefore, it is necessary to establish the estimation equation of  
263 LSTM or FFM of arms and legs for athletes. But in fact, for the research of BIA measurement  
264 equation of LSTM or FFM of athletes' arms or legs is very limited. Sardinha *et al.* [25] developed  
265 the estimation equation for limb LSTM for single-frequency BIA in Caucasian athletes. The results  
266 of the LSTM estimation equation in the VG of that study were that the LOA and correlation  
267 coefficient of the lower limb LSTM were  $-1.11$  to  $1.32$  kg ( $r = 0.90$ ) and  $-3.78$  to  $3.87$  kg ( $r =$   
268  $0.94$ ), respectively. Using the resistance, reactance and anthropometric parameters of athletes in  
269 Taiwan as entered into the estimation equation of Sardinha *et al.* [25], the correlation coefficients  
270 between the estimated results of ArmsLSTM, LegsLSTM with DXA were  $r = 0.81$  and  $0.86$ ,  
271 respectively. The LOAs of Bland-Altman plots were  $-2.70$  to  $2.14$  kg and  $-6.96$  to  $2.32$  kg,  
272 respectively. The estimation equation established by Sardinha *et al.* [25] is better than the  
273 existing commercial BIA device in the measurement of LSTM or FFM of Arms and Legs.  
274 Therefore, it is necessary to establish an athlete-specific LSTM measurement equation for arms  
275 and legs.

276 This study and Sardinha *et al.* [25] both used stepwise regression analysis and the same  
277 candidate estimated variables. The ArmsLSTM measurement equation of this study was selected  
278 after stepwise regression analysis. The measured variables were  $h^2/R$ , Gender,  $X_c$  and  $h$ . The  
279 estimated variables of the LegsLSTM equation were  $h^2/R$ ,  $h$ , Gender, Weight, Age and  $X_c$ .  
280 Compared with Sardinha *et al.*, the LegsLSTM equation in this study has more estimated  
281 variables for  $h$ , Age, and  $X_c$ . The BIA estimation equations ArmsLSTM<sub>BIA-Asian</sub> and LegsLSTM<sub>BIA-</sub>  
282 <sub>Asian</sub> obtained had LOA and correlation coefficients in the cross-validation group of  $-1.53$  to  $1.43$   
283 kg ( $r = 0.921$ ),  $-2.68$  to  $2.90$  kg ( $r = 0.957$ ). Compared with the LSTM estimation equation

284 developed by Sardinha *et al.*, the LSTM estimation equation developed in the present study is not  
285 only suitable for Asian athletes, but also has better overall performance in legs estimation. In this  
286 study, the estimated variables selected in sequence in the application of stepwise regression  
287 analysis were shown. It was shown in the results that the addition of Xc has little effect on the  
288 coefficient of determination of the estimated equation. But between Xc and LegsLSTM or  
289 ArmsLSTM respectively reached a moderate negative correlation, and will have a certain impact  
290 on reducing SEE.

291 Changes in body composition of the whole body or limb region may provide additional  
292 information on exercise science. In particular, it can be used to formulate an effective training  
293 program for different sports and positions. Therefore, in the future research direction, it is  
294 necessary to measure the body composition of each limb, especially the measurement of and  
295 research results for LSTM, in addition to the measurement of athletes' body composition. This  
296 prospective observational study applied supine bioimpedance measurements to validate the  
297 LSTM reported by Sardinha *et al.* [25] for extremities. Corrections for resistance and reactance  
298 were also performed before the experiment, and the study was replicated with reference to its  
299 experimental protocol.

300 Gender, sports, position, endurance sports, resistance sports or a mixture of the latter two  
301 will all affect the athlete's body composition. Because gender has been added into the estimated  
302 variable in the stepwise regression analysis in the newly constructed estimation equation in this  
303 study. Therefore, this study has included both men and women and used the same equation to  
304 estimate their LSTM. At present, there are only a few studies on the body composition estimation  
305 equation of athletes' bioimpedance in a single sport [35]. In contrast, the scope of application of a  
306 single sport is also relatively limited. If the LSTM for athletes is added to the variable of their  
307 sport, or the sports are classified to construct and verify their LSTM estimation equations, it will  
308 definitely be more suitable for the athlete's composition measurement of their corresponding  
309 sports. Perhaps this could also be a good research direction in the future.

310 In the application of stepwise regression analysis, the estimation variables of the estimation  
311 equations entered first by ArmsLSTM or LegsLSTM were all  $h^2/R$ . Weight also achieves high

312 correlation for ArmsLSTM or LegsLSTM. However, it can be observed from the correlation  
313 coefficient matrix, Weight and reactance are positively correlated with ArmLSTM, LegsLSTM and  
314 estimated variables, but Weight is still greater than reactance. This was also reflected in the  
315 selection order of LSTM estimation equations for estimated variables.

316 Athletes have a unique body composition [36] compared to non-athletes due to the  
317 requirements of competitive sports. Therefore, there may be larger errors when the LSTM  
318 measurement equation of BIA from non-athletes [37] are applied to athletes using. Relative  
319 compared with BIA used to measure the quantity of body composition, bioelectrical impedance  
320 vector analysis (BIVA) can be used to identify the subject's water and hydration status. Through  
321 the qualitative analysis of BIVA, it is possible to avoid make the relevant problem of BIA. Using  
322 BIVA can't estimate the body composition, but can draw the tolerance ellipses for specific ethnic  
323 groups such as athletes to evaluate the vector position. Qualitative analysis of BIVA can be used  
324 for comparing the physical characteristics [38, 39].

325 The equation developed in this study has some limitations. The use of BIA to measure  
326 body composition has a certain relationship with the geometric shape of the human body.  
327 Therefore, there may be certain estimation errors in the measurement of different special  
328 athletes. Furthermore, we used whole body rather than segmental impedance measurements.  
329 Therefore, in theory, the use of whole-body bioimpedance measurement devices to estimate  
330 athletes' LSTM may be inferior to that of segmental measurement devices. However, the results  
331 presented in this study are not worse than commercially available segmental bioimpedance  
332 measurement devices. It is also worth mentioning that it is a good choice to develop estimation  
333 equations for athletes of a single sport in the future. At the same time, it would be a better  
334 research direction if the differences of race can be considered. In addition, the study subjects  
335 were all elite athletes recruited in Taiwan whose data contributed to formulating the limbs LSTM  
336 estimation equations, which limits the extent to which study results can be generalized to other  
337 populations. Whether results of the present study are applicable to other races still needs to be  
338 verified in further studies.

## 339 **Conclusion**

340 Single-frequency BIA estimation equations of LSTM for arms and legs of Asian athletes in Taiwan  
341 have been established and have demonstrated good performance, allowing them to quickly and  
342 accurately measure lean soft tissue mass of the arms and legs of Asian athletes. Nevertheless,  
343 BIA estimation equations of the limbs LSTM for Caucasian athletes should be carefully evaluated  
344 when applied to the measurement of the limb LSTM of Asian athletes. It is suggested that Asian  
345 athletes should apply the BIA estimation equation of the proprietary LSTM for limbs, so that the  
346 measurement results can be of practical value.

## 347 **Author Contributions**

348 All authors made a significant contribution to the work reported, whether that is in the conception,  
349 study design, execution, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation, or in all these areas; took  
350 part in drafting, revising or critically reviewing the article; gave final approval of the version to be  
351 published; have agreed on the journal to which the article has been submitted; and agree to be  
352 accountable for all aspects of the work.

## 353 **Funding**

354 This research was funded by the Tzu Hui Institute of Technology Research Program, grant  
355 number THIT-110004 and MOST 111-2622-E-005-001 was funded in part by the National  
356 Science and Technology Council, Republic of China.

## 357 **Acknowledgments**

358 This work was supported by grants from the Tzu Hui Institute of Technology Research Program  
359 (THIT-110004) and was supported in part by the National Science and Technology Council,  
360 Republic of China, under Grants MOST 111-2622-E-005-001.

## 361 Disclosure

362 The authors have read the journal's policy and have the following competing interests: Dr. Kuen-  
363 Chang Hsieh was employed by a commercial company, StarBIA Meditek Co. Ltd., during this  
364 study. This does not alter our adherence to PLOS ONE policies on sharing data and materials.  
365 There are no patents, products in development or marketed products associated with this  
366 research to declare. All other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. The funders had no  
367 role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of  
368 the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

## 369 References

- 370 1. Wilmore JH. Body composition in sport and exercise: Directions for future research. Med.  
371 Sci. Sports Exerc. 1983; 15: 21-31.
- 372 2. Meyer NL, Sundgot-Borgen J, Lohman, TG, Ackland TR, Arthur D Stewart AD, Maughan  
373 RJ, et al. Body composition for health and performance: A survey of body composition  
374 assessment practice carried out by the Ad Hoc Research working group on body  
375 composition, health and performance under the auspices of the IOC Medical commission.  
376 Br. J. Sports Med. 2013; 47: 1044-53.
- 377 3. Ackland TR, Lohman TG, Sundgot-Borgen J, Maughan RJ, Meyer NL, Stewart AD, et al.  
378 Current status of body composition assessment in sport: review and position statement  
379 on behalf of the ad hoc research working group on body composition health and  
380 performance, under the auspices of the I.O.C. Medical Commission. Sports Med. 2021;  
381 42: 227-49.
- 382 4. Silva AM. Structural and functional body components in athletic and performance  
383 phenotypes. Eur. Clin. Nutr. 2019; 73: 215-224.
- 384 5. Bosch TA, Burruss TP, Weir N L, Fielding KA, Engel BE, Weston TD, et al. Abdominal  
385 body composition differences in NFL football players. J. Strength Cond. Res. 2014: 28:  
386 3313-9.

- 387 6. O'Connor H, Olds T, Maghan RJ. Physique and performance for track and field events. J.  
388 Sports Sci. 2007; 25: S49-60.
- 389 7. Prado CM, Heymsfield SB. Lean tissue imaging: A new era for nutritional assessment  
390 and intervention. J. Parenter Enteral Nutr. 2014; 38: 940-53.
- 391 8. Czeck MA, Raymond-Pope CJ, Stanford PR, Carbuhn A, Bosch TA, Bach CW, et al. Total  
392 and regional body composition of NCAA Division collegiate female softball athletes. Int. J.  
393 Sports Med. 2019; 40: 645-9.
- 394 9. Chiarlitti NA, Delisle-Houde P, Reid RE, Kennedy C, Andersen RE. Importance of body  
395 composition in the national hockey league combine physiological assessments. J.  
396 Strength Cond. Res. 2018; 32: 31135-42.
- 397 10. Roelfs E, Bockin A, Bosch T, Oliver J, Bach CW, Carbuhn A, et al. Body composition of  
398 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Female soccer athletes  
399 through competitive seasons. Int. J. Sports Med. 2020; 41: 766-70.
- 400 11. Raymond-Pope CJ, Solfest AL, Carbuhn A, Stanforth PR, Oliver J, Bach CW, et al. Total  
401 and regional body composition of NCAA Division I Collegiate basketball athletes. Int. J.  
402 Sports Med. 2020; 41: 242-47.
- 403 12. Dengel DR, Keller KA, Stanforth PR, Oliver JM, Carbuhn A, Bosch TA. Body composition  
404 and bone mineral density of Division 1 collegiate track and field athletes, a consortium of  
405 college athlete research (C-CAR) study. J. Clin. Densitom. 2020; 3: 303-13.
- 406 13. Bosch TA, Carbuhn AF, Stanforth PR, Oliver JM, Keller KA, Dengel DR. Body  
407 composition and bone mineral density of Division 1 Collegiate football players: A  
408 consortium of college Athlete Research Study. J. Strength Cond. Res. 2019; 33: 1339-46.
- 409 14. Prokop NW, Reid RE, Andersen RE. Seasonal changes in whole body and regional body  
410 composition profiles of elite collegiate ice-hockey players. J. Strength Cond. Res. 2016;  
411 30: 684-92.
- 412 15. Silverstre R, Kreamer WJ, Wes, C, Kraemer WJ. Body composition and physical  
413 performance during a National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men's soccer  
414 season. J. Strength Cond. Res. 2006; 20: 962-83.



- 415 16. Lukaski HC, Bolonchuk WW, Siders WA, Hall CB. Body composition assessment of  
416 athletes using bioelectrical impedance measurements. *J. Sports Med. Phys. Fit.* 1990;  
417 30: 434-40.
- 418 17. Segal KR. Use of bioelectrical impedance analysis measurements as an evaluation for  
419 participating in sports. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* 1996; 64(3): 469S-71S.
- 420 18. Brewer GJ, Blue MNM, Hirsch KR, Peterjohn AM, Smith-Ryan AE. Appendicular body  
421 composition analysis: validity of bioelectrical impedance compared with Dual-energy x-  
422 ray absorptiometry in division I college athletes. *J. Strength Cond. Res.* 2019; 33(11):  
423 2029-25.
- 424 19. Raymond CG, Dengel DR, Bosch TA. Total and segment body composition examination  
425 in collegiate football players using multifrequency bioelectrical impedance analysis and  
426 dual x-ray absorptiometry. *J. Strength Cond. Res.* 2018; 32: 772-82.
- 427 20. Esco MR, Snarr RL, Leatherwood MD, Chamberlain NA, Redding ML, Flatt AA.  
428 Comparison of total and segmental body composition using DXA and multifrequency  
429 bioimpedance in collegiate female athletes. *J. Strength Cond. Res.* 2015; 29: 918-25.
- 430 21. Sedeaud A, Marc A, Schipman J, Schaal K, Danial M, Guillaume M, et al. Secular trend:  
431 Morphology and performance. *J. Sports Sic.* 2014; 32: 1146-54.
- 432 22. Moon JR. Body composition in athletes and sports nutrition: An examination of the  
433 bioimpedance analysis technique. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* 2013; 67: S54-9.
- 434 23. Matias CN, Santo DA, Judice PB, Magalhães JP, Minderico CS, Fields DA, et al.  
435 Estimation of total body water and extracellular water with bioimpedance in athletes: A  
436 need for athlete-specific prediction models. *Clin. Nutr.* 2016; 35: 468-74.
- 437 24. Matias CN, Campa F, Santos DA, Lukaski H, Sardinha LB, Silva AM. Fat-free mass  
438 bioelectrical impedance analysis predictive equation for athletes using a compartment  
439 model. *Int. J. Sports Med.* 2021; 42: 27-32.
- 440 25. Sardinha LB, Correia IR, Magalhaes JP, Júdice PB, Silva AM, Megan H-R. Development  
441 and validation of BIA prediction equations of upper and lower limb lean soft tissue in  
442 athletes. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* 2020; 74: 1646-52.

- 443 26. Deurenberg P, Deurenberg-Yap M, Schouten FJ. Validity of total and segmental  
444 impedance measurements for prediction of body composition across ethnic population  
445 groups. *Eur. J. Clin. Nutr.* 2002; 56: 214-20.
- 446 27. Lukaski HC, Bolonchuk WW, Siders Wa, Hall CB. Body composition assessment of  
447 athletes using bioelectrical impedance measurements. *J. Sports Med. Phys. Fit.* 1990; 30:  
448 434-40.
- 449 28. Fornetti WC, Pivarnik JM, Foley JM, Fiechtner JJ. Reliability and validity of body  
450 composition measures in female athletes. *J Appl Physiol*, 1985; 87: 1114-22.
- 451 29. Graybeal AJ, Moore ML, Cruz MR, Tinsley GM. Body composition assessment in male  
452 and female bodybuilders: a 4-compartment model comparison of dual-energy X-ray  
453 absorptiometry and impedance-based devices. *J Strength Cond Res.* 2020; 34:1676-89.
- 454 30. Matiats CN, Campa F, Santo DA, Lukaski H, Sardinha LB, Silva AM. Fat-free mass  
455 bioelectrical impedance analysis predictive equation for athletes using a 4-compartment  
456 model. *Int J Sports Med.* 2021; 42:27-32.
- 457 31. Campa F, Gobbo LA, Stagi S, Cyrino LT, Toselli S, Marini E. Bioelectrical impedance  
458 analysis versus reference methods in assessment of body composition in athletes.  
459 *European Journal of Applied Physiology.* 2022; 122: 561-89.
- 460 32. Surąła O, Malczewska-Lenczowska J, Crewther BT. Contemporaneous and temporal  
461 interrelationships between menstrual fluctuations in sex hormones and DXA estimates of  
462 body composition in a premenopausal female: a case study. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness,*  
463 2021; 61:1423-28.
- 464 33. Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Baumgartner RN, Ross R. Estimation of skeletal muscle mass  
465 by bioelectrical impedance analysis. *J. Appl. Physiol.* (1985). 2000; 89: 465-71.
- 466 34. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Gómez JM, et al. Bioelectrical  
467 impedance analysis – part II: utilization in clinical practice. 2004; 22: 1400-53.
- 468 35. Pichard C, Kyle UG, Gremion G, Gerbase M, Slosman DO. Body composition by x-ray  
469 absorptiometry and bioelectrical impedance in female runners. *Medicine & Science in*  
470 *sports & Exercise.* 1997; 29: 1527-34.

471 36. Prior BM, Modlesky CM, Evans EM, Sloniger MA, Saunders MJ, Lewis RD. Muscularity  
 472 and the density of the fat-free mass in athletes. J Appl Physiol. (1985). 2001; 90: 1523-  
 473 31.

474 37. Beaudra C, Bryyere O, Geerinck A, Hajaoui M, Scafoglieri A, Perkisas S. Equation model  
 475 developed with bioelectrical impedance analysis tools to assess muscle mass: a  
 476 systematic review. Clin Nutr. 2020; 35:47-62.

477 38. Campa F, Matias C, Gatterer H, Toselli S, Koury JC, Angela Andreoli. et al. Classic  
 478 bioelectrical impedance vector reference values for assessing body composition in male  
 479 and female athletes. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2019; 16(24): 5066.

480 39. Francesco C, Stefania T, Massimiliano M, Luis AG. Giuseppe C. Assessment of body  
 481 composition in athletes: A narrative review of available methods with special reference to  
 482 quantitative and qualitative bioimpedance analysis. Nutrients. 2021;12:1620.

483  
 484  
 485 **Table 1.** Physical characteristics of the subjects <sup>1</sup>.

<b>All Subject</b>	<b>Male (n = 121)</b>	<b>Female (n = 77)</b>	<b>Total (n = 198)</b>
Age(year)	22.7±5.8(17.0, 46.0)	21.0±5.0(17.0, 45.0)	22.0±5.6(17.0, 46.2)
Height(cm)	174.9±8.3(155.9, 198.3)	161.6±6.9(147.1, 181.9) <sup>3</sup>	169.7±10.1 (147.1, 198.3)
Weight(kg)	74.9±11.9(48.9, 123.9)	58.2±9.4(40.8,84.7) <sup>3</sup>	68.4±13.7 (40.8, 123.9)
BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	24.5±3.0(18.9, 36.0)	22.2±2.5 (17.7, 29.8) <sup>2</sup>	23.6±3.1(17.7, 36.0)
R(ohm)	483.4±52.2(339.8, 696.9)	602.5±54.7(452.0, 727.0) <sup>3</sup>	529.7±83.1(339.8, 724.0)
Xc(ohm)	64.7±8.9(43.4, 92.9)	70.9±7.4(55.8, 86.7) <sup>3</sup>	67.2±8.9(43.4, 92.9)
ArmsLSTM(kg)	7.0±1.4(2.7, 11.1)	3.8±0.8 (2.6,7.5) <sup>3</sup>	5.7±2.0(2.6, 11.1)
LegsLSTM(kg)	22.6±3.4(12.9, 33.7)	15.0±2.7(10.9,27.5) <sup>3</sup>	19.6±4.9(10.9,33.7)
TrunkLSTM(kg)	26.4±3.6(14.5-41.7)	17.8±2.1(13.8,27.1) <sup>3</sup>	22.8±5.3(13.8, 41.7)
FM%	15.3±6.8(5.10-34.0)	27.2±8.1(9.40,46.5) <sup>3</sup>	20.2±9.4(5.1, 46.5)
WHR	0.82±0.05(0.72,0.96)	0.80±0.06(0.65,0.94) <sup>3</sup>	0.81±0.05(0.65,0.96).
<b>Modeling Group</b>	<b>Male (n = 70)</b>	<b>Female (n = 52)</b>	<b>Total (n = 132)</b>
Age(year)	22.9±6.1(17.0, 46.0)	20.9±5.0(17.0, 42.0) <sup>2</sup>	22.1±5.8(17.0, 46.0)
Height(cm)	174.8±7.8(157.3, 198.3)	160.9±6.4(150.3, 181.9) <sup>3</sup>	169.3±10.0(150.5, 198.3)
Weight(kg)	73.7±9.9(56.9,123.1)	57.4±8.7(40.8, 84.7) <sup>3</sup>	67.3±12.4(40.8, 123.1)

BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	24.1±2.7(18.9, 36.0)	22.1±2.5(17.7, 29.8) <sup>2</sup>	23.3±2.9(17.7, 36.0)
R(ohm)	483.8±58.8(339.8,679.5)	602.3±49.8(506.2, 704.7) <sup>3</sup>	530.5±80.2(339.8, 704.7)
Xc(ohm)	65.2±8.8(43.4, 89.9)	70.7±7.5(55.8, 86.8) <sup>3</sup>	67.3±8.7(43.4, 89.9)
ArmsLSTM(kg)	6.9±1.3(2.6, 9.4)	3.8±0.7(2.6, 6,8) <sup>3</sup>	5.7±1.9(2.6, 9.4)
LegsLSTM(kg)	22.5±3.0(15.4, 32.6)	14.8±2.4(10.9, 25.7) <sup>3</sup>	19.4±4.7(10.9, 32.6)
TrunkLSTM(kg)	26.3±3.6(14.5,41.7)	17.7±2.1(13.9,27.1) <sup>3</sup>	22.7±5.2(13.9,41.7)
BF%	15.2±7.1(5.4,33.7)	27.5±8.5(9.4,46.5) <sup>3</sup>	20.4±9.8(5.4,46.5)
WHR	0.81±0.05(0.72,0.96)	0.79±0.06(0.69,0.92) <sup>3</sup>	0.81±0.05(0.69,0.96)
<b>Validation Group</b>	<b>Male (n = 41)</b>	<b>Female (n = 25)</b>	<b>Total (n = 66)</b>
Age(year)	22.1±5.3(18.0, 46.0)	21.3±5.2(17.0, 45.0) <sup>2</sup>	21.8±5.2(17.0, 46.0)
Height(cm)	175.0±9.1 (155.8, 194.6)	163.3±7.6(147.1, 178.1) <sup>3</sup>	170.6±10.3(147.1, 194.6)
Weight(kg)	77.4±18.8 (48.9, 119.1)	59.7±10.6(45.2, 81.2) <sup>3</sup>	70.7±15.9(45.2, 119.1)
BMI(kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.2±3.6(19.6, 33.7)	22.3±2.6(18.5, 29.4) <sup>2</sup>	24.1±3.5(18.5, 33.7)
R(ohm)	482.6±69.2(355.2, 696.9)	602.8±64.8(452.0, 724.0) <sup>3</sup>	528.1±89.2(355.2, 724.0)
Xc(ohm)	63.8±9.3(43.4, 92.8)	71.4±7.1(56.8, 83.7) <sup>3</sup>	66.7±9.2(43.4, 92.8)
ArmsLSTM(kg)	7.1±1.6(3.0, 11.1)	3.9±1.1(2.6, 7.5) <sup>3</sup>	5.9±2.1(2.6, 11.1)
LegsLSTM(kg)	22.7±4.2 (12.9, 33.7)	15.5±3.4(11.9, 27.5) <sup>3</sup>	20.0±5.3(11.9, 33.7)
TrunkLSTM(kg)	26.6±3.8(19.7,36.8)	17.8±1.9(13.8,23.0) <sup>3</sup>	22.9±5.4(13.8,36.8)
FM%	15.3±6.4(5.10,34.0)	26.4±7.1(13.5,40.7) <sup>3</sup>	20.0±8.6(5.1, 40.7)
WHR	0.82±0.04(0.74,0.84)	0.80±0.06(0.65,0.94) <sup>3</sup>	0.81±0.05(0.65,0.94)

486 <sup>1</sup> All values are  $x \pm SD$ ; minimum and maximum in parentheses. <sup>2,3</sup> Significantly different from  
487 male (one-factor ANOVA): <sup>2</sup>  $P = 0.005$ , <sup>3</sup>  $P < 0.001$ ; BMI, body mass index; R, resistance; Xc,  
488 reactance, LSTM, Lean soft tissue mass, WHR, Waist-to-hip ratio; FM%, Fat Mass % (body fat  
489 percentage).

490 **Table 2.** Multiple regression analysis results for ArmsLSTM, Based on bioimpedance index and anthropometric.

ArmsLSTM, Modeling Group (n = 132)									
h <sup>2</sup> /R	+ Gender	+Weight	+Xc	+h	Intercept	SEE	r <sup>2</sup>	VIF	β
-0.131 ± 0.005**	-	-	-	-	-0.663 ± 0.270 **	0.878	0.802	2.27	0.659
0.100 ± 0.006**	-1.147 ± 0.171**	-	-	-	-0.547 ± 0.418	0.797	0.837	2.39	-0.281
0.094 ± 0.426**	-1.184 ± 0.171**	0.026 ± 0.007**	-	-	0.094 ± 0.426*	0.775	0.847	3.57	0.211
0.087 ± 0.010**	-1.102 ± 0.172**	0.025 ± 0.007**	0.019 ± 0.008**	-	-1.742 ± 0.871	0.765	0.848	1.66	0.098
0.096 ± 0.011**	-1.132 ± 0.171**	0.030 ± 0.007**	0.022 ± 0.008**	-0.022 ± 0.010**	0.905 ± 1.462*	0.757	0.855	3.29	-0.112

491 ArmsLSTM, Arms lean soft tissue mass; Regression coefficient estimate ± SEE; r<sup>2</sup>, coefficient of determination; \* p < 0.01; \*\* p < 0.001; β,

492 standardized coefficient; VIF: variance inflation factor; SEE, standard error of the estimate; h, height.

493

494 **Table 3.** Multiple regression analysis results for LegsLSTM, Based on bioimpedance index and anthropometric.

LegsLSTM, Modeling Group (n = 132)										
h <sup>2</sup> /R	+h	+ Gender	+Weight	+Age	+Xc	Intercept	SEE	r <sup>2</sup>	VIF	β
.336±.010**	-	-	-	-	-	.675±.554	1.792	.863	2.89	.546
.241±.014**	.156±.019**	-	-	-	-	-20.496±2.577**	1.543	.899	3.35	.248
.213±.016**	.150±.018**	-1.151±.332**	-	-	-	-17.497±2.653**	1.502	.905	2.42	-.125
.179±.018**	.132±.019**	-1.254±.325**	.050±.014**	-	-	-15.845±2.263**	1.467	.911	3.60	.155
.178±.018**	.127±.018**	-1.362±.323**	.053±.014**	-.048±.019**	-	-14.030±2.683	1.443	.914	1.04	-.059
.197±.020**	.120±.019**	-1.242±.324**	.055±.014**	-.052±.019**	.033±.015*	-16.139±2.826	1.431	.916	1.67	.060

495 LegsLSTM, Legs lean soft tissue mass; Regression coefficient estimate  $\pm$  SEE;  $r^2$ , coefficient of determination; \*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.001$ ;  $\beta$ , standardized  
 496 coefficient; VIF: variance inflation factor; SEE, standard error of the estimate; h, height

497

498 **Table 4.** LegsLSTM and ArmsLSTM estimation equation by DXA and bioimpedance for Asian Athlete<sup>1</sup>

Method	Male ( $n = 121$ )	Female ( $n = 77$ )	Total ( $n = 198$ )
		ArmsLSTM	
DXA(kg)	6.99 $\pm$ 1.38 (2.69, 11.06)	3.79 $\pm$ 0.82 (2.6,7.5)**	5.74 $\pm$ 1.97 (2.6, 11.1)
Sardinha [25](kg)	5.93 $\pm$ 1.13 (3.03,9.75)	4.67 $\pm$ 0.76 (3.52, 7.37)**	5.44 $\pm$ 1.18 (3.14,7.,79)
Asian(kg)	6.92 $\pm$ 1.06 (4.25, 10.30)	3.74 $\pm$ 0.65 (2.72, 6.14)	5.74 $\pm$ 1.81 (2.14,9.92)
		LegsLSTM	
DXA (kg)	22.55 $\pm$ 3.42 (12.86, 33.70)	15.03 $\pm$ 2.74 (10.9,27.5)**	19.62 $\pm$ 4.85 (10.9,33.7)
Sardinha [25](kg)	18.58 $\pm$ 2.91 (11.09,29.11)	15.11 $\pm$ 2.30(11.24,22.97)**	17.33 $\pm$ 3.06 (11.34,23.45)
Asian (kg)	22.62 $\pm$ 3.14 (14.12,31.72)	15.03 $\pm$ 2.74 (10.98, 27.49)**	19.62 $\pm$ 4.64 (10.61,28.98)

499 <sup>1</sup> All values are  $x \pm$  SD; minimum and maximum in parentheses. Significantly different from male (one-factor ANOVA): \*,  $P = .05$ , \*\*,  $P < .01$

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

**Table 5.** Correlation coefficient matrix of independent and dependent variables ( $n = 198$ )

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

	<b>ArmsLSTM</b>	<b>LegsLSTM</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Wegith</b>	<b>Xc</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>h<sup>2</sup>/R</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Height</b>
<b>ArmsLSTM</b>	1	.908**	-.795**	.794**	-.451**	-.836**	.895**	.122	.725**
<b>LegsLSTM</b>		1	-.757**	.839**	-.487**	-.777**	.929**	.034	.864**
<b>Gender</b>			1	-.601**	.341**	.701**	-.748**	-.145*	-.642**
<b>Weight</b>				1	-.500**	-.687**	.833**	.106	.765**
<b>Xc</b>					1	.624**	-.597**	.017	-.399**
<b>R</b>						1	-.900**	-.133	-.517**
<b>h<sup>2</sup>/R</b>							1	.093	.811**
<b>Age</b>								1	.028
<b>Height</b>									1

where: h<sup>2</sup>/R, resistance index; Xc, reactance; R, resistance; h, height; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.001$

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530


531

532

533

534

535



536

**Figure 1.** Flow chart of participants for the inclusion in the analysis for the study.

537

538

539

540


541

542

543

544





545

546

547 **Figure 2.** Asian athletes were compared with DXA using the Sardinha equation. (a) Scatter plots

548 and regression line of ArmsLSTM ( $y = 1.358 x - 1.650$ ,  $r = 0.812$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\text{CCC} = 0.784$ ); (b)

549 Bland-Altman Plots of ArmsLSTM (trend,  $y = -0.551 x + 2.780$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ); (c) Distribution plot

550 and regression line of LegsLSTM ( $y = 1.359 x - 3.941$ ,  $r = 0.863$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\text{CCC} = 0.824$ ); (d)

551 Bland-Altman Plots of LegsLSTM (trend,  $y = -0.418 x + 6.714$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

552


553

554

555

556

557



558

559 **Figure 3.** A new equation was developed to measure the outcomes of Asian athletes compared  
 560 with DXA in the validation group (VG). a. scatter plots and regression line of ArmsLSTM ( $y =$   
 561  $0.024 + 1.007 x$ ,  $r = 0.924$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\text{CCC} = 0.913$ ); b. Bland-Altman Plots of ArmsLSTM (Trend:  
 562  $y = 0.441 - 0.088 x$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ); c. Scatter plots and regression line of LegsLSTM ( $y = -0.094 +$   
 563  $1.000 x$ ,  $r = 0.957$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\text{CCC} = 0.943$ ); d. Bland-Altman Plots of LegsLSTM (trend:  $y =$   
 564  $0.978 - 0.04 x$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).