

1 Validation of anthropometric-based weight prediction equations among

2 Ugandan adults: A Cross-sectional study

3 Zakaria Mukasa^{1,2}, Juliet Mutanda Ntuulo², Ronnie Kasirye¹, Emmanuel Olal³, Christopher

4 Lwanga², Victoria Nankabirwa², Fred Nuwaha²

5

6 ¹Makerere University Johns Hopkins University Research Collaboration, Kampala, Uganda.

7 ²Makerere University College of Health Sciences, School of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda.

8 ³Uganda Medical Association, Acholi Branch-Gulu, Gulu, Uganda.

9

10 *Corresponding author

11 E-mail: mukasaz4@gmail.com

12 ABSTRACT

13 **Introduction:** Proper patient management often requires accurate weight estimation. However,
14 the appropriate weight-measuring equipment is not always available in resource-limited settings,
15 making clinicians resort to less reliable methods like the visual estimation of weight often with
16 negative consequences. In this study, we assess the accuracy of anthropometric-based equations
17 in predicting weight in Ugandan adults.

18 **Methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted at Kira Health Center IV between December
19 2021 and February 2022. A sample of 240 adult patients, 18 years and above, was selected by
20 quota sampling, stratified by sex and body mass index. Demographic information was obtained
21 and anthropometric measurements including weight, height, knee height, subscapular skin fold
22 thickness, and circumference measurements were taken. The predicted weight was computed using
23 the proposed equations and the accuracy of the different equations was determined using Bland
24 Altman analysis taking the equation with the best agreement as the most accurate.

25 **Results:** Out of 240 participants, 50% were females. The mean (standard deviation) age was
26 32.5(11.8) years; (34.1(12.9) years for males and 30.8(10.3) years for females). The mean
27 (standard deviation) actual weight was 66.43 (16.33) kg while the mean height was 1.64 (0.09)
28 meters. Using Bland-Altman analysis, Rabito equation ($\text{Weight} = (0.5759 \times \text{MAC}) + (0.5263 \times \text{AC})$
29 $+ (1.2452 \times \text{CC}) - (4.8689 \times \text{S}) - 32.9241$) was found to have the best agreement with the actual weight
30 with a mean difference (standard deviation) of 2.55(6.99) kilograms overall.

31 **Conclusion:** Equation R3 was the most accurate equation for predicting weight among Ugandan
32 adults. Therefore, in the absence of appropriate weighing scales to weigh patients, using this
33 anthropometric-based weight estimation equation can act as a relatively accurate alternative.

34 **Keywords:** Anthropometric, Weight prediction, Adults, Validation.

35 INTRODUCTION

36 Measurement of weight is essential for the proper management of patients (1) as safe administering
37 of most medications requires careful tailoring of dosages by clinicians to patients' weights to
38 minimize overdose-related harm (2, 3). Accurate weights are essential in the effective calibration
39 of fluid volumes, a common intervention when managing patients such as those with kidney
40 failure, septic shock, severe dehydration, and extensive burns (4-8). Routine weight measurement
41 in clinical care is further crucial for the diagnosis and management of conditions such as
42 underweight, and overweight or obesity which are a growing epidemic in many countries (9).

43 Accurate measurement is critical to quality patient care, and yet, globally, research shows that
44 many patients seeking care from health facilities are unweighed, hindering correct medication
45 dosages (8, 10, 11). For example, one study in Uganda found that over 98% of patients were not
46 weighed(11).

47 Failure to obtain and use accurate patients' weights is associated with increased errors in
48 medication dosing and subsequently suboptimal treatment, antimicrobial resistance, and drug
49 toxicities (12-14). According to a study conducted in four hospitals in Uganda, 58% of the health
50 workers witnessed medication errors and from a review of documents, medication errors were
51 among the most frequent kind of errors, accounting for 17.2% of all the errors (15). In another
52 study, drug overdose was found to be the most common medication error, accounting for 42.9%
53 of all medication errors (16). While these studies identified medication errors, none explored the
54 possibility of missing patient weights as a contributor to these errors. The omission of weights as
55 a possible contributor to high medication errors in healthcare practices in Uganda sheds light on a
56 critical oversight, which needs further exploration, for effective strategies to improve weight
57 measurements in healthcare practices to be developed.

58 A review of the literature provides several barriers to routine measurement of patient weights in
59 healthcare practices including heavy workload, inadequate staffing, and inaccurate weighing
60 machines(10). Likewise, it is often difficult to obtain an accurate weight of bedridden patients
61 using conventional scales. While chair or bedbound scales can be used to obtain their weight (17),
62 these are expensive and often not available in resource-limited countries like Uganda(18). In these
63 situations, patients' weight is just estimated by visual estimation or using the 70 kg standard adult
64 weight, leading to either over or underestimation.

65 Several weight prediction techniques have been proposed over time, for both adults and
66 children(19-22), nevertheless, they often have low accuracy(23). Due to weight measurement
67 challenges, anthropometric-based weight prediction has been employed for a long time both in
68 adults(20) and pediatrics (22) and it's more objective than visual weight estimation.
69 Anthropometric weight predictions involve estimating a person's weight using measurements of
70 body size and proportions rather than directly weighing them on scales. However, weight
71 prediction equations have mostly been developed in high-income settings(20). While there is a
72 dearth of research in this area, a few pioneering studies have made efforts to validate and adapt
73 weight measurement equations for the sub-Saharan African context (24, 25). One such study
74 successfully validated the use of an anthropometric-based dose for praziquantel among children,
75 which greatly improved access to this lifesaving medicine in rural and remote populations with
76 high schistosomiasis endemicity (26). This tool has nevertheless a main limitation of being used
77 only for praziquantel dosing for children. Another study tested a weight prediction equation among
78 university students in Nigeria (27). Although their formula had good accuracy in providing weight
79 estimates among 122 adults, it had major limitations in terms of its small sample size, limited

80 applicability to populations with heights lower than 1.2m or greater than 2.0m, and inaccuracies
81 in estimating underweight (27).

82 Accurate weight estimation methods are therefore needed for both bedbound patients and
83 individuals in communities where access to conventional weighing scales may be limited. These
84 methods should be easy to implement, require minimal training, and provide reliable estimates of
85 weight for use in clinical decision-making and mass treatment campaigns. This study aimed to
86 assess the feasibility of using anthropometric-based equations for weight estimation in resource-
87 limited settings. To achieve this goal, we evaluated the accuracy of various equations in predicting
88 weight among Ugandan adults.

89 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

90 **Site:** To evaluate the accuracy of anthropometric-based weight estimation equations, we
91 conducted a cross-sectional study at Kira Health Center IV, a high-volume primary healthcare
92 facility in central Uganda, between 05 January 2022 and 21 February 2022. The center serves over
93 100 patients daily, with approximately half of the population being adults aged 18 years and above.

94 **Participants:** We enrolled adult participants (18 years and older) from both inpatient and
95 outpatient units at the health facility. Inclusion criteria included the ability to stand upright for
96 weighing and height measurement and willingness to provide informed consent. Participants who
97 were pregnant, had altered mental status or had amputated or immobilized limbs were excluded.

98 **Sample size determination:** The sample size was calculated using MedCalc for Windows, version
99 20.215. In MedCalc, a sample size calculation for the Bland Altman plot was done. The α error
100 was set at 0.05, β at 0.10, and the expected mean difference (MD) between methods was set at
101 0.8kg (28), the expected standard deviation (SD) of the differences of 1.96kg, and the maximum

102 allowable difference between methods was set at 7kg. A sample size of 28 patients was obtained
103 for each quota leading to a total sample size of 224 participants. Assuming a refusal rate of about
104 (5%) and using the formula (Final sample size = Effective sample size/ (1- nonresponse rate
105 anticipated)). The final sample size was 240 participants.

106 **Sampling procedure:** Quota sampling was used. First, sampling was stratified by sex. Then
107 further stratification within the strata of nutritional status of the patients using BMI (underweight,
108 normal, overweight, and obese) was done. An equal number of participants was sampled in each
109 stratum using convenience sampling.

110 **Study procedures:** The health center staff identified potential participants for the different
111 categories using BMI and these were referred to the research assistant. The research assistant
112 approached the identified participants and told them about the study. Those who were interested
113 in participating provided written informed consent to join the study and had their anthropometric
114 measurements taken. Recruitment for a given stratum was stopped as soon as the target sample
115 size (30) in the stratum was achieved. Overall recruitment was stopped when the target sample
116 size of 240 participants was achieved.

117 **Variables:** The dependent variable for the study was estimated weight. The independent variables
118 were subscapular skinfold thickness (mm), height (cm), knee height (cm), calf circumference (cm),
119 arm circumference (cm), hip circumference (cm), and abdominal circumference (cm). These were
120 collected using a skin fold thickness caliper for subscapular skinfold thickness, a stadiometer for
121 height, and a measuring tape for the rest.

122 Using an interviewer-administered questionnaire, data were also collected on other variables like;
123 age in completed years, sex (male and female), education level (preprimary, primary, secondary,

124 and tertiary), the reason for clinic attendance (respiratory conditions, genital-urinary,
125 gastrointestinal, cardiovascular, and others), admission status (outpatient and inpatient), the study
126 participants' tribe, BMI (underweight, normal, overweight, and obese) and actual weight.

127 **Data Sources and Measurement:** Weight (W) was measured using a well-calibrated standing
128 weighing scale (Seca type) and the same weighing scale was used for all patients. Weight was
129 measured with the patient standing upright and barefooted on the weighing scale placed on a firm
130 and flat surface. The participants first removed all heavy coats, sweaters, shoes, and heavy pocket
131 contents. The weight was measured in kilograms and to the nearest one-tenth of a kilogram (100
132 grams) (29).

133 *Height (H) was measured with a wall mounted (Seca type) stadiometer:* To ensure measurement
134 accuracy, patients were asked to stand barefooted on a flat surface with their feet flat on the floor,
135 heels against the wall, and the head, shoulders, and buttocks touching the wall. They were
136 instructed to look straight ahead without lifting their chins. Just before taking the measurements,
137 the participants were told to take a deep breath, hold it, and keep their shoulders relaxed. The
138 headpiece of the scale was placed perpendicular to the wall and lowered until it rested on top of
139 the patient's head. The reading was then taken. Height was measured in centimeters and to the
140 nearest millimeter (0.1cm) (29).

141 *The Subscapular Skinfold Thickness (SST):* patients were measured standing upright facing away
142 from the tester. They were asked to put the hand behind their backs and the inferior angle of the
143 scapular was palpated. The tester pinched the skin at the angle, pulled it away from the underlying
144 muscle, and using a skinfold caliper, the tester measured the skinfold thickness about one
145 centimeter below the angle. The skinfold thickness was measured in millimeters.

146 *The Abdominal Circumference (AC)*: was measured between the iliac crest and the last rib through
147 the umbilical scar(30). It was measured with the patient standing upright, in centimeters to the
148 nearest millimeter.

149 *The Calf Circumference (CC)*: was measured in a standing position. The largest part of the calf
150 was identified and used a flexible non-stretch measuring tape, not so tightly applied, to measure
151 the circumference. The measurements were done in centimeters and to the nearest millimeter.

152 *Mid-arm circumference (MAC)*: also known as Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC), was
153 measured at the midpoint of the distance between the acromion and the olecranon process on the
154 shoulder blade and the ulna respectively, of the arm. This was done using a flexible non-stretch in
155 centimeters and to the nearest millimeter.

156 *Hip Circumference (HC)*: was measured at the largest circumference around the buttocks with the
157 patient in an upright position using a flexible non-stretch measuring tape. It was measured in
158 centimeters and to the nearest millimeter (29).

159 *Knee Height (KH)*: This was measured with the patient barefooted. The knee was exposed and
160 with the patient seated in a chair with their knee at a right angle, the assessor held the tape measure
161 between their third and fourth fingers and placed their hand flat across the thigh of the patient at
162 about 4cm behind the front of the knee. Then the tape measure was positioned down the leg in line
163 with the lateral malleolus (ankle bone) to the base of the heel. The measurements were recorded
164 to the nearest half a centimeter (31).

165 For uniformity, the Subscapular Skinfold Thickness, the Mid-Upper Arm Circumference, and the
166 Calf Circumferences were taken from the right side for every patient.

167 **Quality Assurance and Control:** A research assistant with a medical background and experience
168 taking anthropometric measurements, was recruited. The research assistant was trained to properly
169 use the weighing scale, stadiometer, and measuring tape to take the anthropometric measurements.
170 The training was practical, and it lasted one week. The research assistant was also trained on the
171 research protocol and good clinical and documentation practices. The tools were first tested and
172 calibrated among the patients at Kira Health Center IV before beginning actual recruitment. The
173 tools (weighing scale, stadiometer, and skinfold caliper) were also calibrated (set to zero) every
174 morning before starting to recruit participants. Field editing of the data was done by the
175 investigator on the day the data was collected, and correctable errors were resolved on the same
176 day.

177 **Equation selection:**

178 Table 1 shows the selected equations, their sample size, study area, and the respective model
179 coefficients of determination. Crandall and colleagues utilized only two variables in their
180 equations(32). The rest of the equations used three or more variables and their models were more
181 predictive. Rabito and colleagues developed a single-weight prediction model for both females
182 and males. Although his models were highly predictive, it is imperative to validate these models
183 for both sexes and different ages due to the morphological differences conferred by gender and
184 age(33).

185 In the study, we chose equations that contain variables that require only a measuring tape and a
186 skinfold caliper to measure because they can easily be measured in emergency rooms, even in
187 uncooperative patients. The equations chosen were evaluated and validated for application in the
188 Ugandan population. The equation for estimation of weight from height developed by Kokong
189 and colleagues in Nigeria (Estimated Weight = (Height-1)100)) was developed through

190 observation and trial and error as stated in their study and therefore, this was not considered for
 191 evaluation(27). Equations by Donini and colleagues(34) have parameters similar to Chumlea
 192 equations so these were not evaluated as well.

193 Table 1: Equations for weight estimation selected for evaluation in the study.

Authors	Population	Equation	Model
Chumlea (Ch) (20)	228 elderly (USA)	W (Female) = (MAC x 0.98) + (CC x 1.27) + (SST x 0.40) + (KH x 0.87)-62.35	R ² = 0.85
		W (Male) = (MAC x 1.73) + (CC x 0.98) + (SST x 0.37) + (KH x 1.16)-81.69	R ² = 0.90
Rabito (R) (1)	368 (Brazil)	W = (0.5030xMAC) + (0.5632xAC) + (1.3180xCC) + (0.0339xSST)-43.1560 (1)	R ² = 0.93
		W = (0.4808xMAC) + (0.5646xAC) + (1.316xCC) - 42.2450 (2)	R ² = 0.93
		W = (0.5759xMAC) + (0.5263xAC) + (1.2452xCC) - (4.8689xS)-32.9241 (3)	R ² = 0.94
Crandall (Cr) (32)	1471 Obese (USA)	W (Females) = -64.6 + (2.15xMAC) + (0.54xH)	R ² = 0.55
		W (Males) = -93.2 + (3.29xMAC) + (0.43xH)	R ² = 0.59
Lorenz (L) (35)	7000 general population (German)	W (Males) = -137.432 + (0.60035xH) + (0.785xAC) + (0.392xHC)	R ² = 0.85
		W (Females) = -110.924 + (0.4053xH) + (0.325xAC) + (0.836xHC)	R ² = 0.82
MAC (cm) = Mid-arm circumference, AC (cm) = Abdominal circumference, CC (cm) = calf circumference, Subscapular Skinfold Thickness = SST (mm) and S = sex (male=1 and female=2), H (cm) = height, HC (cm) = Hip Circumference, KH (cm) = Knee Height, and W (kg) = Weight.			

194

195 **Data management:** The data was collected on paper case report forms (CRFs) and then entered
 196 into Microsoft Excel. Weight predicted by each of the equations was computed using Excel before
 197 the data was exported to STATA 17 SE for further data management and analysis. For
 198 confidentiality, patient initials and unique identification numbers were used on the CRF to identify
 199 participants.

200 **Data analysis:** Analysis was done at univariable, bivariable, and multivariable levels. Continuous
201 variables were summarized using means and standard deviations (SD). The categorical variables
202 were summarized using frequencies and proportions/percentages. The mean weights by the
203 different equations were calculated and shown in Table 4 below. These predicted mean weights
204 were compared to the actual mean weight using the paired t-test for equality of means at a 5% (α
205 = 0.05) level of significance. The bias, the level of agreement (LOA), and the precision of estimates
206 were obtained using the Bland-Altman plots with 95% Confidence Intervals (CI). These enabled
207 the determination of the equation which was most accurate at the estimation of weight (which was
208 the equation with the best agreement with actual weight using BA analysis). The assumptions of
209 Bland Altman's analysis were met before conducting the analysis. Bland Altman's analysis is used
210 to describe the level of agreement between two methods of the same measurements(36). It can be
211 used to compare two new methods or to compare one method to a gold standard and it helps
212 quantify agreement by constructing the limits of agreement using the SD and MD(37). It involves
213 using scatter plots with the Mean of the two methods on the X-axis and the difference between the
214 two methods on the Y-axis. Less scatter and closeness to the mean bias line represent good
215 agreement(38).

216 **Ethical Considerations:** Permission was sought from the Makerere University School of Public
217 Health Higher Degrees Research and Ethics Committee. Administrative clearance was obtained
218 from the District Health Officer (DHO) of Wakiso district and the in-charge Kira Health Center
219 IV. Written informed consent was sought from the patients before carrying out any study
220 procedures. Only adults were approached for consent, all participants provided consent by
221 themselves, and none required a witness.

222 RESULTS

223 Description of study participants

224 A total of 240 patients who fulfilled the eligibility criteria were enrolled in the study. An equal
225 number of males and females were sampled. The overall mean (SD) age of the patients was 32.48
226 (11.76) years: for women was 30.83 (10.28) and for men was 34.12 (12.91), with an overall age
227 range of 18-75 years (Table 2).

228 Table 2: Summary of descriptive statistics by Sex (Continuous variables)

Continuous Variables			
	All:	Females:	Males:
	mean (SD)	mean (SD)	mean (SD)
Age (years)	32.48 (11.76)	30.83 (10.28)	34.12 (12.91)
Weight (kg)	66.43 (16.33)	64.36 (17.22)	68.5 (15.19)
Height (cm)	163.7 (9.33)	160 (8.97)	167.3 (8.20)
Abdominal Circumference (cc)	83.60 (13.72)	84.01 (15.56)	83.18 (11.64)
Mid-arm circumference (cm)	28.61 (4.31)	28.41 (4.83)	28.80 (3.74)
Knee Height (cm)	50.73 (4.39)	49.09 (4.76)	52.37 (3.27)
Subscapular Skinfold Thickness (mm)	13.21 (7.16)	14.79 (7.97)	11.63 (5.85)
Calf Circumference (cm)	35.04 (4.50)	34.71(4.32)	35.38 (4.66)
Hip Circumference (cm)	98.46 (12.44)	100.55 (14.29)	96.38 (9.90)

229

230 Accuracy of various anthropometric-based weight estimation equations

231 Overall, at bivariable analysis, equation L (by Lorenz et al.) had the smallest MD of 0.72 and a p-
232 value of 0.166. After stratification by sex, equations R2 (by Rabito et al.) and Ch (by Chumlea et
233 al.) had the smallest MD for females and males respectively. A summary of the mean, SD, MD,
234 and p-values is given in Table 3.

235

236 Table 3: Comparison between actual and estimated body weight by Sex

	Mean	SD	MD	p	Mean	SD	MD	p	Mean	SD	MD	p
All (Males and Females)				Females				Male				
R1	64.95	14.64	1.48	0.002	64.69	16.04	-0.33	0.518	65.21	13.15	3.29	<0.001
R2	64.82	14.38	1.61	<0.001	64.52	15.74	-0.16	0.760	65.13	12.94	3.37	<0.001
R3	63.88	14.22	2.55	<0.001	61.13	15.30	3.23	<0.001	66.63	12.51	1.87	0.010
Ch	63.03	13.95	3.40	<0.001	58.19	13.74	6.17	<0.001	67.87	12.44	0.63	0.390
L	65.70	14.64	0.72	0.166	65.30	15.99	-0.94	0.120	66.11	13.22	2.39	0.005
Cr	78.21	12.36	-11.78	<0.001	82.89	10.47	-18.53	<0.001	73.52	12.38	-5.02	<0.001
W	66.43	16.33	-	-	64.36	17.22	-	-	68.50	15.19	-	-

237

238 Table 4: Comparison between actual and estimated body weight by BMI and Sex

BMI		Equation					
		R1	R2	R3	Ch	Cr	L
Males							
Under	Mean	52.67	52.83	54.62	55.67	74.57	56.85
	SD	8.92	8.84	8.53	7.01	8.43	9.031
	MD	-0.74	-0.90	-2.69	-3.74	-28.34	-4.92
	p-value	0.613	0.535	0.060	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Normal	Mean	58.58	58.65	60.45	62.31	79.25	59.45
	SD	5.94	5.871	5.66	6.41	6.99	9.84
	MD	2.45	2.38	0.58	-1.28	-23.25	1.58
	p-value	0.002	0.003	0.424	0.195	<0.001	0.170
Over	Mean	69.76	69.57	70.96	73.16	85.00	70.66
	SD	7.70	7.64	7.34	9.11	7.45	10.28
	MD	5.40	5.60	4.20	2.00	-16.94	4.50
	p-value	0.001	0.001	0.011	0.252	<0.001	<0.001
Obese	Mean	79.81	79.47	80.48	80.33	92.72	77.48
	SD	9.21	9.13	8.77	9.29	9.18	11.98
	MD	6.06	6.40	5.39	5.53	-5.59	8.39
	p-value	0.001	<0.001	0.003	0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Females							
Under	Mean	47.05	47.22	44.24	44.50	63.12	50.01
	SD	7.61	7.55	7.20	5.07	9.83	8.82
	MD	-0.82	-0.99	1.99	1.73	-11.19	-3.78
	p-value	0.50	0.412	0.090	0.014	<0.001	0.003
Normal	Mean	57.28	57.29	54.10	50.81	70.77	58.96
	SD	5.72	5.63	5.44	9.08	8.06	8.96
	MD	-1.28	-1.29	1.90	5.19	-9.74	-2.96
	p-value	0.09	0.083	0.012	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Over	Mean	68.88	68.62	65.20	62.57	78.23	67.76
	SD	4.66	4.64	4.53	5.60	9.88	7.12

	MD	-0.81	-0.56	2.87	5.50	-3.07	0.31
	p-value	0.288	0.465	<0.001	<0.001	0.118	0.749
Obese	Mean	85.55	84.94	80.98	74.87	81.97	84.46
	SD	9.84	9.70	9.39	8.82	12.35	13.06
	MD	1.58	2.19	6.16	12.26	3.90	2.67
	p-value	0.232	0.102	<0.001	<0.001	0.038	0.084

239 **MD**: Mean difference (actual-estimated), **SD**: Standard Deviation from the mean estimated weight.

240

241 S1 Fig 1 shows several bland Altman plots A to F. Graph A, shows the bland Altman plot between
 242 actual weight and weight estimated by Rabito 1 (R1) equation, graph B between actual weight and
 243 estimated weight by Rabito 2 (R2), graph C between actual weight and Rabito 3 (R3), graph D
 244 between actual weight and weight estimated from Crandall (Cr) equation, graph E between actual
 245 weight and weight estimated from Chumlea (Ch) equation and graph F is for actual weight and
 246 weight estimated from equations by Lorenz et al (L). The central dashed line represents the mean
 247 difference, and the upper and lower outer parallel dashed lines represent the upper and lower limits
 248 of agreement respectively. All equations underestimated weight except the Cr equation which
 249 overestimated it. Equations R1, R2, and R3 have most of their points closer to the mean difference
 250 line as compared to the other equations. Equation Cr has the most spread-out points on the Bland
 251 Altman plots. All equations overestimated weight for patients with small weights and
 252 underestimated weight for patients with large weights.

253 S1 Fig 1: Bland Altman plots comparing the predicted weight by different equations and Actual
 254 weight.

255

256 Table 5: Shows the coefficient of determination for the respective equations the mean difference
 257 and the standard deviation.

Equation	Overall		Female		Male	
	R-Squared	MD (SD)	R-Squared	MD (SD)	R-Squared	MD (SD)
R1	0.8061	1.48 (7.19)	0.8924	-0.33(5.65)	0.7172	3.29(8.08)
R2	0.8046	1.61 (7.23)	0.8910	-0.16(5.71)	0.7140	3.37(8.12)
R3	0.8178	2.55 (6.99)	0.8952	3.23(5.66)	0.7177	1.87(8.08)
Ch	0.7602	3.40 (8.00)	0.8482	6.17(7.003)	0.7248	0.63(7.98)
L	0.7560	0.724 (8.08)	0.8543	-0.94(6.57)	0.6474	2.39(9.05)
Cr	0.4433	-11.78 (12.28)	0.7134	-18.53(10.08)	0.5339	-5.02(10.45)

258

259 Overall, equation R3 was the best at predicting weight while equation Cr was the worst. For
260 females, equation R1 was the best at predicting weight, and equation Ch for males.

261

262 **DISCUSSION**

263 The study evaluated the accuracy of six weight prediction equations proposed in the literature in
264 the Ugandan population. Based on the quantitative data analysis done in the study, weight
265 prediction from the R3 equation (by Rabito et al.) had the best agreement with the actual weight
266 using Bland-Altman analysis. R3 is an equation that uses a simple cheap and readily available
267 measuring tape to take the mid-arm, abdominal, and calf circumference, which can easily be
268 measured in bedridden patients with minimal turning. When stratified by sex, equations R1 and
269 Ch had the best agreement with actual weight for females and males respectively. However, they
270 contained variables that require sophisticated and expensive equipment like skinfold thickness
271 calipers and knee height calipers to measure. This would limit its applicability in resource-
272 constrained settings. In 2008, in Brazil, Rabito and colleagues came to comparable conclusions
273 when they evaluated anthropometric-based weight prediction equations they had developed earlier
274 in 2006 and those that had been developed by Chumlea and colleagues(39).

275 In inpatient care, and more importantly for critically ill, emergency, elderly long-term bedridden
276 patients, and in community mass drug administration, knowing the accurate body weight of a
277 patient is important. Accurate weight is essential in critical care to minimize drug overdoses,
278 especially for drugs with a small therapeutic window(40). Appropriate weighing scales are not
279 always available in resource-limited settings to measure patients' weight. Several studies have
280 evaluated the accuracy and appropriateness of weight estimation equations, nonetheless, only a
281 few have evaluated several equations at once like in this study where six equations were evaluated
282 at once(28). The evaluation of several equations enabled us to have a wider number of options for
283 selection, hence reducing bias.

284 In Latvia, Balode, and colleagues found the R1 equation to be the most accurate(28) which was
285 different from the results obtained from this study, albeit using a different measure of accuracy. In
286 this study, only equation L had a non-significant MD overall. The difference could be due to the
287 different study populations. Their population was made of predominantly elderly females, unlike
288 our study sample which had predominantly young adults of both sexes in equal numbers. Several
289 studies have shown that there are gender(41, 42) and age(43) differences in anthropometric
290 dimensions. With stratification by sex, R1 had a non-significant MD for females which is
291 comparable to findings from Latvia. Our study used the degree of agreement measured by the
292 Bland-Altman analysis as the measure of accuracy and found equation R3 to be the most accurate,
293 unlike Balode and colleagues who used the mean difference. We used the Bland-Altman analysis
294 because it provides more information about the relationship between methods than using either the
295 paired t-test(44) or correlation(38, 45). It provides information about the magnitude and direction
296 of the differences between the two methods of weight prediction, in addition to information about
297 the overall agreement between the methods. In contrast, the paired t-test only provides information

298 about the average difference between the two methods and correlation only tells us about the
299 strength and direction of the relationship.

300 Generally, all equations underestimated the weight except equation Cr which overestimated the
301 weight. This was different from what was found in Nigeria by Kokong and colleagues where their
302 novel weight prediction method overestimated weight(27). All equations performed poorer in
303 males than females and in obese individuals compared to those in other nutrition categories.

304 Overall, the data supports the theory that other anthropometric measurements can be used for
305 predicting weight and anthropometric weight estimation equations.

306 **Strengths and Limitations:**

307 A major strength of this study was the stratification of study participants by nutritional status and
308 sex. Stratification by nutritional status made it possible to obtain enough participants in the
309 extremes of nutritional statuses that would otherwise be underrepresented with non-stratified
310 sampling. This enabled us to assess how the proposed equations performed in these extremes.
311 Stratifying by sex also enabled us to assess how the performance of the equations was affected by
312 sex.

313 The major limitation of the study was a potential selection bias due to the use of non-probability
314 sampling techniques. The sample ultimately obtained was predominantly young adults hence not
315 representative of all adults and especially elderly bedridden patients on whom the equations may
316 be applied. Stratification by sex and nutritional status was done, however, representation in the
317 different categories of other variables like age and ethnicity was not very meaningful.
318 Measurement error cannot be eliminated, and this may have introduced bias. However, this was
319 reduced by using trained health workers using calibrated and standard equipment.

320

321 **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

322 Equation R3 was found to have the best agreement overall and R1 and Ch for females and males
323 respectively. In situations where patients' weight cannot be measured, equation R3 is
324 recommended for use to predict the weight of young adult patients with relative confidence.
325 Equation R3 only requires a measuring tape to use which is cheap and readily available. Equations
326 R1 and Ch require a skin fold thickness and knee height calipers to compute and therefore would
327 not be very easily applicable in resource-limited settings. However, this equation should be used
328 with caution in obese and underweight individuals.

329 Further future research should aim at evaluating these equations in the elderly population and or
330 develop equations tailored for the Ugandan and sub-Saharan African population.

331 This equation could also be digitalized and incorporated into a phone-based application that can
332 be used to predict weight.

333

334 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

335 We wish to acknowledge the efforts of the lecturers of Makerere University School of Public
336 Health for their unrelenting effort and guidance throughout the course of the study. We would also
337 like to acknowledge the assistance and support rendered to me by the DHO of Wakiso district and
338 the administration of Kira Health Center IV. Our appreciation also goes to the patients of Kira
339 Health Center IV for their voluntary participation that made this study a reality. We acknowledge
340 EDCTP grant number TMA2018SF-2479, Career Strengthening for improved randomized
341 controlled trials in Uganda, for supporting the writing process.

342

343 This study is a version of the study that was conducted for the dissertation for partial fulfillment

344 of the requirements for the Master of Public Health from Makerere University.

345 **REFERENCES**

- 346 1. Rabito EI, Vannucchi GB, Suen VMM, Castilho Neto LL, Marchini JS. Weight and height
347 prediction of immobilized patients. *Revista de Nutrição*. 2006;19(6):655-61.
- 348 2. Committee JF. BNF 78: September 2019-March 2020. BMJ Group/Pharmaceutical Press.
349 2019.
- 350 3. Blix HS, Viktil KK, Moger TA, Reikvam A. Drugs with narrow therapeutic index as
351 indicators in the risk management of hospitalised patients. *Pharmacy practice*. 2010;8(1):50.
- 352 4. Toukhsati SR, Driscoll A, Hare DL. Patient self-management in chronic heart failure—
353 establishing concordance between guidelines and practice. *Cardiac failure review*.
354 2015;1(2):128.
- 355 5. Mengesha MM, Deyessa N, Tegegne BS, Dessie Y. Treatment outcome and factors affecting
356 time to recovery in children with severe acute malnutrition treated at outpatient therapeutic
357 care program. *Global health action*. 2016;9(1):30704.
- 358 6. Committee JF. British National Formulary (online). London: BMJ Group and Pharmaceutical
359 Press; 2015. URL: www.medicinescomplete.com (accessed 7 June 2016). 2015.
- 360 7. Goodman LS. Goodman and Gilman's the pharmacological basis of therapeutics: McGraw-
361 Hill New York; 1996.
- 362 8. Charani E, Gharbi M, Hickson M, Othman S, Alfituri A, Frost G, Holmes A. Lack of weight
363 recording in patients being administered narrow therapeutic index antibiotics: a prospective
364 cross-sectional study. *BMJ open*. 2015;5(4):e006092.
- 365 9. Safaei M, Sundararajan EA, Driss M, Boulila W, Shapi'i A. A systematic literature review on
366 obesity: Understanding the causes & consequences of obesity and reviewing various machine

- 367 learning approaches used to predict obesity. *Computers in biology and medicine*.
368 2021;136:104754.
- 369 10. Flentje KM, Knight CL, Stromfeldt I, Chakrabarti A, Friedman ND. Recording patient
370 bodyweight in hospitals: are we doing well enough? *Internal Medicine Journal*.
371 2018;48(2):124-8.
- 372 11. Kavuma M, Mars M. The effect of an integrated electronic medical record system on malaria
373 out-patient case management in a Ugandan health facility. *Health Informatics Journal*.
374 2022;28(4):14604582221137446.
- 375 12. Evans L, Best C. Accurate assessment patient weigh. *Nursing times*. 2014;110(12):12-4.
- 376 13. Roberts JA, Kruger P, Paterson DL, Lipman J. Antibiotic resistance—what’s dosing got to do
377 with it? *Critical care medicine*. 2008;36(8):2433-40.
- 378 14. Maskin L, Attie S, Setten M, Rodriguez P, Bonelli I, Stryjewski M, Valentini R. Accuracy of
379 weight and height estimation in an intensive care unit. *Anaesthesia and intensive care*.
380 2010;38(5):930-4.
- 381 15. Katongole SP, Anguyo RD, Nanyingi M, Nakiwala SR. Common medical errors and error
382 reporting systems in selected Hospitals of Central Uganda. 2015.
- 383 16. Mauti G, Githae M. Medical error reporting among physicians and nurses in Uganda. *African*
384 *health sciences*. 2019;19(4):3107-17.
- 385 17. Assured MA. Best practice: how to weigh someone who can’t stand United Kingdom:
386 MARSDEN Accuracy Assured; [cited 2021 20 Jan 2021]. Available from:
387 [https://www.marsden-weighing.co.uk/index.php/blog/2017/10/26/best-practice-weigh-](https://www.marsden-weighing.co.uk/index.php/blog/2017/10/26/best-practice-weigh-someone-cant-stand/)
388 [someone-cant-stand/](https://www.marsden-weighing.co.uk/index.php/blog/2017/10/26/best-practice-weigh-someone-cant-stand/).

- 389 18. Namale G, Kamacooko O, Makhoba A, Mugabi T, Ndagire M, Ssanyu P, et al. HIV sero-
390 positivity and risk factors for ischaemic and haemorrhagic stroke in hospitalised patients in
391 Uganda: A prospective-case-control study. *Public Health in Practice*. 2021;2:100128.
- 392 19. Cristy M. Reference man anatomical model. Oak Ridge National Lab., TN (United States);
393 1994.
- 394 20. Chumlea WC, Guo S, Roche AF, Steinbaugh M. Prediction of body weight for the
395 nonambulatory elderly from anthropometry. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*.
396 1988;88(5):564-8.
- 397 21. Anglemyer BL, Hernandez C, Brice JH, Zou B. The accuracy of visual estimation of body
398 weight in the ED. *The American journal of emergency medicine*. 2004;22(7):526-9.
- 399 22. Lubitz DS, Seidel JS, Chameides L, Luten RC, Zaritsky AL, Campbell FW. A rapid method
400 for estimating weight and resuscitation drug dosages from length in the pediatric age group.
401 *Annals of emergency medicine*. 1988;17(6):576-81.
- 402 23. Kahn CA, Oman JA, Rudkin SE, Anderson CL, Sultani D. Can ED staff accurately estimate
403 the weight of adult patients? *The American journal of emergency medicine*. 2007;25(3):307-
404 12.
- 405 24. Bernal-Orozco MF, Vizmanos B, Hunot C, Flores-Castro M, Leal-Mora D, Fernández-Ballart
406 J. Equation to estimate body weight in elderly Mexican women using anthropometric
407 measurements. *Nutrición Hospitalaria*. 2010;25(4):648-55.
- 408 25. Jung M, Chan M, Chow V, Chan Y, Leung P, Leung E, et al. Estimating geriatric patient's
409 body weight using the knee height caliper and mid-arm circumference in Hong Kong Chinese.
410 *Asia Pacific journal of clinical nutrition*. 2004;13(3):261.

- 411 26. Sousa-Figueiredo JC, Betson M, Stothard JR. Treatment of schistosomiasis in African infants
412 and preschool-aged children: downward extension and biometric optimization of the current
413 praziquantel dose pole. *International health*. 2012;4(2):95-102.
- 414 27. Kokong DD, Pam IC, Zoakah AI, Danbauchi SS, Mador ES, Mandong BM. Estimation of
415 weight in adults from height: a novel option for a quick bedside technique. *International
416 journal of emergency medicine*. 2018;11:1-9.
- 417 28. Balode A, Stolarova A, Villerusa A, Zepa D, Kalnins I, Vētra J. Estimation of body weight
418 and stature in latvian hospitalized seniors. *Papers on Anthropology*. 2015;24(2):27-36.
- 419 29. Lohman TG, Roche AF, Martorell R. *Anthropometric standardization reference manual:*
420 *Human kinetics books*; 1988.
- 421 30. Chaves TdO, Reis MS. Abdominal Circumference or Waist Circumference? *International
422 Journal of Cardiovascular Sciences*. 2019;32:290-2.
- 423 31. Todorovic V, Russell C, Elia M. The ‘MUST’ explanatory booklet: a guide to the
424 ‘Malnutrition Universal Screening Tool’(‘MUST’) for adults, 2011.
- 425 32. Crandall CS, Gardner S, Braude DA. Estimation of total body weight in obese patients. *Air
426 medical journal*. 2009;28(3):139-45.
- 427 33. Bredella MA. Sex differences in body composition. Sex and gender factors affecting
428 metabolic homeostasis, diabetes and obesity. 2017:9-27.
- 429 34. Donini L, De Felice M, De Bernardini L, Ferrari G, Rosano A, De Medici M, Cannella C.
430 Body weight estimation in the Italian elderly. *JOURNAL OF NUTRITION HEALTH AND
431 AGING*. 1998;2:92-5.

- 432 35. Lorenz MW, Graf M, Henke C, Hermans M, Ziemann U, Sitzer M, Foerch C. Anthropometric
433 approximation of body weight in unresponsive stroke patients. *Journal of Neurology,*
434 *Neurosurgery & Psychiatry.* 2007;78(12):1331-6.
- 435 36. Bland JM, Altman D. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of
436 clinical measurement. *The lancet.* 1986;327(8476):307-10.
- 437 37. Giavarina D. Understanding bland altman analysis. *Biochemia medica.* 2015;25(2):141-51.
- 438 38. Doğan NÖ. Bland-Altman analysis: A paradigm to understand correlation and agreement.
439 *Turkish journal of emergency medicine.* 2018;18(4):139-41.
- 440 39. Rabito E, Mialich M, Martínez EZ, García R, Jordao AJ, Marchini JS. Validation of predictive
441 equations for weight and height using a metric tape. *Nutrición Hospitalaria.* 2008;23(6):614-
442 8.
- 443 40. Herout PM, Erstad BL. Medication errors involving continuously infused medications in a
444 surgical intensive care unit. *Critical care medicine.* 2004;32(2):428-32.
- 445 41. Rezende FAC, Ribeiro AQ, Priore SE, Franceschini SdCC. Anthropometric differences
446 related to genders and age in the elderly. *Nutrición Hospitalaria.* 2015;32(2):757-64.
- 447 42. Silva AM, Shen W, Heo M, Gallagher D, Wang Z, Sardinha LB, Heymsfield SB.
448 Ethnicity-related skeletal muscle differences across the lifespan. *American Journal of Human*
449 *Biology: The Official Journal of the Human Biology Association.* 2010;22(1):76-82.
- 450 43. Su Y-J, Ho C-C, Lee P-F, Lin C-F, Hung Y-C, Chen P-C, et al., editors. *Gender and Age*
451 *Differences in Anthropometric Characteristics of Taiwanese Older Adults Aged 65 Years and*
452 *Older.* *Healthcare;* 2023: MDPI.
- 453 44. Van Stralen K, Dekker F, Zoccali C, Jager K. Measuring agreement, more complicated than
454 it seems. *Nephron Clinical Practice.* 2012;120(3):c162-c7.

455 45. Ranganathan P, Pramesh C, Aggarwal R. Common pitfalls in statistical analysis: Measures of
456 agreement. Perspectives in clinical research. 2017;8(4):187.

457


458 **SUPPORT INFORMATION FILES**

459 1. Files name: S 1 Fig 1. Bland Altman plots comparing the predicted weight by different
460 equations and Actual weight.

461

462 2. Files name: S 2 data file.

S1 Fig 1. Bland Altman plots comparing the predicted weight by different equations and the Actual weight



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.18.24309142>; this version posted June 19, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).