

1 Handgrip strength as a screening tool for diabetes in
2 resource-constrained settings: a potential solution to
3 overcome barriers to diagnosis

4
5 **Lekan Sheriff Ojulari^{1*}¶, Swabirah Enimire Sulaiman^{1¶}, Taofeek Olanrewaju Ayinde^{1&},**
6 **Eniola Riskat Kadir^{2&}**

7 ¹ Department of Physiology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

8 ² Department of Anatomy, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

9
10 * Corresponding author

11 Email: Ojulari.ls@unilorin.edu.ng LS

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Abstract**

31

32 **Background Information**

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

38 **Objective**

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

42 **Methods**

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

48 **Results**

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

54 **Conclusion**

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

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

63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79

80 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

146 approach to managing diabetes, ultimately reducing the economic implications of the disease,
147 particularly in resource-constrained settings.

148 **Materials and methods**

149 **Participants**

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

156 **Inclusion criteria**

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

161 **Exclusion criteria**

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

165 **Ethical considerations**

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

172 **Dependent variables**

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

179 **Glycaemic control**

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

186 **Insulin resistance**

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

192 **Independent variables**

193 **Handgrip strength**

194 Handgrip strength (HGS) was measured as an indicator of muscle strength and functional capacity
195 in daily activities. It was assessed using a dynamometer and is associated with various chronic
196 diseases (19), cognitive decline (20), length of hospital stays, and mortality. Before measuring
197 handgrip strength, participants were given instructions and a warm-up for their hands and fingers.
198 The measurements were taken while participants stood with their feet hip-width apart and arms
199 straight, slightly away from the body. Each hand was tested thrice, with a rest period between trials
200 (21).

201 **Relative handgrip strength**

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

205 **Height and body weight**

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

208 Body mass index (BMI) was calculated by dividing the body weight (kilograms) by the square of
209 height (meters) (kg/m^2).

210 **Waist/hip ratio**

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

215 **Co-variates**

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

220 **Statistical analysis**

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

227 Results

228 Overall, data of 59 subjects (male 30 = 50.8 % and female 29 = 49.2 %) were used for this study
 229 with a mean age of 18 to 21 years. Dominant HGS ranged from 11.5 - 29.8 kg with interquartile
 230 range (IQR) of 18.4 – 25.1 kg (6.7 kg) in females and from 15.0 – 33.2 kg with IQR of 21.6 – 27.4
 231 kg (5.8 kg) in males (Table 1).

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

	Mean	Median	Min	Max	25%	75%	Interquartile Range (%)	Std Dev
HGS Right Hand (kg)	22.95	22.70	11.50	33.2	20.1	26.2	6.1	4.534
HGS Left Hand (kg)	21.46	21.20	13.80	31.80	18.2	24.9	6.7	4.543
Absolute HGS (kg)	46.22	45.60	28.40	67.80	41.4	52.4	11.0	8.706
Relative HGS (m²)	2.13	2.12	0.98	3.81	1.82	2.39	0.57	0.520
BMI (Kg/m²)	22.32	22.00	15.40	38.6	19.4	23.8	4.4	4.304
Waist/Hip Ratio	0.79	0.80	0.70	1.1	0.7	0.80	0.1	0.078
Pulse Pressure (mmHg)	49.34	49.00	30.0	68	43.0	57.0	14.0	9.278
Fasting Blood Glucose (mmol/L)	4.86	4.80	3.60	6.4	4.5	5.3	0.8	0.560
HBA1c (%)	3.73	3.42	0.51	8.58	2.87	4.59	1.72	1.396
2-hour Postprandial Glucose (mmol/L)	5.20	5.20	3.90	7.6	4.5	5.7	1.2	0.779
Serum Insulin (µIU/L)	18.86	14.09	5.88	158.55	10.58	19.59	9.01	20.522
	N	(%)						
Gender								
Male	30	50.8						
Female	29	49.2						
Age								
18-21	19	32.2						
22-25	38	64.4						
26-30	2	3.4						
Smokes								
Yes	0	0.0						
No	59	100.0						
Alcohol Intake								
Yes	6	10.2						
No	53	89.8						
Does Exercise								
Yes	29	49.2						
No	30	50.8						
Hand Dominance								
Right	51	86.4						
Left	8	13.6						
BMI denotes body mass index								
HBA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin								
HGS denotes Handgrip strength								

234 In this study HGS < 18kg was defined as low while HGS >18kg was defined as normal, fasting
235 blood sugar between 3.9-5.9mmom/l and 2HPG < 7.8 mmol/l was defined as normal range of
236 blood glucose levels. HGS values recorded from study subjects were within normal range with a
237 mean of 21.07kg and 18.70kg for dominant and non-dominant hands respectively

238 The dominant HGS in females (mean = 21.4 ± 4.53) was significantly reduced ($p = 0.005$) when
239 compared to males (mean = 24.6 ± 4.06). (Table 2). Non-Dominant HGS ranged from 13.8 - 25.8
240 kg with interquartile range (IQR) of 15.7 – 21.2 kg (5.5 kg) in females and from 14.7 – 31.8 kg
241 with IQR of 20.5 – 26.1 kg (5.6 kg) in males. The non-dominant HGS in females (mean = $18.9 \pm$
242 3.61) was significantly reduced ($p = 0.001$) when compared to males (mean = 24.0 ± 4.09). (Table
243 2)

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255 **Table 2:** Clinical Characteristics and biomarkers by sex

	Males		Females		p value
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	
HGS Right Hand (kg)	24.62	4.06	21.37	4.53	0.008
HGS Left Hand (kg)	24.01	4.09	18.97	3.61	0.000
Absolute HGS (kg)	4975	8.27	42.87	7.99	0.003
Relative HGS (m²)	2.37	0.61	1.93	0.40	0.003
BMI (Kg/m²)	21.59	3.47	22.85	5.13	0.357
Waist/Hip Ratio	0.82	0.06	0.77	0.09	0.020
Pulse Pressure (mmHg)	53.65	8.02	44.55	8.14	0.000
Fasting Blood Glucose (mmol/L)	4.69	0.64	5.01	0.44	0.042
HBA1c (%)	3.81	1.24	3.61	1.56	0.519
2-hour Postprandial Glucose (mmol/L)	5.15	0.75	5.22	0.83	0.818
Serum Insulin (µIU/L)	17.40	8.76	15.65	9.01	0.449
	N = 30	%	N = 29	%	
Age					
18-21	6	20.0	13	44.83	
22-25	23	77.0	15	51.72	
26-30	1	3.0	1	3.45	
Smokes					
Yes	0	0.0	0	0.00	
No	30	100.0	29	100.00	
Alcohol Intake					
Yes	1	3.3	5	17.24	
No	28	93.4	24	82.76	
Missing	1	3.3	0	0.00	
Does Sports					
Yes	19	63.3	10	34.48	
No	11	36.7	19	65.52	
Hand Dominance					
Right	27	90.0	25	86.21	
Left	3	10.0	4	13.79	

BMI denotes body mass index

HBA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

HGS denotes handgrip strength

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

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

257 In both sexes, there was significant difference (female $p = 0.03$ & male $p = 0.04$) (Fig 1) in HGS
258 between both hands suggesting that hand dominance could be a relevant factor in this study. As
259 such, the results of dominant and non-dominant HGS were also considered independently (Table
260 3).

261 **Fig 1:**

262 **Table 3:** Results of Multiple linear regression of handgrip strength (dominant and non-dominant) on
263 blood glucose regulation biomarkers

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

264

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

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277 **Table 4:** Results of Multiple regression of absolute handgrip strength and relative handgrip strength on
 278 blood glucose regulation biomarkers

	Absolute Handgrip Strength				Relative Handgrip strength			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Estimate (SE)	p	Estimate (SE)	p	Estimate (SE)	P	Estimate (SE)	P
Fasting Blood Glucose	0.322 (0.62)	0.09	0.319 (0.42)	0.08	0.139 (0.64)	0.46	0.08 (0.45)	0.68
2-hour Post Prandial	0.067 (0.76)	0.72	0.396 (0.77)	0.03	0.287 (0.73)	0.12	0.284 (0.80)	0.14
HbA1c	0.088 (1.25)	0.64	0.085 (1.58)	0.66	0.335 (1.19)	0.07	0.303 (1.51)	0.11
Serum Insulin	0.232 (8.67)	0.21	0.102 (9.12)	0.59	0.227 (8.68)	0.22	0.079 (9.14)	0.68

SE denotes standard error. HbA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

279

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

Absolute HGS	Fasting blood glucose		2-hour post prandial		HbA1c		Serum Insulin	
	Estimate (SE)	P	Estimate	P	Estimate	P	Estimate	P
Model 1 ^a	0.3755 (0.59)	0.04	0.1133 (0.76)	0.55	0.0560 (1.26)	0.77	0.2318 (8.82)	0.22
Model 2 ^b	0.4543 (0.58)	0.04	0.2511 (0.75)	0.42	0.2165 (1.26)	0.52	0.3694 (8.58)	0.14
Model 3 ^c	0.5311 (0.56)	0.01	0.4231 (0.70)	0.07	0.3239 (1.22)	0.22	0.2435 (8.95)	0.44
Model 4 ^d	0.5465 (0.56)	0.03	0.4311 (0.71)	0.14	0.3392 (1.23)	0.36	0.3707 (8.74)	0.27
Relative HGS								
Model 1 ^a	0.0436 (0.64)	0.82	0.2223 (0.74)	0.24	0.2947 (1.21)	0.11	0.2408 (8.79)	0.20
Model 2 ^b	0.2408 (0.64)	0.45	0.2769 (0.75)	0.34	0.3248 (1.22)	0.22	0.3406 (8.68)	0.19

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

SE denotes standard error. HbA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

^a Multiple Linear regression analysis

^b Adjusted for Waist hip ratio (WHR)

^c Adjusted for Body mass index (BMI)

^d Adjusted for WHR and BMI

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

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

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

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

SE denotes standard error. HBA1c denotes glycated haemoglobin

^a Multiple Linear regression analysis

^b Adjusted for Waist hip ratio (WHR)

^c Adjusted for Body mass index (BMI)

^d Adjusted for WHR and BMI

294

295

296 Findings in males and females

297 While still maintaining normal ranges in the blood regulatory markers (FBS, 2-hour Postprandial
298 and HBA1c) serum insulin levels were slightly elevated in both sexes (male 17.40±8.76 female
299 15.65±9.01).

300 Fasting blood glucose

301 In males, a notable finding emerged as absolute handgrip strength was consistently linked to
302 fasting blood glucose levels across all models (P<0.05), irrespective of adjustments made for WHR
303 and BMI (Table 5). This association persisted, highlighting the robustness of the relationship. In
304 contrast, among females, absolute HGS was only found to be associated to blood glucose levels
305 following adjustments to BMI (Model 3) (Table 6).

306 **2-hour post-prandial glucose**

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

311 **HBA1c**

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

317 **Serum insulin**

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

321

322

323

324

325

326 **Discussion**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

409

410 **Conclusion**

411 **Summary of Key Findings**

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

419 **Implications for Resource-Constrained Settings**

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

428 **Study Limitations**

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

439 **Acknowledgements**

440
441 We thank all the participants and research staffs of the Physiology Laboratory of the University
442 of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria, for their helpful cooperation in this study.

443

444

445

446

447

448

449 **References**

- 450 1. Laukkanen JA, Voutilainen A, Kurl S, Araujo CGS, Jae SY, Kunutsor SK. Handgrip
451 strength is inversely associated with fatal cardiovascular and all-cause mortality events.
452 *Ann Med.* 2020;52(3–4):109.
- 453 2. Kunutsor SK, Voutilainen A, Laukkanen JA. Handgrip strength improves prediction of
454 type 2 diabetes: a prospective cohort study. *Ann Med.* 2020 Nov 16;52(8):471–8.
- 455 3. Cho NH, Shaw JE, Karuranga S, Huang Y, da Rocha Fernandes JD, Ohlrogge AW, et al.
456 IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2017 and projections for
457 2045. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2018 Apr;138:271–81.
- 458 4. Eckman M, Gigliotti C, Sutermaster S, Butler PJ, Mehta K. Using handgrip strength to
459 screen for diabetes in developing countries. *J Med Eng Technol.* 2016 Jan 2;40(1):8–14.
- 460 5. Mapa-Tassou C, Katte JC, Mba Maadjhou C, Mbanya JC. Economic Impact of Diabetes
461 in Africa. *Curr Diab Rep.* 2019 Jan 24;19(2):5.
- 462 6. Kunutsor SK, Laukkanen JA. Serum zinc concentrations and incident hypertension: new
463 findings from a population-based cohort study. *J Hypertens.* 2016 Jun;34(6):1055–61.
- 464 7. Jacobson B, Conchola E, Thompson B, Glass R. A comparison of absolute, ratio and
465 allometric scaling methods for normalizing strength in elite american football players. *J*
466 *Athl Train.* 2013 Apr 4;2.
- 467 8. Newman AB, Kupelian V, Visser M, Simonsick EM, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, et
468 al. Strength, but not muscle mass, is associated with mortality in the health, aging and body
469 composition study cohort. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2006 Jan;61(1):72–7.

- 470 9. Kawamoto R, Ninomiya D, Kasai Y, Kusunoki T, Ohtsuka N, Kumagi T, et al. Handgrip
471 strength is associated with metabolic syndrome among middle-aged and elderly
472 community-dwelling persons. *Clin Exp Hypertens N Y N* 1993. 2016;38(2):245–51.
- 473 10. Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Avezum A, Orlandini A, et al.
474 Prognostic value of grip strength: findings from the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology
475 (PURE) study. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2015 Jul 18;386(9990):266–73.
- 476 11. Celis-Morales CA, Welsh P, Lyall DM, Steell L, Petermann F, Anderson J, et al.
477 Associations of grip strength with cardiovascular, respiratory, and cancer outcomes and all
478 cause mortality: prospective cohort study of half a million UK Biobank participants. *BMJ*.
479 2018 May 8;361:k1651.
- 480 12. Chang HY, Chou KY, Lin JJ, Lin CF, Wang CH. Immediate effect of forearm Kinesio
481 taping on maximal grip strength and force sense in healthy collegiate athletes. *Phys Ther*
482 *Sport Off J Assoc Chart Physiother Sports Med*. 2010 Nov;11(4):122–7.
- 483 13. Reichkender MH, Auerbach P, Rosenkilde M, Christensen AN, Holm S, Petersen MB, et
484 al. Exercise training favors increased insulin-stimulated glucose uptake in skeletal muscle
485 in contrast to adipose tissue: a randomized study using FDG PET imaging. *Am J Physiol*
486 *Endocrinol Metab*. 2013 Aug 15;305(4):E496-506.
- 487 14. Bell DS. Importance of postprandial glucose control. *South Med J*. 2001 Aug;94(8):804–
488 9.
- 489 15. Bawadi H, Alkhatib D, Abu-Hijleh H, Alalwani J, Majed L, Shi Z. Muscle Strength and
490 Glycaemic Control among Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. *Nutrients*. 2020 Mar
491 14;12(3):771.

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

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

- 532 31. Grøntved A, Ried-Larsen M, Møller NC, Kristensen PL, Froberg K, Brage S, et al. Muscle
533 strength in youth and cardiovascular risk in young adulthood (the European Youth Heart
534 Study). *Br J Sports Med*. 2015 Jan;49(2):90–4.
- 535 32. Niemann MJ, Tucker LA, Bailey BW, Davidson LE. Strength Training and Insulin
536 Resistance: The Mediating Role of Body Composition. *J Diabetes Res*. 2020 May
537 8;2020:7694825.
- 538 33. Lazarus R, Sparrow D, Weiss ST. Handgrip strength and insulin levels: cross-sectional and
539 prospective associations in the Normative Aging Study. *Metabolism*. 1997
540 Nov;46(11):1266–9.
- 541 34. O’Neill ED, Wilding JPH, Kahn CR, Van Remmen H, McArdle A, Jackson MJ, et al.
542 Absence of insulin signalling in skeletal muscle is associated with reduced muscle mass
543 and function: evidence for decreased protein synthesis and not increased degradation. *Age*.
544 2010 Jun;32(2):209–22.
- 545 35. Huang Q, Chen X, Shen HY, Zhou JM, Zhang HQ, Wang L, et al. Gender-Specific
546 Association of Handgrip Strength with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Chinese Han Older
547 Adults. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes Targets Ther*. 2023;16:913–23.
- 548 36. Chidi-Ogbolu N, Baar K. Effect of Estrogen on Musculoskeletal Performance and Injury
549 Risk. *Front Physiol*. 2019 Jan 15;9:1834.
- 550 37. Camporez JPG, Jornayvaz FR, Lee HY, Kanda S, Guigni BA, Kahn M, et al. Cellular
551 Mechanism by Which Estradiol Protects Female Ovariectomized Mice From High-Fat
552 Diet-Induced Hepatic and Muscle Insulin Resistance. *Endocrinology*. 2013 Mar
553 1;154(3):1021–8.

- 554 38. Jang BN, Nari F, Kim S, Park EC. Association between relative handgrip strength and
555 prediabetes among South Korean adults. PLoS ONE. 2020 Oct 1;15(10):e0240027.
- 556 39. Dhindsa S, Ghanim H, Batra M, Dandona P. Hypogonadotropic Hypogonadism in Men
557 With Diabetes and Obesity. Diabetes Care. 2018 Jun 14;41(7):1516–25.
- 558 40. Mainous AG, Tanner RJ, Anton SD, Jo A. Grip Strength as a Marker of Hypertension and
559 Diabetes in Healthy Weight Adults. Am J Prev Med. 2015 Dec;49(6):850–8.

560

561 **Supporting information**

562

563 **S1 Fig 1 Title**

564 Boxplots comparing handgrip strength in both dominant and non-dominant hands in both male
565 and female subjects

566 **Si Fig 1 Legend**

567 **Figure 1:** Boxplots comparing handgrip strength in both dominant and non-dominant hands in
568 both male (a) and female (b) subjects. Mean HGS in males was 24.47 ± 4.05 and 23.86 ± 4.07 in
569 both right and left hands, respectively; and in females was 21.37 ± 4.53 and 18.97 ± 3.61 in both
570 right and left hands, respectively. The difference was statistically significant at p-value 0.03 and
571 0.04 between hands in females and males, respectively. HGS – handgrip strength

572

573

574

575 **Ethical approval**

576

577 Ethical approval was collected from the Research Ethics Committee of the **University of Ilorin**

578 **Teaching Hospital**, Ilorin Kwara state, with the reference number: UITH/CAT/189/VOL.21^B

579 /486. An informed consent was also obtained from the research subjects.

580


581

582

583

584

585



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.19.23297260>; this version posted October 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

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