



This is a repository copy of *The Authors reply: "Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry: gold standard for muscle mass?"*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/136626/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Buckinx, F., Landi, F., Cesari, M. et al. (28 more authors) (2018) The Authors reply: "Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry: gold standard for muscle mass?". *Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle*, 9 (4). pp. 788-790. ISSN 2190-6009

<https://doi.org/10.1002/jcsm.12329>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

The Authors reply:

“Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry: gold standard for muscle mass?” by Scafoglieri et al.

We appreciate your interest in our recent publication¹ and your valuable comments. We completely agree that there is still ambiguity in the literature on the definition and use of parameters characterizing body composition.² From this perspective, DXA actually is a progress as the definition of lean and fat (according to DXA terminology) and based on differences of X-ray mass absorption coefficients. With a two energy X-ray system, two materials that differ in atomic number can be uniquely identified using a so-called base material composition.³ Specific calibration equations of identification of dedicated anatomical entities consisting of either one of the materials is not required. As shown by Pietrobelli *et al.*⁴ in terms of the so-called *R*-value that quantifies differences in the mass absorption coefficient for a given material at different X-ray energies fatty acids and triglycerides the ingredients of can well be separated from non-lipid body composition materials.

From this perspective, lean and fat mass as measured by DXA are clearly defined, but do not necessarily agree with anatomical entities such as the amount of adipose tissue. As fat is a term used in many different contexts, perhaps a different name should have been given to what is now known as DXA fat mass. We agree that DXA lean body mass is smaller than FFM.⁵ FFM is the mass of the body excluding the chemical fat. So essential lipids are also excluded. Lean body mass, interpreted the ‘DXA way’, is the soft lean tissue of the body, excluding the bone minerals and the chemical fat. However, lean body mass from a historical point of view, does include the bone, and very closely resembles FFM (but is not perfectly the same). What we would like to stress is that the concept of lean body mass (of FFM for that matter) is not very useful for muscle research. You would like to focus on the bone-free and fat-free mass of the arms and legs, as this measure most closely resembles the actual skeletal muscle tissue. Apparently, a standardization of terminology in the field of body composition is required.

We agree with comments that lean mass and muscle mass are two different measurements but this was clearly outlined as a weakness of DXA in Table 1. However, as the commentators showed themselves, the correlation was high ($r = 0.94$),⁶ and lean was almost the sum of muscle, skin, and viscera. In the appendicular skeleton, there is no viscera, thus

only the difference in the lean composition, i.e. the variation of relative amounts of water, protein, and glycogen remains.

With regard to estimations of fat-free mass and (appendicular) lean mass using bioelectrical impedance (BIA), we appreciate the confirmation that large prediction errors at the individual level may occur which hampers the use of BIA in clinical practice. We also showed that on a group level, discrepancies might occur between lean mass predicted by BIA and lean mass measured by DXA. We agree these discrepancies should not be interpreted as BIA not being valid to assess lean mass. We merely provided these examples to highlight the fact that estimates of lean mass from BIA clearly differ from those from DXA, thereby influencing the interpretation of findings (e.g. the prevalence of sarcopenia and the comparison of data obtained with different methods).

Given the high degree of DXA standardization, excellent precision, the high correlation of DXA lean mass with muscle mass and muscle volume, currently DXA seems to be the best reference technique, in particular for appendicular muscle measurements. This does not imply that DXA will be the gold standard for the diagnosis of sarcopenia, which requires a functional component in addition to appendicular muscle mass assessments. It also calls for further efforts to develop anthropometric standards representing the wide range of body compositions encountered in the clinical routine in order to validate the accuracy of methods, such as DXA and BIA. At this stage, the scientific evidence derived from the published literature seems to support the conclusions of the original article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. The authors certify that they comply with the ethical guidelines for publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle: update 2017.⁷

Fanny Buckinx

Department of Public Health, Epidemiology and Health Economics,
 University of Liège, Liège, Belgium
 fanny.buckinx@ulg.ac.be

Francesco Landi

Department of Geriatrics, Neurosciences and Orthopedics, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart Rome, Milan, Italy

Matteo Cesari

*Gérontopôle, University Hospital of Toulouse, Toulouse, France
INSERM UMR1027, University of Toulouse III Paul Sabatier, Toulouse, France*

Roger A. Fieding

Nutrition, Exercise Physiology and Sarcopenia Laboratory, Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging at Tufts University, Boston, MA, USA

Marjolein Visser

*Department of Health Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Internal Medicine, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, Netherlands*

Klaus Engelke

Institute of Medical Physics, University of Erlangen, Erlangen, Germany

Stefania Maggi

National Research Council, Neuroscience Institute, Aging Branch, Padova, Italy

Elaine Dennison

MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

Nasser M. Al-Daghri

Prince Mutaib Chair for Biomarkers of Osteoporosis, Biochemistry Department, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia

Sophie Allepaerts

Department of Geriatrics, CHU-Liège, Liège, Belgium

Jurgen Bauer

Department of Geriatric Medicine, Klinikum, Carl von Ossietzky University, Oldenburg, Germany

Ivan Bautmans

Gerontology and Frailty in Ageing Research Department, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Brussels, Belgium

Maria Luisa Brandi

Department of Surgery and Translational Medicine, University of Florence, viale Pieraccini 6, Florence 59139, Italy

Olivier Bruyère

Department of Public Health, Epidemiology and Health Economics, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

Tommy Cederholm

Human Medicines Research and Development Support Division, Scientific Advice, London, UK

Francesca Cerreta

Human Medicines Research and Development Support Division, Scientific Advice, London, UK

Antonio Cherubini

Geriatrics and Geriatric Emergency Care, IRCCS-INRCA, Ancona, Italy

Cyrus Cooper

*MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
NIHR Musculoskeletal Biomedical Research Unit, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK*

Alphonso Cruz-Jentoft

Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal, Instituto Ramón y Cajal de Investigación Sanitaria (Irycis), Madrid, Spain

Eugene McCloskey

*Centre for Metabolic Bone Diseases, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
MRC and Arthritis Research UK Centre for Integrated Research in Musculoskeletal Ageing (CIMA), London, UK*

Bess Dawson-Hughes

Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging at Tufts University, Boston, MA, USA

Jean-Marc Kaufman

Department of Endocrinology and Unit for Osteoporosis and Metabolic Bone Diseases, Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium

Andrea Laslop

Scientific Office, Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety, Vienna, Austria

Jean Petermans

Department of Geriatrics, CHU-Liège, Liège, Belgium

Jean-Yves Reginster

Department of Public Health, Epidemiology and Health Economics, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

René Rizzoli

Service of Bone Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine Specialties, Geneva University Hospitals and Faculty of Medicine, Geneva, Switzerland

Sian Robinson

*MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Unit, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
National Institute for Health Research Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital, Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK*

Yves Rolland

Gérontopôle de Toulouse, Institut du Vieillissement, Centre Hospitalo-Universitaire de Toulouse (CHU Toulouse); UMR INSERM 1027, University of Toulouse III, Toulouse, France

Ricardo Rueda

Abbott Nutrition R&D, Granada, Spain

Bruno Vellas

Gérontopôle de Toulouse, Institut du Vieillissement, Centre Hospitalo-Universitaire de Toulouse (CHU Toulouse); UMR INSERM 1027, University of Toulouse III, Toulouse, France

John A. Kanis

Centre for Metabolic Bone Diseases, University of Sheffield, UK and Institute of Health and Ageing, Australian Catholic University, Melbourne, Australia

References

1. Buckinx F, Landi F, Cesari M, Fielding RA, Visser M, Engelke K, et al. Pitfalls in the measurement of muscle mass: a need for a reference standard. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2018;**9**:269–278.
2. Beaudart C, McCloskey E, Bruyère O, Cesari M, Rolland Y, Rizzoli R, et al. Sarcopenia in daily practice: assessment and management. *BMC Geriatr* 2016;**16**:170.
3. Lehmann LA, Alvarez RE, Macovski A, Brody WR, Pelc NJ, Riederer SJ, et al. Generalized image combinations in dual-kVp-digital radiography. *Med Phys* 1981;**8**:659–667.
4. Pietrobelli A, Formica C, Wang Z, Heymsfield SB. Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry body composition model: review of physical concepts. *Am J Physiol* 1996;**271**:E941–E951.
5. Buckinx F, Reginster JY, Dardenne N, Croisier JL, Kaux JF, Beaudart C. Concordance between muscle mass assessed by bioelectrical impedance analysis and by dual energy X-ray absorptiometry: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2015;**16**:60.
6. Clarys JP, Scafoglieri A, Probyn S, Louis O, Wallace JA, De Mey J. A macro-quality evaluation of DXA variables using whole dissection, ashing, and computer tomography in pigs. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2010;**18**:1477–1485.
7. von Haehling S, Morley JE, Coats AJS, Anker SD. Ethical guidelines for publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle: update 2017. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2017;**8**: 1081–1083.