



UNICA

UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI CAGLIARI



Università di Cagliari

UNICA IRIS Institutional Research Information System

This is the Author's [accepted: 27 February 2021] manuscript version of the following contribution:

Stagi S, Irurtia A, Rosales Rafel J, Cabras S, Buffa R, Carrasco-Marginet M, Castizo-Olier J, Marini E. Segmental body composition estimated by specific BIVA and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. Clin Nutr. 2021 Apr;40(4):1621-1627. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2021.02.043.

The publisher's version is available at:

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261561421001321?via%3Dihub>

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Clinical Nutrition

Segmental body composition estimated by specific BIVA and Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	YCLNU-D-21-00082
Article Type:	Full Length Article
Keywords:	segmental body composition; bioelectrical impedance vector analysis; BIVA; phase angle; DXA
Corresponding Author:	Silvia Stagi University of Cagliari Cagliari, Sardinia ITALY
First Author:	Silvia Stagi
Order of Authors:	Silvia Stagi Alfredo Iurtia Joaquim Rosales Rafel Stefano Cabras Roberto Buffa Marta Carrasco-Marginet Jorge Castizo-Olier Elisabetta Marini
Abstract:	<p>Aims : The aim of this study was to analyse the association between specific bioelectric impedance vector analysis (BIVA) and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) to assess segmental body composition using DXA as the reference technique.</p> <p>Methods : The sample comprised 50 young active students who practised or played different sports (25 men, age: 24.37 ± 4.79 y; 25 women, age: 24.32 ± 4.43 y) from the National Institute of Physical Education of Catalonia (INEFC). Anthropometric data (height, weight, arm, waist, and calf circumferences) and bioelectrical measurements (R, ohm; Xc, ohm) were recorded. Body composition was analysed with specific BIVA. DXA was used as the reference method to assess body composition of the whole-body, the trunk, and the limbs. The percentage of fat mass (%FM DXA) and fat-free mass index (FFMI DXA = $FFM/length^2$) were calculated. The agreement between specific BIVA and DXA was evaluated by a depth-depth analysis, two-way ANOVA, and Pearson's correlations.</p> <p>Results : The depth-depth analysis showed a good agreement between DXA and BIVA ($F = 14.89$, $p < 0.001$) in both sexes and all body segments. Specific vector length (Zsp; i.e. indicative of %FM) was correlated with %FM DXA in the whole body and all body segments, and the phase angle was correlated with FFMI DXA , with the trunk in women as the only exception. Specific BIVA demonstrated to balance the effect of body size on bioelectrical measurements in both whole and segmental approaches.</p> <p>Conclusions : Segmental specific BIVA and DXA provided a consistent evaluation of body composition in both sexes, of the whole body and each body segment. The indices %FM and FFMI obtained with DXA were correlated to vector length and phase angle in each segment, respectively. Segmental specific BIVA may be a suitable technique to monitor changes in segmental body composition.</p>
Opposed Reviewers:	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Segmental body composition estimated by *specific* BIVA and Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry

Submission type: Full length article

Silvia Stagi¹, Alfredo Irurtia², Joaquim Rosales Rafel³, Stefano Cabras⁴, Roberto Buffa¹, Marta Carrasco-Marginet⁵, Jorge Castizo-Olier⁶, Elisabetta Marini¹

1. Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Cagliari, Cittadella Universitaria, Monserrato, Cagliari 09042, Italy.

2. Department of Sports Performance, National Institute of Physical Education and Sport of Catalonia, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

3. Faixat Body Scan Sport Department, Avinguda de l'Estadi, 12-22, Barcelona 08038, Spain.

4. Department of Statistics, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Getafe, Spain.

5. Department of Health and Applied Sciences, National Institute of Physical Education and Sport of Catalonia, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

6. School of Health Sciences, Tecnocampus Mataró-Maresme, Pompeu Fabra University, Mataró, Spain.

Corresponding Authors: Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Neuroscience and Anthropology Section, University of Cagliari, Cittadella di Monserrato, Cagliari, Italy.

E-mail addresses: emarini@unica.it (E. Marini), silviastagi@unica.it (S.Stagi).

Key words: segmental body composition; bioelectrical impedance vector analysis; BIVA; phase angle; DXA

Running head: Segmental body composition by means of BIVA and DXA

Abstract

Aims: The aim of this study was to analyse the association between *specific* bioelectric impedance vector analysis (BIVA) and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) to assess segmental body composition using DXA as the reference technique.

Methods: The sample comprised 50 young active students who practised or played different sports (25 men, age: 24.37 ± 4.79 y; 25 women, age: 24.32 ± 4.43 y) from the National Institute of Physical Education of Catalonia (INEFC). Anthropometric data (height, weight, arm, waist, and calf circumferences) and bioelectrical measurements (R, ohm; Xc, ohm) were recorded. Body composition was analysed with *specific* BIVA. DXA was used as the reference method to assess body composition of the whole-body, the trunk, and the limbs. The percentage of fat mass (%FM_{DXA}) and fat-free mass index (FFMI_{DXA} = FFM/length²) were calculated. The agreement between *specific* BIVA and DXA was evaluated by a depth-depth analysis, two-way ANOVA, and Pearson's correlations.

Results: The depth-depth analysis showed a good agreement between DXA and BIVA ($F = 14.89$, $p < 0.001$) in both sexes and all body segments. *Specific* vector length (Zsp; i.e. indicative of %FM) was correlated with %FM_{DXA} in the whole body and all body segments, and the phase angle was correlated with FFMI_{DXA}, with the trunk in women as the only exception. *Specific* BIVA demonstrated to balance the effect of body size on bioelectrical measurements in both whole and segmental approaches.

Conclusions: Segmental *specific* BIVA and DXA provided a consistent evaluation of body composition in both sexes, of the whole body and each body segment. The indices %FM and FFMI obtained with DXA were correlated to vector length and phase angle in each segment, respectively. Segmental *specific* BIVA may be a suitable technique to monitor changes in segmental body composition.

Introduction

1
2 The evaluation of body composition is relevant during the whole life cycle because of its
3
4 relationship with health conditions and diseases (1). The analysis assumes particular interest when it
5
6 is used to monitor age-related variations or changes associated with lifestyles, such as training
7
8 effects or dietary interventions.
9

10
11 Although body composition is mostly applied to the whole body, the definition of variations at a
12
13 segmental level, i.e. in different body segments (limbs, trunk), is growing in interest. Most studies
14
15 have been directed at using segmental bioelectrical impedance measurements to predict whole-body
16
17 composition (2). However, segmental body composition is also useful to provide selective
18
19 information about the risk of some diseases (e.g. trunk adiposity for type 2 diabetes (3)), in
20
21 diagnostic investigation (e.g. limb FFM in sarcopenia; (4)), for analysing the effect of medicaments
22
23 (e.g. arm hydration in lymphedema; (5)), in the evaluation of training effects (6), and for studying
24
25 body asymmetry (e.g. in athletes; (7,8)). Furthermore, in some experimental conditions, such as in
26
27 the elderly where total body measurements may not be convenient, the information on limbs can be
28
29 used as an alternative to total body composition (9,10). Indeed, the association between the whole
30
31 body and segmental approaches has been observed in various experimental contexts (11–13).
32
33

34
35 Presently, several techniques are available for body composition analysis, each with different
36
37 advantages and disadvantages (14). Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) is considered the
38
39 reference technique that provides an assessment of fat mass (FM), fat-free mass (FFM) and bone
40
41 mineral content, of both the total body and body segments (15).
42
43

44
45 Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) is a non-invasive, rapid and economical technique that
46
47 allows quantitative estimates of body composition to be obtained (16). Phase-sensitive BIA devices
48
49 provide two components: resistance (R), negatively correlated with total body water (TBW) and
50
51 FFM, and reactance (Xc), positively correlated with body cell mass. Traditional BIA analysis is
52
53 based on population-specific regression equations. However, this approach can lead to errors when
54
55 applied to samples with different characteristics from the ones used for the equation's validation
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

(17). The use of highly specialised equations reduces the possibility of generalisation and comparison.

These problems can be avoided using alternative approaches to analyse raw bioelectrical data (R, Xc, or their derivatives: phase angle [PA = $\arctan Xc/R \cdot 180/\pi$] and vector length [$(R^2 + Xc^2)^{0.5}$, $\Omega \text{ cm}$]) that were proposed for body composition estimation. Phase angle depends on the quantity and quality of cells' membranes and is related to the distribution of body fluids (18). As shown by Gonzalez et al. (19), the major determinants of PA variation are age, the extracellular to intracellular water (ECW/ICW) ratio, FFM, height and population. The association between PA and ECW/ICW has been confirmed by Marini et al. (20). A growing body of research is considering the PA indicative of muscle mass and functional status, a marker of nutritional status and a prognostic index of morbidity and mortality.

Analysis of the phase angle alone, however, can lead to interpretation errors since it does not consider the information provided by the vector length. Groups of individuals characterised by very similar phase angles, but with different vector lengths, may show different body fluids or %FM (21,22).

Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (classic BIVA, (21); and *specific* BIVA, (23,24)) considers phase angle and vector length simultaneously. The classic and *specific* BIVA approaches differ from each other for the standardisation of resistance and reactance. In classic BIVA, adjustments are made for height to reduce the effect of conductor length, while in *specific* BIVA, adjustments are made for height and cross-sectional areas, thus obtaining resistivity and reactivity, to reduce the effect of body volume.

Specific BIVA has been validated in a large sample of adults using DXA as the reference technique (23) and proved to be significantly more accurate than classic BIVA in measuring total body composition. These results are consistent with those obtained in a sample of older adults (24) and young athletes (20), where it was also found that both techniques are sensitive to ECW/ICW, and that classic BIVA is highly accurate in estimating TBW. In addition, the associations between

1 resistivity and %FM in different body segments have been observed by Biggs et al. (10) and Fuller
2 et al. (25), even not under a BIVA approach.
3

4 *Specific* BIVA has been applied in several contexts (26–28), while the segmental approach has been
5 introduced more recently (9,29). At the present day, no studies have evaluated the performance of
6 *specific* BIVA at the segmental level.
7

8 The present research aims to analyse the relationship between *specific* BIVA and DXA, used as the
9 reference technique, for segmental body composition, and to analyse comparatively the information
10 retrieved from different body segments and the whole body.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Methods

Study participants

Fifty active students (25 women, 25 men) from the National Institute of Physical Education of Catalonia (INEFC) volunteered for this research. The average age of the volunteers was 24.37 (\pm 4.79) years for men and 24.32 (\pm 4.43) years for women. The sample includes students involved in different sports: swimming, football, running, tennis, cycling, padel, badminton, skiing, dancing, water polo, basketball, climbing, taekwondo, rugby, gymnastics, callisthenics and weightlifting.

Before the measurements, each participant was informed about the aims of the project and the type of measurements. The following exclusion criteria were adopted: electronic medical implants such as a pacemaker, diuretic therapy, pregnancy, alcohol or drug abuse, a physical disability that might interfere with body composition measurement and the use of contraceptives. Each participant provided his or her consent before the examination. The experimental protocols were approved by the Ethics Committee for Clinical Research of the Catalan Sports Council (24/CEICGC/2020).

Protocol

Subjects were asked to come to the laboratory after at least three hours of fasting and no previous exercise. For the evaluation, volunteers were asked to wear light, casual clothing, and remove all metal jewellery. The experimental protocol was performed following a precise order of measurement steps. First, anthropometrical measurements were recorded. Then, the densitometric analysis was conducted. Finally, the total and segmental bioimpedance analysis was performed. The data registration procedure was done between 9:00 and 14:00.

Anthropometric measurements were obtained by an ISAK-certified technician following an international standardised protocol (30). Body mass was measured with a scale (Seca 700®, Seca Corp®, Hamburg, DE) to the nearest 0.01 kg and height was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm with a stadiometer (Holtain stadiometer®, Holtain Limited®, Crymych, UK).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Circumferences of the relaxed right arm, right calf and waist were taken. Also, lengths were measured for the right arm, right leg and trunk. Arm length was measured as the distance between the acromion and the stylium, leg length as the distance between the trochanter and the malleolus and trunk length as the distance between injector electrodes.

The technical error of intra-observer measurement (TEM) and TEM% were calculated in a sample of ten subjects (height: TEM = 0.04 cm, TEM% = 0.02; weight: TEM = 0.04 kg, TEM% = 0.07; arm circumference: TEM = 0.16 cm, TEM% = 0.22; waist circumference: TEM = 0.14 cm, TEM% = 0.53; calf circumference: TEM = 0.10 cm, TEM% = 0.29).

DXA analysis was performed using a whole-body DXA scan (Lunar Prodigy Advance model with an enCORE v18 software platform, from GE Medical Systems Madison, Wisconsin, USA). The scanning method involves a narrow fan beam (4.5° angle) with an intelligent fan and MVIR. X-ray characteristics include a constant potential source at 76 kV, K-edge filter at efficient dose, tube current: 0.15 to 3.00 mA. DXA quality control calibration procedures were performed using dedicated circuit (120 VAC 50–60 Hz 20 A or 230–240 VAC 50–60 Hz 10 A; ± 10%). Ambient requirements were a temperature between 18°C–27°C and humidity between 20%–80%. A specialised technician positioned the subjects in a supine position within the edges outlined on the scan table. Each full-body scan took about seven minutes. DXA measurements included whole-body and segmental measurements of %FM, FM (kg) and FFM (kg).

FFM indexes were calculated for total and body segments using the formula: $FFMI_{totalbody} = FFM/height^2$ (kg/m²) or $FFMI_{segmental} = FFM/segment\ length^2$ (kg/m²).

A total and segmental bioelectrical impedance analysis was performed on the right side of the body, using a single-frequency phase-sensitive impedance device (BIA 101 Anniversary Sport Edition, Akern, Firenze, Italy; 50 kHz and 400 μA). The BIA device and cables were checked for each session with a test circuit. Subjects were measured lying on a non-conductive bed. The positioning of the electrodes (BIATRODES, Akern, Firenze, Italy) for the entire body followed the standard hand-to-foot position (16). For segmental body composition, to ease the procedure and to optimise

1 the representation of different body segments, an ad hoc protocol was defined. As suggested by
2 Chumlea et al. (31), on the arm, a pair of electrodes were placed on the shoulder and the hand. On
3
4 the leg, the procedure indicated by Fuller and Elia (32), at the level of the iliac crest and the foot
5
6 was preferred, that was considered less affected by measurement error. On the trunk, the same pair
7
8 of electrodes that were placed on the shoulder and the iliac crest were used. The difference between
9
10 the sum of raw bioelectrical values measured in the arm, the trunk and the leg, and the value of the
11
12 total body was below the threshold of biological significance ($R = 2.7$; $Xc = -0.5$).
13
14
15

16 *Specific* BIVA was applied for the estimation of body composition (23,24). The resistance (R) and
17
18 reactance (Xc) values were adjusted for a correction factor (A/L). For the whole body, A was
19
20 estimated as 0.45 arm area + 0.10 trunk area + 0.45 calf area (cm²); the arm, trunk and calf areas
21
22 were calculated as $C^2/4\pi$, where C (cm) is the circumference of each segment. The length was
23
24 calculated as $L = 1.1H$, where H is the height in cm. The correction factors for the arm, the leg and
25
26 the trunk were calculated using the cross-sections (A) and the length (L) of the arm, the calf and the
27
28 trunk, respectively.
29
30
31

32
33 Specific impedance (Zsp) was calculated using the formula $(R_{sp}^2 + X_{csp}^2)^{0.5}$ (Ω cm) and phase
34
35 angle with the formula $\arctan Xc/R/180/\pi$ (degree). Bioelectrical values were projected on the R/Xc
36
37 graph and analysed with tolerance ellipses, where the major axis refers to variations in FM%
38
39 (higher values towards the upper pole). The minor axis refers to the variations in body cell mass,
40
41 skeletal muscle mass in particular, and ECW/ICW ratio (lower values on the left side).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Statistical analysis**

49
50 Descriptive analyses of the total and segmental bioelectrical and DXA variables were performed.
51
52 The distribution of bioelectrical specific vectors was evaluated with tolerance ellipses representing
53
54 the Italo-Spanish reference population. The comparison between sexes was made using the
55
56 Student's t-test.
57
58
59
60
61
62

1 Pearson's correlation was used to estimate the correlation between specific bioelectrical variables
2 (Rsp, Xcsp, Zsp), phase angle and %FM, FM, FFM and FFMI for total and segmental body
3
4 composition.
5
6

7 The general agreement between *specific* BIVA and DXA was evaluated with a depth-depth analysis
8
9 (33,34) ANOVA. The depth statistics measures the compatibility of a single multivariate
10
11 observation with the rest of the sample. The more the depth, the less different is the sample. In
12
13 particular, we considered the measures of FM% and FFMI obtained in each subject with DXA and
14
15 compared them with the measures for Zsp and phase measured with BIVA. The two sets of
16
17 measures lead to two corresponding unknown multivariate distributions and, thus, to two sets of
18
19 depth measures. In this case, we used the so-called Zonoid depth, which is suitable for small sample
20
21 sizes that provide low information regarding the two unknown multivariate distributions (34). The
22
23 two sets of depths from the two techniques were compared using ANOVA. If the subjects measured
24
25 with *specific* BIVA and DXA received similar depths, the two techniques provided similar
26
27 information on their body composition.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 Statistical analyses were performed using the free software R (<http://www.R-project.org>) with the
35
36 MASS library and *specific* BIVA (www.specificbiva.unica.it).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

The sample of young students practising physical exercise showed that both sexes had normal weight, as indicated by their BMI, and low %FM values (Table 1). Considering the whole body, the majority of specific vectors among men (84%) and women (92%) fell on the left side of tolerance ellipses, indicating high values of cell mass, muscle mass in particular, and ICW/ECW (Figure 1).

A normal pattern of sexual dimorphism was detected in the total body and different body segments. Compared with women, men showed higher anthropometric values, FFM, FFMI, and phase angle, and lower values of %FM, and, in most cases, of Rsp and Zsp (Table 1).

The bivariate depth-depth analysis showed good agreement between the results of DXA on FFMI and %FM and those of *specific* BIVA based on the phase angle and vector length ($F = 14.89$, $p < 0.001$). The relationship was similar in men and women, as the effect of sex was not significant ($F = 0.27$, $p = 0.84$), in different body segments ($F = 0.77$, $p = 0.51$), without interactions (sex * body segment, $F = 1.39$, $p = 0.25$).

In both sexes, in the total and the segmental approach, vector length was positively correlated with %FM (Table 2, Figure 2), and in some cases with FM (Table 2). Among women, a negative correlation between the vector length and FFMI was also detected at the trunk level (Table 2, Figure 3).

Phase angle was positively correlated with total body FFMI in both sexes and all segments, with the only exception of the trunk among women (Table 2, Figure 3). It was also negatively associated with %FM in the total body in men, and in the arm and trunk in both sexes (Table 2, Figure 2).

Discussion

1
2 This research showed that body composition evaluation performed with *specific* BIVA agrees well
3
4 with that of DXA. The analysis showed a similar association in both sexes, in the total body and the
5
6 trunk, arms and legs. These results are consistent with previous research on total body composition,
7
8 where *specific* BIVA was compared with DXA in different samples (20,23,24). However, this
9
10 research study is the first to demonstrate that such an association has also been detected at the
11
12 segmental level.
13
14

15
16 BIVA is based on the joint analysis of variables that are correlated (R and Xc, or phase angle and
17
18 vector length) and provides information on variables also related to each other, such as those
19
20 describing body composition (e.g. FM and FFM). Thus, the bivariate statistical approach used in
21
22 this study to analyse the performance of BIVA regarding DXA is very appropriate. The analysis of
23
24 body composition based on single variables may not be fully informative, and it may furnish the
25
26 wrong information. As shown by Mereu et al. (22), for example, individuals with the same phase
27
28 angle but different specific vector length, can be characterised by %FM differences as high as 60%.
29
30

31
32 However, it is undeniable that the vector components are influenced differently by different body
33
34 compartments. The specific vector length is strongly and positively related to %FM, as clearly
35
36 indicated by the results of this research (whole body and all body segments) and those of previous
37
38 studies (whole body: (10,20,23,24); body districts: (25)). Phase angle shows a positive association
39
40 with FFMI (this research, except the trunk among women), with skeletal muscle mass index (35) or
41
42 with FFM (this research; Maddocks et al. (36); Gonzalez et al. (19)). Other relationships are less
43
44 clear and consistent among studies. Phase angle shows a tendency to be negatively related with
45
46 %FM (whole body, arm and trunk in men, arm and trunk in women: this research; men only: (23);
47
48 women only: (20); men: (37), or with FM (trunk: this research; Gonzalez et al., (19)). In contrast,
49
50 the association between vector length and FFMI or FFM is rarely significant and inconsistent
51
52 among studies (negative, only in the trunk among women: this research; positive, in the legs and
53
54 arms among men: (25); positive, whole body among men: (20)). When the body composition of
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 different body segments was considered comparatively, the trunk's higher FFM content with respect
2 to the limbs was detected by both specific BIVA and DXA, consistently with the results of other
3 studies in athletes (38) and the general population population (39). However, the Z_{sp} values of the
4 trunk were indicative of %FM values tendentially higher than expected on the basis of DXA,
5 whereas recent research based on traditional BIA have shown an underestimation of fat mass at the
6 trunk level (40,41). Also, the literature and our results on raw R and X_c data show that the Z of the
7 trunk accounts for only about 10% of the total impedance, whereas the trunk represents 45% of
8 body mass (25). This difference has been attributed to the composition and shape of this segment
9 (10,17,25,32). The trunk includes internal organs, visceral and subcutaneous fat with variable
10 density and distribution, and empty spaces, such as the air volume included in the lungs (that
11 overemphasises the trunk volume). Furthermore, the trunk is characterised by a wider cross-
12 sectional area concerning the limbs, whereas the length is similar. Hence, based on Ohm's law, the
13 current passage in the trunk is easier, and the resistance is consequently lower.

14 The volume effect problem is overwhelmed by the *specific* BIVA approach, where the bioelectrical
15 values are adjusted by A/L, i.e. by an estimate of body cross-sectional areas and length.

16 This study also showed that the information provided by *specific* BIVA for the body segments is
17 also aligned with the results of the whole-body approach, confirming the correctness of the
18 analytical procedure. The confidence ellipses of the whole body are located in an intermediate
19 position with respect to those of different body segments (Figure 4).

20 This study has some limitations. In fact, the lack of individuals with different expressions of body
21 composition, particularly overweight individuals, reduces the potential generalisation of the results,
22 that should be verified in different samples. Moreover, it was not possible to carry out the analysis
23 on body water, for which the classic BIVA would have been appropriate because there are no
24 reference methods to estimate body fluids at the segmental level.

25 However, this study has the strength of being the first research to analyse the relationship between
26 *specific* BIVA and DXA and demonstrate that the consistency between two approaches is

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

appreciable the sexes and different segments. Furthermore, a new protocol regarding electrode position was used in this study, selecting and integrating previous research contributions. This method has proven to be adequate, as the sum of raw bioelectrical values at the segmental level corresponded to those of the whole body. Hence, the criticism highlighted by Ward (2) about the imprecision in locating electrodes in the segmental approach does not apply to our case. Furthermore, the adequacy of the analytical approach used in *specific* BIVA for the whole body, that weights the contribution of different body segments differently, was confirmed to be correct.

Conclusions

Specific BIVA has shown to be associated with DXA in both sexes and the whole body and all body segments. The indices %FM and FFMI obtained with DXA were correlated to vector length and phase angle in each segment, respectively.

From a methodological point of view, the new protocol proposed for segmental analysis proved to be effective. The comparative analysis of different body segments indirectly confirmed that *specific* BIVA effectively overwhelmed the effect of body size in both the whole and segmental approaches. *Specific* BIVA represents a suitable technique for monitoring segmental body composition changes in sport science and clinical applications.

Funding statement

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: E.M., S.S, A.I.; Data curation: S.S., A.I., M.C.M., J.R.R.; Formal analysis: S.S., E.M., S.C.; Methodology: all authors; Supervision: E.M., A.I.; Visualization: S.S.; Writing - original draft: S.S., E.M; Writing - review & editing: all authors.

Competing Interests

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgments

Silvia Stagi gratefully acknowledges Sardinia Regional Government for the financial support of her PhD scholarship (P.O.R. Sardegna F.S.E. Operational Programme of the Autonomous Region of

1 Sardinia, European Social Fund 2014-2020-Axis III Education and training, Thematic goal 10,
2 Priority of investment 10ii), Specific goal 10.5, Action partnership agreement 10.5.12.
3

4 The authors would like to thank Mr. Ferran Faixat for the possibility of having both the technology
5 and his knowledge related to DXA used in the present study.
6
7
8
9

10 11 **References**

- 12 1 WHO. Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic. Report of a WHO
13 consultation. World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser. 2000;894:i-xii, 1-253.
14
15
- 16 2. Ward LC. Segmental bioelectrical impedance analysis: An update. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr*
17 *Metab Care.* 2012;15(5):424–9.
18
- 19 3. Roh E, Hwang SY, Kim JA, Lee Y-B, Hong S, Kim NH, et al. Age- and Sex-Related
20 Differential Associations between Body Composition and Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Metab*
21 *J.* 2020;44:1–12.
22
- 23 4. Guglielmi G, Ponti F, Agostini M, Amadori M, Battista G, Bazzocchi A. The role of DXA in
24 sarcopenia. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2016;28(6):1047–60.
25
- 26 5. Ward L, Winall A, Isenring E, Hills A, Czerniec S, Dylke E, et al. Assessment of bilateral
27 limb lymphedema by bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.*
28 2011;21(2):409–18.
29
- 30 6. Tinsley GM, Harty PS, Moore ML, Grgic J, Silva AM, Sardinha LB. Changes in total and
31 segmental bioelectrical resistance are correlated with whole-body and segmental changes in
32 lean soft tissue following a resistance training intervention. *J Int Soc Sports Nutr.*
33 2019;16(1):1–9.
34
- 35 7. Czeck MA, Raymond-Pope CJ, Bosch TA, Bach CW, Oliver JM, Carbuhn A, et al. Total and
36 regional body composition of NCAA Division I collegiate baseball athletes. *Int J Sports Med.*
37 2019;40(07):447–52.
38
- 39 8. Milsom J, Barreira P, Burgess DJ, Iqbal Z, Morton JP. Case study: Muscle atrophy and
40 hypertrophy in a premier league soccer player during rehabilitation from ACL injury. *Int J*
41 *Sport Nutr Exerc Metab.* 2014;24(5):543–52.
42
- 43 9. Mereu E, Succa V, Buffa R, Sanna C, Mereu RM, Catte O, et al. Total body and arm
44 bioimpedance in patients with Alzheimer’s disease. *Exp Gerontol.* 2018;102:145–8.
45
- 46 10. Biggs J, Cha K, Horch K. Electrical resistivity of the upper arm and leg yields good estimates
47 of whole body fat. *Physiol Meas.* 2001;22(2):365–76.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

11. Shafer KJ, Siders WA, Johnson LAK, Lukaski HC. Validity of segmental multiple-frequency bioelectrical impedance analysis to estimate body composition of adults across a range of body mass indexes. *Nutrition*. 2009;25(1):25–32.
12. Kim M, Kim H. Accuracy of segmental multi-frequency bioelectrical impedance analysis for assessing whole-body and appendicular fat mass and lean soft tissue mass in frail women aged 75 years and older. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2013;67(4):395–400.
13. Nescolarde L, Doñate T, Piccoli A, Rosell J. Comparison of segmental with whole-body impedance measurements in peritoneal dialysis patients. *Med Eng Phys*. 2008;30(7):817–24.
14. Heymsfield SB, Ebbeling CB, Zheng J, Pietrobelli A, Strauss BJ, Silva AM, et al. Multi-component molecular-level body composition reference methods: evolving concepts and future directions. *Obes Rev*. 2015;16(4):282–94.
15. Marra M, Sammarco R, De Lorenzo A, Iellamo F, Siervo M, Pietrobelli A, et al. Assessment of body composition in health and disease using bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) and dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA): A critical overview. *Contrast Media Mol Imaging*. 2019:3548284.
16. NIH Consensus statement. Bioelectrical impedance analysis in body composition measurement. National Institutes of Health Technology Assessment Conference Statement. *Nutrition*. 1996;12(11–12):749–62.
17. Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, Deurenberg P, Elia M, Gómez JM, et al. Bioelectrical impedance analysis—part I: review of principles and methods. *Clin Nutr*. 2004;23(5):1226–43.
18. Norman K, Stobäus N, Pirlich M, Bosy-Westphal A. Bioelectrical phase angle and impedance vector analysis—clinical relevance and applicability of impedance parameters. *Clin Nutr*. 2012;31(6):854–61.
19. Gonzalez MC, Barbosa-Silva TG, Bielemann RM, Gallagher D, Heymsfield SB. Phase angle and its determinants in healthy subjects: Influence of body composition. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2016;103(3):712–6.
20. Marini E, Campa F, Buffa R, Stagi S, Matias CN, Toselli S, et al. Phase angle and bioelectrical impedance vector analysis in the evaluation of body composition in athletes. *Clin Nutr*. 2020;39(2):447–54.
21. Piccoli A, Rossr B, Pillon L, Bucciante G. A new method for monitoring body fluid variation by bioimpedance analysis: The RXc graph. *Kidney Int*. 1994;46:534–9.
22. Mereu E, Buffa R, Lussu P, Marini E. Phase angle, vector length, and body composition. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 2016;104(3):845–7.

23. Buffa R, Saragat B, Cabras S, Rinaldi AC, Marini E. Accuracy of Specific BIVA for the Assessment of Body Composition in the United States Population. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(3):e58533.
24. Marini E, Sergi G, Succa V, Saragat B, Sarti S, Coin A, et al. Efficacy of specific bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) for assessing body composition in the elderly. *J Nutr Health Aging*. 2013;17(6):515–21.
25. Fuller NJ, Fewtrell MS, Dewit O, Elia M, Wells JCK. Segmental bioelectrical impedance analysis in children aged 8–12 y: 1. The assessment of whole-body composition. *Int J Obes*. 2002;26(5):684–91.
26. Buffa R, Mereu E, Comandini O, Ibanez ME, Marini E. Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) for the assessment of two-compartment body composition. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2014;68:1234.
27. Castizo-Olier J, Irurtia A, Jemni M, Carrasco-Marginet M, Fernández-García R, Rodríguez FA. Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) in sport and exercise: Systematic review and future perspectives. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(6):e0197957.
28. Stagi S, Ibáñez-Zamacona ME, Jelenkovic A, Marini E, Rebato E. Association between self-perceived body image and body composition between the sexes and different age classes. *Nutrition*. 2020:111030.
29. Stagi S, Doneddu A, Mulliri G, Ghiani G, Succa V, Crisafulli A, et al. Lower percentage of fat mass among tai chi chuan practitioners. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(4):1232.
30. Ros FE, Cristóbal R V, Marfell-Jones M, Cineantropometría SI para el A de la, Murcia UC de. Protocolo internacional para la valoración antropométrica. Publicado por Sociedad Internacional para el Avance de la Cineantropometría; 2019. Available from: <https://books.google.it/books?id=QzPEXgEACAAJ>
31. Baumgartner RN, Chumlea WC, Roche AF. Bioelectric impedance phase angle and body composition. *Am J Clin Nutr*. 1988;48(1):16–23.
32. Fuller NJ, Elia M. Potential use of bioelectrical impedance of the “whole body” and of body segments for the assessment of body composition: comparison with densitometry and anthropometry. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 1989;43(11):779—91.
33. Mosler K. Multivariate Dispersion, Central Regions, and Depth: The Lift Zonoid Approach. Vol. 165. Springer Science & Business Media; 2012.
34. Ochoa Arellano MJ, Cascos Fernández I. Multivariate expectile trimming and the BExPlot. Universidad Carlos III de Madrid. Departamento de Estadística; 2019.
35. Marini E, Buffa R, Saragat B, Coin A, Toffanello ED, Berton L, Manzato E, Sergi G. The

potential of classic and specific bioelectrical impedance vector analysis for the assessment of sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2012;7:585-91.

36. Maddocks M, Kon SSC, Jones SE, Canavan JL, Nolan CM, Higginson IJ, et al. Bioelectrical impedance phase angle relates to function, disease severity and prognosis in stable chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Clin Nutr*. 2015;34(6):1245–50.
37. Tanaka S, Ando K, Kobayashi K, Hida T, Ito K, Tsushima M, et al. A low phase angle measured with bioelectrical impedance analysis is associated with osteoporosis and is a risk factor for osteoporosis in community-dwelling people: the Yakumo study. *Arch Osteoporos*. 2018;13(1):39.
38. Buehring B, Krueger D, Libber J, Heiderscheit B, Sanfilippo J, Johnson B, et al. Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry measured regional body composition least significant change: Effect of region of interest and gender in athletes. *J Clin Densitom*. 2014;17(1):121–8.
39. Bracco D, Thiébaud D, Chioléro RL, Landry M, Burckhardt P, Schutz Y. Segmental body composition assessed by bioelectrical impedance analysis and DEXA in humans. *J Appl Physiol*. 1996;81(6):2580–7.
40. Wingo BC, Garr V, Ellis AC, Gower BA. Clinical Nutrition ESPEN Comparison of segmental body composition estimated by bioelectrical impedance analysis and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. *Clin Nutr ESPEN*. 2018;6–12.
41. Majeed KG, Sulyman SAA, Fathi HB. Estimation of segmental and total body fat in healthy adults: Comparison of bio-electric impedance analysis and dual energy X-ray absorptiometry. *Turkish J Endocrinol Metab*. 2019;23(4):240–7.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Distribution of bioelectrical vectors of subjects on the sex-specific bivariate tolerance ellipses.

Figure 2. Correlation between specific impedance vectors and %FM of the whole body and body segments.

Figure 3. Correlation between phase angle and FFMI of the whole body and body segments.


Figure 4. Confidence ellipses representing the whole body and body segments.


Highlights


1 - Segmental *specific* BIVA and DXA provided a consistent evaluation of body composition in both
2 sexes;

3
4
5 - In each segment, %FM and FFMI, obtained with DXA, were correlated with Zsp and PA,
6
7 respectively;

8
9
10 - *Specific* BIVA demonstrated to balance the effect of body size on bioelectrical measurements in
11
12 both the whole and segmental approaches.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65










Table 1. Subject characteristics, including the bioelectrical variables of total and segmental specific BIVA and the comparison between the sexes.

	Men (n= 25)		Women (n= 25)		t-test
	Mean	s.d.	Mean	s.d.	<i>p</i>
TOTAL					
Weight (kg)	72.4	7.9	57.1	7.6	0.000
Height (cm)	175.7	7.0	163.0	7.4	0.000
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.5	2.4	21.5	2.0	0.000
FFM (kg)	60.4	7.4	43.1	6.6	0.000
FM (kg)	12.0	3.6	14.0	3.4	0.046
%FM	16.5	4.2	24.5	5.5	0.000
FFMI (kg/m ²)	19.6	2.2	16.2	1.6	0.000
Rtot (ohm)	460.9	55.7	559.5	58.7	0.000
Xctot (ohm)	65.9	7.3	69.1	5.5	0.091
Rsptot (ohm·cm)	306.5	19.6	324.6	30.3	0.017
Xcsptot (ohm·cm)	44.2	4.0	40.3	4.9	0.004
Zsptot (ohm·cm)	309.7	19.7	327.1	30.5	0.022
Phase angle (°)	8.2	0.7	7.1	0.6	0.000
ARM					
Arm C. (cm)	30.9	3.1	26.9	2.2	0.000
FFM (kg)	3.8	0.7	2.2	0.5	0.000
FM (kg)	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.003
%FM	14.0	4.1	26.4	7.4	0.000
FFMI (kg/m ²)	11.0	2.3	7.7	1.1	0.000
R (ohm)	195.6	34.7	257.6	34.8	0.000
Xc (ohm)	25.7	3.6	29.0	3.0	0.001
Rsp (ohm·cm)	247.2	29.0	274.4	39.1	0.007
Xcsp (ohm·cm)	32.8	4.8	31.1	5.1	0.241
Zsp (ohm·cm)	249.4	29.2	276.2	39.3	0.009
Phase angle (°)	7.6	0.8	6.5	0.8	0.000
LEG					
Calf C. (cm)	36.7	1.9	34.3	1.9	0.000
FFM (kg)	10.3	1.5	7.2	1.1	0.000
FM (kg)	2.4	0.7	3.0	0.7	0.002
%FM	18.1	4.7	29.5	5.1	0.000
FFMI (kg/m ²)	14.2	1.7	11.4	1.3	0.000
R (ohm)	223.7	23.6	250.9	24.3	0.000
Xc (ohm)	33.6	4.2	33.6	3.2	0.976
Rsp (ohm·cm)	280.2	13.6	293.7	23.5	0.017
Xcsp (ohm·cm)	42.1	3.9	39.4	4.4	0.024
Zsp (ohm·cm)	283.4	13.8	296.4	23.7	0.022
Phase angle (°)	8.6	0.7	7.6	0.6	0.000
TRUNK					
Waist C. (cm)	77.3	4.8	67.4	3.9	0.000
FFM (kg)	28.5	3.3	20.9	3.4	0.000
FM (kg)	5.2	2.1	5.6	1.9	0.453
% FM	15.2	4.2	21.2	7.0	0.001
FFMI (kg/m ²)	70.6	11.5	58.5	7.9	0.000
R (ohm)	39.0	5.5	48.1	6.7	0.000
Xc (ohm)	7.3	0.8	7.0	0.9	0.250
Rsp (ohm·cm)	287.0	41.4	290.7	39.9	0.754
Xcsp (ohm·cm)	54.0	7.9	42.1	5.1	0.000
Zsp (ohm·cm)	292.1	28.8	293.8	38.9	0.888
Phase angle (°)	10.7	1.2	8.3	1.1	0.000

Table 2. Total and segmental correlations between bioelectrical and body composition variables.

		<i>Pearson's correlations</i>							
		Men (n=25)				Women (n=25)			
TOTAL		<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>	<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>
Rsp		0.755**	0.788**	-0.077	-0.206	0.782**	0.765**	-0.240	-0.096
Xcsp		0.231	0.376	0.313	0.282	0.331	0.528**	0.218	0.503*
Zsp		0.751**	0.787**	-0.070	-0.197	0.778**	0.765**	-0.233	-0.084
Phase		-0.447*	-0.315	0.420*	0.528**	-0.350	-0.077	0.532**	0.769**
ARM		<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>	<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>
Rsp		0.486*	0.089	0.134	0.292	0.754**	0.734**	-0.281	-0.147
Xcsp		-0.067	0.127	0.493*	0.692**	0.304	0.537**	0.250	0.399**
Zsp		0.478*	0.090	0.143	0.303	0.750**	0.734**	-0.274	-0.140
Phase		-0.591**	0.030	0.526**	0.639**	-0.453*	-0.109	0.680**	0.719**
LEG		<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>	<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>
Rsp		0.611**	0.695**	0.018	0.029	0.589**	0.441*	-0.193	0.146
Xcsp		-0.032	0.093	0.275	0.365	0.319	0.372	0.086	0.403*
Zsp		0.596**	0.684**	0.029	0.044	0.587**	0.443*	-0.188	0.153
Phase		-0.386	-0.287	0.310	0.409*	-0.143	0.062	0.292	0.404*
TRUNK		<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>	<i>%FM</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>FFM</i>	<i>FFMI</i>
Rsp		0.626**	0.686**	0.047	0.070	0.832**	0.796**	-0.452*	-0.440*
Xcsp		0.008	0.152	0.494*	0.475*	0.077	0.209	0.221	-0.087
Zsp		0.612**	0.676**	0.063	0.085	0.826**	0.794**	-0.443*	-0.438*
Phase		-0.669**	-0.554**	0.547**	0.502*	-0.731**	-0.583**	0.628**	0.339