## REVIEW ARTICLE

## Sarcopenia: Prevalence and associated factors based on different suggested definitions in community-dwelling older adults

Hunkyung Kim,<sup>1</sup> Hirohiko Hirano,<sup>1</sup> Ayako Edahiro,<sup>1</sup> Yuki Ohara,<sup>2</sup> Yutaka Watanabe,<sup>3</sup> Narumi Kojima,<sup>1</sup> Miji Kim,<sup>1</sup> Erika Hosoi,<sup>1</sup> Yuko Yoshida,<sup>1</sup> Hideyo Yoshida<sup>1</sup> and Shoji Shinkai<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Team for Promoting Independence of the Elderly, <sup>4</sup>Research Team for Social Participation and Community Health, Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology, <sup>2</sup>Graduate School of Medical and Dental Science, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, and <sup>3</sup>Department of Advanced Medicine, Division of Oral and Dental Surgery, National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Aichi, Japan

The age-related loss of muscle mass and/or strength and performance, sarcopenia, has been associated with geriatric syndromes, morbidity and mortality. Although sarcopenia has been researched for many years, currently there is a lack of consensus on its definition. Some studies define sarcopenia as low muscle mass alone, whereas other studies have recently combined low muscle mass, strength and physical performance suggested by the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People, as well as the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia. The arbitrary use of various available sarcopenia definitions within the literature can cause discrepancies in the prevalence and associated risk factors. The application of population-specific cut-off values in any sample population can be problematic, particularly among different ethnicities. Using commonly used cut-off points to define sarcopenia, including solely muscle mass and combined definitions, on a community-dwelling elderly Japanese population, the prevalence of sarcopenia ranged from 2.5 to 28.0% in men and 2.3 to 11.7% in women, with muscle mass measured by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, and 7.1–98.0% in men and 19.8–88.0% in women measured by bioelectrical impedance analysis. Body mass index was the most prominent related factor for sarcopenia across the definitions in this Japanese sample. However, other associated hematological and chronic condition factors varied depending on the definition. **Geriatr Gerontol Int 2016; 16 (Suppl. 1): 110–122.** 

Keywords: muscle strength, sarcopenia, skeletal muscle mass, walking ability.

## Introduction

Sarcopenia, a term proposed by Rosenburg in 1989 referring to the age-related decline in lean body mass, has become a relatively well-known condition among researchers and physicians.<sup>1</sup> Many investigators have attempted to clarify and establish a definition for the estimation of sarcopenia in older adults, as there is still a lack of consensus on components for the diagnosis of sarcopenia and the corresponding cut-off values.<sup>2–8</sup>

While some investigators maintain that sarcopenia should be characterized solely on muscle mass, since the publication of the European Working Group on

Accepted for publication 27 November 2015.

Sarcopenia in Older People (EWGSOP) definition, more studies have used the combined definition of muscle mass, strength and performance to define sarcopenia.<sup>9</sup> The issue then, is that the reported prevalence of sarcopenia, or any outcome, varies depending on the definition used.<sup>10-13</sup> Furthermore, the differences in cut-off values used for the definition can also greatly affect the outcome of the results depending on the population on which said cut-off value is applied.<sup>2,6,7,10</sup> The different definitions of sarcopenia and their corresponding cut-off points might also have an effect on the risk factors associated with sarcopenia, which is an area that has not yet been explored. Understanding these risk factors can potentially assist in identifying early markers for sarcopenia prevention.

The purpose of the present review was to determine the differences in prevalence and factors associated with sarcopenia based on different definitions found in the literature, and to investigate how different sarcopenia definitions affect prevalence and associated factors

Correspondence: Dr. Hunkyung Kim PhD, Research Team for Promoting Independence of the Elderly, Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology, 35-2 Sakaecho, Itabashi-ku, Tokyo 173-0015, Japan. Email: kimhk@tmig.or.jp

when applied to a population of community-dwelling Japanese older adults.

# Criteria for sarcopenia diagnosis and cut-off points

#### Muscle mass

The loss of muscle mass and increase in fat mass with aging has been well established in numerous studies.<sup>14–18</sup> The age-related loss of much mass is strongly associated with impaired mobility, greater morbidity and mortality,<sup>7,19,20</sup> and is a principal component in the causal pathway leading to frailty.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, the proper measurement and evaluation of muscle mass in older adults is extremely important.

The most widely used muscle mass cut-off points are those suggested by Baumgartner et al., which used skeletal muscle mass index cut-off points two standard deviations below the mean of a young reference group measured by dual x-ray absorptiometry (DXA), 7.26 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for men and 5.45 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for women.<sup>2</sup> As seen in Table 1, several methods and cut-off points have been used, although many follow Baumgartner's example. The range of cut-off values shown in Table 1 for skeletal muscle index (SMI) or appendicular skeletal muscle mass adjusted by height, was 5.72-8.81 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in men and 4.23-7.36 kg/m2 in women measured by DXA.<sup>2-6,10,11,14,15,22-36</sup> In addition, although the golden standard method of measurement is dual DXA, bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) has also been used, as the method is convenient and cost-effective, making it a more desirable and perhaps appropriate method for large-scale population studies. The range of cut-off values for BIA measurements of muscle mass were 7.00-8.87 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in men and 5.75-6.42 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in women, which are smaller ranges as the number of studies are fewer relative to those using DXA.7,8,12,19,31,37,38

It is not uncommon to witness these previously established cut-off points applied to various populations and samples in the literature. However, whether these population-specific cut-points should be used for any sample is questionable.

#### Muscle strength

Loss of muscle strength can lead to a number of major geriatric syndromes in addition to sarcopenia including frailty, mobility impairment and falls.<sup>20,21,39,44</sup> Low muscle strength is an important public health issue, as it has been associated with poor future health outcomes, and some researchers insist that muscle quality and functionality might be more vital within the elderly population.<sup>39,41,44,48,49</sup> Generally, upper extremity strength is measured using hand grip strength,<sup>20,39,50</sup> and knee flexion or extension is used for lower extremity

strength assessments.<sup>37,41</sup> However, leg strength measurements might not be practical for large population studies or in clinical practice, as the equipment can be quite large and inconvenient, and the participants often require practice trials for accurate measurements. Therefore, grip strength is most often used in trials not only for the simplicity, reliability and affordability, but also because grip strength is a valid predictor of physical disability and mobility limitation. Grip strength cut-off points from the literature range from 26.0 to 37.0 kg in men and 18.0 to 21.0 kg in women.9,13,19-21,31,35,38,39 One study suggested adjusting the cut-off values of grip strength based on body mass index (BMI).<sup>21</sup> Other measures of muscle strength included isokinetic knee extension torque and knee extension strength; however, these are not used as frequently (cut-off values summarized in Table 1).40,41,48,51

#### Physical performance

Among the commonly used available physical performance measures including the Short Physical Performance Battery, usual walking speed, 6-min walk test, timed get-up & go test and the stair climb power test,<sup>52-54</sup> usual walking speed is quick, inexpensive and a reliable measurement of physical function that can be easily implemented in clinical settings.<sup>55</sup> The predictive values of usual walking speed measurements for major health-related outcomes have been well established in the literature.<sup>42,43,55</sup> Determining the cut-off value for walking speed necessary to maintain a healthy, independent lifestyle is very important, which several researchers have investigated (Table 1).

The cut-point of gait speed ranged from 0.65 to 1.22 m/s.<sup>9,19–21,31,38,41–43,45–47,55</sup> Many of the studies found provided the same cut-off value for men and women, which does not take into account the likely height differences between the sexes. Fried *et al.* stratified walking speed by sex and height using the slowest 20% of a 15-ft walk as a cut-point.<sup>21</sup> The cut-points converted into m/s were 0.65 m/s for men  $\leq$ 173 cm and women  $\geq$ 159 cm, and 0.76 m/s for men  $\geq$ 173 cm and women  $\geq$ 159 cm.

## Working definition of sarcopenia

The term sarcopenia was originally defined as the agerelated loss of muscle mass.<sup>1</sup> Several cut-off points have been used to define sarcopenia based on muscle mass alone. The definition proposed by Baumgartner is the most commonly used definition of sarcopenia based on height-adjusted skeletal muscle mass measured by DXA.<sup>2</sup> Newman suggested a definition with similar cutoff values (7.23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for men and 5.67 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for women) measured by DXA, defining sarcopenia as those whose muscle mass was in the lowest 20% of the

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Criteria	Country	Measurement and index of muscle mass	Cut-off values Male F	alues Female	Cut-off value criteria	Prevalence Male	Female	References
DMA (SA)DMA (SA)DMA (SA)DMA (SA)DMA (SA)SM (gam)DMA (SA)SM (gam)DMA (SA)SM (gam)DMA (SA)SM (gam)DMA (SA)SM (gam)DMA 									
All (ggm)         5/2         5/4         2/2         5/4         2/2         5/4         2/2         5/4         2/2         5/4         2/2	Muscle mass		DXA	c I	1				
K       Trail XM (ggm) $6.77$ $4.81$ $2.50$ $6.37$ <td></td> <td>USA</td> <td>SMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</td> <td>7.26</td> <td>5.45</td> <td></td> <td>13.5-57.8</td> <td>23.1-60.0</td> <td>Baumgartner <i>et al.</i> (1998)<sup>2</sup></td>		USA	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.26	5.45		13.5-57.8	23.1-60.0	Baumgartner <i>et al.</i> (1998) <sup>2</sup>
K.       SMI (ggm); $-726$ $5.46$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $5.3$ $4.6$ SMI (ggm); $-726$ $5.45$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $5.8$ $22.6$ SMI (ggm); $-726$ $5.45$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $5.8$ $22.6$ SMI (ggm); $-726$ $5.45$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.8$ $2.26$ SMI (ggm); $5.74$ $4.2$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.8$ $2.49$ SMI (ggm); $5.74$ $4.2$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.8$ $2.49$ SMI (ggm); $5.74$ $4.23$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.8$ $4.1$ SMI (ggm); $5.31$ $6.57$ $4.29$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.6$ $4.1$ SMI (ggm); $5.31$ $6.87$ $4.93$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.6$ $4.1$ SMI (ggm); $5.31$ $6.87$ $4.39$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $2.8$ $4.1$ SMI (ggm); $5.35$ $5.90$ below young reference mean $2.8$ $4.1$ <td></td> <td>USA</td> <td>Total SMI (kg/m²)</td> <td>6.77</td> <td>4.51</td> <td></td> <td>11.3</td> <td>7.3</td> <td>Melton <i>et al.</i> (2000)a<sup>3</sup></td>		USA	Total SMI (kg/m²)	6.77	4.51		11.3	7.3	Melton <i>et al.</i> (2000)a <sup>3</sup>
th.       LithAbeghir       -       5.40       2.51       Delowyoung reference mean       -       1.23         Hong Kong       SMI (ggm*)       7.26       5.45       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.53         Hong Kong       SMI (ggm*)       7.26       5.45       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.53         Hong Kong       SMI (ggm*)       5.72       4.82       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.54         SMI (ggm*)       5.72       4.82       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.54         SMI (ggm*)       5.74       5.44       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.54         SMI (ggm*)       5.37       5.46       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.57         SMI (ggm*)       6.53       5.49       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.72         SMI (ggm*)       6.53       5.46       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       -       2.25         SMI (ggm*)       6.53       5.46       2.55       Delowyoung reference mean       1.77         SMI (ggm*)       6.53       5.49       2.55       Delowyoung reference me		USA	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.26	5.45		5.3	4.6	Melton <i>et al.</i> $(2000)b^3$
SMI (ggm)T265.452.5D below young reference mean2.62.26Mit (ggm)XMI (ggm)7.265.452.5D below young reference mean2.82.26SMI (ggm)SMI (ggm)5.725.452.5D below young reference mean2.32.6SMI (ggm)SMI (ggm)5.746.42.5D below young reference mean2.32.6SMI (ggm)5.746.42.5D below young reference mean2.22.6SMI (ggm)5.746.42.5D below young reference mean2.37.4SMI (ggm)5.745.42.5D below young reference mean2.37.6SMI (ggm)5.745.42.5D below young reference mean2.37.6SMI (ggm)5.745.42.5D below young reference mean2.37.7SMI (ggm)5.745.42.5D below young reference mean2.32.7SMI (ggm)5.735.42.5D below young reference mean2.42.7SMI (ggm)5.84.952.5D below young reference mean2.42.7SMI (ggm)5.84.952.5D below young reference mean2.42.7SMI (ggm)5.85.42.5D below young reference mean2.42.7SMI (ggm)5.84.952.5D below young reference mean2.42.7SMI (ggm)5.84.932.72.84.932.7SMI (ggm)5.84.932.72.84.932.7SMI (ggm)5.8		Denmark	LTM <sub>A</sub> /height <sup>2</sup>	I	5.40		I	12.3	Tanko <i>et al.</i> $(2002)^4$
SMI (kgm)SMI (kgm) $2.26$ 5.452.5D below young reference mean $ 2.35$ Hong KongSMI (kgm) $ 5.72$ $4.82$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $ 2.35$ SMI (kgm) $5.72$ $4.82$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $ 2.35$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $ 2.36$ SMI (kgm) $5.72$ $4.82$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $ 2.36$ $2.5$ SMI (kgm) $5.72$ $4.82$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $2.2$ $2.66$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $2.3$ $7.40$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $6.53$ $4.30$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $7.20$ $2.2D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $7.20$ $2.2D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $7.20$ $2.2D$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kgm) $2.2D$ $2.2D$ belo		USA	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.26	5.45	2 SD below young reference mean	26.8	22.6	Iannuzzi-Sucich et al. (2002) <sup>22</sup>
SMI (ig/m)SMI (ig/m) $-$ 54525D below young reference mean $-$ 238Hong KongSMI (ig/m) $-$ 5.724.8225D below young reference mean $-$ 23Hong KongSMI (ig/m) $-$ 5.724.8225D below young reference mean $-$ 23SMI (ig/m) $-$ 5.442.5D below young reference mean $-$ 237.6SMI (ig/m) $-$ 5.442.5D below young reference mean $-$ 237.6SMI (ig/m) $-$ 5.412.492.5D below young reference mean $-$ 237.6SMI (ig/m) $6.53$ 4.392.5D below young reference mean $-$ 237.6SMI (ig/m) $6.53$ 4.392.5D below young reference mean $-$ 237.6SMI (ig/m) $6.53$ 4.392.5D below young reference mean $-$ 232.7SMI (ig/m) $6.53$ 4.302.5D below young reference mean $-$ 232.7SMI (ig/m) $ 5.40$ AWCS recommendian $ -$ 27SMI (ig/m) $       -$ SMI (ig/m) $       -$ SMI (ig/m) $        -$ SMI (ig/m) $        -$ SMI (ig/m) $  -$		France	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.26	5.45		I	9.5	Rolland <i>et al.</i> $(2003)^{23}$
Hong Kong Kong SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         5.7         5.45 5.45         2.5D below young reference mean         -         8.9 6.3           Hong Kong SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         5.41         5.35         2.5D below young reference mean         -         6.3           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         7.4         6.45         2.5D below young reference mean         -         6.3           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         6.31         5.45         2.5D below young reference mean         -         6.3           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         6.37         5.45         2.5D below young reference mean         6.3         4.1           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         6.38         4.39         2.5D below young reference mean         6.3         4.1           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         6.38         4.39         2.5D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         6.38         4.39         2.5D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         6.38         4.39         2.5D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         5.36         5.40 AWGS recommunduation         1.7         2.7         2.7           SMI ( $g_{0}m$ )         5.35         5.40 AWGS recommenduation         1.4         1.4         3.6 <td></td> <td>USA</td> <td>SMI <math>(kg/m^2)</math></td> <td>I</td> <td>5.45</td> <td>2 SD below young reference mean</td> <td>I</td> <td>23.8</td> <td>Kenny et al. (2003)<sup>24</sup></td>		USA	SMI $(kg/m^2)$	I	5.45	2 SD below young reference mean	I	23.8	Kenny et al. (2003) <sup>24</sup>
Hong Kong Kong Mi (kgm)Sill (kgm)2.72 5.484.82 2.502.50 below young reference mean construction mean12.3 construction mean7.6 construction mean12.3 construction mean7.6 construction mean7.6 construction mean7.2 construction mean2.30 construction mean7.3 construction mean7.3 construction mean7.3 construction mean7.3 construction mean7.3 		France	SMI $(kg/m^2)$	I	5.45	2 SD below young reference mean	I	8.9	Gillette-Guvonnet et al. (2003) <sup>14</sup>
Hong Kong SMI (kg/m)         7.4         6.4         2.5D below young reference mean         2.2         2.6           SMI (kg/m)         5.314         2.3D below young reference mean         6.3         4.1           SMI (kg/m)         6.35         5.46         2.3D below young reference mean         6.3         4.1           SMI (kg/m)         6.37         5.46         2.3D below young reference mean         6.3         4.1           SMI (kg/m)         6.37         5.46         2.3D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI (kg/m)         6.35         4.45         2.3D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI (kg/m)         6.38         4.35         2.3D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI (kg/m)         7.26         -         2.3D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI (kg/m)         7.26         -         2.3D below young reference mean         1.7         2.7           SMI (kg/m)         7.23         5.67         Sex-specific lowes 2.0% of the distribution         0.0-51.0           SMI (kg/m)         7.23         5.7         Lowes 2.0% of the distribution         1.4-23.0           SMI (kg/m)         2.32 D below young reference mean		China (Hong Kong)	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	5.72	4.82	2 SD below young reference mean	12.3	7.6	Lau <i>et al.</i> (2005) <sup>25</sup>
SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         5.45         2 SD below young reference mean         -         6.8           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         5.31         2.32 Delow young reference mean         6.3         4.11           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         6.37         5.45         2.32 Delow young reference mean         6.3         4.11           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         6.58         4.59         2.32 Delow young reference mean         6.3         4.11           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         6.58         4.59         2.32 Delow young reference mean         6.3         4.11           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         6.58         4.59         2.32 Delow young reference mean         1.17         2.17           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         6.58         4.59         2.32 Delow young reference mean         1.17         2.17           SNI (kgm <sup>2</sup> )         5.50         5.40         AVGS recommendation         -		China (Hong Kong)	$SMI (kg/m^2)$	7.4	6.4	2 SD below voung reference mean	2.2	2.6	Woo et al. (2009) <sup>26</sup>
SMI ( $g_{2}m_{1}$ )SMI ( $g_{2}m_{2}$ )SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )S.12.5D below young reference mean6.34.1SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )6.875.462.5D below young reference mean6.34.12.7SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )6.875.462.5D below young reference mean6.34.12.7SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )6.875.462.5D below young reference mean6.34.1SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )6.584.592.5D below young reference mean1.72.7SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )7.265.32.5D below young reference mean1.72.7SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )7.265.402.5D below young reference mean1.72.7SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )7.205.402.5D below young reference mean1.72.7SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )7.235.67Sex-specific lowest 2.0% of the distribution 1.1.6-2.231.4-2.30SMI ( $g_{2}m_{3}$ )8.817.36Lowest 2.0% of the distribution 1.1.5-2.231.4-2.30Residuals method-1.187-1.62Sex-specific lowest 2.0% of the distribution 1.1.5-2.301.8Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lowest 2.0% of the distribution 1.1.6-2.331.4-2.30Residuals method		France	SMI (ko/m <sup>2</sup> )	1	5.45	2 SD below voung reference mean		6.8	Rolland <i>et al.</i> $(2009)^{27}$
a       SMI (kg/m)       5.31       6.29       25D below young reference mean       3.3       177         SMI (kg/m)       6.58       4.59       25D below young reference mean       6.3       471         SMI (kg/m)       6.58       4.59       25D below young reference mean       1.7       2.4         SMI (kg/m)       6.58       4.59       25D below young reference mean       1.7       2.4         SMI (kg/m)       7.50       5.40       25D below young reference mean       1.7       2.7         SMI (kg/m)       7.20       5.40       25D below young reference mean       1.7       2.7         SMI (kg/m)       7.20       5.40       25D below young reference mean       1.7       2.7         SMI (kg/m)       7.20       5.40       25D below young reference mean       1.7       2.7         SMI (kg/m)       7.25       5.67       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.93       1.4.230         SMI (kg/m)       7.25       5.67       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.93       1.4.230         SMI (kg/m)       7.25       5.87       5.87       5.87       5.44       0.5       2.23       1.4.		Korea	SMI (ka/m <sup>2</sup> )	7 40	5 14	2 SD helow voltato reference mean	63	41	Kim <i>et al</i> (2009) $a^{10}$
and tegrit         and te		Canada	SMI (ha/m <sup>2</sup> )	8 51	679	2 SD helow with reference mean	28.9	177	Rouchard of al (2000)28
And (kg/m²) $5.87$ $5.40$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.72$ SMI (kg/m²) $6.58$ $4.59$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.71$ SMI (kg/m²) $6.58$ $4.59$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.71$ SMI (kg/m²) $5.81$ $4.59$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kg/m²) $5.33$ $4.23$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kg/m²) $5.35$ $5.40$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kg/m²) $5.35$ $4.23$ $2.50$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.7$ SMI (kg/m²) $7.25$ $5.67$ $5.40$ $2.90$ of the distribution $0.0-50.4$ $0.0-51.9$ SMI (kg/m²) $7.25$ $5.67$ $5.40$ $2.90$ of the distribution $0.0-50.4$ $0.0-51.9$ SMI (kg/m²) $7.25$ $5.67$ $5.87$ -specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $0.0-51.9$ $2.72$ SMI (kg/m²) $2.32$ $2.90$ below young reference mean $1.7$ $2.72$ SMI (kg/m²) $2.75$ $5.67$ $5.87$ -specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $1.7$ $2.23$ Residuals method $-2.23$ $-1.53$ $5.87$ -specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $1.5$ $2.23$ Residuals method $-1.87$ $-1.62$ $5.87$ -specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution fresiduals $2.33$ $2.56$ Residuals method $-1.62$ $1.96$ $1.97$ $1.16$ $1.87$ $2$		Valiaua	CIVIL (NG/III )	10.0	1 50	2 DD balow young reference mean	7.2	1.1	$\mathbf{V}_{iiii} \xrightarrow{af af} (\mathbf{D}01 0)^2 9$
SMI (ggm <sup>+</sup> )SMI (ggm <sup>+</sup> )<		NOICA		00	4.07		0.0	- <del>1</del> 1	$\begin{array}{cccc} \text{NIII} & et & at. & (2010)^{-1} \\ \hline \end{array}$
SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         5.8         4.59         2 SD below young reference mean         12.4         0.1           SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         -         5.5         4.59         2 SD below young reference mean         12.4         0.1           SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         7.26         -         2 SD below young reference mean         13.5         -         -         3.7           Consensus         SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         5.85         4.23         2 SD below young reference mean         13.5         -         -         3.7           AlM/height <sup>+</sup> (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         5.85         5.40         AWGs         2 SD below young reference mean         13.5         -         3.7           AlM/height <sup>+</sup> (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         7.25         5.67         Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution         0.0         7.9         2.02         2.9           SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )         8.81         7.36         Lowest 2 quintles in recruited colort         4.4         4.05         3.2         2.0         2.2         2.0.3         2.2         2.0.3         2.3         2.6         2.3         2.3         2.6         2.2         2.0.3         2.2         2.0.3         2.2         2.0.3         2.2         2.0.3         2.2         2.0.3         2.0.4         4.0.5		Japan	SMI (kg/m <sup><math>z</math></sup> )	6.87	5.46	2 SD below young reference mean	1.7	7.7	Sanada <i>et al.</i> (2010) <sup>3</sup>
SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $-$ 5.52 SD below young referance mean $ 3.7$ ConsensusSMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $7.26$ $ 2$ SD below young referance mean $13.5$ $-$ SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $7.26$ $ 2$ SD below young referance mean $13.5$ $ -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $7.23$ $5.67$ Sex-specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $00-504$ $00-51.9$ SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $7.23$ $5.67$ Sex-specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $0.0-504$ $0.0-51.9$ SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $ 5.77$ Sex-specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $0.0-504$ $0.0-51.9$ SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $ 2.29$ $-1.73$ Sex-specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $0.3$ $2.22$ SMI (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) $  2.29$ $-1.73$ Sex-specific lowest $20\%$ of the distribution $11.3-32.8$ Residuals method $  2.29$ $-1.73$ Sex-specific cut-off points of lower $20\%$ of $15.4$ $2.23$ Residuals method $ -1.62$ Sex-specific cut-off points of lower $20\%$ of $15.4$ $2.23$ Residuals method $ -1.45$ $20$ hp percentile of distribution of residuals $-$ Residuals method $  20$ hp percentile of distribution of residuals $-$ Residuals method $    -$ Residuals method $    -$ Residuals method $    -$ Residuals metho		Japan	SMI (kg/m²)	6.58	4.59	2 SD below young reference mean	12.4	0.1	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2012)a <sup>15</sup>
SMI (kg/m²)7.26-2 SD below young reference mean13.5-SMI (kg/m²)SMI (kg/m²)5.40AWGS recommendationSMI (kg/m²)5.875.43AWGS recommendation0.0-50.40.0-51.91aLM/height² (kg/m²)5.875.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.67SMI (kg/m²)7.235.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.67SMI (kg/m²)7.235.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.675.67SMI (kg/m²)8.817.385.675.675.675.675.675.672.2314.4-23.0Residuals method-1.87-1.621.00-1.87-1.621.641.672.2314.4-23.0Residuals method-1.87-1.625.675.675.675.675.675.675.67Residuals method-1.87-1.621.621.621.642.0314.4-23.0Residuals method-1.87-1.625.755.755.755.755.755.75Residuals method-1.871.625.755.755.755.752.0314.4-23.0Residuals method-1.871.621.661.691.671.722.0314.4-23.0Residuals method-1.871.621.661.661.662.222.		Brazil	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	I	5.5	2 SD below young reference mean	I	3.7	Domiciano et al. (2013)a <sup>30</sup>
Consensus         SMI ( $g_{S}(m^2)$ 7.00         5.40         AWGS recommendation         -         2.23         5.67         Sec-specific lowest 20% of the distribution         0.0         -         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         2.32         3.32         2.32         3.33         2.32         3.33         2.36         4.4         4.05         7.38         Lowest 20% of the distribution of residuals         2.22         3.44         4.05         7.38         Residuals method         -         2.23         1.44         2.33         2.36         4.4 </td <td></td> <td>Brazil</td> <td>SMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</td> <td>7.26</td> <td>I</td> <td>2 SD below young reference mean</td> <td>13.5</td> <td>Ι</td> <td>Figueiredo <i>et al.</i> (2014)a<sup>11</sup></td>		Brazil	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.26	I	2 SD below young reference mean	13.5	Ι	Figueiredo <i>et al.</i> (2014)a <sup>11</sup>
SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )5.854.232 SD below young reference mean0.017.9aLM/height <sup>2</sup> (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )7.235.67Sex-specific lowers 20% of the distribution0.0–50.40.0–51.9aLM/height <sup>2</sup> (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )7.235.67Sex-specific lowers 20% of the distribution20.22.22SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )-5.70Lowest 2 quintiles in recruited cohort54.440.5SMI (kg/m <sup>+</sup> )5.70Lowest 2 quintiles in recruited cohort54.440.5Residuals method2.29-1.73Sex-specific lower 20% of the distribution20.314.4-23.0Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of the distribution11.5-32.814.4-23.0Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of fish20.313.4Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of fish20.313.4Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of fish20.313.5Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of fish20.313.5Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of fish20.320.3Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific lower 20% of fish21.923.6Residuals method-1.6720.120.313.623.623.6ASM digits of for total fat mass-1.4520.021.423.723.6ASM digit-1.00 (%)29.123		Asian Consensus	SMI $(kg/m^2)$	7.00	5.40	AWGS recommendation	I	I	Chen et al. (2014) <sup>31</sup>
al.M/heigh? (kg/m²)7.235.67Sex-specific lowes: 20% of the distribution0.0-50.40.0-51.9 $M_{1}M_{1}M_{1}M_{2}M_{2}M_{1}^{2}M_{2}^{2}$		China	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	5.85	4.23	2 SD below young reference mean	0.0	17.9	Wen <i>et al.</i> (2011)a <sup>32</sup>
al.M/height² (kg/m²)7.255.67Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution20.320.2SMI (kg/m²)-5.70Lowest 2 quintiles in recruited cohort-27.227.2SMI (kg/m²)-5.70Lowest 2 quintiles in recruited cohort-27.2SMI (kg/m²)2.29-1.73Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution 11.5-32.814.4-23.0Residuals method20th percenile of distribution of residuals20.320.2Residuals method20th percenile of distribution of residuals20.320.3Residuals method20th percenile of distribution of residuals20.320.4Residuals method20th percenile of distribution of residuals20.325.6ASM adjusted for fair mass20th percenile of distribution of residuals20.420.4ASM dijusted for tait mass and height1.420.4ASM (kg)20th percenile of distribution of residuals1.8ASM (kg)2.01ASM (kg)1.9-ASM veight) × 100 (%)2.912.3.02.51 below young reference mean2.711.91RIA% SMI (kg/m²)2.51 below young reference mean2.71.11 <td< td=""><td></td><td>USA</td><td>aLM/height<sup>2</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</td><td>7.23</td><td>5.67</td><td>Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution</td><td></td><td>0.0 - 51.9</td><td>Newman <i>et al.</i> (2003)a<sup>6</sup></td></td<>		USA	aLM/height <sup>2</sup> (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.23	5.67	Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution		0.0 - 51.9	Newman <i>et al.</i> (2003)a <sup>6</sup>
SMI ( $gym^2$ )-5.70Lowest 2 quintiles in recruited cohort-27.2SMI ( $gym^2$ )SMI ( $gym^2$ )8.817.36Lowest 20% of the distribution-27.2SMI ( $gym^2$ )2.29-1.73Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution11.5-23.814.4-23.0Residuals method2.01Breaction51.42.031Residuals method2.01Breaction51.42.231Residuals method2.01Breaction15.42.231Residuals method2.01Breaction51.42.231Residuals method2.01Breaction51.42.231Residuals method2.01Breacting of distribution of residuals20.22.031ASM dijusted for total fat mass2.01Breacting of distribution of residuals9.71.1.8ASM weight) × 100 (%)2.912.3.02.50 below young reference mean9.71.1.81ASM/weight) × 100 (%)2.912.3.02.50 below young reference mean7.010.01BIA% SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100)31.52.2.12.50 below young reference mean7.010.01BIA% SMI (gym2)6.422.50 below young reference mean7.010.0111BIASMI (g		USA	aLM/height <sup>2</sup> (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.25	5.67	Sex-specific lowest 20% of the distribution	20.3	20.2	Delmonico et al. (2007)a <sup>33</sup>
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		Italy	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	I	5.70	Lowest 2 quintiles in recruited cohort	I	27.2	Zoico <i>et al.</i> $(2004)^{34}$
Residuals method $-2.29$ $-1.73$ Sex-specific lowes 20% of the distribution $11.5-32.8$ $14.4-23.0$ Residuals method $-1.87$ $-1.62$ Sex-specific cut-off points of lower 20% of $15.4$ $22.3$ $11.5-32.8$ $14.4-23.0$ Residuals method $-1.87$ $-1.62$ Sex-specific cut-off points of lower 20% of $15.4$ $22.3$ $11.5-32.8$ $11.5-32.8$ $11.4-23.0$ Residuals method $-1.87$ $-1.62$ Sex-specific cut-off points of lower 20% of $15.4$ $22.3$ $20.3$ Residuals method $-1.45$ $20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $33.3$ $25.6$ $25.6$ ASM adjusted for total fat mass $-2.06$ $ 20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $ 19.9$ ASM (kg) $ -1.45$ $20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $ 19.9$ $-$ ASM (kg) $ -1.45$ $20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $ 19.9$ ASM/weight) × 100 (%) $29.1$ $23.0$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $12.1$ $11.8$ BIA% SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100) $31.5$ $22.1$ $2.5D$ below young reference mean $2.1$ $ SMI (kg/m2)8.876.422.5D below young reference mean2.1  SMI (kg/m2)5.755.755.755.7510.010.010.0SMI (kg/m2)  2.5D below young reference mean2.1-75.02.4.5-71.4SMI (kg/m2)$		Korea	SMI (kø/m <sup>2</sup> )	8.81	7.36	Lowest 2 auintiles in recruited cohort	54.4	40.5	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2009) $b^{10}$
Residuals method20h percentile of distribution of residuals20.22.3Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific cut-off points of lower 20% of 15.42.2.31Residuals method-1.87-1.62Sex-specific cut-off points of lower 20% of 15.42.2.31Residuals method20th percentile of distribution of residuals33.325.6ASM adjusted for total fat mass-2.061.4520th percentile of distribution of residuals-ASM adjusted for total fat mass-2.061.4520th percentile of distribution of residuals-19.9ASM weight) × 100 (%)29.129.123.02 SD below young reference mean15.711.8ASM/weight) × 100 (%)29.123.02 SD below young reference mean12.111.91BIA% SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100)31.522.12 SD below young reference mean7.010.0M (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )% SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )8.505.75SMI below young reference mean7.010.0M (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )6.422 SD below young reference mean23.6-N (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )6.422 SD below young reference mean2.1SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) <td< td=""><td></td><td>1 ISA</td><td>Residuals method</td><td>-2.29</td><td>-1.73</td><td>Sex-snerific lowest 20% of the distribution</td><td></td><td>14.4-23.0</td><td>Newman et al. <math>(2.003)</math>b<sup>6</sup></td></td<>		1 ISA	Residuals method	-2.29	-1.73	Sex-snerific lowest 20% of the distribution		14.4-23.0	Newman et al. $(2.003)$ b <sup>6</sup>
Residuals method $-1.87$ $-1.62$ Sex-specific cut-off points of lower 20% of $15.4$ $22.3$ Residuals method $  20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $33.3$ $25.6$ ASM adjusted for tat mass and height $  20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $33.3$ $25.6$ ASM adjusted for total fat mass $-2.06$ $ 20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $19.9$ $11.9$ ASM veight) × 100 (%) $29.1$ $23.0$ $25$ SD below young reference mean $9.7$ $11.8$ (ASM/weight) × 100 (%) $29.1$ $23.0$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $9.7$ $11.8$ BIA% SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100) $31.5$ $22.1$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $12.1$ $11.9$ BIA% SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $5.75$ SMI below joung reference mean $23.6$ $ -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $5.75$ SMI below joung reference mean $23.6$ $ -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $  5.75$ SMI below joung reference mean $23.6$ $-$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $       -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $       -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $        -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $        -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $-$		11SA	Residuals method	i i I		20th nercentile of distribution of residuals		20.3	Delmonico et al. $(2007)b^{33}$
ConservationCons		Koner	Decidinale method	1 97	-1 67	Sav-conside cut-off nointe of lower 2002 of		27.3	Vim at al (2000) allo
Residuals method20th percentile of distribution of residuals33.325.6ASM adjusted for fat mass20th percentile of distribution of residuals33.325.6ASM adjusted for total fat mass14.520th percentile of distribution of residuals33.325.6ASM dijusted for total fat mass20th percentile of distribution of residuals19.8-ASM weight) × 100 (%)29.129.123.02 SD below young reference mean9.711.8ASM/weight) × 100 (%)29.123.02 SD below young reference mean9.711.8BIA% SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100)31.522.12 SD below young reference mean7.010.0BIA% SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )8.505.75SMI below jukelihood ratio for positiveaSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )8.876.422 SD below young reference mean23.6aSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )6.755.072 SD below young reference mean21.111.9aSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )aSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )aSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )aSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )aSMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) <td></td> <td>1001 Cd</td> <td>ivesiduais incluiod</td> <td>10.1</td> <td>70.1</td> <td>residuals</td> <td></td> <td>0.44</td> <td>2(1007) "m 12 IIINI</td>		1001 Cd	ivesiduais incluiod	10.1	70.1	residuals		0.44	2(1007) "m 12 IIINI
ASM adjusted for fat mass and height1.45 20th percentile of distribution of residuals - 19.9 ASM adjusted for total fat mass -2.06 - 2.016 percentile of distribution of residuals 19.8 - ASM (kg) ASM (kg) 15.7 15.7 15.7 15.8 Lowest 15% during 3-year follow up, 15.7 (ASM/weight) × 100 (%) 2.9.1 2.3.0 2.510 below young reference mean 1.2.1 11.9 $BIA$ % SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100) 31.5 2.2.1 2.510 below young reference mean 1.2.1 11.9 $BIA$ % SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 5.75 SMI below likelihood ratio for positive SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 8.87 6.42 2.510 below young reference mean 23.6 18.6 SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 5.75 SMI below young reference mean 23.6 18.6 SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 5.75 SMI below young reference mean 23.6 18.6 SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 5.75 SMI below young reference mean 23.6 18.6 SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 5.70 AVGS for the ordin stute of the values		China	Residuals method	I	I	20th percentile of distribution of residuals	33.3	25.6	Wen <i>et al.</i> (2011)b <sup>32</sup>
ASM adjusted for total fat mass $-2.06$ $ 20$ th percentile of distribution of residuals $19.8$ $-$ tetherlandsASM (kg) $15.7$ $10.6$ $10.8 \times 33\%$ Lowest 15% during 3-year follow up, $15.7$ $(ASM/weight) \times 100 (\%)$ $29.1$ $23.0$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $9.7$ $11.8$ $(ASM/weight) \times 100 (\%)$ $29.1$ $23.0$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $9.7$ $11.8$ $BIA$ $(ASM/weight) \times 100 (\%)$ $29.1$ $23.0$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $12.1$ $11.9$ $BIA$ $\%$ SMI (muscle mass/body mass $\times 100)$ $31.5$ $22.1$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $7.0$ $10.0$ $BIA$ $\%$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $8.50$ $5.75$ SMI below likelihood ratio for positive $   m$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $8.87$ $6.42$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $23.6$ $18.6$ $ m$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $7.00$ $5.80$ $5.75$ SMI below ilkelihood ratio for positive $   m$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $           m$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $                                -$		Brazil	ASM adjusted for fat mass and height	I	-1.45	20th percentile of distribution of residuals	I	19.9	Domiciano et al. (2013)b <sup>30</sup>
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Brazil	ASM adjusted for total fat mass	-2.06	I	20th percentile of distribution of residuals	19.8	I	Figueiredo <i>et al.</i> (2014)b <sup>11</sup>
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		The Netherlands	ASM (kg)		ss >3%	Lowest 15% during 3-vear follow up.	15	5.7	Visser et al. (2003) <sup>35</sup>
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Ianan	$(ASM/weight) \times 100$ (%)		23.0	2 SD helow volino reference mean		11.8	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2012) $h^{15}$
BIA $0.0$ BIA       % SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100) $31.5$ $22.1$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $7.0$ $10.0$ % SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.50 $5.75$ SMI below likelihood ratio for positive $ -$ n       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.87 $6.42$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $23.6$ $18.6$ n       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $7.00$ $5.80$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $23.6$ $18.6$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $7.00$ $5.80$ $2$ SD below mean young adult values $ -$ SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $ 6.42$ $2$ SD below mean young reference mean $2175.0$ $24.5-71.4$ Conservers       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) $6.75$ $5.07$ $2$ SD below young reference mean $2175.0$ $24.5-71.4$		Korea	$(ASM/weight) \times 100$ (%)	29.1	23.0	2 SD below voung reference mean	12.1	11.9	Rvu <i>et al.</i> $(2013)^{36}$
% SMI (muscle mass/body mass × 100)       31.5       22.1       2 SD below young reference mean       7.0       10.0         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.50       5.75       SMI below likelihood ratio for positive       -       -       -         n       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.87       6.42       2 SD below young reference mean       23.6       18.6         n       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       7.00       5.80       2 SD below young reference mean       23.6       18.6         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       7.00       5.80       2 SD below mean young adult values       -       -       -         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       -       6.42       Based on Chien's cut-off value       -       -       -         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       -       6.75       5.07       2 SD below young reference mean       21.1-75.0       24.5-71.4			BIA			······································			
SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.50       5.75       SMI below likelihood ratio for positive       -       -         n       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.87       6.42       2 SD below young reference mean       23.6       18.6         NMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       8.87       6.42       2 SD below young reference mean       23.6       18.6         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       7.00       5.80       2 SD below mean young adult values       -       -         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       -       6.42       Based on Chien's cut-off value       -       -         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )       6.75       5.07       2 SD below young reference mean       21.1-75.0       24.5-71.4		USA	$\%$ SMI (muscle mass/body mass $\times100)$	31.5	22.1		7.0	10.0	Janssen <i>et al.</i> $(2002)^7$
n         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         8.87         6.42         2 SD below young reference mean         23.6         18.6           SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         8.87         6.42         2 SD below young reference mean         23.6         18.6           SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         7.00         5.80         2 SD below mean young adult values         -         -         -           SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         -         6.42         B ased on Chien's cut-off value         -         -           SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         6.75         5.07         2 SD below young reference mean         21.1–75.0         24.5–71.4		USA	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	8.50	5.75	SMI below likelihood ratio for positive	I	I	Janssen <i>et al.</i> $(2004)^{12}$
n         SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         8.87         6.42         2 SD below young reference mean         23.6         18.6           SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )         7.00         5.80         2 SD below mean young adult values         - <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>result</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>						result			
SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )     7.00     5.80     2 SD below mean young adult values     -     -       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )     -     6.42     Based on Chien's cut-off value     -     -       SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )     6.75     5.07     2 SD below young reference mean     21.1-75.0     24.5-71.4       Consensus     SMI (kc/m <sup>2</sup> )     7.00     5.70     AWGS recommendation     -     -		Taiwan	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	8.87	6.42	2 SD below young reference mean	23.6	18.6	Chien <i>et al.</i> $(2008)^8$
SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) – 6.42 Based on Chien's cut-off value – – – – – – – – – – SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 6.75 5.07 2 SD below young reference mean 21.1–75.0 24.5–71.4 <sup>–</sup> Consensus SMI (kc/m <sup>2</sup> ) – 7.00 5.70 AWGS recommendation – – – –		Japan	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.00	5.80	2 SD below mean young adult values	I	I	Tanimoto <i>et al.</i> (2012) <sup>19</sup>
SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) 6.75 5.07 2 SD below young reference mean 21.1–75.0 24.5–71.4 Consensus SMI (kc/m <sup>2</sup> ) – – – – –		Japan	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	I	6.42	Based on Chien's cut-off value	I	I	Kim <i>et al.</i> $(2012)^{37}$
SMI (ke/m <sup>2</sup> ) 7 00 5 70 AWGS recommendation – – – –		Japan	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	6.75	5.07	2 SD below young reference mean	21.1-75.0	24.5 - 71.4	Yamada <i>et al.</i> (2013) <sup>38</sup>
		Asian Consensus	SMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	7.00	5.70	AWGS recommendation	I	I	Chen et al. (2014) <sup>31</sup>

induce successi	200	ant success (ng)			quartiles			
	Italy	Grip strength (kg)	30.3	19.3	ROC curve identifying walking disability (speed <0.8 m/s)	I	I	Lauretani <i>et al.</i> (2003)a <sup>20</sup>
	The Netherlands European Consensus	Grip strength (kg) Grip strength (kg)	loss > 30.0	loss >40.0% 20.0	Lowest 15% during 3-year follow up EWGSOP recommendation based on	I	13.5 -	Visser <i>et al.</i> (2003) <sup>35</sup> Cruz-Jentoft <i>et al.</i> (2010) <sup>9</sup>
	Finland	Grip strength (kg)	37.0	21.0	Risk of mobility limitation	I	I	Sallinen <i>et al.</i> $(2010)^{39}$
	Japan	Grip strength (kg)	30.3	19.3	The lowest quartile	I	I	Tanimoto <i>et al.</i> $(2012)^{19}$
	Taiwan	Grip strength (kg)	22.4	14.3	Modified EWGSOP definition for Taiwanese population	I	I	Lee <i>et al.</i> (2013) <sup>13</sup>
	Japan	Grip strength (kg)	30.0	20.0	EWGSOP recommendation		31.9	Yamada <i>et al.</i> $(2013)^{38}$
	Asian Consensus	Grip strength (kg)	26.0	18.0	AWGS suggestion for low hand grip strength	I	I	Chen <i>et al.</i> $(2014)^{31}$
	USA	Knee extension torque $(Nm/kg m^{-1})$	Ĺ N	2.5	Maximal voluntary muscle torque threshold	I	I	Cress <i>et al.</i> (2003) <sup>40</sup>
	Italy	Knee extension torque (N/dm)	390.9	266.4	ROC curve identifying walking disability (speed <0.8 m/s)	I	I	Lauretani (2003)b <sup>20</sup>
	USA	Knee extension strength (Nm/kg)	1.13	1.01	Deciles with high risk of mobility limitation	9.8	29.7	Manini <i>et al.</i> (2007) <sup>41</sup>
	Japan	Knee extension strength (Nm/kg)	I	1.01	Based on Manini's cut-off value	I	I	Kim et al. (2012) <sup>37</sup>
Gait speed	USA	Usual walking speed $(m/s)$	1	1.22	Speed allotted to cross signaled intersection		99.5	Langlois et al. (1997) <sup>42</sup>
	USA	Usual walking speed (m/s)	-	1.20	Future functional disability		77.9	Brach <i>et al.</i> $(2001)^{43}$
	USA	Walking speed (m/s)	$0.65 \text{ or } 0.76^{\ddagger}$	6†	Slowest 20% of 15-ft walk	I	I	Fried <i>et al.</i> $(2001)^{21}$
	Italy	Walking speed (m/s)	0	0.80	4-m course, ROC curve identifying walking disability	I	I	Lauretani <i>et al.</i> (2003) <sup>20</sup>
	USA	Usual walking speed (m/s)	1	1.00	Onset of persistent lower extremity limitation		24.0	Cesari et al. (2005) <sup>55</sup>
	USA	Walking speed (m/s)	$0.98 \text{ or } 1.06^{\ddagger}$	6 <sup>‡</sup>	6-m course. Based on Fried (2001) criteria	1	I	Cawthon <i>et al.</i> $(2007)^{45}$
	USA	Usual walking speed (m/s)	1	1.22	Speed allotted to cross signaled intersection	19.7	38.5	Manini <i>et al.</i> $(2007)^{41}$
	France	Gait velocity (m/s)	0	0.80	Based on systematic review	I	I	Abellan van Kan <i>et al.</i> (2009) <sup>46</sup>
	European Consensus	Gait velocity (m/s)	0	0.80	EWGSOP recommendation based on Lauretani cut-off	I	I	Cruz-Jentoft et al. (2010) <sup>9</sup>
	Japan	Walking speed (m/s)	1.27	1.19	The lowest quartile	I	I	Tanimoto <i>et al.</i> (2012) <sup>19</sup>
	Japan	Walking speed (m/s)	0	0.80	EWGSOP recommendation		4.1	Yamada <i>et al.</i> $(2013)^{38}$
	Asian Consensus	Usual walking speed	0	0.80	6-m course, AWGS recommendation	I	I	Chen <i>et al.</i> (2014) <sup>31</sup>
	England	Usual walking speed (m/s)	0.78	0.72	3-m course, self-reported walking speed	3.8	5.0	Syddall <i>et al.</i> (2015) <sup>47</sup>
References with : for men ≤174 cm	everal methods and cut-of and 1.06 m/s for men >17	References with several methods and cut-off points within the same criteria have been differentiated using "a,b,c". <sup>4</sup> 0.65 m/s for men ≤173 cm and women ≤159 cm; 0.76 m/s for men >173 cm and women >159 cm. <sup>#</sup> 0.98 m/s for men ≤174 cm and 1.06 m/s for men >174 cm. a.LM. appendicular lean mass. AWGS. Asian working eroup on sarcoenta: BIA, bioelectrical impedance analysis: DXA. dual-emeryx z-ray absorptionetry: EWGSOP.	differentiated u S Asian workii	tsing "a,b,c". †	References with several methods and cut-off points within the same criteria have been differentiated using "a,b,c". <sup>+</sup> 0,65 m/s for men ≤173 cm and women ≤159 cm; 0.76 m/s for men >173 cm and women >159 cm. <sup>+</sup> 0.98 m/s for mens <174 cm and 1.06 m/s for mens ×174 cm a 1 M annovaliant parameters. FWGSOD	n; 0.76 m/s	for men >173	s cm and women >159 cm. #0.98 m/s

#### Prevalence and risk factors of sarcopenia

distribution.<sup>6</sup> Sanada *et al.* reported cut-off values for an Asian sample using Baumgartner's suggested method, two standard deviations below the sex-specific mean of a young population, 6.87 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Japanese men and 5.46 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in women measured by DXA.<sup>5</sup>

In 2000, Janssen developed and published predictive equations for estimating skeletal muscle mass using BIA,<sup>56</sup> which has since been referred to by many researchers using BIA to define sarcopenia.<sup>8,19,37,57</sup> Janssen *et al.* used the common definition for sarcopenia (i.e. two standard deviations below the sex-specific mean for young adults), measured by BIA, where the muscle mass cut-off points were 8.50 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in men and 5.75 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in women.<sup>12</sup> Chien *et al.* reported muscle mass cut-off values of 8.87 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for men and 6.42 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for women in Taiwanese older adults.<sup>8</sup>

In 2010, the EWGSOP developed a practical clinical definition and consensus diagnostic criteria for agerelated sarcopenia combining muscle mass, strength and physical performance.<sup>9</sup> As Manini and Clark summarized, muscle mass alone was not associated with mortality, and muscle strength is a crucial factor in the determination of physical disability and mortality.<sup>58</sup> The combined definition, which includes muscle mass and strength, as well as performance, might be more relevant for investigating the effects of sarcopenia on older adults. Based on the EWGSOP algorithm, walking speed below or equaling 0.8 m/s would be the first step in screening sarcopenic people. Followed by measures of muscle strength and muscle mass.

After the publication of the EWGSOP definition of sarcopenia in 2010, many investigators have applied this definition, even within trials studying populations of different ethnicities. Chen et al. summarized the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia (AWGS), as Asian populations differ from Caucasians in ethnicity, adiposity, size and lifestyle, and the use of previous definitions obtained from varying ethnicities can be inappropriate.<sup>31</sup> The authors reported that a cohort effect might be observed in the use of a cut-off point derived from a young Asian population, as younger people lead a more Westernized lifestyle compared with the older generation, who most likely would have lived a more traditional lifestyle. Regardless, the AWGS recommended the traditionally used two standard deviations below the mean muscle mass of a young reference group or the lowest quintile for cut-off determination. The recommended cut-off value for height-adjusted skeletal muscle were 7.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in men and 5.4 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in women using DXA, and 7.0 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in men and 5.7 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in women measured by BIA.31 Chen et al. specifically suggested the use of height-adjusted skeletal muscle mass, although research has shown that this method of measurement can underestimate the prevalence sarcopenia in Korean and Chinese populations.15,32 The AWGS definition of sarcopenia further suggested low handgrip

strength (<26 kg for men and <18 kg for women) in addition to muscle mass to screen for sarcopenia. A walking speed of  $\leq 0.8$  m/s was recommended as the cut-off for low physical performance in Asian people. Researchers should be aware and careful of the use of previous cut-off points, as they could have an effect on the prevalence rates of sarcopenia, as well as possible risk factors.

## Risk factors of sarcopenia components

#### Muscle mass

Investigation into the risk factors and associated factors of muscle mass decline has been ongoing for several decades. Many of the risk factors assessed for declines in muscle mass, summarized in Table 2, include chronic conditions, such as diabetes, heart disease and hyperlipidemia; arterial stiffness, malnutrition and hematological factors.<sup>57,59,60</sup> Several hematological components have been linked to the loss of muscle mass, such as high creatinine, and high albumin concentration had protective effects.<sup>57,61</sup> BMI and inflammation have also been significantly associated with muscle mass loss.<sup>57,75</sup>

### Muscle strength

Factors associated with muscle strength loss have also been investigated. Similar to muscle mass, the literature describes hematological factors including total freetestosterone, insulin-like growth factor-1, high parathyroid hormone, hemoglobin, low 25-hydroxy vitamin D and low serum albumin to be linked to grip strength decline in longitudinal studies.<sup>35,62,63</sup> One study by Stenholm *et al.* found that high concentrations of interleukin-6 and interleukin-1RA, and low levels of dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate were predictors of muscle strength loss over 22 years.<sup>66</sup>

Muscle strength loss has been associated with many chronic conditions and lifestyle factors, such as back pain, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, chronic kidney disease, hypertension, asthma, cognitive function, use of calcium channel blockers, caffeine intake, excess bodyweight, stress and smoking.<sup>57,64,65,67,68,76</sup>

## Walking ability

Detailed study into hematological factors linked to declines in walking ability are more limited, and although walking speed decline has been studied extensively, few studies exist that have investigated blood component risk factors. In a recent letter to the editor of the *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, Onuoha outlined that red blood cell indices (red blood cell count, hematocrit, white blood cell count) were associated with gait rhythm, but not speed.<sup>77</sup> The author suggested that hematological mechanisms might cause disturbances in

Study design and Participants	Factors	Main results	References
Muscle mass			
Cross-sectional, 142 people aged 70 years and older	Diabetes, malnutrition, inflammation	The presence of diabetes mellitus was the strongest predictor of lean body mass loss (B = $-2.302$ , <i>P</i> < 0.001). Malnutrition (B = $1.265$ , <i>P</i> = $0.027$ ) and inflammation (B = $-1.321$ , <i>P</i> = $0.022$ ) were also significantly associated with lean body mass loss.	Pupim <i>et al.</i> (2005) <sup>59</sup>
Cross-sectional, 175 people aged 65 years or older	CAVI	Higher CAVI was significantly associated with low SMI (OR1.82, 95% CI 1.14–2.90).	Sampaio <i>et al.</i> (2014) <sup>60</sup>
Longitudinal (4 years), 3026 people aged 70–79 years	Serum creatinine	High serum creatinine was associated with loss of lean mass in men, but not women.	Fried et al. (2007)61
Longitudinal (4 years), 538 women aged 75 years or older	Age, BMI, calf circumference, albumin, heart disease, hyperlipidemia	Older age and BMI lower than 21 kg/m2 predicted muscle mass decline. High albumin had protective effects for SMI decline (OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.82–0.98). History of heart disease (OR 2.05, 95% CI 1.19–3.55) and hyperlipidemia (OR 1.74, 95% CI 1.10–2.77) were significant risk factors for decrease in SMI.	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2015) <sup>57</sup>
Auscle strength (Grip strength) Cross-sectional, 121 men and 180 women aged 65–97 years	Physical activity, IGF1, total free-testosterone	Grip strength had significant positive associations with physical activity, IGF1 and free-testosterone in men; and IGF1 in women.	Baumgartner <i>et al.</i> (1999) <sup>6</sup>
Longitudinal (3 years), 331 people aged 65 years or older at baseline	PTH, 25-hydroxy vitamin D	Low 25-OHD was associated with loss of strength (OR 2.57, 95% CI 1.4–4.7). Those with high PTH levels were 1.71-fold (95% CI 1.07–2.73) more likely to experience grip strength loss.	Visser et al. (2003) <sup>35</sup>
Longitudinal (3 and 6 years), 676 women and 644 men aged 65–88 years	Serum albumin	Low serum albumin was associated with grip strength decline over 3 years in men ( $\beta = 0.57$ , SE = 0.18) and women ( $\beta = 0.37$ , SE = 0.16). Weaker associations found over 6 years.	Schalk <i>et al.</i> (2005) <sup>63</sup>
Longitudinal (7 years), 321 men aged 51–84 years	Age, back pain, use of calcium channel blockers, caffeine intake, height, weight loss	Multivariate analysis showed that greater grip strength at baseline, higher lifetime caffeine intake, use of calcium channel blocker (OR 2.37, 95% CI 1.17–4.17), older age, height loss and back pain were associated with grip strength loss.	Forrest <i>et al.</i> (2005) <sup>64</sup>
Longitudinal (25 years), 3522 people aged 71–93 years at follow up	Age, glucose, cognitive function, BMI, hemoglobin	Handgrip strength was inversely associated with age and glucose. Cognitive function, BMI and hemoglobin levels were directly associated with strength.	Charles <i>et al.</i> (2006) <sup>65</sup>
Longitudinal (22 years), 716 people aged 65 years and older	IL-6, IL-1RA, DHEA-S	High concentrations of IL-6 and IL-1RA, and low levels of DHEA-S predicted muscle strength decline.	Stenholm et al. (2010) <sup>66</sup>
Longitudinal (22 years), 963 people aged 30–73 years at baseline	Excess body weight, smoking, CVD, hypertension, diabetes, asthma, weight loss	Over-weight/obese persons and current and former smokers had greater decline in handgrip strength as well as those with hypertension, diabetes and asthma. People who lost more than 10% of weight during follow-up had greater handgrip declines.	Stenholm <i>et al.</i> (2012) <sup>67</sup>
Longitudinal (22 years), 849 men and women aged 50–88 years at baseline	Stress, smoking, dementia, marital status, mean arterial pressure, physical activity at work, chronic disorders	Significant factors for women were stress, smoking and dementia. For men, factors associated with grip strength decline were marital status, mean arterial pressure, physical activity at work, and having a chronic disorder.	Sternang et al. (2015) <sup>68</sup>
Longitudinal (4 years), 538 women aged 75 years or older	Age, BMI, BMD, calf circumference, regular exercise habit	Age and low BMI were risk factors for muscle strength decline. Calf circumference (OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.52–0.83) had protective effects for strength. Greater BMD (OR 0.40, 95% CI 0.17–0.91) and regular exercise (OR 0.30, 95% CI 0.12–0.72) also had protective effects for grip strength declines.	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2015) <sup>57</sup>
Valking speed			D
Cross-sectional, 1002 women aged 65 years and older (of which 129 women had severe walking disability)	Strength, balance	Greater knee extension strength (OR 0.91, 95% CI 0.86–0.97) and balance (OR 0.48, 95% CI 0.37–0.62) had protective effects for severe walking disability.	Rantanen <i>et al.</i> (1999) <sup>51</sup>
Cross-sectional, 3075 people aged 70–79 years	Cystatin C	Increase in cystatin C concentration was associated with 1.32 odds (95% CI 1.20–1.46) of walking difficulty (slow walking speed, not completing 400-m walk).	Odden <i>et al.</i> (2006) <sup>69</sup>
Cross-sectional and longitudinal (2.3 years), 333 people aged 70 years and older	IL-6	High IL-6 levels were associated with slow walking speed (estimate -4.90 cm/s, P = 0.008). Older adults in highest IL-6 quartile had a 1.75 cm/s/year faster decline in walking speed.	Verghese <i>et al.</i> (2011) <sup>70</sup>
Longitudinal (22 years), 840 people aged 32–72 years, with no walking ability at baseline	BMI, handgrip strength, physical function	Walking limitation after 22 years was significantly associated with BMI (OR 1.39, 95% Cl 1.10-1.75) and grip strength (OR 0.56, 95% Cl 0.38–0.81), as well as major difficulties with running and squatting.	Stenholm <i>et al.</i> (2007) <sup>71</sup>
Longitudinal (5 years), 909 people mean age 75.2 ± 2.8 years	Global function, verbal memory, memory, executive function	Poor performance in global function, verbal memory, and executive function was associated with walking speed declines.	Watson <i>et al.</i> (2010) <sup>72</sup>
Longitudinal (3 years), 434 women aged 63–76 years at baseline and after 3-year follow up	Fear of falling, sensory difficulties, CVD, diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis	OR for incident walking difficulty was 3.5 (95% CI 1.6–7.8) in those with fear of falls. Chronic conditions like CVD, diabetes and arthritis were also significant predictors of walking difficulty.	Viljanen <i>et al.</i> (2012) <sup>73</sup>
Longitudinal (mean follow up 6.6 years), 1226 older than 60 years and free of mobility disability at baseline	Chronic kidney disease (using cystatin C-based estimated glomerular filtration rate	Those with chronic kidney disease determined by cystatin C had greater odds of mobility disability (OR 1.55, 95% CI 1.05–2.31).	Liu <i>et al.</i> (2014) <sup>74</sup>
Longitudinal (4 years), 538 women aged 75 years or older	Age, BMI, BMD, calf circumference, TUG, albumin, HDL cholesterol, cystatin C, knee pain	Age and low BMI were predictive of walking speed decline. Longer TUG (OR 1.28, 95% CI 1.12–1.48) high HDL cholesterol (OR 1.01, 95% CI 1.00–1.03), cystatin c levels (OR 1.34, 95% CI 1.03–1.74), and knee pain (OR 1.73, 95% CI 1.08–2.76), were risk factors for walking speed decline. Greater BMD and albumin had protective effects.	Kim <i>et al.</i> (2015) <sup>57</sup>

 Table 2
 Summary of risk factors associated with sarcopenia components

25-OHD, 25-hydroxy vitamin D; BMD, bone mineral density; BMI, body mass index; CAVI, cardio-ankle vascular index; CI, confidence interval; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DHEA-S, dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate; HDL, high-density lipoprotein; IGF, insulin-like growth factor; IL-1RA, interleukin-1 receptor antagonist; IL-6, interleukin-6; OR, odds ratio; PTH, parathyroid hormone; SE, standard error; SMI, skeletal muscle index; TUG, timed up & go.

separate aspects of gait, but not overall gait performance. Some studies have shown that kidney function, specifically the increase in cystatin C, was associated with increased risk of mobility disability.<sup>57,69,74</sup> Interleukin-6 was also associated with walking ability, being one of the hematological factors associated across all the components of sarcopenia.<sup>70</sup>

Reports have found that walking speed declines are associated with strength, balance, fear of falling, sensory difficulties, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, global function, verbal memory and executive function (Table 2).<sup>51,57,71–73</sup>

## Risk factors of sarcopenia

Sarcopenia is a systemic condition, and as such, the risk factors reported vary greatly. Age and BMI are evident risk factors for sarcopenia. Landi et al. found that sarcopenia was more likely seen in men,78 whereas Yu et al. reported that the female sex was a risk factor for sarcopenia (Table 3).83 Perhaps the difference in ethnicity between the populations might explain the conflicting results. Greater calf circumference has been reported to be protective against sarcopenia, whereas slow timed up & go test was associated with sarcopenia development longitudinally.57 One investigation showed that higher education increased the likelihood of sarcopenia.84 Chewing ability has also been reported to be associated with sarcopenia defined by the AWGS definition.85 Murakami et al. state that while relationships between muscle strength, physical function and chewing ability have been reported previously, the association between muscle mass and chewing ability had not, and further suggested that the changes in general muscle mass and muscle mass related to chewing ability might have been the reason for the notable relationship between chewing ability in the study.85 More detailed investigation into the causal relationship between sarcopenia and chewing-related muscle function decline are required.

Researchers have sought to identify blood biomarkers for sarcopenia. Currently in the literature, the associated hematological factors include low 25-hydroxyvitamin D, insulin-like growth factor 1, albumin and testosterone, as well as high gamma-glutamyl transferase and cystatin C (Table 3).<sup>22,35,57,62,79–81,84,86</sup>

Several chronic conditions and lifestyle factors have also been associated with sarcopenia. As summarized in Table 3, older adults with high blood pressure, instrumental activities of daily living impairment, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, chronic kidney disease, hyperlipidemia, osteoporosis and stroke are at risk for sarcopenia.<sup>57,80,82,83,87</sup> Furthermore, BMI, pain, being overweight, lacking exercise (sedentariness), and high fat and protein intake also increase the likelihood of being sarcopenic.<sup>80,88</sup>

## Comparison of sarcopenia prevalence and risk factors associated with sarcopenia based on different suggested definitions

The literature is inconsistent in the application of sarcopenia definitions using previously established muscle mass cut-off points or the EWGSOP definition, which combines muscle mass, strength and physical performance. Some studies have examined the differences in prevalence rates using different sarcopenia definitions; however, there are few studies, if any, that investigate both sarcopenia prevalence and associated risk factors with differing definitions in a sample population.<sup>3,10,11,15,30,32,33</sup>

The prevalence of sarcopenia was determined in a sample of 1464 community-dwelling Japanese elderly men (n = 246) and women (n = 1218, mean age men 74.3 ± 5.17 years; women 79.9 ± 4.43 years) using each definition described in the previous section (Table 4). The data analyzed in the present review was obtained using protocol that has been approved by the Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology Ethics Committee, and all participants gave informed consent. As seen in Table 4, sarcopenia prevalence in this sample varied greatly depending on the definition used. Within the DXA-measured definitions, the prevalence ranged from 2.5 to 28.0% in men and 2.3 to 11.7% in women, which is not unlike previously reported prevalence values.

The BIA-measured definitions, however, resulted in sarcopenia prevalence ranging from 7.1 to 98.0% in men and 19.8 to 88.0% in women. These largely wide ranges within the same population are problematic, as it brings into question the results of the existing studies, and the sarcopenia prevalence we understand as a research community. In the existing literature, some studies refer to these previously established definitions of sarcopenia without providing reasoning beyond its common use. Ideally, each trial should determine population-specific cut-off points; however, this would be very expensive and impractical. Large populationbased studies are required for Japanese people to establish appropriate cut-off values for Japanese older adults. The seemingly arbitrary use of published cut-off values can affect the resulting prevalence rates of sarcopenia and associated factors.

We investigated the risk factors of sarcopenia in the same Japanese community-dwelling population using multiple step-wise logistic regressions. Table 5 shows that the risk factors associated with sarcopenia varied depending on the definition for sarcopenia assessment used.

BMI was predominantly associated with sarcopenia in men and women across most definitions, where greater BMI was inversely associated with the likelihood of

Study design and Participants	Factors	Main results	References		
Cross-sectional study Cross-sectional, 121 men and 180 women aged 65–97 years	Serum free-testosterone, physical activity, CVD, IGF1, fat mass	Muscle mass had significant positive associations with physical activity, IGF1 and free testosterone in men; and total fat mass and energy intake in women.	Baumgartner <i>et al.</i> $(1999)^{62}$		
Cross-sectional, 195 women aged 64–93 years and 142 men aged 64–92 years	BMI, serum estrone, estradiol, 25-hydroxy vitamin D, physical performance	Serum estrone, estradiol, and Physical Performance Test total score were significantly correlated with ASM/Ht <sup>2</sup> . 25-OHD was inversely related to muscle mass.	Iannuzzi-Sucich (2002) <sup>22</sup>		
Longitudinal (3 years), 331 people aged 65 years or older at baseline	PTH, 25-hydroxy vitamin D	Low 25-OHD was significantly associated with ASM loss (OR 2.25, 95% CI 1.11–4.56) Those with high PTH levels were 2.35 times (05% CI 1.05–5.28) more likely to have ASM loss.	Visser <i>et al.</i> (2003) <sup>35</sup>		
Longitudinal (5 years), 1882 men and women aged 70–79 years	Albumin concentration	Lower albumin concentrations are associated with future loss of ASM and is a risk factor for sarcopenia.	Visser et al. (2005) <sup>79</sup>		
262 community-dwelling men and 265 women aged over 70 years	BMI	BMI < 18.5 was a significant risk factor for sarcopenia in men (OR 39.1, 95% CI 11.3–134.6) and women (OR 9.7, 95% CI 2.8–33.8).	Lau <i>et al.</i> (2005) <sup>25</sup>		
13 770 men and women aged over 20 years	Age; overweight; lack of exercise; low carbohydrate, fat, and protein intake; hyperglycemia; low 25- OHD3; high diastolic BP; insulin resistance	Prevalence of sarcopenia rose with declining kidney function. Older age; low income-to- poverty ratio; overweight; lack of exercise; low carbohydrate, fat and protein intake; hyper- calcemia; low 25-OHD3; higher diastolic BP; and insulin resistance were factors associated with sarcopenia for subjects with glomerular filtration rate <60 mL/min/1.73 m <sup>2</sup> or a urinary albumin-to-creatine ratio >30 mg/g.	Foley <i>et al.</i> (2007) <sup>80</sup>		
1380 men and 1789 women aged 50 years or older, community-dwelling people	Vitamin D	The highest quartile (≥24.1) , OR 0.47 (95% CI 0.30–0.73), strong inverse association between 25-OHD level and sarcopenia.	Kim et al. (2011) <sup>81</sup>		
313 women (mean age $79.7 \pm 7.4$ years)	Osteoporosis	Sarcopenia was significantly associated with osteoporosis (OR 1.8, 95% CI 1.07–3.02).	Di Monaco <i>et al.</i> (2011) <sup>82</sup>		
122 people aged 70 years and older living in nursing homes	Male sex, cerebrovascular dis- ease, osteoarthritis, BMI	High risk of sarcopenia was seen in men (OR 13.39, 95% CI 3.51–50.63), those with cerebrovascular disease (OR 5.16, 95% CI 1.03–25.87), osteoarthritis (OR 7.24, 95% CI 2.02–25.95). High BMI had protective effects.	Landi <i>et al.</i> (2012) <sup>78</sup>		
4000 community-dwelling Chinese men and women over 65 years or older	Age, stroke, physical activity, IADL impairments, BMI, female sex, COPD	Stroke OR 2.56 (95% CI 1.32–4.95); IADL impairment OR 2.12 (95% CI 1.49–3.02); COPD OR 1.84 (95% CI 1.02–3.31); physical activity and BMI had protective effects. Protein and vitamin D not associated with sarcopenia incidence.	Yu <i>et al.</i> (2014) <sup>83</sup>		
730 participants 74% aged 65 years and older (age range 27–97 years)	Education, IGF-1, testosterone	Higher education (OR 0.85; 95% CI 0.74–0.98), low IGF-1 (lowest tertile: OR 3.89; 95% CI 1.03–14.1), low bioavailable testosterone (OR 2.67; 95% CI 1.31–5.44) were associated with the likelihood of being sarcopenic.	Volpato <i>et al.</i> (2014) <sup>84</sup>		
761 community-dwelling people aged 65–85 years	Age, BMI, chewing ability	Sarcopenia was significantly associated with age (OR 2.37, 95% CI 1.52–3.70), BMI (OR 0.75, 95% CI 0.69–0.81) and chewing ability (OR 2.18, 95% CI 1.21–3.93).	Murakami <i>et al.</i> (In Press) <sup>85</sup>		
3193 community-dwelling people aged ≥50 years	Gamma-glutamyl transferase	Overall, OR 1.35 (95% CI 1.15–1.58), elevated serum GGT activity was independently associated with sarcopenia.	Hong <i>et al.</i> (2015) <sup>86</sup>		
11 625 community-dwelling people aged 40 years or older,	Chronic kidney disease	CKD 3–5, OR 1.93 (95% CI 1.02–3.68) in men, stage of CKD was associated with an increased prevalence of sarcopenia in men, but not women.	Moon <i>et al.</i> (2015) <sup>87</sup>		
Longitudinal study 2928 people aged 70–79 years at baseline (9 years follow up)	Age, pain, BMI	Increasing age (OR 1.12, 95% CI 0.80–1.18, <i>P</i> < 0.001), history of pain (OR 1.18, 95% CI 1.01–1.39) and higher BMI (OR 1.30, 95% CI 1.25–1.36) were predictive of transition from	Murphy <i>et al</i> . (2014) <sup>88</sup>		
538 community-dwelling women aged >75 years (4 years follow up)	Age, BMI, calf circumference, TUG, hyperlipidemia, cystatin C	normal state into sarcopenic state. Low BMI and slow TUG were significantly associated with sarcopenia development. Cystatin C was significantly associated with severe sarcopenia (OR = 1.83, 95%CI = 1.08–3.12).	Kim et al. (2015) <sup>57</sup>		

Table 3 Summary of risk factors associated with sarcopenia

25-OHD, 25-hydroxy vitamin D; ASM, appendicular skeletal muscle mass; BMI, body mass index; BP, blood pressure; CI, confidence interval; CKD, chronic kidney disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; GGT, gamma-glutamyl transferase; Ht, height; IADL, instrumental activities of daily living; IGF, insulin-like growth factor; OR, odds ratio; PTH, parathyroid hormone; TUG, timed up & go.

Reference study	SMI measurement	Cut-o: SMI	ff values	Muscle	e strength	Walkii	ng speed	Preval	ence
	measurement	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Baumgartner <i>et al.</i> $(1998)^2$	DXA	7.26	5.45	_	_	_	_	28.0	5.7
Newman <i>et al.</i> (2003) <sup>6</sup>	DXA	7.23	5.67	_	_	_	_	25.6	11.7
Sanada <i>et al.</i> (2010) <sup>5</sup>	DXA	6.87	5.46	_	_	_	_	11.0	6.3
EWGSOP (2010) <sup>9</sup>	DXA	7.26	5.45	30.0	20.0	0.8	0.8	13.2	3.2
AWGS (2014) <sup>31</sup>	DXA	7.00	5.40	26.0	18.0	0.8	0.8	2.5	2.3
Janssen <i>et al.</i> (2004) <sup>12</sup>	BIA	8.50	5.75	_	_	_	_	95.1	57.3
Chien <i>et al.</i> (2008) <sup>8</sup>	BIA	8.87	6.42	_	_	_	_	98.0	88.0
EWGSOP (2010) <sup>9</sup>	BIA	8.87	6.42	30.0	20.0	0.8	0.8	24.2	39.0
AWGS (2014) <sup>31</sup>	BIA	7.00	5.70	26.0	18.0	0.8	0.8	7.1	19.8

**Table 4** Sarcopenia prevalence based on different suggested definitions in Japanese community-dwelling older adults

AWGS, Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia; BIA, bioelectrical impedance analysis; DXA, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; EWGSOP, European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People; SMI, skeletal muscle index (appendicular muscle mass/height<sup>2</sup>).

**Table 5** Risk factors (odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals) associated with sarcopenia based on differing definitions

Reference definition for sarcopenia	Risk factors			
1	Male	Female		
DXA				
Baumgartner <i>et al.</i> (1998) <sup>2</sup>	BMI: 0.60 (0.48–0.75)	BMI: 0.45 (0.35–0.57)		
C	TG: 1.01 (1.0–1.01)	Knee OA: 3.89 (1.27–11.91)		
	HbA1c: 3.34 (1.26-8.82)			
Newman <i>et al.</i> (2003) <sup>6</sup>	BMI: 0.65 (0.53–0.80)	BMI: 0.51 (0.43–0.60)		
	HbA1c: 2.04 (0.96-4.31)	TG: 1.01 (1.00–1.01)		
Sanada <i>et al.</i> $(2010)^5$	BMI: 0.52 (0.37–0.72)	BMI: 0.52 (0.43–0.63)		
	TG: 1.01 (1.00–1.01)			
EWGSOP (2010) <sup>9</sup>	BMI: 0.79 (0.66–0.94)	BMI: 0.48 (0.36–0.63)		
	HbA1c: 1.84 (0.96-3.52)	HDL-C: 0.95 (0.92-0.99)		
		Falls: 3.84 (1.00-14.73)		
AWGS (2014) <sup>31</sup>	BMI: 0.40 (0.21–0.78)	BMI: 0.56 (0.43-0.73)		
	HDL-C: 0.90 (0.82–0.99)	Falls: 5.05 (1.26-20.28)		
	Falls: 3.90 (2.82-5.40)			
BIA				
Janssen <i>et al.</i> $(2004)^{12}$	BMI: 0.58 (0.37–0.90)	BMI: 0.66 (0.61–0.71)		
		Creatinine: 4.36 (1.46-13.01)		
Chien <i>et al.</i> $(2008)^8$	_	BMI: 0.60 (0.53–0.68)		
		Diabetes: 3.68 (1.53-8.84)		
EWGSOP (2010) <sup>9</sup>	BMI: 0.87 (0.76–1.00)	BMI: 0.91 (0.87–0.96)		
	Diabetes: 2.99 (0.99–9.03)	Falls: 2.78 (1.71-4.50)		
		Albumin: 0.31 (0.16–0.60)		
AWGS (2014) <sup>31</sup>	Falls: 6.0 (1.81–19.99)	BMI: 0.79 (0.74–0.85)		
	Hypertension: 3.37 (1.02–11.14)	Falls: 2.21 (1.33–3.68)		
		Albumin: 0.28 (0.13-0.61)		
		Hyperlipidemia: 1.52 (1.00–2.3		

AWGS, Asian Working Group on Sarcopenia; BIA, bioelectrical impedance analysis; BMI, body mass index; DXA, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, EWGSOP, European working group on sarcopenia in older people, TG, triglyceride; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; OA, osteoarthritis.

sarcopenia (Table 5). In men, high glycated hemoglobin level was a significant risk factor for sarcopenia using the Baumgartner (OR 3.34, 95% CI 1.26–8.82) definition. High high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.82–0.99) was protective from sarcopenia in Japanese men according to the AWGS definition using DXA. The chronic conditions associated with sarcopenia in men based on AWGS were falls (DXA: OR 3.90, 95% CI 2.82–5.40; BIA: OR 6.0, 95% CI 1.81–19.99) and hypertension (OR 3.37, 95% CI 1.02– 11.14).

Based on the EWGSOP and AWGS definitions of sarcopenia using both DXA and BIA, falls were a significant risk factor for sarcopenia in women (Table 5). Similarly, high albumin levels had protective effects in the EWGSOP (OR 0.31, 95% CI 0.16–0.60) and AWGS (OR 0.28, 95% CI 0.13–0.61) definitions, although only using BIA. Other risk factors for sarcopenia in women included knee OA, TG levels, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, creatinine, diabetes and hyperlipidemia.

The results presented in Table 5 show disparities in risk factors of sarcopenia vary greatly depending on the definition used to define sarcopenia in the same sample population. BMI was the only factor associated with sarcopenia across all definitions within the Japanese population studied, and a predominant risk factor for sarcopenia in previous studies (Table 5). Herein lies the problem with the many available definitions currently used in the literature. Without a clear consensus, the risk factors of sarcopenia differ, not only with varying definitions, but also with methods of measurement; that is, DXA or BIA. The discrepancies in prevalences and associated factors of sarcopenia in the existing literature can negatively affect the understanding of sarcopenia within the research community.

## Conclusion

In summary, the inconsistencies in sarcopenia definitions, cut-off values and risk factors are apparent within the literature. Ideally, cut-off values should detect people with risk factors, and using cut-off values obtained from a vastly different population should be avoided. The application of the different sarcopenia definitions further shows that sarcopenia prevalence and risk factors vary greatly depending on the definition. Further studies and discussions are necessary in order to confirm the discrepancies in prevalence and particular risk factors, and develop a consensus definition or cut-off points for sarcopenia in Japanese older adults.

## **Disclosure statement**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- 1 Rosenberg I. Summary comments. *AmJ Clin Nutr* 1989; **50**: 1231–1233.
- 2 Baumgartner RN, Koehler KM, Gallagher D *et al.* Epidemiology of sarcopenia among the elderly in New Mexico. *Am J Epidemiol* 1998; **147**: 755–763.
- 3 Melton LJ 3rd, Khosla S, Crowson CS, O'Connor MK, O'Fallon WM, Riggs BL. Epidemiology of sarcopenia. J Am Geriatr Soc 2000; 48: 625–630.
- 4 Tanko LB, Movsesyan L, Mouritzen U, Christiansen C, Svendsen OL. Appendicular lean tissue mass and the prevalence of sarcopenia among healthy women. *Metabolism* 2002; **51**: 69–74.
- 5 Sanada K, Miyachi M, Yamamoto K *et al.* Prediction models of sarcopenia in Japanese adult men and women. *Jpn J Phys Fitness Sports Med* 2010; **59**: 291–302.
- 6 Newman AB, Kupelian V, Visser M *et al.* Sarcopenia: alternative definitions and associations with lower extremity function. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**: 1602–1609.
- 7 Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Ross R. Low relative skeletal muscle mass (sarcopenia) in older persons is associated with functional impairment and physical disability. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2002; **50**: 889–896.
- 8 Chien MY, Huang TY, Wu YT. Prevalence of sarcopenia estimated using a bioelectrical impedance analysis prediction equation in community-dwelling elderly people in Taiwan. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2008; **56**: 1710–1715.
- 9 Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM *et al.* Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis: report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. *Age Ageing* 2010; **39**: 412–423.
- 10 Kim TN, Yang SJ, Yoo HJ *et al.* Prevalence of sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in Korean adults: the Korean sarcopenic obesity study. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2009; **33**: 885– 892.
- 11 Figueiredo CP, Domiciano DS, Lopes JB *et al.* Prevalence of sarcopenia and associated risk factors by two diagnostic criteria in community-dwelling older men: the Sao Paulo Ageing & Health Study (SPAH). *Osteoporos Int* 2014; **25**: 589–596.
- 12 Janssen I, Baumgartner RN, Ross R, Rosenberg IH, Roubenoff R. Skeletal muscle cutpoints associated with elevated physical disability risk in older men and women. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004; **159**: 413–421.
- 13 Lee WJ, Liu LK, Peng LN, Lin MH, Chen LK. Comparisons of sarcopenia defined by IWGS and EWGSOP criteria among older people: results from the I-Lan longitudinal aging study. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2013; 14: 528.e1–528.e7.
- 14 Gillette-Guyonnet S, Nourhashemi F, Andrieu S et al. Body composition in French women 75+ years of age: the EPIDOS study. *Mech Ageing Dev* 2003; **124**: 311–316.
- 15 Kim YS, Lee Y, Chung YS *et al.* Prevalence of sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in the Korean population based on the Fourth Korean National Health and Nutritional Examination Surveys. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2012; **67**: 1107–1113.
- 16 Myhre LG, Kessler WV. Body density and potassium 40 measurements of body composition as related to age. *J Appl Physiol* 1966; 21: 1251–1255.
- 17 Bemben MG, Massey BH, Bemben DA, Boileau RA, Misner JE. Age-related variability in body composition methods for assessment of percent fat and fat-free mass in men aged 20–74 years. *Age Ageing* 1998; 27: 147–153.
  18 Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Wang ZM, Ross R. Skeletal
- 18 Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Wang ZM, Ross R. Skeletal muscle mass and distribution in 468 men and women aged 18–88 yr. J Appl Physiol (1985) 2000; 89: 81–88.

- 19 Tanimoto Y, Watanabe M, Sun W *et al.* Association between sarcopenia and higher-level functional capacity in daily living in community-dwelling elderly subjects in Japan. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2012; **55**: e9–e13.
- 20 Lauretani F, Russo CR, Bandinelli S *et al.* Age-associated changes in skeletal muscles and their effect on mobility: an operational diagnosis of sarcopenia. *J Appl Physiol* 2003; **95**: 1851–1860.
- 21 Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J et al. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2001; 56: M146–M156.
- 22 Iannuzzi-Sucich M, Prestwood KM, Kenny AM. Prevalence of sarcopenia and predictors of skeletal muscle mass in healthy, older men and women. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2002; **57**: M772–M777.
- 23 Rolland Y, Lauwers-Cances V, Cournot M *et al.* Sarcopenia, calf circumference, and physical function of elderly women: a cross-sectional study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**: 1120–1124.
- 24 Kenny AM, Dawson L, Kleppinger A, Iannuzzi-Sucich M, Judge JO. Prevalence of sarcopenia and predictors of skeletal muscle mass in nonobese women who are long-term users of estrogen-replacement therapy. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2003; 58: M436–M440.
- 25 Lau EM, Lynn HS, Woo JW, Kwok TC, Melton LJ III. Prevalence of and risk factors for sarcopenia in elderly Chinese men and women. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2005; **60**: 213–216.
- 26 Woo J, Leung J, Sham A, Kwok T. Defining sarcopenia in terms of risk of physical limitations: a 5-year follow-up study of 3,153 chinese men and women. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009; 57: 2224–2231.
- 27 Rolland Y, Lauwers-Cances V, Cristini C et al. Difficulties with physical function associated with obesity, sarcopenia, and sarcopenic-obesity in communitydwelling elderly women: the EPIDOS (EPIDemiologie de l'OSteoporose) Study. Am J Clin Nutr 2009; 89: 1895– 1900.
- 28 Bouchard DR, Dionne IJ, Brochu M. Sarcopenic/obesity and physical capacity in older men and women: data from the Nutrition as a Determinant of Successful Aging (NuAge)-the Quebec longitudinal Study. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2009; **17**: 2082–2088.
- 29 Kim TN, Park MS, Yang SJ *et al.* Prevalence and determinant factors of sarcopenia in patients with type 2 diabetes: the Korean Sarcopenic Obesity Study (KSOS). *Diabetes Care* 2010; **33**: 1497–1499.
- 30 Domiciano DS, Figueiredo CP, Lopes JB *et al.* Discriminating sarcopenia in community-dwelling older women with high frequency of overweight/obesity: the Sao Paulo Ageing & Health Study (SPAH). *Osteoporos Int* 2013; 24: 595–603.
- 31 Chen LK, Liu LK, Woo J *et al.* Sarcopenia in Asia: consensus report of the asian working group for sarcopenia. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2014; **15**: 95–101.
- 32 Wen X, Wang M, Jiang CM, Zhang YM. Are current definitions of sarcopenia applicable for older Chinese adults? *J Nutr Health Aging* 2011; **15**: 847–851.
- 33 Delmonico MJ, Harris TB, Lee JS *et al.* Alternative definitions of sarcopenia, lower extremity performance, and functional impairment with aging in older men and women. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; **55**: 769–774.
- 34 Zoico E, Di Francesco V, Guralnik JM *et al.* Physical disability and muscular strength in relation to obesity and different body composition indexes in a sample of healthy elderly women. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2004; **28**: 234–241.

- 35 Visser M, Deeg DJ, Lips P. Low vitamin D and high parathyroid hormone levels as determinants of loss of muscle strength and muscle mass (sarcopenia): the Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2003; **88**: 5766–5772.
- 36 Ryu M, Jo J, Lee Y, Chung YS, Kim KM, Baek WC. Association of physical activity with sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in community-dwelling older adults: the Fourth Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Age Ageing* 2013; **42**: 734–740.
- 37 Kim HK, Suzuki T, Saito K *et al.* Effects of exercise and amino acid supplementation on body composition and physical function in community-dwelling elderly Japanese sarcopenic women: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012; **60**: 16–23.
- 38 Yamada M, Nishiguchi S, Fukutani N et al. Prevalence of sarcopenia in community-dwelling Japanese older adults. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2013; 14: 911–915.
- 39 Sallinen J, Stenholm S, Rantanen T, Heliovaara M, Sainio P, Koskinen S. Hand-grip strength cut points to screen older persons at risk for mobility limitation. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010; 58: 1721–1726.
- 40 Cress ME, Meyer M. Maximal voluntary and functional performance levels needed for independence in adults aged 65 to 97 years. *Phys Ther* 2003; **83**: 37–48.
- 41 Manini TM, Visser M, Won-Park S *et al.* Knee extension strength cutpoints for maintaining mobility. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; **55**: 451–457.
- 42 Langlois JA, Keyl PM, Guralnik JM, Foley DJ, Marottoli RA, Wallace RB. Characteristics of older pedestrians who have difficulty crossing the street. *Am J Public Health* 1997; 87: 393–397.
- 43 Brach JS, Berthold R, Craik R, VanSwearingen JM, Newman AB. Gait variability in community-dwelling older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc 2001; 49: 1646–1650.
- 44 American Geriatrics Society, British Geriatrics Society, Prevention AAoOSPoF. Guideline for the prevention of falls in older persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2001; **49**: 664–672.
- 45 Cawthon PM, Marshall LM, Michael Y *et al.* Frailty in older men: prevalence, progression, and relationship with mortality. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; **55**: 1216–1223.
- 46 Abellan van Kan G, Rolland Y, Andrieu S et al. Gait speed at usual pace as a predictor of adverse outcomes in community-dwelling older people an International Academy on Nutrition and Aging (IANA) Task Force. J Nutr Health Aging 2009; 13: 881–889.
- 47 Syddall HE, Westbury LD, Cooper C, Sayer AA. Selfreported walking speed: a useful marker of physical performance among community-dwelling older people? *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2015; **16**: 323–328.
- 48 Goodpaster BH, Carlson CL, Visser M *et al.* Attenuation of skeletal muscle and strength in the elderly: the Health ABC Study. *J Appl Physiol* 2001; **90**: 2157–2165.
- 49 Kim M, Shinkai S. Sarcopenia: its definition, prevalence, functional outcomes and prevention. J Phys Fitness Sports Med 2013; 2: 439–449.
- 50 Bohannon RW. Hand-grip dynamometry predicts future outcomes in aging adults. J Geriatr Phys Ther 2008; 31: 3–10.
- 51 Rantanen T, Guralnik JM, Ferrucci L, Leveille S, Fried LP. Coimpairments: strength and balance as predictors of severe walking disability. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 1999; 54: M172–M176.
- 52 Guyatt GH, Sullivan MJ, Thompson PJ *et al.* The 6-minute walk: a new measure of exercise capacity in patients with chronic heart failure. *Can Med Assoc J* 1985; **132**: 919–923.

- 53 Mathias S, Nayak US, Isaacs B. Balance in elderly patients: the "get-up and go" test. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1986; **67**: 387–389.
- 54 Guralnik JM, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L *et al.* A short physical performance battery assessing lower extremity function: association with self-reported disability and prediction of mortality and nursing home admission. *J Gerontol* 1994; **49**: M85–M94.
- 55 Cesari M, Kritchevsky SB, Penninx BW *et al.* Prognostic value of usual gait speed in well-functioning older peopleresults from the Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005; **53**: 1675–1680.
- 56 Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Baumgartner RN, Ross R. Estimation of skeletal muscle mass by bioelectrical impedance analysis. *J Appl Physiol* 2000; **89**: 465–471.
- 57 Kim H, Suzuki T, Kim M *et al.* Incidence and predictors of sarcopenia onset in community-dwelling elderly Japanese women: 4-year follow-up study. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2015; 16: 85.e1–85.e8.
- 58 Manini TM, Clark BC. Dynapenia and aging: an update. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2012; 67: 28–40.
- 59 Pupim LB, Heimburger O, Qureshi AR, Ikizler TA, Stenvinkel P. Accelerated lean body mass loss in incident chronic dialysis patients with diabetes mellitus. *Kidney Int* 2005; 68: 2368–2374.
- 60 Sampaio RA, Sewo Sampaio PY, Yamada M *et al.* Arterial stiffness is associated with low skeletal muscle mass in Japanese community-dwelling older adults. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2014; **14** (Suppl 1): 109–114.
- 61 Fried LF, Boudreau R, Lee JS *et al.* Kidney function as a predictor of loss of lean mass in older adults: health, aging and body composition study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; **55**: 1578–1584.
- 62 Baumgartner RN, Waters DL, Gallagher D, Morley JE, Garry PJ. Predictors of skeletal muscle mass in elderly men and women. *Mech Ageing Dev* 1999; **107**: 123–136.
- 63 Schalk BW, Deeg DJ, Penninx BW, Bouter LM, Visser M. Serum albumin and muscle strength: a longitudinal study in older men and women. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005; 53: 1331– 1338.
- 64 Forrest KY, Zmuda JM, Cauley JA. Patterns and determinants of muscle strength change with aging in older men. *Aging Male* 2005; **8**: 151–156.
- 65 Charles LE, Burchfiel CM, Fekedulegn D *et al.* Occupational and other risk factors for hand-grip strength: the Honolulu-Asia Aging Study. *Occup Environ Med* 2006; **63**: 820–827.
- 66 Stenholm S, Maggio M, Lauretani F *et al.* Anabolic and catabolic biomarkers as predictors of muscle strength decline: the InCHIANTI study. *Rejuvenation Res* 2010; **13**: 3–11.
- 67 Stenholm S, Tiainen K, Rantanen T *et al.* Long-term determinants of muscle strength decline: prospective evidence from the 22-year mini-Finland follow-up survey. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012; **60**: 77–85.
- 68 Sternang O, Reynolds CA, Finkel D, Ernsth-Bravell M, Pedersen NL, Dahl Aslan AK. Factors associated with grip strength decline in older adults. *Age Ageing* 2015; **44**: 269– 274.
- 69 Odden MC, Chertow GM, Fried LF *et al.* Cystatin C and measures of physical function in elderly adults: the Health, Aging, and Body Composition (HABC) Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006; **164**: 1180–1189.
- 70 Verghese J, Holtzer R, Oh-Park M, Derby CA, Lipton RB, Wang C. Inflammatory markers and gait speed decline in older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2011; 66: 1083– 1089.

- 71 Stenholm S, Sainio P, Rantanen T *et al.* High body mass index and physical impairments as predictors of walking limitation 22 years later in adult Finns. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2007; **62**: 859–865.
- 72 Watson NL, Rosano C, Boudreau RM *et al.* Executive function, memory, and gait speed decline in wellfunctioning older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2010; 65: 1093–1100.
- 73 Viljanen A, Kulmala J, Rantakokko M, Koskenvuo M, Kaprio J, Rantanen T. Fear of falling and coexisting sensory difficulties as predictors of mobility decline in older women. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2012; 67: 1230– 1237.
- 74 Liu CK, Lyass A, Massaro JM, D'Agostino RB Sr, Fox CS, Murabito JM. Chronic kidney disease defined by cystatin C predicts mobility disability and changes in gait speed: the Framingham Offspring Study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2014; 69: 301–307.
- 75 Payette H, Roubenoff R, Jacques PF *et al.* Insulin-like growth factor-1 and interleukin 6 predict sarcopenia in very old community-living men and women: the Framing-ham Heart Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003; **51**: 1237–1243.
- 76 Steffl M, Bohannon RW, Petr M, Kohlikova E, Holmerova I. Relation between cigarette smoking and sarcopenia: meta-analysis. *Physiol Res* 2015; 64: 419–426.
- 77 Onuoha Ś, Verghese J. Association between red blood cell indices and quantitative gait variables in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2015; **63**: 1481–1483.
- 78 Landi F, Liperoti R, Fusco D *et al.* Prevalence and risk factors of sarcopenia among nursing home older residents. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2012; 67: 48–55.
- 79 Visser M, Kritchevsky SB, Newman AB *et al.* Lower serum albumin concentration and change in muscle mass: the Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2005; 82: 531–537.
- 80 Foley RN, Wang C, Ishani A, Collins AJ, Murray AM. Kidney function and sarcopenia in the United States general population: NHANES III. *Am J Nephrol* 2007; 27: 279–286.
- 81 Kim MK, Baek KH, Song KH *et al.* Vitamin D deficiency is associated with sarcopenia in older Koreans, regardless of obesity: the Fourth Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (KNHANES IV) 2009. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2011; **96**: 3250–3256.
- 82 Di Monaco M, Vallero F, Di Monaco R, Tappero R. Prevalence of sarcopenia and its association with osteoporosis in 313 older women following a hip fracture. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2011; **52**: 71–74.
- 83 Yu R, Wong M, Leung J, Lee J, Auyeung TW, Woo J. Incidence, reversibility, risk factors and the protective effect of high body mass index against sarcopenia in community-dwelling older Chinese adults. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2014; **14** (Suppl 1): 15–28.
- 84 Volpato S, Bianchi L, Cherubini A *et al.* Prevalence and clinical correlates of sarcopenia in community-dwelling older people: application of the EWGSOP definition and diagnostic algorithm. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2014; **69**: 438–446.
- 85 Murakami M, Hirano H, Watanabe Y, Sakai K, Kim H, Katakura A. Relationship between chewing ability and sarcopenia in Japanese community-dwelling older adults. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2015; **15**: 1007–1012.
- 86 Hong N, Lee EY, Kim CO. Gamma-glutamyl transferase is associated with sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in community-dwelling older adults: results from the Fifth Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2010–2011. *Endocr J* 2015; 62: 585–592.

- 87 Moon SJ, Kim TH, Yoon SY, Chung JH, Hwang HJ. Relationship between stage of chronic kidney disease and sarcopenia in korean aged 40 years and older using the korea national health and nutrition examination surveys (KNHANES IV-2, 3, and V-1, 2), 2008–2011. *PLoS ONE* 2015; **10**: e0130740.
- 88 Murphy RA, Ip EH, Zhang Q et al. Transition to sarcopenia and determinants of transitions in older adults: a population-based study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2014; 69: 751–758.