MASSEY UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HEALTH TE KURA HAUORA TANGATA School of Sport, Exercise and Nutrition, College of Health

Validity of quantitative ultrasound (QUS) and bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) against dual X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) for measuring bone quality and body composition in children

Maryam Delshad

Kathryn L Beck, Cathryn A Conlon, Owen Mugridge, Marlena C Kruger, Pamela R von Hurst.



Background



COLLEGE OF HEALTH TE KURA HAUORA TANGATA

- Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) is a radiological device, which is designed primarily for measuring bone mineral density (BMD) [1].
- DXA can also provide information on bone mineral content (BMC) [2], and other compartments of body composition including fat mass (FM), lean mass (LM), and percentage of fat mass (%FM) [3].
- Quantitative ultrasound (QUS) provides information about bone mineral status, which may be important in determining fracture risk [4].
- BIA is able to estimate the volume of total body water (TBW), LM, and FM [5].

Aim



 To examine the validity of quantitative ultrasound (QUS) and bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) measurements against dual X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) for bone quality and body composition in children (8-13 years) living in Auckland, New Zealand.

Methods (Sample size)



- Cross-sectional study
- A sample of 128 children was calculated based on G*Power program [version 3.1 software [6]: medium effect size: 0.6; power: 95%; level of significance: 5%].
- Recruited a total of 127 children (58), aged 8–13 years



COLLEGE OF HEALTH TE KURA HAUORA TANGATA

VERSITY

MASSEY

Methods (Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry)

- The DXA measurements were performed on a Hologic QDR Discovery A (Hologic Inc, Bedford, MA, USA) with APEX V. 3.2 software.
- Total body (TB) scans were performed and lumbar spine (LS) values were derived from TB scans.
- Bone mineral content (BMC) (g) and BMD (g/cm²) of the total body (TB) and lumbar spine (LS).
- Lean mass (LM) (kg), fat mass (FM) (kg), and body fat percentage (%FM) were measured.



Methods (Quantitative Ultrasound)



- The calcaneal BMD was measured by Quantitative Ultrasound (QUS) (Sahara Clinical Bone Sonometre Hologic Inc, USA).
- >Speed of sound (SOS) (m/s), broadband ultrasound attenuation (BUA) (dB/ MHz), and the quantitative ultrasound index or "stiffness (SI)" were assessed.



Methods (Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis)

MASSEY UNIVERSITY College of Health te kura hauora tangata

>LM (kg), FM (kg), and %BF were measured by bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) (InBody 230, Biospace Co. Ltd., Seoul, Korea).



Statistical analysis

> Relative validity was assessed using Pearson correlation coefficients, cross-classification, and weighted κ -statistic.





Baseline characteristics of participants (mean (SD))¹

Variable	Total (127)
Age (years)	10.46 (1.19)
Height (cm)	147.57 (13.04)
Weight (kg)	42.07 (10.77)
BMI $(kg/m^2)^2$	21.15 (26.77)

 ^{1}SD standard deviation, ^{2}BMI body mass index



MASSEY UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HEALTH TE KURA HAUORA TANGATA

Bone quality measurements from DXA and correlations with QUS variables

Variable	DXA mean (SD)	QUS SI correlations	QUS BMD (g/m ²) correlations
LS BMC (g)	28.24 (7.35)	0.40*	0.11
LS BMD (g/cm²)	0.74 (0.10)	0.45*	0.24*
TB BMC (g)	1188.91 (257.35)	0.40*	0.09
TB BMD (g/cm²)	0.77 (0.08)	0.43*	0.18*

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed), ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)



Body composition measurements and correlations between BIA and DXA

Variable	BIA mean (SD)	DXA mean (SD)	Correlations	<i>P</i> -value
Total LM (kg)	25.83 (7.06)	29.71 (6.66)	0.90	<0.01
Total FM (kg)	9.63 (5.99)	11.34 (5.49)	0.97	<0.01
%FM (kg)	21.77 (8.38)	26.01 (6.42)	0.88	<0.01

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed), ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed)



Cross-classification between QUS and DXA variables

Variable	%CC	%GM	Weighted κ -statistic
QUS SI vs. DXA TB BMD ⁴	52	8	0.40
QUS SI vs. DXA LS BMD	52	5	0.42
QUS BMD vs. DXA TB BMD	49	11	0.29
QUS BMD vs. DXA LS BMD	50	8	0.37



Cross-classification between DXA and BIA variables

Variable	%CC	%GM	Weighted κ -statistic
BIA LM vs. DXA LM	73	0	0.70
BIA FM vs. DXA FM	84	0	0.82
BIA %FM vs. DXA %FM	70	0	0.65





- Fair to moderate agreement was found between QUS and DXA parameters, suggesting the QUS has reasonable validity for measuring bone mineral density in children.
- The BIA demonstrated good validity and is suitable for measuring body composition in healthy children, providing similar estimates to DXA of LM, FM, and %FM.
- QUS and BIA provide efficient, safe and economically feasible alternative methods for assessing bone status and body composition in children, particularly in large cohort field studies.





1. Binkley TL, Berry R, Specker BL (2008) Methods for measurement of pediatric bone. Rev Endocr Metab Disord 9(2):95-106.

2. Specker BL, Schoenau E (2005) Quantitative bone analysis in children: current methods and recommendations. J Pediatr 146(6):726-731.

3. Ellis KJ, Shypailo RJ, Pratt JA, Pond WG (1994) Accuracy of dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry for body-composition measurements in children. Am J Clin Nutr 60(5):660-665.

4. Genant HK, Engelke K, Fuerst T, Gluer CC, Grampp S, Harris S T, Jergas M, Lang T, Lu Y, Majumdar S, Mathur A, Takada, M (1996) Noninvasive assessment of bone mineral and structure: state of the art. J Bone Miner Res 11(6):707-730.

5. Houtkooper LB, Lohman TG, Going SB, Hall MC (1989) Validity of bioelectric impedance for body composition assessment in children. J Appl Physiol 66(2): 814-821.

6. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang AG (2009) Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav Res Methods 41(4):1149-1160.