Population-based cohort imaging: skeletal muscle mass by magnetic resonance imaging in correlation to bioelectrical-impedance analysis
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Abstract

Background  Skeletal muscle mass is subjected to constant changes and is considered a good predictor for outcome in various diseases. Bioelectrical-impedance analysis (BIA) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are approved methodologies for its assessment. However, muscle mass estimations by BIA may be influenced by excess intramuscular lipids and adipose tissue in obesity. The objective of this study was to evaluate the feasibility of quantitative assessment of skeletal muscle mass by MRI as compared with BIA.

Methods  Subjects from a population-based cohort underwent BIA (50 kHz, 0.8 mA) and whole-body MRI including chemical-shift encoded MRI (six echo times). Abdominal muscle mass by MRI was quantified as total and fat-free cross-sectional area by a standardized manual segmentation-algorithm and normalized to subjects' body height2 (abdominal muscle mass indices: AMMIMRI).

Results  Among 335 included subjects (56.3 ± 9.1 years, 56.1% male), 95 (28.4%) were obese (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m2). MRI-based and BIA-based measures of muscle mass were strongly correlated, particularly in non-obese subjects [r < 0.74 in non-obese (P < 0.001) vs. r < 0.56 in obese (P < 0.001)]. Median AMMI_total(MRI) was significantly higher in obese as compared with non-obese subjects (3246.7 ± 606.1 mm2/m2 vs. 2839.0 ± 535.8 mm2/m2, P < 0.001, respectively), whereas the ratio AMMI Fat-free/AMMI Total (by MRI) was significantly higher in non-obese individuals (59.3 ± 10.1% vs. 53.5 ± 10.6%, P < 0.001, respectively). No significant difference was found regarding AMMI Fat-free(MRI) (P = 0.424). In analyses adjusted for age and sex, impaired glucose tolerance and measures of obesity were significantly and positively associated with AMMI_total(MRI) and significantly and inversely with the ratio AMMI Fat-free(MRI)/AMMI Total(MRI) (P < 0.001).

Conclusions  MRI-based assessment of muscle mass is feasible in population-based imaging and strongly correlated with BIA. However, the observed weaker correlation in obese subjects may explain the known limitation of BIA in obesity and promote MRI-based assessments. Thus, skeletal muscle mass parameters by MRI may serve as practical imaging biomarkers independent of subjects' body weight.
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Introduction

Skeletal muscle, as one of the largest body compartments in adults, has a fundamental influence on health. It determines the physical condition, provides mobility and plays a key role in hormone and glucose metabolism and homeostasis. Therefore, skeletal muscle is a cardinal phenotypic marker and may serve as a good predictor for outcome in numerous health and disease states as well as an ideal target for health preservation and/or improvement.¹,²

Skeletal muscle is subject to significant changes in mass, composition and function with ageing and in various diseases.³ These changes of morphology and physiology are based on inflammation, hormonal dysregulation, denervation of motor units, and intramuscular lipid deposition.⁴ Major consequences are not only mobility limitations and physical disability with an increased risk of falls, injuries, and hospitalization but also cardiometabolic disorders with consecutively increased adverse health-events and all-cause mortality.¹,²,⁵ Due to ongoing demographic transition with progressive ageing and weight gain of the population, disease-related and age-related deterioration of skeletal muscle is an important public health issue.⁴ Thus, simple, practicable and valid research, screening, and diagnosing tools as well as robust biomarkers for the assessment of relevant muscle properties are of high clinical importance.

Currently, bioelectrical-impedance analysis (BIA) is a commonly used methodology for body composition estimations and the rough assessment of skeletal muscle mass. Its strength is based on the easy and safe way to use and also on its cost-efficiency compared with other methods. However, BIA features a large individual prediction error for the estimation of skeletal muscle mass, because its reliability is influenced by multiple factors [e.g. device-related factors, such as intra-instrumental/inter-instrumental variability], operator-related factors (such as intra-operator/inter-operator variability), subject-related factors (such as age, ethnicity, body weight and temperature, fasting and hydration state, and recent activity), and environment-related factors (such as room temperature)]. Also, BIA is not able to accurately determine intramuscular fatty and fibrous components.⁶ In contrast, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) with its lack of ionizing radiation, excellent soft tissue contrast, and high spatial resolution provides the possibility of simultaneous assessment of mass and other morphological and textural features and is therefore particularly suited with regard to large cohort settings. Furthermore, it is also sensitive to very small changes in muscle mass and allows concomitant evaluation of surrounding structures relevant for muscle activity and performance, such as bones, joints, or tendons.⁶,⁷

Therefore, our hypothesis is that MRI is a feasible alternative to other accepted modalities of skeletal muscle assessment and that muscle mass parameters as assessed by MRI may serve as feasible imaging biomarkers in clinical and research settings independent of subjects’ body weight. Aim of the present study was to evaluate the feasibility of quantitative assessment of total and fat-free muscle mass by MRI using a standardized manual segmentation approach in non-obese and obese subjects from the general population. This segmentation approach allows for the simultaneous assessment of additional muscle parameters (such as total, intramyocellular, and extramyocellular fat content), complementing quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Materials and methods

Study design and population

Subjects were derived from the KORA-FF4 study (2013–2014, n = 2279), the second follow-up of a population-based survey within the Cooperative Health Research in the Region of Augsburg (KORA) survey. The design of the KORA studies has been described in detail previously.⁸ In brief, a comprehensive health assessment was prospectively performed for all subjects. Additionally, 400 subjects underwent whole-body MRI according to previously described inclusion and exclusion criteria.⁹ Median time to MRI examination was 33 days (IQR: 24–45 days) after the health assessment. The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Bavarian Chamber of Physicians, Munich, Germany, and the local institutional review board of the Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich, Germany. The study complies with the Declaration of Helsinki, including written informed consent of all participants.

Anthropometry

The body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight in kg divided by body height squared in square meters, with body weight and height both measured at the study centre. Waist
circumference was measured at the smallest abdominal circumference or, in obese subjects, in the midpoint of the lowest rib and the upper margin of the iliac crest. Hip circumference was determined at the most protruding part of the hips to the nearest 1 mm. Obesity was defined according to the WHO-definition with a BMI of 30 kg/m² as cut-off value.²

**Bioelectrical-impedance analysis**

Whole-body BIA-scans were acquired using a body impedance analyser (BIA 2000-S, Data-Input, Pöcking, Germany) with an operating frequency of 50 kHz at 0.8 mA to determine total body fat mass, lean body mass, and appendicular muscle mass in kilograms as well as the correspondent indices in kg normalized to subjects’ body height squared. Therefore, ohmic resistance was measured between the dominant hand wrist and dorsum and the dominant foot angle and dorsum in supine position.

Muscle mass in kg was then calculated by the following equation according to Janssen et al.¹⁰ and subsequently normalized to subjects’ body height squared (skeletal muscle index: SMI_BIA):

\[
\text{BMI} = \frac{\text{body height}^2}{\text{resistance} \times 0.401}
\]

\[
+ (\text{gender} \times 3.825) + (\text{age} \times -0.071) + 5.102
\]

with body height in centimeter, resistance in Ω, for gender: male = 1 and female = 0 and age in years.³,¹⁰

**Imaging protocol and data acquisition**

Magnetic resonance imaging examinations were performed in supine position on a 3-Tesla Magnetom Skyra (Siemens Healthineers, Erlangen, Germany) using an 18-channel body surface coil in combination with a table-mounted spine matrix coil. The complete imaging protocol and technical specifications have been described in detail elsewhere.⁸

For muscle segmentation, a T2*-corrected, multi-echo 3D-gradient-echo Dixon-based sequence (multi-echo Dixon) of the upper abdomen providing a coverage of approximately 40 to 50 cm with the following parameters was used (time to repetition (TR): 8.90 ms; time to echo (TEs): 1.23, 2.46, 3.69, 4.92, 6.15, and 7.38 ms; flip angle 4°, readout echo bandwidth 1080 Hz/pixel, matrix 256 × 256, slice thickness 4 mm). Data were acquired during a single breath-hold of 15 s. The post-processing algorithm using the Software MR LiverLab (Version VD13, Siemens Healthineers, Cary, USA) automatically calculated proton-density fat-fraction maps as DICOM-files, which were used to simultaneously assess muscle mass and fat content.

**Image analysis and muscle segmentation**

The DICOM-files were implemented into the Software MITK (Version 2015.5.2, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany). Two independent observers blinded to any covariates performed muscle segmentation. Details of the applied segmentation approach have been described previously.¹¹ In brief, each muscle compartment (both the right and left psoas major, quadratus lumborum, rectus abdominis, and autochthonous back muscles) was manually segmented according to standardized anatomical landmarks on one axial slice at the level of the lower endplate of the L3 vertebral body, because recent studies demonstrated that level L3 is a good surrogate for the entire lumbar spine and that skeletal muscle cross-sectional area at this level is a reliable method for the determination of sarcopenia.¹²,¹³ If L3 vertebral body was not imaged, the most caudal possible axial slice was selected. Subjects with significant image artefacts on all levels were excluded from the analysis. The complete manual segmentation and post-processing procedure took an average 10 min.

Interobserver and intraobserver reproducibility of the segmentation algorithm was assessed in a subset of 50 randomly selected subjects, being excellent for all included muscle compartments with only minor absolute and relative differences [intraclass correlation (ICC): 0.93–0.97, 31.0 ± 44.7 mm², 2.7 ± 3.9%; ICC: 0.96–0.98, 5.5 ± 25.3 mm², 0.5 ± 2.3%; respectively].¹¹

**Total and fat-free muscle mass**

Muscle compartments were segmented as described earlier using dedicated, anatomical landmarks defining the exact muscle boundaries. Muscle cross-sectional area (CSA) in mm² was then used as surrogate for MRI-based muscle mass. Total mass was defined as the complete muscle CSA_total comprised by its muscle fascia, including macroscopically visible, intramyocellular-intrafascial fatty septa. For the determination of fat-free muscle mass (CSAfat-free), the segmented compartments were post-processed using a semi-automated, inhouse application (Matlab_R2017a, The MathWorks, Inc., Massachusetts, USA) (Figure 2). Given the presumptions that even myocytes with a high amount of intramyocellular lipids do not feature an intensity value greater than approximately 200 (corresponding to 20% fat content) in proton-density fat-fraction maps and that every voxel with an intensity value greater than 200 therefore contains extramyocellular adipose tissue, a former approved threshold value of 200 was set to quantify those voxels that solely comprise myocytes with intramyocellular lipids, excluding extramyocellular, adipose tissue.¹⁴ Fat-free mass was accordingly calculated by the following equation:

\[
\text{Fat-free mass} = \text{Total mass} - \text{Fat mass}
\]
Total and fat-free muscle mass were then normalized to subjects’ body height squared calculating the correspondent indices in mm²/m² indicated as total and fat-free abdominal muscle mass index (AMMI_{Total} and AMMI_{Fat-free}, respectively). Furthermore, the ratio AMMI_{Fat-free}/AMMI_{Total} in % was calculated to indicate the amount of functionally contractable muscle tissue within the whole muscle compartments.

Myosteatosis

Total myosteatosis was quantified as mean proton-density fat-fraction in percentage (PDFF_{muscle}) in the same segmented muscle compartments at level L3 vertebra.

Visceral and subcutaneous adipose tissue

Visceral and subcutaneous adipose tissue (VAT and SAT, respectively) as abdominal adipose tissue compartments were segmented and quantified in square centimeters by a

Figure 1 Example of an obese (A) and normal weight (B) subject with lower (A) and higher (B) total and fat-free abdominal skeletal muscle mass as cross-sectional areas by MRI (post-processed with Matlab_R2017a). (1) Original proton-density fat-fraction map. (2) Segmentation of adipose tissue. (3) Segmentation of intra (myo)cellular lipids. (4) Segmentation of fat-free muscle mass.
Other covariates

To determine the glycaemic status, a 75 g oral glucose tolerance test was performed for all subjects not yet diagnosed with diabetes mellitus. According to the WHO definition, subjects were classified with an impaired glucose metabolism either with established type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) or prediabetes and as healthy controls. Hypertension was determined as systolic blood pressure $\geq$140 mmHg and/or diastolic blood pressure $\geq$90 mmHg or current intake of antihypertensive medication, given that the subjects were aware of being hypertensive. Alcohol consumption and smoking status were classified by self-report as no (0 g/day) or any alcohol consumption ($\geq$0.1 g/day) and never-smoker and ex-smoker or current (regular/sporadic) smoker. Nutritional supply was evaluated with a 24 h food list and food frequency questionnaire. Regarding physical activity, subjects were categorized as physically active (regular physical activity $\geq$1 h/week) or physically inactive (irregular physical activity $<1$ h/week, almost no or no physical activity). Routinely intake of medication was generally categorized according to most recent guidelines. Standardized laboratory tests were used to determine important blood values. Dyslipidaemic changes of blood lipids were defined as increased levels of triglycerides, total cholesterol and LDL and decreased levels of HDL. The presence of somatic (musculoskeletal) symptoms, such as back pain and pain in arms, legs or joints was recorded in addition.

Results

Study population

Among 400 subjects who underwent whole-body MRI, 335 subjects (83.7%) were included in this analysis. Fifty-seven subjects (14.3%) were excluded due to insufficient image quality (e.g. fat-water swapping artefacts due to field inhomogeneities, and motion/breathing artefacts) or because they did not complete the imaging protocol and eight subjects (2%) were subsequently excluded due to missing values in any of the covariates. Demographics and characteristics of the study population are provided in Table 1.

In general, included subjects were predominantly middle-aged men (mean age: 56.3 $\pm$ 9.1 years; male gender: 56.1%) with 95 subjects (28.4%) being classified as obese based on a BMI $\geq$ 30 kg/m². Overall, obese subjects featured a more distinct cardiometabolic risk profile having a higher prevalence of impaired glucose metabolism, hypertension, and dyslipidaemia and being significantly less physically active. Furthermore, obese subjects had significantly lower levels of vitamin D, significantly higher consumption rates of alcohol and nicotine and a significantly higher prevalence of musculoskeletal pain symptoms (all $P < 0.04$; Table 1).

Body composition and muscle mass

Detailed measurements of body composition by anthropometry, BIA, and MRI are shown in Table 2. Non-obese subjects had a significantly lower waist and hip circumference in anthropometry and based on BIA significantly lower indices of total body fat mass, lean body, and appendicular muscle mass as well as calculated SMIMIA (all $P < 0.001$).

Based on MRI, mean total and fat-free abdominal skeletal muscle mass of the entire sample by MRI was 8759.2 $\pm$ 2143 mm² and 5099.8 $\pm$ 1749.2 mm², respectively. AMMItotal was lowest in female subjects with normal body weight and highest in obese male subjects (non-obese female subjects: 2495.3 $\pm$ 389.6 mm²/m², obese male subjects: 3501.1 $\pm$ 532.9 mm²/m², $P < 0.001$). No significant difference was found regarding AMMIFat-free between non-obese and obese subjects (1695.9 $\pm$ 478.3 mm²/m², 1743.7 $\pm$ 527.8 mm²/m², respectively, $P = 0.424$). Concerning the ratio of normalized fat-free to total abdominal skeletal muscle mass AMMIFat-free/AMMItotal and in contrast to AMMItotal, normal weight male and female subjects had a significantly higher portion of fat-free muscle tissue compared with obese, male and female subjects (male: 61.4 $\pm$ 9.7% and 56.3 $\pm$ 11.4%, $P = 0.007$, female: 56.6 $\pm$ 10.1% and 50.0 $\pm$ 8.4%, $P < 0.001$) (Figure 2). Furthermore, regarding the main body fat compartments by MRI, obese subjects with a BMI $\geq$ 30 kg/m² showed significantly higher amounts of semi-automated algorithm based on fuzzy-clustering on one axial slice at the level of the umbilicus.\textsuperscript{2,17,18}
Table 1 Demographics of the study population

| Characteristics                     | All subjects N = 335 | Normal weight (BMI ≤ 30 kg/m²) N = 240 (71.6%) | Obesity (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²) N = 95 (28.4%) | P value |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------|
| Age (years)                         | 56.3 ± 9.1           | 55.8 ± 9.1                                      | 57.7 ± 9.1                             | 0.100   |
| Sex (male gender)                   | 188 (56.1%)          | 136 (56.7%)                                     | 52 (54.7%)                             | 0.84    |
| Impaired glucose metabolism (prediabetes & T2DM) | 127 (37.9%)          | 69 (28.8%)                                      | 58 (61.1%)                             | <0.001  |
| Hypertension                        | 110 (32.8%)          | 64 (26.7%)                                      | 46 (48.4%)                             | <0.001  |
| Alcohol consumption (>0.1 g/day)    | 253 (75.5%)          | 190 (79.2%)                                     | 63 (66.3%)                             | 0.04    |
| Current smoking status (regular or sporadic) | 204 (60.9%)          | 138 (57.5%)                                     | 66 (69.5%)                             | 0.005   |
| HbA1c (%)                           | 5.6 ± 0.8            | 5.5 ± 0.7                                       | 5.7 ± 0.8                              | 0.022   |
| Fasting serum glucose (mg/dL)       | 104.6 ± 23.3         | 102.0 ± 23.8                                    | 111.2 ± 20.6                           | 0.001   |
| Triglycerides levels (mg/dL)        | 130.3 ± 87.5         | 120.0 ± 86.9                                    | 156.5 ± 83.8                           | <0.001  |
| Total cholesterol (mg/dL)           | 217.9 ± 36.2         | 218.4 ± 36.3                                    | 216.6 ± 36.4                           | 0.69    |
| LDL (mg/dL)                         | 139.2 ± 32.9         | 139.0 ± 33.3                                    | 139.9 ± 32.1                           | 0.83    |
| Vitamins D (calciferol)² (ng/mL)    | 23.7 ± 11.9          | 24.4 ± 11.9                                     | 21.8 ± 11.7                            | 0.07    |
| Creatinine (mg/dL)                  | 0.9 ± 0.2            | 0.9 ± 0.2                                       | 0.9 ± 0.1                              | 0.21    |
| Potassium (mEq/L)                   | 4.3 ± 0.3            | 4.3 ± 0.3                                       | 4.3 ± 0.3                              | 0.75    |
| Nutrient supply³                    | Energy (kcal/day)    | 1827.6 ± 408.3                                   | 1848.3 ± 405.7                         | 0.18    |
| Protein (mg/day)                    | 69.8 ± 15.0          | 69.4 ± 15.0                                     | 70.8 ± 15.1                            | 0.48    |
| Physically active                   | 204 (60.9%)          | 155 (64.6%)                                     | 49 (51.6%)                             | 0.04    |
| Medication                          | Lipid-lowering medication | 35 (10.4%)                                  | 20 (8.3%)                              | 0.07    |
| Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs | 10 (3.0%)            | 5 (2.1%)                                        | 5 (5.3%)                               | 0.24    |
| Oral antihyperglycaemic agents      | 28 (8.4%)            | 17 (7.1%)                                       | 11 (11.6%)                             | 0.26    |
| Musculoskeletal symptoms (pain in back, joints, arms, and legs) | 128 (38.2%)          | 80 (33.3%)                                      | 48 (50.5%)                             | 0.005   |

Based on N = 260.

VAT, SAT, and PDFFmuscle compared with normal weights (P < 0.001).

Correlation to bioelectrical-impedance analysis

Correlations of AMMI Total and AMMI Fat-free with anthropometric and BIA-based measurements are provided in Table 3, Figures 3 and S1. AMMI Total and lean body mass index showed a strong and positive, linear correlation (r = 0.70), especially in normal weight subjects (r = 0.74). In contrast, AMMI Fat-free showed best correlation with calculated SMIBIA with a moderate relationship (r = 0.58). In general, measures of muscle mass by MRI and BIA correlated considerably stronger in non-obese compared with obese subjects (normal weight: r = 0.59–0.74, obesity: r = 0.47–0.56). After adjustment for age and sex, both AMMI Total and AMMI Fat-free were significantly and positively associated with calculated SMIBIA (β: 0.80 [95% confidence interval (CI): 0.66–0.94], P < 0.001; β: 0.42 [95% CI: 0.27–0.57], respectively, P < 0.001). In further obesity-stratified analyses, the age- and sex-adjusted associations of MRI- and BIA-based measurements of muscle mass were substantially weaker in obese individuals compared with normal weight subjects [association of calculated SMIBIA with AMMI Total in obese subjects: β: 0.50 (95% CI: 0.12–0.88), P < 0.011; with AMMI Total in normal weight subjects: β: 0.77 (95% CI: 0.59–0.95), P < 0.001; with AMMI Fat-free in obese subjects: β: 0.45 (95% CI: 0.08–0.83), P < 0.017; and with AMMI Fat-free in normal weight subjects: β: 0.53 (95% CI: 0.32–0.73), P < 0.001; respectively (Table S2).

Predictors of muscle mass

Associations of muscle mass by MRI with demographics and cardiometabolic risk factors are provided in Table S1 and Figure S2. Regarding muscle composition, higher levels of PDFFmuscle indicating myosteatosis are associated with a significantly lower AMMI Fat-free and ratio AMMI Fat-free/AMMI Total respectively (P < 0.001).

In explorative analyses adjusted for age and gender, impaired glucose metabolism, measures of dyslipidaemia, obesity, and adipose tissue (elevated triglyceride levels, BMI ≥ 30 kg/m², higher waist and hip circumference, VAT and SAT) as well as hypertension were significantly and positively associated with AMMI Total (P < 0.01). Furthermore, a significantly positive association was found for AMMI Total and musculoskeletal pain symptoms (P = 0.002) as well as for AMMI Fat-free and total cholesterol, LDL and creatinine (P < 0.03). However, no significant association of muscle mass parameters by MRI with physical activity, nutrient supply, alcohol and nicotine consumption was found (P > 0.05).
|Measurements of body composition          | All subjects | Normal Weight (BMI ≤ 30 kg/m²) | Obesity (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²) | P value |
|------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| **Anthropometry**                        |              |                                |                          |         |
| Body height (m)                          | 171.5 ± 9.7  | 172.4 ± 9.6                    | 169.3 ± 9.4              | 0.01    |
| Body weight (kg)                         | 81.9 ± 15.7  | 76.1 ± 12.6                    | 96.6 ± 13.1              | <0.001  |
| BMI (kg/m²)                              | 27.8 ± 4.7   | 25.5 ± 2.7                     | 33.7 ± 3.3               | <0.001  |
| Waist circumference (cm)                 | 97.6 ± 13.6  | 92.2 ± 10.9                    | 111.2 ± 9.4              | <0.001  |
| Hip circumference (cm)                   | 106.3 ± 8.6  | 102.7 ± 5.6                    | 115.6 ± 7.8              | <0.001  |
| **BIA**                                  |              |                                |                          |         |
| Total body fat mass index (kg/m²)        | 9.1 ± 3.2    | 7.6 ± 1.9                      | 12.8 ± 3.0               | <0.001  |
| Lean body mass index (kg/m²)             | 18.7 ± 2.4   | 17.8 ± 2.1                     | 20.9 ± 1.9               | <0.001  |
| Appendicular muscle mass index (kg/m²)   | 7.8 ± 1.2    | 7.4 ± 1.1                      | 8.8 ± 1.0                | <0.001  |
| Skeletal muscle mass index (SMI_{BIA} in kg/m²)
†‡ | 9.2 ± 1.6    | 8.9 ± 1.5                      | 10.0 ± 1.5               | <0.001  |
| **MRI**                                  |              |                                |                          |         |
| Total abdominal skeletal muscle mass (CSA_{total} in mm²)
AMMI_{total} (mm²/m²)
Female | 8759.2 ± 2143.1 | 8514.9 ± 2080.8 | 9376.4 ± 2184.8 | 0.001  |
| Male                                      | 2954.6 ± 585.4 | 2839.0 ± 535.8 | 3246.7 ± 606.1 | <0.001  |
| Fat-free abdominal skeletal muscle mass (CSA_{fat-free} in mm²)
AMMI_{fat-free} (mm²/m²)
Female | 2625.1 ± 484.2 | 2495.3 ± 389.6 | 2939.0 ± 547.9 | <0.001
†‡ | 3101.8 ± 481.5 | 3501.1 ± 532.9 | 3501.1 ± 532.9 | <0.001
†‡ |
| Male                                      | 1428.1 ± 344.5 | 1417.3 ± 367.8 | 1454.4 ± 282.5 | 1†‡ |
| Ratio AMMI_{fat-free}/AMMI_{total} (%)    | 57.7 ± 10.6   | 59.3 ± 10.1                    | 53.5 ± 10.6              | <0.001  |
| Female                                    | 54.7 ± 10.0   | 56.6 ± 10.1                    | 50.0 ± 8.4               | <0.001
†‡ |
| Male                                      | 60.0 ± 10.4   | 61.4 ± 9.7                     | 56.3 ± 11.4              | 0.007†‡ |
| PDFF, muscle (%)                         | 11.5 ± 4.7    | 10.8 ± 4.3                     | 13.3 ± 5.2               | <0.001  |
| VAT (cm²)                                 | 146.8 ± 84.7  | 122.6 ± 76.4                   | 208.0 ± 73.4             | <0.001  |
| SAT (cm²)                                 | 272.2 ± 116.6 | 229.5 ± 74.2                   | 397.7 ± 117.7            | <0.001  |

AMMI, abdominal muscle mass index; BIA, bioelectrical-impedance analysis; BMI, body mass index; CSA, cross-sectional area; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; PDFF, proton-density fat-fraction; SAT, subcutaneous adipose tissue; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

†Bonferroni-adjusted for three independent tests.
‡Skeletal muscle mass index derived by the following equation and normalized to subjects body height squared: Skeletal muscle mass (kg) = (body height²/ resistance × 0.401) + (gender × 3.825) + (age × −0.071) + 5.102 (body height in cm, resistance in Ω, for gender: male = 1 and female = 0, age is in years).
Skeletal muscle has a fundamental influence on physical and metabolic health. Its characteristics may therefore serve as imaging biomarkers for the general and cardiometabolic health status for both clinical and research purposes. In this study, we evaluated a straightforward approach to total and fat-free muscle mass by MRI complementing other, qualitative imaging parameters of muscle composition, and compared it to one of the standard methods used for muscle quantification, that is, BIA. On the one hand, our results confirm the significant prediction error of muscle mass by BIA in obesity, with considerably stronger correlations of MRI-based and BIA-based measures in normal weight subjects. On the other hand, our results indicate different patterns of MRI-derived mass parameters between obese and non-obese subjects as well as specific associations with risk.

**Figure 2** Differences in total abdominal muscle mass index (AMM_{Total}) (A), fat-free abdominal muscle mass index (AMM_{Fat-free}) (B) and the ratio AMM_{Fat-free}/AMM_{Total} (C) between non-obese and obese subjects and male and female subjects.

**Discussion**

Skeletal muscle has a fundamental influence on physical and metabolic health. Its characteristics may therefore serve as imaging biomarkers for the general and cardiometabolic health status for both clinical and research purposes. In this study, we evaluated a straightforward approach to total and fat-free muscle mass by MRI complementing other, qualitative imaging parameters of muscle composition, and compared it to one of the standard methods used for muscle quantification, that is, BIA. On the one hand, our results confirm the significant prediction error of muscle mass by BIA in obesity, with considerably stronger correlations of MRI-based and BIA-based measures in normal weight subjects. On the other hand, our results indicate different patterns of MRI-derived mass parameters between obese and non-obese subjects as well as specific associations with risk.
factors for cardiometabolic disease. Thus, MRI allows for a comprehensive assessment of different morphologic characteristics of muscle mass biomarkers, for example, in cardiometabolic risk stratification, independent of subjects’ body weight.

Currently, there are several modalities available for body composition analysis and estimation/quantiﬁcation of muscle mass, relying on different technologies and assessing different aspects of skeletal musculature. However, the most commonly applied methods have substantial limitations and disadvantages. First, anthropometry, as an indirect modality for muscle mass quantiﬁcation, is generally limited by its susceptibility to signiﬁcant, individual and obesity-related prediction errors with the tendency to overestimate muscle mass.19,20 Accordingly, anthropometric and MRI-based measures showed no to only weak correlations in this study. Second, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA), which some authors consider as the reference standard for quantiﬁcation of muscle mass,6 is less sensitive to small changes compared with, for example, CT and MRI21,22 and additionally based on ionizing radiation, thus limiting its feasibility. Third, cross-sectional imaging, such as CT, is indeed characterized by a considerably smaller error in quantifying total and fat-free skeletal muscle mass. However, the amount of ionizing radiation involved in whole-body CT is limiting its utility in clinical/preventive and also research settings. Also, MRI as another cross-sectional modality has several contraindications (e.g. metallic implants and claustrophobia), is more time consuming and costly compared with, for example, BIA and DEXA and requires a higher amount of technical expertise. Fourth, BIA lacks standardization of the technical procedure and its validity may be strongly inﬂuenced by different disease conditions, hydration status and physical activity in temporal relation with the measurement procedure. Thereby, BIA generally tends to overestimate lean body mass and consecutively underestimates total body fat mass in conditions with water retention, such as liver, renal, or heart failure, after exercise and most importantly in obese subjects.6,23 In summary, there is no available technique that serves all the requirements for the precise and practical measurement of skeletal muscle mass until date. Each method has its own advantages and limitations, none is fully standardized, and therefore, none serves as gold standard at present.

In this study, measures of muscle mass assessed by MRI and BIA correlated considerably stronger in normal weight compared with obese subjects. Also, obese subjects featured comparatively higher values in BIA-derived measurements of lean body and appendicular muscle mass as well as calculated skeletal muscle mass index. Independent of subjects’ actual muscle mass, BIA generally overestimates lean body and therewith muscle mass in obesity. Furthermore, BIA is unable to determine intramuscular lipids and adipose tissue, which might account for a large fraction of non-myocellular content in muscle tissue. According to this, signiﬁcant differences were not found regarding AMMIfat-free between obese and non-obese subjects by MRI, whereas in BIA, obese subjects featured signiﬁcantly higher muscle mass parameters. Overall, these results conﬁrm the well-known, signiﬁcant prediction error of muscle mass parameters by BIA in obese subjects, which accounts primarily for the markedly lower correlation coefﬁcients in subjects with a BMI ≥ 30 kg/m². Thus, MRI might outperform BIA regarding quantiﬁcation of skeletal muscle mass parameters speciﬁcally in obese subjects with a BMI ≥ 30 kg/m², for example, in the assessment of sarcopenic obesity, an obese subtype with relatively low muscle mass.

Figure 3  Correlations of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)-based and bioelectrical-impedance analysis (BIA)-based measurements of skeletal muscle mass in non-obese (light circle) and obese (dark triangle) subjects.
Another advantage of MRI is the possibility to additionally perform a morphological and qualitative evaluation of muscle tissue complementing mass measurements, such as the assessment of intramyocellular and extramyocellular fat content and their distribution patterns as well as further, textural analyses. Because mass alone does not predict muscular performance sufficiently, MRI may be particularly suited for muscle composition analyses determining further aspects of related to its functional properties. Given the high likelihood of a relationship between MRI-detectable muscle composition patterns, muscular performance and cardiometabolic disease, associations between these quantitative imaging findings with both clinical performance and outcome (e.g. in ageing and development of cardiometabolic disease) need to be further determined in large cohort studies.24

Some limitations of this study should be taken into account. First, we did not compare our results to DEXA, which is considered as the current gold standard by some authors. However, previous studies have demonstrated the validity and reproducibility of the standardized, muscle quantification by multi-echo Dixon that we used in this study.11 Second, muscle performance does not depend solely on mass. Besides distinct associations of cardiometabolic risk factors and MRI-derived measurements of muscle composition in this study, these imaging biomarkers should further be evaluated regarding their diagnostic and prognostic value and therefore rather be seen as a complement for conventional strength and endurance tests. Third, this study focused on the evaluation of muscle mass parameters by MRI and their correlation with BIA-based measurements in both non-obese and obese subjects. We did not interpret our results in reference to a standard population and did not aim to categorize subjects as sarcopenic or find a cut-off value for sarcopenia in this population. However, as it is generally accepted that an absolute muscularity below the 5th percentile indicates sarcopenia,25 the applied approach should be further evaluated as a simple estimate of the quantitative index in this condition.

The assessment of muscle mass parameters by MRI based on a standardized segmentation algorithm is a feasible alternative to BIA in population-based imaging. The weaker correlation of BIA and MRI in obese subjects may explain the known limitation of BIA in obesity and further promote MRI-based assessments in large cohort settings in both non-obese and specifically in obese subjects. AMMI\textsubscript{Fat-free} and AMMI\textsubscript{Total} as well as their ratio as surrogates for muscle mass by MRI might serve as promising imaging biomarkers for the comprehensive assessment of skeletal muscle and whole-body composition analysis as well as for a more accurate, cardiometabolic risk stratification, independent of subjects’ body weight.
Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Online supplementary material

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

References

1. Joglekar S, Nau PN, Mezhr JJ. The impact of sarcopenia on survival and complications in surgical oncology: a review of the current literature. J Surg Oncol 2015;112:503–509.

2. Filippini U, de Oliveira N, Teixeira V, Monteiro P, da Silva M, Miraglia F, et al. Sarcopenia: a predictor of mortality and the need for early diagnosis and intervention. Aging Clin Exp Res 2015;27:249–254.

3. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, Boirie Y, Cederholm T, Landi F, et al. Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing 2010;39:412–423.

4. Lang T, Streep T, Cawthon P, Baldwin K, Taaffe DR, Harris TB. Sarcopenia: etiology, clinical consequences, intervention, and assessment. Osteoporos Int 2010;21:543–559.

5. Vetrano DL, Landi F, Volpato S, Corsonello A, Meloni E, Bernabei R, et al. Association of sarcopenia with short- and long-term mortality in older adults admitted to acute care wards: results from the CRIME study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2014;69:1154–1161.

6. Buckinx F, Landi F, Cesari M, Fielding RA, Visser M, Engkelke K, et al. Pitfalls in the measurement of muscle mass: a need for a reference standard. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle 2018;9:269–278.

7. Cooper C, Fielding R, Visser MV, Van Loon LJ, Rolland Y, Orwoll E, et al. Tools in the assessment of sarcopenia. Calcif Tissue Int 2013;93:201–210.

8. Bamberg F, Hetterich H, Rospølsscz S, Lorbeer R, Auweter SD, Schlett CL, et al. Subclinical disease burden as assessed by whole-body MRI in subjects with prediabetes, subjects with diabetes, and normal control subjects from the general population: the KORA-MRI study. Diabetes 2017;66:158–169.

9. World Health Organization. Obesity: preventing and managing the global epidemic. WHO Tech. Rep. Ser. (2000).

10. Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Baumgartner RN, Ross R. Estimation of skeletal muscle mass by bioelectrical impedance analysis. J Appl Physiol 2000;89:465–471.

11. Kiefer LS, Fabian J, Lorbeer R, Machann J, Storz C, Kraus MS, et al. Inter- and intraobserver variability of an anatomical landmark-based, manual segmentation method by MRI for the assessment of skeletal muscle fat content and area in subjects from the general population. Br J Radiol 2018;91:9–9.

12. Jones KL, Doleman B, Scott S, Lund JN, Williams JP. Simple psoas cross-sectional area measurement is a quick and easy method to assess sarcopenia and predicts major surgical complications. Colorectal Dis 2014;17:20–26.

13. Crawford RJ, Filli L, Elliott JM, Nanz D, Fischer MA, Marcon M, et al. Age- and level-dependence of fatty infiltration in lumbar paravertebral muscles of healthy volunteers. Spine (Phila. Pa. 1976) 2016;37:742–748.

14. Boettcher M, Machann J, Stefan N, Thamer C, Häring HU, Claussen CD, et al. Intermuscular adipose tissue (IMAT): association with other adipose tissue compartments and insulin sensitivity. J Magn Reson Imaging 2009;29:1340–1345.

15. Han D-S, Chang KV, Li CM, Lin YH, Kao TW, Tsai KS, et al. Skeletal muscle mass adjusted by height correlated better with muscular functions than that adjusted by body weight in defining sarcopenia. Nutr Sci Reports 2016;6:1–8.

16. Kiefer LS, Fabian J, Rospølsscz S, Lorbeer R, Machann J, Storz C, et al. Assessment of the degree of abdominal myosteatosis by magnetic resonance imaging in subjects with diabetes, prediabetes and healthy controls from the general population. Eur J Radiol 2018;105:261–268.

17. Würslin C, Machann J, Rempp H, Claussen C, Yang B, Schick F. Topography mapping of whole body adipose tissue using a fully automated and standardized procedure. J Magn Reson Imaging 2010;31:430–439.

18. Storz C, Heber SD, Rospølsscz S, Machann J, Sellner S, Nikolau K, et al. The role of visceral and subcutaneous adipose tissue measurements and their ratio by magnetic resonance imaging in subjects with prediabetes, diabetes and healthy controls from a general population without cardiovascular disease. Br J Radiol 2018;91:1–10.

19. Baumgartner RN, Koehler KM, Gallagher D, Romero L, Heymsfield SB, Ross RR, et al. Epidemiology of sarcopenia among the elderly in New Mexico. Am J Epidemiol 1998;147:755–763.

20. Tonson A, Ratel S, Le Fur Y, Cozzone P, Bendahan D. Effect of maturation on the relationship between muscle size and force production. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2008;40:918–925.

21. Delmonico MJ, Kostek MC, Johns J, Hurley BF, Conway JWM. Can dual energy X-ray absorptiometry provide a valid assessment of changes in thigh muscle mass with strength training in older adults? Eur J Clin Nutr 2008;62:1372–1378.

22. Chen Z, Wang Z, Lohman T, Heymsfield SB, Outwater E, Nicholas IS, et al. Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry is a valid tool for assessing skeletal muscle mass in older women. J Nutr 2007;137:2775–2780.

23. Newton RL, Alfonso A, White MA, York-Crowe E, Walden H, Ryan D, et al. Percent body fat measured by BIA and DEXA in obese, African-American adolescent girls. Int J Obes 2005;29:594–602.

24. Schlett CL, Hendel T, Weckbach S, Reiser M, Kauczor H, Nikolaou K, et al. Population-based imaging and radiomics: rationale and perspective of the german national cohort MRI study. Fortschr Röntgenstr 2016;188:652–661.

25. Fearon K, Strasser F, Anker SD, Bosaeus I, Bruera E, Fainsinger RL, et al. Definition and classification of cancer cachexia: an international consensus. Lancet Oncol 2011;12:489–495.

Figure S1. Correlations of MRI- and BIA-based measurements of skeletal muscle mass in non-obese (light circle) and obese (dark triangle) subjects.

Figure S2. Correlations of AMMI Total (A) and AMMI Fat-free (B) with age, BMI, VAT and physical activity.

Table S1. Associations between demographics, cardiometabolic risk factors and AMMI Total and AMMI Fat-free.

Table S2. Obesity-stratified associations of MRI- and BIA-based measurements of skeletal muscle mass.