Body mass index (BMI) is the most common method used to classify individuals as overweight, obese and thin.\(^1\)–\(^3\) BMI is used to determine obesity-related disease risks in both adults and children.\(^4\) Skinfold thickness has long been used as the subcutaneous fat measurement method, on the grounds that half of the total body fat is collected in the subcutaneous fat deposits and this is related to the total amount of fat.\(^5\)\(^6\) Since the amount of subcutaneous fat is an indicator of total body fat, it has been widely used to determine total body fat.\(^7\)\(^8\) The skinfold technique is commonly used because it is noninvasive, relatively easy to administer, and inexpensive.\(^9\)

In this study we aimed to investigate the relationship between the body mass index and ultrasound-measured subcutaneous adipose tissue (SCAT), in order to propose an alternative non-invasive and inexpensive method to measure the subcutaneous fat. We also evaluated the liver size and the existence of hepatosteatosis, and investigated whether there was a relationship between liver measurements and BMI, and the SCAT measurements.

**Materials and Methods**

Seventy-two volunteers (41 women, 31 men), aged between 20 and 76 were included in this study. Those with physical problems, diabetes, severe liver, kidney and heart diseases, those who were treated with diuretics, those who were treated for cancer, and those who were on a special diet program to gain or lose weight were excluded from the study.

Measurements of the subjects were made in the morning on an empty stomach and without excessive fluid intake.
(between 8–10 am) and height measurements were made with bare feet. Weight was measured barefoot and wearing light clothing. Length measurement was made with a wall tape measure sensitive to centimeter, and weight measurement was made with a scale sensitive to 0.1 kilograms. In order to avoid errors that may occur in the body compositions to be measured, the subjects were asked to rest for half an hour and avoid exercise before starting the measurement.

Measurements with ultrasound were made with 5–11 MHz linear (for the SCAT measurements) and 1–6 MHz convex (for the deeper measurements) probes (LOGIQ S7 Expert, GE, Medical Systems). SCAT measurements were done while the volunteers were lying supine, and while limbs were extended in anatomic position, from three regions: mid-arm (arm SCAT), umbilical (umbilical SCAT), and mid-thigh (thigh SCAT). Mid-arm was determined as the mid-point between the uppermost point of the glenohumeral joint and antecubital fossa (Figure 1a). Mid-thigh was determined as the mid-point between the anterior superior iliac spine and the base of patella (Figure 1b). Limb measurements were done on the right side. Umbilical measurements were done on the midline, 5 cm above the umbilicus (Figure 1c). The thickness (antero-

---

**Figure 1.** Ultrasound measurements on images. (a) measurement of the subcutaneous adipose tissue of the arm; (b) measurement of the subcutaneous adipose tissue of the thigh; (c) measurement of the umbilical preperitoneal fat (1) and umbilical subcutaneous adipose tissue (2).
posterior diameter) of the subcutaneous fat tissue (hypodermis) in the transverse view was measured as the arm SCAT anterior to the biceps muscle, the thigh SCAT anterior to the rectus femoris muscle, and the umbilical SCAT anterior to the rectus abdominis muscle. The thickness of the adipose tissue between the deep fascia and the peritoneum was measured as umbilical preperitoneal fat (PPF). In the right upper quadrant of the abdomen, cranio-caudal liver size and parenchymal echogenicity, in terms of steatosis, were evaluated with a 1–6 MHz convex probe, while the patient was in inspiration.

The correlations between BMI and the SCAT, the PPF, and liver measurements were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for Windows (Version 22, Chicago, IL, USA). Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to check normality. The Student’s t-test was used to compare normally distributed pairs, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare non-normally distributed pairs, and chi-square test was used to compare categorical variables. Pearson correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between normally distributed variables, and Spearman correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between non-normally distributed variables. For all analyses; p<0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

**Results**

The characteristics of the volunteers and the results of the measurements are summarized in Table 1, and the correlations between the measurements are summarized in Table 2.

Ultrasound examination showed that 68.1% of the volunteers (49 out of 72) did not have hepatosteatosis, 16.7% (12 out of 72) had grade I hepatosteatosis, 15.3% (11 out of 72) had grade II hepatosteatosis. Hepatomegaly was detected in two of the volunteers (2.8%).

BMI was mostly well correlated with umbilical SCAT (r=0.650, p<0.001). The arm SCAT (well correlated) (r=0.549, p<0.001) and the thigh SCAT (fairly correlated) (r=0.470, p<0.001) followed it. The umbilical PPF was only correlated with the umbilical SCAT. There was an excellent correlation between arm SCAT and thigh SCAT, and good correlation between arm SCAT and umbilical SCAT. Interestingly, arm SCAT showed correlation with age even if it was weak. There was no relationship between arm, or thigh SCAT values and existence of hepatosteatosis, but existence of hepatosteatosis was related with umbilical SCAT (p<0.008), and umbilical PPF (p<0.009) values. Since hepatomegaly was detected in only two volunteers, which was not statistically sufficient to correlate with any measure.

Except for the height, none of the measurements showed any statistically significant gender difference (Table 3).

**Discussion**

Obesity is a metabolic disease which can cause many health problems and related deaths. It is a health problem that increases the risk of coronary artery disease, hypertension, type II diabetes, obstructive pulmonary disease, osteoarthritis and some types of cancer, and significantly reduces life expectancy. BMI is generally the first step and the most ideal method for measuring obesity, but it is considered as a rough guide. Because the fat rates in different people do not correspond to the same level of obesity.

World Health Organization (WHO) interprets BMI for adults as follows: <18.5: underweight, 18.5–24.9: normal, 25.0–29.9: overweight, 30.0 and above: obesity.
BMI is calculated based on the formula: weight (kg) / \([\text{height (m)}]^2\). BMI, which is one of the most basic methods in determining obesity, is also the first method used by WHO to determine obesity. However, BMI does not take into account the weight of the increased muscle tissue, the body’s water retention and the distribution of adipose tissue. Individuals with similar BMI may have different abdominal fat tissue. Therefore, waist circumference and waist-hip ratio measurements have been seen as an alter-

Table 2
Correlations between measurements.

|                | Arm SCAT  | Thigh SCAT | Umbilical SCAT | Umbilical PPF |
|----------------|-----------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| Age r-value    | 0.296     | 0.423      | 0.078          | 0.545         |
| Age p-value    | 0.012*    | <0.001     | <0.001         | <0.001        |
| Height r-value | -0.397    | -0.451     | 0.627          | 0.653         |
| Height p-value | <0.001    | <0.001     | <0.001         | <0.001        |
| Weight r-value | 0.252     | 0.287      | 0.554          | 0.430         |
| Weight p-value | 0.033*    | <0.001     | <0.001         | <0.001        |
| BMI r-value    | 0.549     | 0.470      | 0.650          | 0.420         |
| BMI p-value    | 0.001     | <0.001     | <0.001         | <0.001        |
| Arm SCAT r-value | 0.724    | 0.555      | <0.001         | 0.070         |
| Arm SCAT p-value | <0.001   | <0.001     | <0.001         | 0.310         |
| Thigh SCAT r-value | 0.724     | <0.001     | 0.383          | 0.334         |
| Thigh SCAT p-value | <0.001   | <0.001     | <0.001         | 0.004*        |
| Umbilical SCAT r-value | 0.555    | 0.383      | <0.001         | 0.334         |
| Umbilical SCAT p-value | <0.001   | <0.001     | <0.001         | 0.004*        |
| Umbilical PPF r-value | 0.070    | 0.310      | 0.004*         |               |
| Umbilical PPF p-value |          |            |                |               |

*p<0.05. BMI: body mass index; PPF: preperitoneal fat; SCAT: subcutaneous adipose tissue.

Table 3
Gender differences.

|                | Gender | Mean or median* | P-value |
|----------------|--------|-----------------|---------|
| Height (cm)    | W      | 161.85          | 0.003†  |
|                | M      | 176.00          |         |
| Weight (kg)    | W      | 70.42           | 0.301   |
|                | M      | 83.53           |         |
| BMI            | W      | 26.95           | 0.347   |
|                | M      | 26.97           |         |
| Arm SCAT (cm)  | W      | 3.50*           | 0.495   |
|                | M      | 2.00*           |         |
| Thigh SCAT     | W      | 14.85           | 0.251   |
|                | M      | 7.41            |         |
| Umbilical SCAT (cm) | W   | 18.46           | 0.424   |
|                | M      | 18.17           |         |
| Umbilical PPF (cm) | W   | 3.70*           | 0.447   |
|                | M      | 6.70*           |         |

*Arm SCAT and umbilical PPF were given as median since they were not distributed normally. †p<0.05. BMI: body mass index; M: man; PPF: preperitoneal fat; SCAT: subcutaneous adipose tissue; W: woman
native to BMI, with measurements regularly used in both clinical and research settings.

Anthropometric methods are generally preferred when screening for obesity on populations. The most obvious advantages of anthropometric methods are that they are portable, inexpensive and useful in field studies. BMI, which relates weight to height, is the most widely used and also the simplest measure of body size, and is often used to estimate the prevalence of obesity in a population. However, it has been subjected to many criticisms that it does not reveal the fat ratio, and BMI value of the individuals in the body with excess muscle mass or water retention is high. For these reasons, alternative methods are sought for BMI. At this point, circumference measurements are preferred because they give direct information about the individual’s fatness status.

Skin fold thickness measurement, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry scans, and assessment of the SCAT with computed tomography are commonly used methods to evaluate the fat distribution of the body. SCAT and visceral adipose tissue measurements with ultrasound have also been used in recent years to evaluate body fat distribution.

It has been reported in the literature that there is a relationship between waist circumference and fatty liver. In our study, no correlation was found between any SCAT measurements and hepatosteatosis, not even with umbilical SCAT. This is probably because hepatosteatosis is associated with visceral adipose tissue, not SCAT. But still, we found that the umbilical SCAT was the most correlated SCAT with BMI. In clinical practice, abdominal fat is the most widely accepted in the assessment of obesity.

Some researchers compared the skinfold measurements with ultrasound-measured SCAT values, and dual energy X-ray with CT-measured and ultrasound-measured SCAT values, and found that the measurements were correlated. We also found good correlation between BMI values and all three SCAT measurements. In the light of this information, we suggest that SCAT measurements with ultrasound is an inexpensive, safe and easily applicable method for the evaluation of body fat composition.

Conclusion
As an alternative method to skinfold measurement, SCAT measurement with ultrasound can be used to evaluate body fat status.
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