# DETERMINATION OF TOTAL BODY WATER: COMPARISON OF BIOIMPEDANCE SPECTROSCOPY WITH COMMON ANTHROPOMETRIC EQUATIONS

Ulrich Moissl<sup>1</sup>, Peter Wabel<sup>1</sup>, Paul Chamney<sup>1</sup>, Ingvar Bosaeus<sup>2</sup>, Nathan Levin<sup>3</sup>, Anja Bosy-Westphal<sup>4</sup>, Oliver Korth<sup>4</sup>, Manfred Müller<sup>4</sup>, Lutz Renders<sup>5</sup>, Lars Ellegård<sup>2</sup>, Vibeke Malmros<sup>2</sup>, Ch. Kaitwatcharachai<sup>3</sup>, Martin Kuhlmann<sup>3</sup>, Fansan Zhu<sup>3</sup> and Nigel Fuller<sup>6</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> Fresenius Medical Care D GmbH, R&D, Bad Homburg, Germany
- <sup>2</sup> Dpt. of Clinical Nutrition, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Gothenburg, Sweden
- <sup>3</sup> Renal Research Institute and Beth Israel Medical Center, New York, USA

## 1. BACKGROUND

· The assessment of total body water (TBW) is an important aspect of renal replacement therapy since it represents the urea xt distribution volume and is used for the determination of dialysis adequacy Kt/V.



#### 2. AIMS

- · To assess TBW errors introduced by different anthropometric equations in health and different diseases
- To investigate whether better estimates of TBW may be achieved with bioimpedance spectroscopy (BIS) when comparing these methods against a dilution reference.

# **3. STUDY DESIGN**

- · Retrospective analysis
- · 132 subjects from three different centers, including 54 dialysis patients and 19 cirrhosis patients. No adjustment for center effects.

# 4. METHODS

#### **BIS** measurements

- BIS-Device: BCM-Body Composition Monitor (Fres. Med. Care)
- 50 frequencies from 5 kHz to 1 MHz
- · Measurements before dialysis treatment
- · ECW and ICW using new equations validated in [1]. ECW =  $(a/BMI + b) * (H^{2*}W^{0.5}/R_{0})^{2/3}$

 $ICW = (c/BMI + d) * (H^{2*}W^{0.5}/R_{inf})^{2/3} \xrightarrow{(H = height, W = weight, R = resistance, BMI = body mass index)}$ 

D\_0

· Only a small subset from the available cohort (32 dialysis patients) was used for setting up the these equations.

## **Reference methods**

 $0.4 \text{ g } D_2 0 / \text{kg} \rightarrow \text{TBW}$ 0.04 g Br / kg → ECW Br Br FCW Deuterium dilution in Kiel and New York D<sub>2</sub>0 + NaBr Tritium dilution in Gothenburg 4 h equilibration 10 h fasting (still fasting) Figure 1. Procedure of dilution measure-Baseline Final RIS sample sample ments

## Anthropometric TBW equations

(A=age, W=weight, H=height, S=sex, D=diabetes)

· Watson [2]: male: 2.447 + 0.1074 H + 0.3362 W - 0.09516 A female: -2.097 + 0.1069 H + 0.2466 W

· Hume-Weyers [3]: male: 0.1948 H + 0.2968 W - 14.0129 female: 0.3445 H + 0.1838 W - 35.2701

• Chertow [4]:

-0.04 W + 0.13 H - 0.07 A - 0.02 S + 0.58 D - 0.0007 W<sup>2</sup> -0.03 A S + 0.11 S W + 0.001 A W + 0.002 H W

<sup>4</sup> Inst. für Lebensmittelkunde und Humanernährung, Christ.-Albrechts-Univ., Kiel, Germany <sup>5</sup> Klinik für Nieren- und Hochdruckkrankheiten, Kiel, Germany <sup>6</sup> MRC Childhood Nutrition Research Centre, Institute of Child Health, London, UK

## 4. RESULTS

- In 53 subjects with extreme BMIs (<20 and >30 kg/m^2), the precision of BIS (SD=2.8 L) was about 1 L better as compared to the anthropometric equations (3.7-3.9 L) (see table below).
- The SD of paired differences was more than half a litre smaller in BIS than in the anthropometric measures.
- The same tendency was found in the subgroups of healthy subjects, dialysis and cirrhosis patients.
- The Chertow equation significantly overestimated TBW.

TBW <sub>D20</sub> – TBW <method></method>	All subj. (n=132) mean ± SD	Healthy (n=59) mean ± SD	Dialysis (n=54) mean ± SD	Cirrhosis (n=19) mean ± SD	Extreme BMIs (<20 & >30) (n=53)
BIS	$0.4 \pm 3.0$ L	$0.4\pm \textbf{3.2}~L$	$0.3\pm \textbf{3.1 L}$	0.5 ± <mark>2.3</mark> L	$0.5\pm2.8$
Watson	$0.3\pm3.6\ L$	$0.1\pm3.7$ L	$0.7\pm3.3\ L$	$\textbf{-0.2}\pm\textbf{4.3}~\textbf{L}$	-0.5 $\pm$ 3.7 L
Chertow	$\text{-3.3}\pm\text{3.7}\text{ L}$	$\textbf{-4.3} \pm \textbf{3.8} \text{ L}$	$\textbf{-2.8} \pm \textbf{3.7} \text{ L}$	$-3.5\pm4.3$ L	$-3.7\pm3.9$ L
Hume- Weyers	$\textbf{-0.4} \pm \textbf{3.6} \text{ L}$	-0.7 ± 3.5 L	$0.0\pm3.5\;L$	$\textbf{-0.6} \pm \textbf{4.0} \text{ L}$	$\textbf{-0.9}\pm\textbf{3.7}\textbf{L}$



Figure 2. Validation results for subjects with extreme BMIs (<20 & >30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>).

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

ICW

- · In comparison with anthropometric equations, BIS offers significantly better precision (SD) for the determination of TBW in both healthy subjects and patients with abnormal fluid status.
- · While anthropometry works quite well in the "normal, average" population, BIS shows clear advantages especially in extremes of body composition

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] U. Moissl et al., "Body fluid volume determination via body composition spectroscopy in health and disease", Physiol. Meas. 27 (2006)
- [2] Watson et al., "Total body water volumes for adult males and females estimated from simple anthropometric measurements", Am J Clin Nutr 33 (1980).
- [3] Hume et al., "Relationship between total body water and surface area in normal and obese subjects." J Clin Pathol 24 (1971)
- [4] Chertow et al., "Development of a population-specific regression equation to estimate total body water in hemodialysis patients", Kidney Int 51 (1997).