Waist circumference-to-height ratio predicts adiposity better than body mass index in children and adolescents
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OBJECTIVE: Body mass index (BMI) is the surrogate measure of adiposity most commonly employed in children and adults. Waist circumference (WC) and the waist circumference-to-height ratio (WCHt) have been proposed as markers of adiposity-related morbidity in children. However, no study to date has compared WCHt, WC, BMI and skinfolds thickness for their ability to detect body adiposity.

AIM: To compare WCHt, WC, BMI and skinfolds for their accuracy in predicting percent body fat (PBF), percent trunk fat (PTF) and fat mass index (FMI) in a large sample of children and adolescents.

DESIGN, SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS: We studied 2339 children and adolescents aged 8–18 years from the US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2003/2004. Body fat was measured using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. Multivariable regression splines were used to model the association between PBF, PTF, FMI and the predictors of interest.

RESULTS: WCHt alone explained 64% of PBF variance as compared with 31% for WC, 32% for BMI and 72% for the sum of triceps and subscapular skinfolds (SF2) (P<0.001 for all). When age and gender were added to the predictors, the explained variance increased to 80% for the WCHt model, 72% for the WC model, 68% for the BMI model and 84% for the SF2 model. There was no practical advantage to add the ethnic group as further predictor. Similar relationships were observed with PTF and FMI.

CONCLUSIONS: WCHt is better than WC and BMI at predicting adiposity in children and adolescents. It can be a useful surrogate of body adiposity when skinfold measurements are not available.
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INTRODUCTION

Body mass index (BMI) is the surrogate measure of adiposity most commonly employed in children and adults. The accuracy of BMI to detect percent body fat (PBF) has been the subject of several recent studies in both adults and children,1–6 and a recent meta-analysis reported high specificity but low sensitivity to detect excess adiposity in adults.7 Although BMI is being routinely measured at all ages because of its prognostic significance,8 it is not an accurate measure of adiposity.1 BMI is in fact not able to disentangle fat- and fat-free tissues, and does not take into account body fat distribution, which may be more important than total adiposity as risk factor for cardiometabolic disease.9

Waist circumference (WC) and the waist circumference-to-height ratio (WCHt) have been proposed as markers of adiposity-related morbidity.9,10 These measures are becoming increasingly popular because of their association with cardiometabolic risk factors and visceral fat.9–15 Recently, the hip circumference-to-height ratio has been suggested as a marker of body adiposity in adults,16 but cross-validation studies suggest that it is not more accurate than BMI.17

Fat mass index (FMI), that is, the ratio between body fat and squared height in analogy with BMI, has been increasingly used as adiposity index in recent years, and is one of the indexes currently employed to evaluate indirect measures of body adiposity.18,19

No study to date has evaluated whether WCHt is superior to WC, BMI and skinfolds at detecting adiposity in the general pediatric population, even though it is known that skinfolds are generally the best option when they are available.20,21 The aim of this study was thus to compare the accuracy of BMI, WC, WCHt and skinfold thickness for the prediction of PBF, percent trunk fat (PTF) and FMI in a general population of children and adolescents.

SUBJECTS AND METHODS

Subjects

We studied 2339 children and adolescents from the US National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) 2003/2004 (http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/nhanes2003-2004/nhanes03_04.htm). They were selected on the basis of the following criteria: (1) age between 8 and 18 years; (2) availability of measured or imputed dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry data (DXA) (first imputation data set); and (3) availability of the other demographic and anthropometric variables of interest (see below). NHANES is an ongoing sample survey that uses a complex, multi-stage and stratified design for collecting representative data for the noninstitutionalized US population. NHANES employs trained personnel to conduct home interviews aimed at collecting demographic, socioeconomic, dietary and health-related data. Medical personnel obtains medical and laboratory information. A detailed description of these assessments has been reported elsewhere.22 Consent to participate was obtained from...
parents or guardians of the subjects, and the NHANES study protocol was approved by the National Center for Health Statistics Ethics Review Board.22

Methods
Age, gender, ethnic group, weight, height, WC and triceps (TSF) and subscapular skinfolds (SSF) were evaluated as described in the US NHANES 2003/2004 operating manuals.23 Weight, height, WC, TSF and SSF were measured in a mobile examination center with standardized methods and equipment. WC was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm at the highest point of the iliac crest. Skinfolds were measured using a Holtain skinfold caliper and the sum of TSF and SSF (2SF) was calculated.

DXA was performed using a Hologic QDR4500 fan-beam machine (Hologic Inc., Bedford, MA, USA) in a mobile examination center. The DXA scans were analyzed by the University of California, San Francisco Department of Radiology Bone Density Group using industry standard techniques. Analysis of all DXA scans was performed using Hologic Discovery software version 12.1-pediatric version in its default configuration. The precision of the Hologic QDR4500 densitometer has been reported in detail elsewhere.23–25 Because the QDR-4500A algorithm overestimated lean tissue mass by 5%, the NHANES lean tissue mass was decreased by 5%, and an equivalent weight in kilograms was added to fat mass without affecting total body mass.

Regression was used to build three prediction models of PBF (%), PTF (%), and FMI. The precision of the Hologic QDR4500 densitometer has been reported in detail elsewhere.23–25 Because the QDR-4500A algorithm overestimated lean tissue mass by 5%, the NHANES lean tissue mass was decreased by 5%, and an equivalent weight in kilograms was added to fat mass without affecting total body mass.

RESULTS
Table 1 reports the measurements of the 2339 subjects stratified by ethnic group.

Table 1. Measurements of the 2339 study subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mexicans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Others</th>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight  (kg)</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height  (cm)</td>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>156.9</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>158.8</td>
<td>153.9</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td>155.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC      (cm)</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCHt    (cm m−1)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSF (mm)</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSF (mm)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2 (mm)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body fat (kg)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body fat (%)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMI (kg m−2)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values are used to check model fit. The adjusted coefficient of determination (Radj2) and the root mean squared errors of the estimate were used to assess the accuracy of the predictions.27

Table 2 reports the values of R2adj and root mean squared errors of the estimate associated with the univariable (M1) and multivariable (M2 and M3) regression models for the prediction of PBF, PTF and FMI.

Table 2 reports the values of R2adj and root mean squared errors of the estimate associated with the univariable (M1) and multivariable (M2 and M3) regression models for the prediction of PBF, PTF and FMI. However, there was no advantage in using 2SF over TSF for the prediction of PBF, and only a modest advantage for the prediction of PTF and FMI. Also, SSF was worse than TSF at predicting body adiposity.

WCHt was much better than WC and BMI at predicting PBF (Radj2 = 0.64 vs 0.31 vs 0.32), PTF (Radj2 = 0.75 vs 0.45 vs 0.45) and FMI (Radj2 = 0.83 vs 0.66 vs 0.73) (P < 0.001 for all, model M1). When the effect of age and gender was taken into account, WCHt was slightly less accurate than skinfolds for the prediction of PBF (Radj2 = 0.80 vs 0.84), nearly as accurate for the prediction of PTF (Radj2 = 0.85 vs 0.84) and slightly more accurate for the prediction of FMI (Radj2 = 0.89 vs 0.87) (P < 0.001 for all, model M2). Adding ethnicity to the predictors (model M3) did not change from a practical viewpoint the conclusions reached by model M2. Because skinfolds are not routinely measured, the M2 model based on WCHt, age and gender is a reasonable surrogate measure of total and trunk adiposity, as well as FMI for purposes of stratification in epidemiological studies.

Figure 1 depicts the variability of PBF (panel A1–C1), PTF (A2–C2) and FMI (A3–C3) explained by the M2 model using WCHt, age and gender as predictors. Each panel from A to C represents the effect of the given predictor after control for the other predictors. This allows a direct comparison of the effects of the predictors. The graphs clearly show that WCHt explains the greatest variability in all the measures. Not surprisingly, the knots identified by multivariable regression spline analysis were similarly placed for all predictors owing to the very strict association between PBF, PTF and FMI ( Spearman’s rho > 0.953, P < 0.001).

Abbreviations: Whites, non Hispanic Whites; Blacks, non Hispanic Blacks; Mexicans, Mexicans Americans; Others, other ethnic groups; N, number of subjects; M, males; F, females; BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference; WC/HH, waist circumference-to-height ratio; TSF, triceps skinfold; SSF, subscapular skinfold; SF2, sum of TSF and SSF; FMI, fat mass index.

The prediction equations of PBF, PTF and FMI from BMI, SF2 and WCHt as detected by model M2 are given in the Supplementary Appendix.

**DISCUSSION**

BMI is a measure of adiposity that is closely associated with weight and moderately associated with height from birth to adulthood. Although BMI identifies adolescents at later risk of diabetes and heart disease, and as such is an important prognostic indicator, it does not distinguish between fat- and fat-free tissues and this may partly explain why WCHt is increasingly reported as a better predictor of cardiometabolic risk. The main finding of the present study, performed in a large sample of US children, is that WCHt is better than WC and BMI at predicting total adiposity. Although skinfolds are expectedly the best single predictor of adiposity, their superiority as compared with WCHt decreases when age and sex are taken into account together with WCHt. Thus, for practical purposes, when direct measures of subcutaneous tissues are not available, a prediction model based on WCHt, age and gender offers a reasonable surrogate of total and trunk adiposity. The better performance of WCHt for predicting FMI as compared with PBF and PTF is not surprising owing to the fact that both WCHt and FMI have height or squared height as denominator. Although the relationship between WCHt and several adiposity-associated risk factors for cardiometabolic disease is well-established in children, our study is the first to evaluate the ability of a single predictor as WCHt to detect both total and trunk adiposity.

Pediatricians do regularly measure weight and height but most of them are not yet measuring WC. Because the measurement of WC and the calculation of WCHt is simple and cheap, as it requires only removal of clothing around the waist and a simple tape, we believe that it should become a routine measurement. The standardized bony landmark is simple to identify and measurements made at this level are highly reproducible.

---

**Table 2.** Accuracy of the prediction of percent body fat, percent trunk fat and fat mass index from the waist-to-height ratio and other anthropometric measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent body fat</th>
<th>Percent trunk fat</th>
<th>Fat mass index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>TSF</td>
<td>SSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.6)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; TSF, triceps skinfold; SSF, subscapular skinfolds; SF2, sum of TSF and SSF; WC, waist circumference; WCHt, waist circumference-to-height ratio. M1 is a regression model including just the anthropometric predictor; M2 adds age and gender to the predictors of M1; and M3 adds ethnicity to the predictors of M2. Values are adjusted coefficients of determination and root mean square errors (in brackets).
As the practical use of WC is concerned, it is important to note that there is a progressive increase in WCHt with increasing body fat so that a single value of WCHt, for example, the 0.50 cut-point employed in some applications of WCHt,\textsuperscript{9} will not work well as predictor of body fat.

A limitation of this study is that we choose to use only the first of five imputed NHANES DXA data sets.\textsuperscript{27,33} This was done because the statistical method that we used to build models, that is, multivariable regression splines,\textsuperscript{34} has yet to find a firm theoretical framework under multiple imputation theory.\textsuperscript{34} Because of this fact, we cannot claim that our data are representative of the US population, but we believe that for the hypothesis tested in this paper this is not essential as for other applications. Our prediction models should be cross-validated in external populations, as it is well-known that most predictive models are not generalizable or require substantial adaptation to work properly in external population.\textsuperscript{27,35}

In conclusion, WCHt is superior to BMI and WC alone as marker of total and trunk adiposity, and is a good marker of body adiposity when the effect of age and gender is taken into account and when direct measures of subcutaneous fat (that is, skinfolds thickness) are not available.
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