ASSESSMENT OF A PROPOSED BMI FORMULA IN PREDICTING BODY FAT PERCENTAGE AMONG FILIPINO YOUNG ADULTS

Romaia Elaiza N. Abrugar, Jianna Gayle A. Almoro, Kristelle Diane A. Batin, JT Martin S. Cabrera, Kryzia C. Dela Merced, Jojomaku E. Higa, Trizha T. Maaño, Francis P. Quitoriano, Emer M. Rondilla II, Darlene Lybelle D. Ternida, Jasmine Lorraine G. Vitug, Michael Q. Van Haute

De La Salle Medical and Health Sciences Institute, College of Medicine

Presented by:

Michael Q. Van Haute, MD

De La Salle Medical and Health Sciences Institute, College of Medicine



BACKGROUND

WHO Global Status Report on Noncommunicable Diseases 2014:

- About 5.1% of the Filipino population is obese, 23.6% overweight

Body Mass Index (BMI) = weight in kg / (height in m)²

- Developed >150 years ago by Belgian mathematician Adolphe Quetelet
- Used in screening for overweight/obesity and for weight group classification
- Unable to distinguish between fat and lean body mass
- Influenced by factors such as age, sex, ethnicity, muscle mass, activity level

Lloyd Trefethen (University of Oxford) proposed a modified BMI formula:

BMI = $(1.3 \times \text{weight in kg}) / (\text{height in m})^{2.5}$



OBJECTIVES

- To assess the performance of the modified BMI formula against the traditional Quetelet formula in predicting percent body fat and in screening for overweight/obesity among a sample of Filipino young adults.
- To assess and compare the diagnostic accuracies of both BMI measures in identifying the overweight-obese state.



METHODS

Study design: Cross-sectional

Study participants: Students enrolled at the DLSMHSI College of Medicine

- Inclusion criteria:
 - Aged 18 to 35 years
 - Of Filipino descent
- Exclusion criteria:
 - Chronic illness (e.g., diabetes mellitus, hypertension, heart failure, malignancy)
 - Acute myocardial infarction or stroke with the past 6 months
 - Pregnancy (for females)
 - Chronic corticosteroid use
 - Conditions affecting posture (kyphosis, scoliosis, kyphoscoliosis)
 - Active engagement in any bodybuilding or exercise program



METHODS

- Direct interview
 - Age, years
 - Sex
 - Smoking history, pack-years
 - Alcohol intake, average number of drinks/week
- Direct measurement
 - Height, cm (standard height rule)
 - Weight, kg (Tanita BC-543 One Size)
 - Percent body fat, %BF (Tanita BC-543 One Size)
 - Waist circumference, cm (standard tape measure)
- Computation
 - BMI_Q and BMI_M



Weight classification	BMI
Underweight	<18.5
Normal	18.5–22.9
Overweight	23.0–24.9
Obese	≥25.0

Weight	% Body Fat (%BF)		
classification	Males	Females	
Underweight	<13	<25	
Normal	13–23	25–35	
Overweight	23.1–28	35.1–40	
Obese	>28	>40	

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

- Summary/descriptive statistics
- Pearson's correlation (BMI_Q and BMI_M; BMI values and %BF)
- Cohen's κ coefficient (weight classifications based on BMI_Q and BMI_M)
- Robust polynomial regression analysis (sex-specific models)
 - Bootstrap resampling (1000 replications)
 - Covariates: age, waist circumference, smoking history, alcohol intake
 - Likelihood ratio test (goodness of fit between nested regression models)
 - AIC and BIC (relative quality of the models)
- Measures of diagnostic accuracy
 - Sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, LR+, LR-
 - Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis



RESULTS

Demographic and Anthropometric Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic	Males (n = 74)	Females (n = 116)	<i>p</i> -value
Age, median (range)	22 (19–30) years	22 (19–27) years	0.614
Height, mean (SD)	168.9 (5.0) cm	156.1 (5.7) cm	<0.001
Weight, mean (SD)	76.1 (14.8) kg	53.2 (11.5) kg	<0.001
WC, median (range)	88.5 (66.5–125.0) cm	73 (59.5–102) cm	<0.001
%BF, mean (SD)	23.2 (5.5) %	29.6 (5.2) %	<0.001
Smoking history, median (range)	0 (0–20) pack-years	0	0.029
Alcohol intake, median (range)	1 (0–10) drinks/week	0 (0–3) drinks/week	0.002
BMI _Q , mean (SD)	26.6 (5.0)	23.0 (4.3)	<0.001
<18.5 (n, %)	1 (1.3%)	13 (11.2%)	
18.5–22.9 (n, %)	19 (25.7%)	54 (46.6%)	
23.0–24.9 (n, %)	11 (14.9%)	19 (16.4%)	
≥25.0 (n, %)	43 (58.1%)	30 (25.9%)	
BMI _M , mean (SD)	26.7 (5.0)	23.9 (4.5)	<0.001
<18.5 (n, %)	1 (1.3%)	4 (3.4%)	
18.5–22.9 (n, %)	20 (27.0%)	56 (48.3%)	
23.0–24.9 (n, %)	12 (16.2%)	20 (17.2%)	
≥25.0 (n, %)	41 (55.4%)	36 (31.0%)	

WC: waist circumference

%BF: body fat percentage

BMI_Q: BMI computed using the traditional Quetelet formula

BMI_M: BMI computed using the modified BMI formula proposed by Lloyd Trefethen

RESULTS

- There is high correlation between BMI and %BF, and BMI_Q and BMI_M
 - Correlation between BMI and %BF tended to be higher among females
- Agreement between BMI_Q and BMI_M :
 - Females: 81.0% (95% CI 73.9%, 88.2%), $\kappa = 0.7139$ (95% CI 0.5969, 0.8309)
 - Males: 96.0% (95% CI 91.5%, 100%), $\kappa = 0.9306$ (95% CI 0.7658, 1.0000)
- BMI and WC significant predictors of %BF among females; only BMI significantly predicted %BF among males
- BMI quadratic full models fit the data better than the BMI linear full models

Madal	Adjusted R ²		AIC		BIC	
woder	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
BMI _Q quadratic full	0.6733	0.8262	302.48	419.40	317.03	434.66
BMI _M quadratic full	0.6694	0.8021	303.19	431.59	317.73	446.85



Regression analysis summary for BMI_Q and BMI_M quadratic full models for both sexes.

BMI _Q quadratic full model (Females)						
Variable	Observed	95% confidence	Bootstrap	Z	<i>p</i> -value	
variable	coefficient, B	interval	standard error			
(Constant)	-49.39	-71.28, -27.49	11.17	-4.42	<0.001	
BMIQ	4.48	2.55, 6.41	0.99	4.54	<0.001	
BMI _Q ²	-0.08	-0.11, -0.04	0.02	-3.75	<0.001	
Age	0.23	-0.02, 0.47	0.12	1.83	0.067	
Smoking	0	Omitted				
Alcohol intake	-0.22	-0.88, 0.44	0.34	-0.65	0.515	
WC	0.16	0.03, 0.29	0.07	2.34	0.020	
	BMI _M guadratic full model (Females)					
Variable	Observed	95% confidence	Bootstrap	Z	<i>p</i> -value	
variable	coefficient, B	interval	standard error			
(Constant)	-46.53	-68.32, -24.73	11.12	-4.18	<0.001	
BMI _M	3.70	1.94, 5.46	0.90	4.12	<0.001	
BMI _M ²	-0.06	-0.10, -0.03	0.02	-3.48	0.001	
Age	0.23	-0.02, 0.48	0.13	1.77	0.076	
Smoking	0	Omitted				
Alcohol intake	-0.06	-0.75, 0.63	0.35	-0.17	0.861	
WC	0.25	0.13, 0.37	0.06	4.00	<0.001	

RESULTS

Summary of measures of accuracy of BMI_Q and BMI_M in diagnosing overweight-obese.* The 95% CIs are indicated in parentheses.

Magguro	BN	/II _Q	BMI _M		
Measure	Males Females		Males	Females	
Sonoitivity	97.5%	100%	97.5%	100%	
Sensitivity	(86.8%,99.9%)	(82.4%,100%)	(86.8%,99.9%)	(82.4%,100%)	
Specificity	58.8%	69.1%	61.8%	61.9%	
Specificity	(40.7%,75.4%)	(58.9%,78.1%)	(43.6%,77.8%)	(51.4%,71.5%)	
Positive predictive value	73.6%	38.8%	75%	33.9%	
(PPV)**	(59.7%,84.7%)	(25.2%,53.8%)	(61.1%, 86%)	(21.8%,47.8%)	
Negative predictive	95.2%	100%	95.5%	100%	
value (NPV)**	(76.2%,99.9%)	(94.6%,100%)	(77.2%,99.9%)	(94%, 100%)	
Likelihood ratio (+)	2.37	3.23	2.55	2.62	
	(1.58, 3.55)	(2.4, 4.35)	(1.66, 3.92)	(2.03, 3.38)	
Likelihood ratio (-)	0.04	0	0.04	0	
	(0.01, 0.3)	(-)	(0.01, 0.3)	(—)	

*Overweight–obesity is defined as \geq 23.1% BF in males and \geq 35.1% BF in females.

**The PPV and NPV were adjusted for known prevalence of overweight-obese based on %BF.

	(0.0000, 0.0000)	(0.000, 1 + 0.000)	M^{-10} MIM. 27.0 (01 – 30.0, 04 – 02.0)
Females	0.9517	0.9430	BMI_Q : 25.1 (Sn = 95%, Sp = 89%)
	(0.9144, 0.9890)	(0.9001, 0.9860)	$BIMI_{M}$: 26.3 (Sn = 89%, Sp = 89%)

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Both BMI_Q and BMI_M significantly predicted %BF, with BMI_Q performing non-significantly better than BMI_M .
- Both BMI_Q and BMI_M are comparable in terms of discriminating between normal and overweight-obese weight classifications.
- We recommend future studies to determine if change in weight classification (based on BMI_M) has long-term health implications.
- We likewise recommend reproducing the study with a larger sample size across different age groups.



THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!



Romaia Abrugar



Jianna Almoro



Kristelle Batin



Trizha Maaño



JT Cabrera



Kryzia Dela Merced



Jojomaku Higa





Emer Rondilla II



Darlene Ternida



Jasmine Vitug



Michael Van Haute



Francis Quitoriano

National Convention on