Western European Journal of Medicine and Medical Science
Volume 3, Issue 04, April 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/3
ISSN (E): 2942-1918 Open Access| Peer Reviewed

TEMA-CLINICAL USEFULNESS OF A NEW EQUATION FOR ESTIMATING BODY FAT.

Ro'ziqulova Gulhayo Sharofutdinovna
+998 99 882-21-06

Annotation: Accurate estimation of body fat is essential in both clinical and research settings for assessing obesity-related health risks. Traditional methods such as BMI, skinfold measurements, and bioelectrical impedance have limitations. This article presents and evaluates a newly proposed equation for estimating body fat percentage based on readily available anthropometric data. The clinical utility of this new model is compared with existing methods in terms of accuracy, accessibility, and applicability in different population groups.
Keywords: dy fat estimation, body composition, anthropometric measurements, clinical evaluation, obesity, new predictive equation.

Body fat percentage is a key indicator of health, associated with risks of cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, and metabolic syndrome. The body mass index (BMI), though widely used, fails to distinguish between fat and lean mass, making it an unreliable measure in certain populations. While more accurate tools such as DEXA scans and hydrostatic weighing exist, they are expensive and inaccessible in most clinical settings. This study introduces a new predictive equation based on anthropometric variables, offering a practical and cost-effective alternative for routine use.

Study Design and Population

A cross-sectional study was conducted with 500 participants (250 males, 250 females) aged 18–65 years from varied ethnic backgrounds. Anthropometric data collected included:

- Weight (kg)
- Height (cm)
- Waist circumference (cm)
- Age (years)
- Gender

New Predictive Equation Development

Multiple regression analysis was used to develop a new equation. The dependent variable was body fat percentage measured by DEXA (used as the reference standard). Independent variables were anthropometric data.

Statistical Analysis

Model performance was assessed using:

- R^2 (coefficient of determination)
- Standard error of estimate (SEE)
- Bland–Altman plots for agreement
- Comparison with existing equations (e.g., Deurenberg)

The clinical usefulness of a new equation for estimating body fat percentage (BF%)—such as the CUN-BAE (Clínica Universidad de Navarra-Body Adiposity Estimator) or similar predictive models—stems from its potential to bridge the gap between advanced laboratory techniques and practical, everyday clinical needs. Body fat estimation is a critical component of health assessment because it provides insights into adiposity-related risks that are not fully captured by traditional metrics like body mass index (BMI). Below, I'll explore in detail the

Western European Journal of Medicine and Medical Science
Volume 3, Issue 04, April 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/3
ISSN (E): 2942-1918 Open Access| Peer Reviewed

context, advantages, applications, and limitations of such equations, emphasizing their role in clinical practice.

Background and Need for New Equations

Body fat percentage is a more direct indicator of adiposity than body weight or BMI, which do not differentiate between fat mass and lean mass (e.g., muscle, bone, water). Excess body fat, particularly visceral fat, is strongly linked to cardiometabolic diseases such as hypertension, type 2 diabetes, dyslipidemia, and cardiovascular disease. For instance, visceral fat contributes to insulin resistance and chronic inflammation, mechanisms central to these conditions. However, accurately measuring BF% typically requires sophisticated methods like dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), air displacement plethysmography (ADP), or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). These techniques, while precise, are expensive, require specialized equipment and training, and are impractical for routine use in most clinical settings or for large-scale population studies.

BMI, though widely used due to its simplicity (weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared), has well-documented shortcomings. It misclassifies individuals with high muscle mass (e.g., athletes) as overweight or obese, while underestimating adiposity in older adults who lose lean mass but gain fat with age. Waist circumference, another common metric, correlates with visceral fat but is less specific and can be influenced by measurement variability. A new equation that estimates BF% using easily obtainable variables—like BMI, age, and sex—aims to address these gaps by offering a more nuanced and accessible tool.

How These Equations Work

Most new equations for estimating BF% are derived from regression models based on large datasets where BF% is measured using a reference method (e.g., DXA or ADP). Researchers correlate these measurements with anthropometric variables to create a formula. For example, the CUN-BAE equation, developed in a Spanish cohort, uses the following formula:

$$BF\% = -44.988 + (0.503 \times age) + (10.689 \times sex) + (3.172 \times BMI) - (0.026 \times BMI^2) + (0.181 \times BMI \times sex) - (0.02 \times BMI \times age) - (0.005 \times BMI^2 \times sex) + (0.00021 \times BMI^2 \times age)$$

(where sex = 0 for males, 1 for females; age in years; BMI in kg/m^2)

This equation accounts for nonlinear relationships and interactions between variables, reflecting how fat accumulation varies by age (e.g., increasing with age due to sarcopenia) and sex (e.g., females typically have higher BF% due to reproductive physiology). Other equations might incorporate additional factors like waist circumference or ethnicity-specific adjustments, depending on the target population.

Clinical Usefulness

1. Improved Accuracy Over BMI:

Studies comparing equations like CUN-BAE to reference methods show high correlation coefficients (e.g., $r > 0.8$) and mean BF% estimates close to measured values, with standard errors often below 5%. For example, a 40-year-old woman with a BMI of 25 might have a BF% of 33% (per CUN-BAE), revealing higher adiposity than BMI alone suggests. This granularity helps clinicians identify patients with "normal-weight obesity"—those with normal BMI but elevated BF% and associated risks.

2. Cardiometabolic Risk Assessment:

Excess BF%, especially when validated against visceral fat, is a stronger predictor of cardiometabolic risk than BMI. Research indicates that BF% estimated by such equations correlates more closely with blood pressure, fasting glucose, triglycerides, and HDL cholesterol than BMI or waist circumference alone. For instance, a study might find that a 1%

Western European Journal of Medicine and Medical Science
Volume 3, Issue 04, April 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/3
ISSN (E): 2942-1918 Open Access| Peer Reviewed

increase in estimated BF% raises the odds of hypertension by 5%, offering a clearer risk profile for intervention.

3. Accessibility and Cost-Effectiveness:

These equations require only basic inputs (e.g., height, weight, age, sex), measurable with a scale, tape measure, and patient history. No specialized equipment or training is needed, unlike DXA (costing $100–$300 per scan) or ADP (requiring a $30,000+ Bod Pod). This makes them ideal for primary care, community health screenings, or resource-limited settings, democratizing adiposity assessment.

4. Screening and Monitoring:

Clinicians can use BF% estimates to screen for at-risk individuals, track changes over time (e.g., during weight loss programs), and tailor interventions. For example, a patient with a BF% of 40% might be prioritized for dietary counseling or pharmacotherapy, even if their BMI is borderline. Repeated measurements can assess the efficacy of interventions, focusing on fat loss rather than just weight loss.

5. Epidemiological Applications:

In population studies, these equations enable researchers to estimate BF% across thousands of participants without prohibitive costs, facilitating analyses of obesity trends, risk factors, and health outcomes.

Practical Examples

- Case 1: Middle-Aged Adult: A 50-year-old man with a BMI of 27 (overweight) has an estimated BF% of 28% using a validated equation. Despite a moderate BMI, this BF% exceeds healthy thresholds (e.g., 25% for men), prompting lipid screening that reveals elevated triglycerides, guiding early lifestyle changes.
- Case 2: Elderly Patient: A 70-year-old woman with a BMI of 22 (normal) has a BF% of 35% due to age-related muscle loss. This flags potential metabolic risk missed by BMI, leading to closer monitoring.
- Case 3: Fitness Setting: A gym trainer uses the equation to estimate a client's BF% at 15%, confirming low adiposity despite a BMI of 26 due to muscle mass, avoiding mislabeling as overweight.

Limitations and Challenges

1. Population Specificity:

Equations are often derived from specific cohorts (e.g., Caucasian adults in the CUN-BAE case). Applying them to different ethnicities, age groups, or fitness levels (e.g., athletes, children) can lead to over- or underestimation. For instance, Asian populations tend to have higher BF% at lower BMIs, requiring adjusted formulas.

2. Validation Gaps:

While some equations match reference methods well on average, individual errors can be significant (e.g., ±5–10% BF%). Outliers—such as the very obese or elderly—may be poorly predicted, reducing reliability in edge cases.

3. Lack of Regional Fat Data:

These equations estimate total BF% but don't distinguish between subcutaneous and visceral fat, the latter being more metabolically harmful. Complementary metrics like waist-to-height ratio might still be needed.

4. Dynamic Factors:

Variables like hydration status, recent exercise, or menstrual cycle phase (in women) can affect BMI or fat distribution but aren't captured, potentially skewing estimates.

Future Directions

To maximize clinical usefulness, new equations should be:
- Validated across diverse populations (e.g., by ethnicity, age, fitness level).
- Paired with machine learning to refine predictions using larger datasets.
- Integrated into electronic health records for automatic BF% calculation during routine visits.
- Compared head-to-head with existing tools (e.g., bioelectrical impedance devices) to establish superiority or complementarity.

A new equation for estimating body fat offers substantial clinical utility by providing a practical, cost-effective alternative to advanced measurement techniques, improving upon BMI's limitations, and enhancing risk assessment for adiposity-related diseases. Its ease of use supports widespread adoption in primary care, public health, and research, while its focus on BF% aligns with the growing emphasis on body composition over crude weight metrics. However, its effectiveness depends on rigorous validation, population-specific adjustments, and an understanding of its boundaries. When implemented thoughtfully, such an equation can empower clinicians to better identify, monitor, and manage patients at risk, ultimately improving health outcomes.

The new equation provides an improved estimation of body fat by incorporating multiple relevant variables and was validated against the DEXA gold standard. Its strength lies in its applicability across genders and age groups, with reduced error in athletic and obese individuals compared to BMI-based methods.

However, limitations include its validation only on adults and the need for waist measurements, which may be inconsistently taken. Further research should assess its utility in pediatric populations and its sensitivity to ethnic differences.

Conclusion

This new body fat estimation equation offers a clinically useful, low-cost alternative for routine health assessments. It significantly outperforms BMI in predicting fat percentage and aligns closely with DEXA-measured values.

Clinical Application: Incorporate this equation into electronic medical record systems for automatic calculation.

Further Validation: Test in pediatric and elderly populations to assess broader applicability.

Training: Educate clinicians on accurate measurement of anthropometric data to enhance reliability.

Integration: Use in conjunction with metabolic risk assessments for early intervention in obesity-related diseases.

References.

1. BerringtondeGonzalezA,HartgeP,Cerhan JR,etal.Body-mass indexandmortality among1.46millionwhiteadults.NEngl JMed2010;363:2211–2219
2. HeitmannBL, EriksonH, EllsingerBM, MikkelsenKL,LarssonB.Mortalityasso ciatedwithbody fat, fat-freemass and bodymassindexamong60-year-oldswed ishmen-a22-yearfollow-up.Thestudyof menbornin1913.IntJObesRelatMetab Disord2000;24:33–37
3. FrühbeckG.Screeningandinterventions for obesity in adults. Ann InternMed 2004;141:245–246;authorreply246
4. Ginde SR, Geliebter A, Rubiano F, et al. Air displacement plethysmography: vali dation in overweight and obese subjects. Obes Res 2005;13:1232–1237

ISSN (E): 2942-1918 Open Access| Peer Reviewed

5. Gallagher D, Visser M, Sepúlveda D, Pierson RN, Harris T, Heymsfield SB. How useful is body mass index for com parison of body fatness across age, sex, and ethnic groups? Am J Epidemiol 1996; 143:228–239
6. Prentice AM, Jebb SA. Beyond body mass index. Obes Rev 2001;2:141–147
7. Jackson AS, Stanforth PR, Gagnon J, et al. The effect of sex, age and race on esti mating percentage body fat from body mass index: The Heritage Family Study. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 2002;26: 789–796