

University of Groningen

The epidemiology of abdominal adiposity

De Lucia Rolfe, Emanuella

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2012

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

De Lucia Rolfe, E. (2012). *The epidemiology of abdominal adiposity: validation and application of ultrasonography to estimate visceral and subcutaneous abdominal fat and to identify their early life determinants*. [s.n.].

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Chapter 2

Ultrasound measurements of visceral and subcutaneous abdominal thickness to predict abdominal adiposity among older men and women

E De Lucia Rolfe, A Sleigh, FM Finucane, S Brage, RP Stolk, C Cooper, SJ Sharp, NJ Wareham, K Ong

Obesity 2010; **18** 3, 625-631

ABSTRACT

Accurate measures of visceral and abdominal subcutaneous fat are essential for investigating the pathophysiology of obesity. Classical anthropometric measures such as waist and hip circumference cannot distinguish between these two fat depots. Direct imaging methods such as CT and MRI are restricted in large-scale studies due to practical and ethical issues. We aimed to establish whether ultrasound is a valid alternative method to MRI for the quantitative assessment of abdominal fat depots in older individuals.

The study population comprised of 74 Caucasian individuals (41 men and 33 women, aged 67 -76 years) participating in the Hertfordshire Birth Cohort Physical Activity trial. Anthropometry included height, weight, waist and hip circumferences. Abdominal fat was measured by ultrasound in two compartments: visceral fat defined as the depth from the peritoneum to the lumbar spine; and subcutaneous fat defined as the depth from the skin to the abdominal muscles and compared to reference measures by MRI (10 mm single slice image).

Ultrasound measures were positively correlated with MRI measures of visceral and subcutaneous fat (visceral: $r = 0.82$ and $r = 0.80$ in men and women, respectively; subcutaneous: $r = 0.63$ and 0.68 in men and women, respectively). In multiple regression models, the addition of ultrasound measures significantly improved the prediction of visceral fat and subcutaneous fat in both men and women over and above the contribution of standard anthropometric variables.

In conclusion, ultrasound is a valid method to estimate visceral fat in epidemiological studies of older men and women when MRI and CT are not feasible.

INTRODUCTION

Obesity among older people is a major public health issue due to its association with increased morbidity and reduced quality of life (1, 2). In the UK, between 1993 and 2005, the prevalence of obesity increased by 12.5 % in the 65-74 year age group (1). This rapid rise will potentially lead to increased health-care costs and challenging healthcare delivery as the proportion of individuals over 65 years in the UK continues to grow (1).

Body mass Index (BMI) is generally used to classify obesity. However, BMI is a very crude measure of obesity in that it does not distinguish between tissues, e.g. muscle and fat mass. Notwithstanding this fundamental potential for misclassification, standard BMI cut-off values may not be appropriate to use among those over 70 years due to age-related changes in body composition (3, 4). These changes are characterised by a progressive loss of muscle mass and increase in fat mass (5, 6). Hence, for any given BMI, loss of muscle mass may mask increased fat (7). Furthermore, with aging a greater proportion of fat tends to accumulate centrally, within the abdominal cavity (5, 6) and BMI is a poor indicator of this distribution of fat in older individuals (6). In large-scale population studies, waist circumference, waist-to-hip ratio and sagittal diameter have been used to estimate abdominal fat (5, 8, 9). However, these measures do not differentiate visceral fat from abdominal subcutaneous fat (10, 11) and these specific depots may have very different metabolic consequences. Excessive visceral adipose tissue (VAT) is related to insulin resistance (10) whereas subcutaneous adiposity (SCAT) may have an independent anti-atherogenic effect (12). Furthermore, a recent study has reported that the ratio between these two abdominal fat depots (VAT:SCAT) is crucial in predicting the development of an unfavourable metabolic profile (13). That study suggested that individuals with a high proportion of visceral fat relative to abdominal subcutaneous fat have more adverse metabolic profiles compared to those with the opposite phenotype (13). Apart from direct imaging methods such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) or Computed Tomography (CT), there are as yet no validated anthropometric indicators of VAT:SCAT ratio. The use of these techniques is limited in large epidemiological studies and for repeated investigations due to practical and ethical constraints (14).

Ultrasonography has been shown to be an alternative, non-invasive, reliable method to estimate these two fat compartments. Its validity compared to MRI or CT has been tested in adult women (15), obese adults (14, 16) and diabetic adults (17, 18); however, it is important to test its validity in older individuals as fat accumulation in the abdomen increases with age.

Therefore, the aim of this study was to assess the validity of ultrasound measures of visceral and subcutaneous abdominal fat in older men and women, compared to MRI. Secondly, we investigated if the addition of ultrasound measures to standard anthropometric variables would increase the prediction accuracy of abdominal fat depots.

METHODS

Study population

The study was based on data collected at baseline on 74 healthy adult women (n=33) and men (n=41) aged 67-76 years, participating in the Hertfordshire Birth Cohort Physical Activity trial (19). Participants attended the Clinical Research Facilities at the MRC Epidemiology Unit, Cambridge and the Addenbrooke's Centre for Clinical Investigation (ACCI), Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK, between January 2007 and February 2008. Based on the Bland-Altman method for comparing methods of measurement (20), a sample size calculation indicated that 40 individuals were required to allow confidence intervals for limits of agreement between any two measures to be around half a standard deviation of their differences.

The exclusion criteria applied in the main trial were also used in this validation study. Participants were excluded if unable to cycle unaided for a minimum of 30 minutes; had contraindications for physical activity; had prevalent diabetes, untreated or unstable ischaemic heart disease, pacemakers, metal implants and were suffering from claustrophobia.

Volunteers were instructed to refrain from eating 10 hours before their arrival at the research clinic due to glucose tolerance testing undertaken for the main trial and to decrease bowel peristalsis for the imaging procedures.

The study was undertaken with approval of the Hertfordshire Local Research Ethics Committee and performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants gave written informed consent.

Anthropometry

Weight (WT), height (HT), waist and hip circumferences (WC, HC) were measured by trained field workers while participants were barefoot and wearing light clothing.

WT was measured using a calibrated scale (TANITA model BC-418 MA, Tokyo, Japan) and recorded to the nearest 0.2 kg. HT was measured using a wall-mounted stadiometer (SECA model 240, Birmingham, UK) and recorded to the nearest 0.1 cm. Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated as WT/HT^2 (kg/m^2). Waist circumference was measured with a D-loop tape measure (Chasmors, London, UK) at the midpoint between the inferior border of the costal margin and the anterior superior iliac crests and the hip circumference at the widest level over the greater trochanters. Both measures were recorded to the nearest 0.1 cm.

Abdominal fat

Ultrasonography (US)

The visceral and subcutaneous abdominal fat thicknesses were measured with a Logic Book XP ultrasound (GE Healthcare, Bedford, UK), using the 3C MHZ -RS abdominal curved array transducer. The transducer was placed on the location where the xiphoid line intercepted the waist circumference. The visceral thickness was defined as the depth from the peritoneal boundary to the corpus of the lumbar vertebra on longitudinal scanning at the end of a quiet expiration to avoid tensing and distorting the abdominal cavity (14).

Subcutaneous abdominal fat thickness was measured on the same location, but on a transverse plane, and was defined as the depth from the cutaneous boundary to the linea alba (14). The image was captured when the transducer just had contact with the skin to avoid compressing the subcutaneous adipose fascia. The scans were obtained by 3 trained sonographers. The relative intra-observer technical error of measurement (TEM) for the visceral thickness ranged between 1.8 to 2.9 % and 0.6 to 3.0% for subcutaneous fat thickness, and the relative inter-observer TEM was 2.4 % for visceral thickness and 2.1 % for subcutaneous thickness.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)

The MRI images were acquired immediately after the participants' arrival, at the Wolfson Brain Imaging Centre, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK. A safety questionnaire was administered prior to the volunteer entering the MRI scanning area. The volunteer was placed supine in a Siemens 3T Tim trio whole body scanner and a body matrix coil in conjunction with a spine coil was used in acquiring the images. Initial localiser images of the abdomen, acquired in three orthogonal directions, were used to locate the L4 vertebral body, which was subsequently placed at the isocentre using the Tim component of the scanner. A T1-weighted turbo spin echo, water suppressed, transaxial slice, with a thickness of 10

mm, was acquired and centred on the L4 vertebral body by trained radiographers. The in-plane resolution was 1.3x1.3 mm, FOV 500x500mm, TR=400ms, TE=21ms, 2 averages, 3 concatenations. Volumes of VAT and SCAT were calculated using a semi automated method and a threshold map, in combination with manual input to distinguish between the VAT and SCAT compartments. The software Analyze 7.0 (BIR, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN) was used for the calculations.

As the US parameters are one-dimensional and the MRI measures are two-dimensional, the precision and validity of US to predict VAT and SCAT cannot be directly assessed. However, to gain some insight into the precision and validity of the US measures, visceral and subcutaneous thicknesses were also determined on the MRI image, using the MRI imaging software. The same anatomical landmarks were applied when obtaining the thickness on the MRI slice as were used for the respective US measures. To avoid inter-reader variation, all the images were reviewed and calculations performed by the same physicist.

Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample

(Mean ± SD)	Men (n= 41)	Women (n= 33)	Total (n= 74)	Range	P-value ^a
Age (yr)	71±2.2	71±2.6	71±2.4	67-76	0.5
<i>Anthropometric measures</i>					
Weight (kg)	83.6±13.1	69.4±10.8	77.2±13.9	48.6-123.3	<0.0001
Height (cm)	174.3±6.6	161.4±5.4	168.5±8.9	148.8-186.4	<0.0001
BMI (kg/m ²)	27.4±3.6	26.7±4.5	27.1±4.0	20.7-40.4	0.4
Waist circumference (cm)	103.2±10.1	91.0±11.3	98.0±12.2	72.2-131	<0.0001
Hip circumference (cm)	106.3±7.3	106.0±9.9	106.1±8.4	89.7-132.3	0.9
Waist:Hip ratio	1.0±0.1	0.8±0.1	0.9±0.1	0.7-1.1	<0.0001
<i>MRI^b measures</i>					
VAT ^c (cm ²)	155.1±73.6	105.3±59.8	132.6±71.8	29.2-393.7	0.001
SCAT ^d (cm ²)	235.6±75.1	278.2±95.9	254.5±87.1	105.9-533.9	0.04
VAT:SCAT ratio	0.7±0.2	0.4±0.2	0.5±0.3	0.1-1.3	<0.0001
Visceral thickness (cm)	7.2±2.4	5.3±2.3	6.3±2.6	2.3-13.6	0.0007
Subcutaneous fat thickness (cm)	2.4±0.8	2.2±0.8	2.3±0.8	1-4.5	0.3
<i>US^e measures</i>					
Visceral thickness (cm)	7.7±2.4	5.6±2.7	6.7±2.8	2.6-14.8	0.001
Subcutaneous fat thickness (cm)	2.6±1.0	3.1±0.9	2.8±0.9	0.9-4.9	0.01
Visceral: subcutaneous thickness ratio	3.3±0.3	1.9±1.1	2.7±1.6	0.7-8.7	0.0001

^aSex differences by T-test

^bMRI magnetic resonance imaging

^cVAT visceral adipose tissue

^dSCAT subcutaneous adipose tissue

^eUS ultrasonography

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA version 9.2 (StataCorp). Means and standard deviations of baseline characteristics were presented separately for men and women and differences between them were tested using unpaired t-tests. Spearman rank correlation coefficients were calculated to describe associations between the different measures of abdominal fat. Linear regression analysis was firstly performed to quantify the proportion of variance of VAT and SCAT explained by US measures. Subsequently, to study the added value of ultrasound measures over simple anthropometry, multiple linear regression models were constructed. A hierarchical and pragmatic approach was used to derive the prediction models for VAT and SCAT, using different anthropometric and US measures as possible predictors. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was used to detect collinearity between the different covariates; if the VIF was >5 for any two covariates, only one of them was included in the prediction model.

Finally, the level of agreement in visceral and subcutaneous abdominal thickness between US and MRI was assessed using Bland-Altman plots. Mean difference/bias between the two methods was calculated and tested against zero using a paired t-test.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the study sample are summarized in Table 1. There were no differences between men and women in mean BMI and MRI- derived subcutaneous fat thickness measures. However, men were taller and heavier and tended to have larger waist circumferences, VAT and visceral thicknesses by US and MRI; while women had greater SCAT and subcutaneous fat thickness by US.

Correlations with abdominal fat

Table 2 shows Spearman correlation coefficients between US or anthropometric variables and either VAT, SCAT or VAT:SCAT ratio by MRI. The measure most highly correlated with VAT was US visceral thickness in both men and women, followed by waist circumference. The weakest correlations with VAT were observed for BMI, weight and hip circumference, particularly in women.

All anthropometric measures and the US subcutaneous fat thickness were moderately correlated with SCAT in both men and women. Hip circumference was the measure most highly correlated with SCAT

in both men and women, whereas BMI showed the strongest correlation in women. Correlations between the US parameters and VAT:SCAT ratio, which is the index generally used to describe abdominal fat distribution, were only moderate, but were higher than those between anthropometric variables and VAT:SCAT ratio.

Table 2. Spearman rank correlation coefficients between ultrasound, anthropometry and abdominal adiposity areas measured by MRI

		MRI measures					
		Men			Women		
		VAT ^a (cm ²)	SCAT ^b (cm ²)	VAT:SCAT ratio	VAT (cm ²)	SCAT (cm ²)	VAT:SCAT ratio
Anthropometry	Weight (kg)	0.69	0.63	0.36	0.54	0.72	0.1
	BMI (kg/m ²)	0.68	0.62	0.38	0.51	0.79	0.12
	Waist circumference (cm)	0.72	0.69	0.36	0.7	0.66	0.32
	Hip circumference (cm)	0.69	0.71	0.37	0.38	0.73	0.1
	Waist:Hip ratio	-	-	0.27	-	-	0.43
US measures	visceral thickness (cm)	0.82	0.7	-	0.8	0.52	-
	subcutaneous fat thickness (cm)	0.1	0.63	-	0.25	0.68	-
	visceral:subcutaneous thickness ratio	-	-	0.65	-	-	0.62

^aVAT visceral adipose tissue area

^bSCAT subcutaneous adipose tissue area

Prediction of abdominal fat by anthropometry and US

Univariate regression analysis was initially performed to quantify the contribution of the different US measures to VAT and SCAT. US visceral thickness explained 69 % and 78% of the variance in VAT in men and women, respectively, whereas US subcutaneous thickness explained 30% and 57% of the variance in SCAT in men and women, respectively.

Results of the multivariate regression analyses are shown in Tables 3 and 4. The addition of US visceral thickness to BMI and waist circumference improved the explained variance in VAT from 64% to 75% in men, and from 63% to 81% in women. This was reflected in the 15% and 28% reduction in RMSE respectively. Similarly, the addition of US subcutaneous thickness to BMI and waist circumference improved the prediction of SCAT from 75% to 87%, in men, and from 76% to 81% in women, with corresponding RMSE reductions of 24% and 8%, respectively.

All models satisfied the multi-collinearity requirement (VIF<5). Age was rejected as a predictor in all models ($p=0.1$ in men and $p=0.7$ in women). The independent variable height was also investigated, but was not included in the final models as the results were similar to those with BMI in the model.

Table 3. Prediction models for VAT using anthropometry and ultrasound visceral thickness

		Model ^a	B ^b ± SE			R ² %	RMSE ^d
			BMI (kg/m ²)	WC ^c (cm)	US visceral (cm)		
Men	VAT (cm ²)	1	15.9 ±2.0	-	-	60	45.6
		2	-	5.8±0.6	-	65	43.7
		3	6.1±4.6	3.8±1.6	-	64	43.4
		4	3.2±4.2	1.7±1.6	14.6±4.2	75	37
Women	VAT (cm ²)	1	8.8 ±1.8	-	-	42	45.7
		2	-	4.3±0.7	-	64	37
		3	-0.6± 2.7	4.5±1.1	-	63	37.7
		4	-1.8±1.9	1.8±0.9	15.9±3.1	81	27

^a Model: 1 included BMI; 2 included waist; 3 BMI and the covariate waist circumference; 4 included BMI and the covariates waist circumference and US visceral thickness

^b B represents expected change in VAT per unit increase in the covariate.

^c WC waist circumference

^dRMSE root mean squared error.

All coefficients were p <0.001

Table 4. Prediction models for SCAT area using anthropometry and ultrasound subcutaneous thickness

		Model ^a	B ^b ± SE			R ² %	RMSE ^d
			BMI (kg/m ²)	WC ^c (cm)	US subcutaneous (cm)		
Men	SCAT (cm ²)	1	15.8 ±2.0	-	-	60	46.5
		2	-	6.2±0.6	-	75	37
		3	-1.7±4.0	6.7±1.4	-	75	37.2
		4	3.6±3.2	4.5±1.2	29.4±5.4	87	28.2
Women	SCAT (cm ²)	1	19.5 ±1.9	-	-	75	48.3
		2	-	6.0±1.2	-	44	73.1
		3	22.0± 3.4	-1.2±1.3	-	76	48.1
		4	17.5±3.6	-1.3±1.3	30.2±11.6	81	44.1

^a Model: 1 included BMI; 2 included waist; 3 included BMI and the covariate waist circumference; 4 included BMI and the covariates waist circumference and US subcutaneous thickness

^b B represents expected change in VAT per unit increase in the covariate.

^c WC waist circumference

^dRMSE root mean squared error.

All coefficients were p <0.001

Precision of ultrasound measures

US subcutaneous and visceral thicknesses were compared to the corresponding MRI thicknesses.

Visceral thickness by US and MRI were highly correlated ($r= 0.90$ in men and women; $r= 0.84$ in men;




Figure 1 a, b. Bland-Altman analysis for men (upper panels) and women (lower panels). In both plots, the Y axis represents the difference between visceral thickness from ultrasound (US) and visceral thickness from magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). The X axis represents the mean visceral thickness from the two methods. The plots show a mean difference/bias of 0.34 ± 1.3 cm (4.7% of mean MRI) in men and 0.33 ± 1.1 cm (6.6% of mean MRI) in women and 95% limits of agreement of $-2.26 ; 2.94$ cm (-31 ; 41% of mean MRI) in men and $-1.87 ; 2.53$ cm (-35 ; 48% of mean MRI) in women.




Figure 2a, b. Bland-Altman analysis for men and women. In both plots, the Y axis represents the difference between subcutaneous thickness from ultrasound (US) and subcutaneous thickness from magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). The X axis represents the mean of subcutaneous thickness from the 2 methods. The plots show a mean difference/bias of 0.25 ± 0.56 cm (10 % of mean MRI) in men and 0.69 ± 0.65 cm (31 % of mean MRI) in women and 95% limits of agreement of $-0.87; 1.37$ cm (-36; 57 % of mean MRI) in men and $-0.61; 1.99$ cm (-28; 90 % of mean MRI) in women.

$r= 0.85$ in women). Subcutaneous thickness by US and MRI were also positively related ($r= 0.73$ in men and women; $r= 0.73$ in men; $r= 0.71$ in women). For the visceral thickness, the Bland Altman analysis (Fig. 1 a, b) revealed a small non-significant mean difference of 0.34 ± 1.3 cm ($p=0.1$) in men and 0.33 ± 1.1 cm ($p=0.09$) in women. However, for subcutaneous thickness (Fig.2 a, b) significant mean biases were observed in both sexes. The mean difference between the two methods for estimating subcutaneous thickness was 0.25 ± 0.56 cm ($p= 0.007$) in men and 0.69 ± 0.65 cm ($p<0.0001$) in women. The differences (relative to the mean) between the two methods for measuring visceral thickness were 4.7% in men and 6.6% in women, and for estimating subcutaneous fat were 10% in men and 31% in women.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we found that ultrasound is a valid method for the assessment of visceral and abdominal subcutaneous fat in older men and women when compared to MRI. The correlations between the two methods were strong particularly for visceral fat in women. Furthermore, ultrasound parameters showed much stronger correlations than anthropometry with the MRI visceral: subcutaneous ratio, the index of abdominal fat distribution used in the prediction of the metabolic consequences (13). Despite the strong correlations, US seemed to slightly overestimate visceral and subcutaneous thicknesses in both men and women. Our results also showed that the addition of ultrasound measures significantly improved the prediction of visceral and subcutaneous fat over and above the contributions of the anthropometric variables BMI and waist circumference. The precision of our final models was significantly improved as the RMSE for VAT and SCAT substantially decreased in both men and women.

Our results are consistent with previous studies, which reported strong correlations between visceral thickness and MRI VAT ranging from 0.75 to 0.81 (14-18). Our correlations with SCAT were slightly lower than in other reports (18). Reproducibility of our ultrasound measurements was acceptable, indicated by the relatively low intra- and inter- observer errors. This error likely stems from the difficulty in standardising the amount of decompression applied by the ultrasound operator when lifting the transducer from the abdomen when assessing the subcutaneous fat thickness.

BMI showed the weakest correlations with VAT, suggesting that this index is not an optimal indicator of this adiposity. Similar observations have been reported in studies investigating body composition in older populations (5, 6). However, BMI seems to be an appropriate marker of subcutaneous fat in this age group, particularly in women.

Limitations of our study include the use of a single MRI slice which can only assess VAT and SCAT areas; a more relevant criterion would be the volume of these adiposities in the whole abdomen, the variance of which may not be fully captured by a single slice of the abdomen. Indeed, there may be substantial inter-individual variation in the distribution of VAT and SCAT across the abdominal area (21, 22). Other studies have also reported that images taken at L1-L2 or L2-L3 might be more suitable for the quantification of these adiposities (23, 24). The most accurate method for the estimation of VAT and SCAT would be to derive volumes of these adiposities from a series of MRI multi-slices. Future research should use MRI volume estimates in validation studies.

Secondly, we were unable to test 'true' agreement between the two methods as the MRI and US measurements have different units. However, there was relatively good agreement between the surrogate thickness measures from the two techniques.

Finally, the use of our prediction models may be limited to populations similar to that examined. These prediction equations will need to be validated in independent studies in different age and ethnic groups. Further research in this area would be valuable.

Obesity is a complex multifactorial disease (25) and large sample sizes are generally required to identify the effects of specific genetic and environmental factors and their interactions (26). The addition of precise and accurate measurements greatly increases the statistical power of studies to identify the aetiology of obesity and also of studies that evaluate the effectiveness of interventions to treat or prevent obesity (26).

In summary, our data in older adults add to the growing evidence that ultrasonography is a robust method for the estimation of abdominal fat compartments. Ultrasonography improved the prediction of VAT and greatly enhanced the ability to assess the relative quantities of VAT and SCAT. Its application in large epidemiological studies is feasible and should greatly increase the power to demonstrate the determinants and potential different metabolic sequelae of visceral and abdominal subcutaneous fat depots.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to all the volunteers who participated in the study. The authors would like to thank Cheryl Kidney, Alice Thompson and the radiographers for assisting in data collection, Jessica Horton for coordinating the study, Richard Powell for assisting with data cleaning and Kirsten Corder for her comments. The study was funded by the Medical Research Council.

REFERENCES

- 1 Cai J, Clark J, Croft S, et al. Older People. 2008. In: *Indications of Public Health in the English Regions*. Observatories WMPH, ed.; Association of Public Health Observatories: 168.
- 2 Craig R, Mindell J, (eds). Health Survey for England 2005. Volumes 1-4: The health of older people. 2007. National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London
- 3 WHO Expert Committee. Adults 60 y of age and older. 1995. In: *Physical Status: the Use and Interpretation of Anthropometry*; WHO: Geneva: 854 chap 9.
- 4 Wannamethee SG, Shaper AG, Morris RW, Whincup PH. Measures of adiposity in the identification of metabolic abnormalities in elderly men. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2005;81:1313-21.
- 5 Harris TB, Visser M, Everhart J, et al. Waist circumference and sagittal diameter reflect total body fat better than visceral fat in older men and women. The Health, Aging and Body Composition Study. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 2000;904:462-73.
- 6 Seidell JC, Visscher TL. Body weight and weight change and their health implications for the elderly. *European journal of clinical nutrition* 2000;54 Suppl 3:S33-39.
- 7 Elia M. Obesity in the elderly. *Obes Res* 2001;9 Suppl 4:244S-248S.
- 8 Stolk RP, Meijer R, Mali WP, Grobbee DE, van der Graaf Y. Ultrasound measurements of intraabdominal fat estimate the metabolic syndrome better than do measurements of waist circumference. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2003;77:857-60.
- 9 Zhang C, Rexrode KM, van Dam RM, Li TY, Hu FB. Abdominal obesity and the risk of all-cause, cardiovascular, and cancer mortality: sixteen years of follow-up in US women. *Circulation* 2008;117:1658-67.
- 10 Montague CT, O'Rahilly S. The perils of portliness: causes and consequences of visceral adiposity. *Diabetes* 2000;49:883-8.
- 11 Snijder MB, Visser M, Dekker JM, et al. The prediction of visceral fat by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry in the elderly: a comparison with computed tomography and anthropometry. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2002;26:984-93.
- 12 Silaghi A, Piercecchi-Marti MD, Grino M, et al. Epicardial adipose tissue extent: relationship with age, body fat distribution, and coronaropathy. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2008;16:2424-30.

- 13 Taksali SE, Caprio S, Dziura J, et al. High visceral and low abdominal subcutaneous fat stores in the obese adolescent: a determinant of an adverse metabolic phenotype. *Diabetes* 2008;57:367-71.
- 14 Stolk RP, Wink O, Zelissen PM, Meijer R, van Gils AP, Grobbee DE. Validity and reproducibility of ultrasonography for the measurement of intra-abdominal adipose tissue. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2001;25:1346-51.
- 15 Armellini F, Zamboni M, Robbi R, et al. Total and intra-abdominal fat measurements by ultrasound and computerized tomography. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 1993;17:209-14.
- 16 Armellini F, Zamboni M, Rigo L, et al. The contribution of sonography to the measurement of intra-abdominal fat. *J Clin Ultrasound* 1990;18:563-7.
- 17 Kim SK, Kim HJ, Hur KY, et al. Visceral fat thickness measured by ultrasonography can estimate not only visceral obesity but also risks of cardiovascular and metabolic diseases. *The American journal of clinical nutrition* 2004;79:593-9.
- 18 Suzuki R, Watanabe S, Hirai Y, et al. Abdominal wall fat index, estimated by ultrasonography, for assessment of the ratio of visceral fat to subcutaneous fat in the abdomen. *The American journal of medicine* 1993;95:309-14.
- 19 Finucane FM, Horton J, Purnow LR, et al. Randomized controlled trial of the efficacy of aerobic exercise in reducing metabolic risk in healthy older people: The Hertfordshire Birth Cohort Physical Activity Trial. *BMC Endocrine Disorders* 2009; 9:1-9.
- 20 Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet* 1986;1:307-10.
- 21 Lee S, Janssen I, Ross R. Interindividual variation in abdominal subcutaneous and visceral adipose tissue: influence of measurement site. *J Appl Physiol* 2004;97:948-54.
- 22 Thomas EL, Bell JD. Influence of undersampling on magnetic resonance imaging measurements of intra-abdominal adipose tissue. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 2003;27:211-8.
- 23 Kuk JL, Church TS, Blair SN, Ross R. Does measurement site for visceral and abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue alter associations with the metabolic syndrome? *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:679-84.
- 24 Shen W, Punyanitya M, Chen J, et al. Visceral adipose tissue: relationships between single slice areas at different locations and obesity-related health risks. *International journal of obesity (2005)* 2007;31:763-9.

- 25 Romao I, Roth J. Genetic and environmental interactions in obesity and type 2 diabetes. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 2008;108:S24-8.
- 26 Wong MY, Day NE, Luan JA, Chan KP, Wareham NJ. The detection of gene-environment interaction for continuous traits: should we deal with measurement error by bigger studies or better measurement? *International journal of epidemiology* 2003;32:51-7.

