Precision MRI phenotyping of muscle 1

volume and quality at a population 2

scale 3

4

5 Marjola Thanaj¹, Nicolas Basty¹, Brandon Whitcher¹, Elena P. Sorokin², Yi Liu², Ramprakash

6 Srinivasan², Madeleine Cule², E. Louise Thomas¹, and Jimmy D. Bell¹

7

¹ Research Centre for Optimal Health, School of Life Sciences, University of Westminster, 8

9 London, UK

10 ²Calico Life Sciences LLC, South San Francisco, California, USA

- 11
- 12 Abstract

13

14 Background: Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) enables direct measurements of muscle 15 volume and quality, allowing for an in-depth understanding of their associations with 16 anthropometric traits, and health conditions. However, it is unclear which muscle volume 17 measurements: total muscle volume, regional measurements, measurements of muscle quality: intermuscular adipose tissue (IMAT) or proton density fat fraction (PDFF), are most 18 19 informative and associate with relevant health conditions such as sarcopenia and frailty.

20 Methods: We developed a pipeline to automatically segment and extract image-derived 21 phenotypes (IDPs) including total and regional muscle volumes and measures of muscle 22 quality, and applied it to the neck-to-knee Dixon images in 44,520 UK Biobank participants.

23 We further segmented paraspinal muscle from 2D quantitative MRI to quantify muscle PDFF NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

and iron concentration. We defined sarcopenia based on grip strength below sex-specific cutoff points and frailty based on five criteria (weight loss, exhaustion, grip strength, low physical
activity and slow walking pace). We used logistic regression to investigate the association
between muscle volume and quality measurements and sarcopenia and frailty.

28 **Results:** Muscle volumes were significantly higher in male compared with female participants, 29 even after correcting for height while. IMAT. (corrected for muscle volume) and paraspinal 30 muscle PDFF were significantly higher in female compared with male participants. From the 31 overall cohort, 7.6% (N = 3.261) were identified with sarcopenia, and 1.1% (N = 455) with 32 frailty. Sarcopenia and frailty were positively associated with age and negatively associated 33 with physical activity levels. Additionally, reduced muscle volume and quality measurements 34 were associated with both sarcopenia and frailty. In sarcopenia, muscle volume IDPs were 35 most informative, particularly total muscle exhibiting odds ratios (OR) of 0.392 and 95% 36 confidence intervals (CI) = 0.361 - 0.426, while for frailty, muscle quality was found to be most 37 informative, in particular thigh IMAT volume indexed to height squared (OR = 1.396, 95% CI = 1.374 - 1.418), both with p-values below the Bonferroni-corrected threshold ($p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$). 38 39 Conclusions: Our fully automated method enables the quantification of muscle volumes and 40 quality suitable for large population-based studies. For sarcopenia, muscle volumes 41 particularly those including greater body coverage such as total muscle are the most 42 informative, whilst, for frailty, markers of muscle quality were the most informative IDPs. These 43 results suggest that different measurements may have varying diagnostic values for different 44 health conditions.

45

Keywords: Muscle volume, Muscle quality, Intermuscular adipose tissue, Magnetic
resonance imaging, Sarcopenia, Frailty.

48

49 Introduction

50

51 Direct population-scale measurements of muscle have been relatively limited, most studies 52 have used measures of fat-free mass (FFM) by bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA), or 53 measures of lean body mass (LBM) from dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) [1,2]. Unlike 54 direct muscle measures, FFM contains all nonfat components of the body, while LBM 55 additionally contains significant and disparate contributions from organs, skin, bones, body 56 water, and essential fat [3]. On the other hand, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) enables 57 the direct quantification of both muscle mass and quality, with the latter, generally related to 58 levels of muscle fat infiltration [4,5].

59 Until recently, measurement of total body muscle volume and distribution by MRI has 60 been typically limited to relatively small cohorts, due to the cost and time-consuming 61 requirements of image acquisition and analysis. The lack of automated techniques led 62 researchers to rely on the measurement of single or multiple cross-sectional areas as an index 63 of overall muscle mass, with a single slice at the third lumbar vertebra (L3) [6], individual 64 muscles groups such as the iliopsoas [7] or anatomical groupings such as the 'thigh muscles' 65 [5] being among the most popular approaches. The extent to which proxies of muscle volume 66 can provide sufficient information to discern the overall impact of muscle volume and quality 67 on health is yet to be fully ascertained. Additionally, there is a lack of consensus regarding 68 whether muscle measurements should be used independently, as ratios or whether these 69 should be indexed to height [8].

70 Ageing and morbidity-related declines in physical function, common in sarcopenia and 71 frailty [9], are associated with a loss of muscle mass, strength and reduction in quality [10]. 72 While sarcopenia and frailty are typically associated with ageing, it is increasingly 73 demonstrated that multiple long-term conditions increase the risk of sarcopenia and frailty at 74 a relatively younger age [11,12]. Recent MRI studies have shown the combination of low 75 muscle mass and high levels of muscle fat infiltration to be a predictor of all-cause mortality, 76 suggesting that muscle fat infiltration could contribute to the definition of sarcopenia [13]. 77 However, much of this work has been limited to specific anatomical regions such as the thigh muscle. While the UK Biobank imaging protocol does not encompass the entire body, 78

including only the neck-to-knee region, it is still possible to derive meaningful muscle
measures including overall muscle volume within that region, specific muscle groups including
iliopsoas muscle, thigh muscles, paraspinal muscles, as well as intermuscular fat content.

In this study, we report both MRI muscle mass and quality measurements for 44,520 UK Biobank participants. We further assess which IDPs related to muscle and fat, both in their unadjusted form and after adjusting for the most common allometric scaling (height squared), are most informative and associate them with anthropometric factors and relevant health conditions including sarcopenia and frailty.

87

88 Methods

89

90 Data

91 A total of 44.520 UK Biobank participants were included in this analysis. Participant data from 92 the cohort was obtained through UK Biobank Access Application number 44584. The UK 93 Biobank has approval from the North West Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee (REC 94 reference: 11/NW/0382). All measurements were obtained under these ethics, adhering to 95 relevant guidelines and regulations, with written informed consent obtained from all participants. Researchers may apply to use the UK Biobank data resources and the results 96 97 generated in this study, by submitting a health-related research proposal that is in the public interest. More information may be found on the UK Biobank researchers and resource 98 99 catalogue pages (https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk).

100

101 Image processing and MRI measurements

Full details of the UK Biobank MRI abdominal protocol have previously been reported [14]. The data included in this paper focused on the neck-to-knee Dixon MRI acquisition and separate single-slice multiecho MRI acquisition for the liver. All data were analysed using our dedicated image processing pipelines for the Dixon and single-slice multiecho acquisitions, with deep learning algorithms employed to segment organs and tissue [15]. Proton density fat

107 fraction (PDFF) and R2* were calculated from the Phase Regularized Estimation using
108 Smoothing and Constrained Optimization (PRESCO) method [15].

109 Our pipeline generates more than 30 image-derived phenotypes (IDPs) from the Dixon 110 MRI data, the subset of IDPs included in this study are primarily muscle volumes, including 111 total muscle (within neck-to-knee volume), thigh (left+right) muscle volume and iliopsoas 112 (left+right) muscle volume. For training the deep learning model, we utilised 108 manual 113 annotations of total muscle and 151 annotations of the iliopsoas muscles. The Dice similarity 114 coefficients on 20% out-of-sample testing data were 0.94 for total muscle and 0.95 for the 115 iliopsoas muscle segmentations. The thigh muscle volumes were derived from the total muscle 116 segmentations using anatomical landmarks from the femur. Together with these IDPs, to avoid 117 any bias of height we also analysed a 10cm image slab, placed at the midpoint of the length 118 of the femur on each leg. This is referred to as the mid-thigh region throughout the text.

119 In addition to muscle IDPs several adipose tissue depots were extracted, including 120 abdominal subcutaneous adipose tissue (ASAT), visceral adipose tissue (VAT) and 121 intermuscular adipose tissue (IMAT) volumes [15]. We also obtained a measure of 122 intramyocellular fat stored in the paraspinal muscles, referred to as PDFF to avoid confusion. 123 We finally extracted a measure of paraspinal muscle iron concentration by transforming the 124 R2* to iron concentration in mg/g [16]. For model training, we had 195 manual annotations of 125 the Iterative Decomposition of Water and Fat with Echo Asymmetry and Least-Squares 126 Estimation (IDEAL) paraspinal muscles and 187 manual annotations of the gradient echo 127 (GRE) paraspinal muscles. The Dice similarity coefficient on 20% out-of-sample testing data 128 was 0.81 and 0.86 for the paraspinal muscle segmentations in IDEAL and GRE acquisitions, 129 respectively.

To account for the potential confounding effect of height on muscle and fat volumes, IDPs were indexed to the commonly used allometric scaling, height squared [8]. Muscle volume was defined from all muscle IDPs whereas muscle quality was defined from all fat measurements including thigh IMAT volume, mid-thigh IMAT volume and paraspinal muscle PDFF however, to determine a muscle quality measurement related to IMAT, we corrected for

volume in the mid-thigh, represented as follows: mid-thigh IMAT/muscle ratio = (mid- MAT volume / (mid-thigh IMAT volume + mid-thigh muscle volume)) * 100.								
MAT volume / (mid-thigh IMAT volume + mid-thigh muscle volume)) * 100.								
thigh IMAT volume / (mid-thigh IMAT volume + mid-thigh muscle volume)) * 100.								
' Control								
vith insufficient anatomical coverage were reported as missing values and a visual								
tion of the MRI data was performed to determine potential extreme values in the IDPs								
irm exclusion. To ensure the full anatomical coverage of the organs a threshold was								
as follows:								
Total muscle volume: 5 L < total muscle < 60 L. No participants were identified above								
or below this threshold.								
Thigh muscle volume: 1 L < thigh muscle < 15 L. A total of 25 participants were								
identified and removed from all subsequent analyses.								
Thigh IMAT volume: thigh IMAT > 50 ml. One participant was identified and removed								
from all subsequent analyses.								
Images from all excluded participants were subsequently visually inspected to confirm								
the original finding.								
A total of 87 participants were excluded from the volumetric analysis of the Dixon MRI								
data due to missing values. We excluded 1,547 participants for the muscle and fat								
volume index analyses, mainly due to missing standing height data. From the single-								
slice multiecho data 319 participants were excluded from the PDFF and iron								
concentration analysis in the paraspinal muscle due to missing values.								
type definitions								
pometric measurements including age, body mass index (BMI), waist and hip								
ferences and hand grip strength (HGS) were taken at the UK Biobank imaging visit.								

160 Ethnicity was self-reported at the initial assessment visit and was categorised as follows: White

161

162 other South Asian background); Black (any Caribbean, African or any other Black

(any British, Irish or other white background); Asian (any Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or any

background); Chinese and Others (mixed ethnic background including White and Black
Caribbean, White and Black African, White and Asian, and other ethnic groups). Sex was selfreported and included those recorded by the NHS and those obtained at the initial assessment
visit. The Townsend deprivation index was calculated immediately prior to participants joining
the UK Biobank.

168 Participant's excess metabolic equivalents of task (MET) in hours per week were 169 computed by multiplying the time in minutes spent in each activity, including walking, moderate 170 and vigorous activity, on a typical day by the number of reported days doing the exercise and 171 the respective MET scores using the methods previously described [17]. Excess METs scores 172 were at 2.3, 3 and 7 for walking, moderate and vigorous activity, respectively [17]. The total 173 physical activity MET was computed by taking the sum of walking, moderate and vigorous 174 MET in hours per week. Any activity lasting less than 10 minutes on a typical day was recorded 175 to 0 for any of the three categories of activity (walking, moderate and vigorous activity). 176 Additionally, for each of the three categories of activity, values exceeding 1260 minutes per 177 week (equivalent to an average of 3 hours per day) were truncated at 1260 minutes [18]. In 178 our following analysis total MET will be referred to as MET. All physical activity measures, 179 alcohol intake frequency and smoking status were self-reported at the UK Biobank imaging 180 visit.

181 Relevant conditions of interest including probable sarcopenia and frailty were defined
182 according to published criteria:

183 Probable Sarcopenia was defined as low muscle strength with HGS below 27 kg in male participants and below 16 kg in female participants [11,19]. The HGS used was 184 185 that of the dominant hand. If participants reported using both hands, the mean of the right and left hand was utilised. Initially, we planned a stricter definition of sarcopenia 186 187 including low muscle quality as recommended by EWGSOP2 [20] which combines 188 both HGS and DXA-measured appendicular lean mass (ALM)/height²: 6.0/7.0 kg/m² 189 (females/males). However, due to the limited availability of UKBB DXA data, (only 190 4,683 participants had available DXA measurements) resulting in only 0.3% (78M /

191 22F) of the cohort meeting the full sarcopenia criteria. Hence, our analysis was focused
192 only on probable sarcopenia. In our analysis probable sarcopenia will be referred to as
193 sarcopenia.

Frailty was defined using the criteria adopted by Hanlon et al. [12], to be used with self reported UK Biobank questionnaire responses which required the presence of 3 out of
 5 indicators. These indicators included weight loss, exhaustion (more than half the
 days or nearly every day), no or only light (once a week or less) physical activity in the
 last 4 weeks, slow walking speed, and low HGS (supplementary Table S1). All the
 frailty indicators were taken at the UK Biobank imaging visit. Additional classifications
 included pre-frailty (1 or 2 of the 5 indicators), and not frail (none of the indicators).

201

202 Statistical Analysis

All summary statistics, hypothesis tests, regression models and figures were performed in R software environment version 4.1.3. Figures were produced using the *ggplot2* package [21]. All descriptive characteristics are presented as means with standard deviations (SD) for quantitative variables and as percentages for categorical variables. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to assess monotonic trends between variables. The Wilcoxon rank-sum test was used to compare the means between two groups. One-way ANOVA was used to compare multiple groups.

210 We explored the association between muscle and fat IDPs and sarcopenia by 211 performing a logistic regression analysis model adjusting for age, sex, ethnicity, alcohol intake 212 frequency, smoking status, Townsend deprivation index, MET and the muscle and fat IDPs 213 including total muscle volume, thigh muscle volume, mid-thigh muscle volume, iliopsoas 214 muscle volume, thigh IMAT volume, mid-thigh IMAT volume, mid-thigh IMAT/muscle volume, 215 paraspinal muscle PDFF and paraspinal muscle iron concentration. We further applied an 216 ordinal logistic regression model to investigate the association between muscle and fat IDPs 217 on frailty given it has multiple ordered categories (not frail, pre-frail, and frail). Ordinal logistic 218 regression models were adjusted for all the variables used in the above logistic regression

219 models. The ordinal logistic regression models were performed using the R *MASS* package 220 [22]. Because muscle and fat IDPs are associated with body composition measurements such 221 as waist-to-hip ratio and BMI, adjustment for these categories might result in over-adjustment 222 bias [23]. Furthermore, HGS was excluded from logistic models since it is used in the definition 223 of sarcopenia. In all models iliopsoas muscle, thigh muscle, thigh IMAT volumes, and indices 224 are shown as the sum of left and right volumes). All anthropometric variables and IDPs were 225 standardised prior to inclusion in the logistic regression models.

226 Summaries of the logistic regression model are reported as odds ratios (OR) with 95% 227 confidence intervals (CIs). To assess the performance of each logistic regression model we 228 used the following metrics: Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the area under the curve (AUC) 229 of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) with corresponding CIs for sarcopenia and 230 concordance index (c-index) for frailty. Lower AIC values indicate a better model fit, while 231 higher AUC and c-index values suggest better discrimination between cases. AUC was 232 calculated using the pROC R package [24], while the c-index was computed using the rms R 233 package [25]. The Bonferroni-corrected threshold for statistical significance was 0.05/583 =234 8.6×10^{-5} .

235

236 Results

237

Typical images showing muscle and fat IDPs generated from each participant are shown in 238 239 Figure 1. Image datasets were available from 44.520 individuals, with all required IDPs being 240 successfully derived for each participant. Summary statistics for the study population are 241 provided in Table 1, 51.7% were female with similar average age to male (female 63.54 ± 7.58 242 years and male 64.93 ± 7.83 years). The average BMI for females and males were $26.02 \pm$ 4.72 kg/m² (range 13.4 to 62.0 kg/m²) and 26.95 ± 3.90 kg/m² (range 16.4 to 58.1 kg/m²) 243 244 respectively. HGS in the dominant hand was 38.82 ± 8.85 kg in males and 23.98 ± 6.12 kg in females and the MET was reported as 24.03 ± 17.51 hours/week from female participants and 245 246 25.16 ± 17.47 hours/week from male participants (Table 1). The overall ethnic distribution for

- the cohort was 96.7% White, 1.1% Asian, 0.7% Black, 0.3% Chinese and 1% Others (see
- 248 methods for details).

249



250

Figure 1. Segmentations from the UK Biobank abdominal MRI of a participant showing: **A**) the total muscle (dark red) overlaid on the coronal view of a neck-to-knee scan, **B**) the paraspinal muscle (green) in 2D quantitative MRI, **C**) the thigh muscles (yellow), thigh IMAT (blue), thigh SAT (purple) overlaid on the coronal view, and **D**) 3D renderings of the muscle segmentations for the following structures: mid-thigh muscle (yellow), mid-thigh IMAT (blue), mid-thigh subcutaneous adipose tissue (purple), paraspinal muscles (green), iliopsoas muscles (red) and total muscle (white).

258

Table 1. Demographics of the participants (N=44,520), separated by sex. (Table can be found
at the end of the page).

262 Total muscle in female and male male participants were 14.04 \pm 1.95 L and 21.80 \pm 3.00 L (p < 8.6×10^{-5}) respectively, with a mean difference between the sexes of 7.76 ± 3.60 263 264 L. or 43% (Table 2). Similar proportional sex differences were observed for all other muscle 265 IDPs. We also observed significant differences between left and right muscle volumes for the 266 thigh, mid-thigh, and iliopsoas muscles in both female and male participants (supplementary Table S2). Mid-thigh IMAT volumes, reflecting reduced muscle guality, were higher in male 267 268 than female participants (55.19 \pm 50.27 ml vs 48.19 \pm 38.40 ml, respectively) (Table 2). 269 However, this trend was reversed when IMAT was corrected for muscle volume in the mid-270 thigh, represented as mid-thigh IMAT/muscle ratio. In this context, female participants 271 exhibited a percentage of 2.48 ± 1.86 %, whereas male participants demonstrated 1.97 ± 1.84 272 % (p < 8.6×10^{-5}) (Table 2). Paraspinal muscle PDFF, was 7.84 ± 4.03 % in female and 6.88 \pm 3.64 % in male participants (p < 8.6 × 10⁻⁵), while iron content showed a small but 273 significant difference between sexes (supplementary Table S2). 274

275

Table 2. Summary statistics for muscle volume and quality IDPs. (Table can be found at theend of the page).

278

279 Associations between sarcopenia and frailty and muscle health

280 From the overall cohort of 44,520 participants 3,261 (7.6%) were classified as having 281 sarcopenia, and 455 (1.1%) were classified as frail (supplementary Table S3). Representative 282 examples of MRI images from these subgroups are shown in Figure 2. The characteristics as 283 well as the summaries of muscle and fat IDPs of sarcopenia and frailty participants are 284 presented in supplementary Tables S4-S7. In summary, participants with and without sarcopenia were aged 67.96 ± 7.17 and 63.86 ± 7.69 years old, respectively. Not-frail, pre-285 286 frail and frail participants were 63.65 ± 7.59 , 64.94 ± 7.79 and 66.56 ± 8.04 years old, 287 respectively. Participants with sarcopenia also had lower physical activity levels and a higher waist-to-hip ratio ($p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$). Similar results were observed for frailty. The average total 288

289 muscle volume for participants without sarcopenia was 17.92 ± 4.64 L whereas for participants 290 with sarcopenia was 16.49 ± 4.20 L (p < 8.6×10^{-5}). For participants without frailty and with 291 pre-frailty, the average total muscle volume was 17.95 ± 4.67 and 17.70 ± 4.57 L, respectively, 292 while frail participants had an average total muscle volume of 16.59 ± 4.13 L. Additionally, 293 muscle quality measurements such as the mid-thigh IMAT/Muscle ratio was higher in 294 participants with sarcopenia and frailty (2.19 \pm 1.84 for no sarcopenia; 2.71 \pm 2.17 % for 295 sarcopenia; 1.98 ± 1.59 for not-frail; 2.49 ± 1.93 for pre-frail and 3.73 ± 2.86 % for frail). 296 Furthermore, there was a significant correlation between dominant HGS and muscle IDPs 297 among participants without sarcopenia for both males and females, showing the highest 298 correlation with total muscle volume (male: $\rho = 0.35$; female $\rho = 0.38$, both $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$), 299 however, this relationship lost significance in the presence of sarcopenia (supplementary 300 Figure S1).



301

302 Figure 2. Representative samples of A) coronal and B) axial MRI views obtained from lean, 303 obese, sarcopenic and frail participants from the Dixon acquisition.

304

305 To determine which IDPs were associated with sarcopenia and frailty, we created 306 logistic regression models, adjusting for age, sex, ethnicity, alcohol intake frequency, smoking 307 status, Townsend deprivation index and MET. Our findings reveal that both sarcopenia and

308 frailty were positively associated with age while displaying negative associations with alcohol 309 and MET in all models. However in models including muscle IDPs only sarcopenia displayed 310 a positive association with males (Table 3 and Table 4). Additionally, smaller muscle volume 311 IDPs and larger muscle fat IDPs were associated with the presence of sarcopenia and frailty. 312 Specifically, sarcopenia and frailty were negatively associated with total muscle volume (OR 313 = 0.392 95% CI 0.361 - 0.426, $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$, for sarcopenia; OR = 0.894 95% CI 0.854 -314 0.935, $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$, for frailty). In contrast, thigh IMAT volume index demonstrated a 315 positive association with increased odds ratios for sarcopenia (OR = 1.129 95% CI 1.091 -316 1.168, $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$) and frailty (OR = 1.410 95% Cl 1.388 - 1.432, $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$). 317 Paraspinal muscle PDFF was also significantly associated with sarcopenia and frailty showing increased odds ratios (OR = 1.094 95% CI 1.059 - 1.130, $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$, for sarcopenia; OR 318 = 1.350 95% CI 1.327 - 1.372, $p < 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$, for frailty) while, paraspinal muscle iron 319 320 concentration was not significantly associated with any of these conditions.

321

322 Performance evaluation

323 Performance judged by the model with the lowest AIC (Akaike's Information Criterion) 324 and the highest AUC and c-index (Table 3, Table 4 and supplementary Table S8), showed 325 that for sarcopenia, total muscle (AUC = 0.707 (0.698, 0.716 95% CI)) and total thigh volume 326 (AUC = 0.707 (0.697, 0.716 95%CI)) were the most informative IDPs (Table 3), with muscle 327 quality IDPs providing the least information. Interestingly, the indexed volumes demonstrated 328 a relatively poor fit in their associations with sarcopenia. Conversely, for frailty, measures of 329 muscle quality including thigh IMAT volume index (c-index = 0.621) and mid-thigh IMAT/Muscle ratio (c-index = 0.618) were the most informative, with muscle volumes IDPs 330 331 providing less information (Table 4 and supplementary Table S8).

332

Table 3. Regression coefficients between sarcopenia and the anthropometric covariate andmuscle and fat IDPs. (Table can be found at the end of the page).

Table 4. Regression coefficients between frailty and the anthropometric covariate and muscleand fat IDPs. (Table can be found at the end of the page).

338

339 Discussion

340

In the present study we have utilised an automated deep-learning technique to accurately measure muscle volumes and quality in a large prospective cohort of middle-aged and older adults in the UK Biobank. We have confirmed and expanded on previous studies looking at the impact of age, sex, and lifestyle factors on muscle strength and have identified muscle volume and quality measurements being strongly associated with sarcopenia and frailty, respectively [26].

347 Muscle volumes were significantly higher in male compared with female participants, 348 even after correcting for height. We further show that total thigh IMAT content was significantly 349 higher in male compared to female participants, however when presented as the mid-thigh 350 IMAT/muscle ratio, this relationship was reversed, with higher levels of mid-thigh IMAT/muscle 351 found in female participants. Similarly, paraspinal muscle PDFF was significantly higher in 352 female participants. This clearly highlights the impact of the type of measurement on possible outcomes. Previously studies have reported higher whole-body and thigh IMAT levels in men 353 354 [4,27], but these were generally not corrected for muscle volume. Although, correcting for 355 muscle mass negated reported sex differences in IMAT [28].

356 The prevalence of sarcopenia (7.6%) and frailty (1.1%) were relatively low in our 357 cohort, in agreement with reports that the UK Biobank cohort is a comparatively healthy 358 population [29]. In this study, we defined sarcopenia based solely on low muscle strength [11], 359 without including reduced muscle mass/quality and/or reduced physical performance. Across 360 all models incorporating muscle volume measurements, this definition of sarcopenia showed 361 a strong positive association with men. Additionally, participants with both sarcopenia and 362 frailty demonstrated strong positive associations with age and lower physical activity level in 363 all models, confirming earlier literature reports [30].

364 Our study further aimed to identify which of our measured muscle IDPs were associated with these health conditions, and which would potentially provide the best 365 366 prognostic tool for identifying this population. We found that sarcopenia was associated with 367 reduced muscle volume and increased levels of mid-thigh IMAT/muscle and paraspinal PDFF. 368 Notably, for sarcopenia, the most informative muscle volume measurements were those with 369 a greater proportion of body included such as total muscle or the entire thigh. On the other 370 hand, for frailty markers of muscle quality, particularly thigh IMAT volume index to height 371 squared and mid-thigh IMAT/Muscle were the most informative IDPs. This suggests that 372 different IDPs may have different diagnostic values for different conditions. Interestingly, we 373 observed that the muscle volumes indexed to height squared demonstrated a relatively poor 374 fit in their associations with sarcopenia. Previous studies investigating associations between 375 low muscle mass, malnutrition and sarcopenia with cancer in the UK Biobank [31], found that 376 in participants with obesity, only the BMI-adjusted muscle mass identified cases of low muscle 377 mass and sarcopenia. They also reported that BMI-adjusted methods may be more suitable 378 for determining these cases of malnutrition and sarcopenia; however, height-adjusted muscle 379 mass showed a higher risk of these conditions occurring. Furthermore, in a previous study, 380 Linge et al, [8] reported that body size adjustments led to unnormalized correlations between 381 muscle volume and body size. However, they also report that adjustments considering the 382 distribution of height-adjusted measurements for each body size value significantly strengthened the associations between muscle volume and both functional and health 383 384 outcomes. Future work using longitudinal data may provide better insights into which muscle 385 volume and quality measurement can best associate with or even predict these health 386 conditions.

Our study is not without limitations. The UK Biobank is a large cross-sectional study that is subject to selection bias with a "healthier" than the wider UK population, excludes younger participants and potentially more severe clinical cases [32]. Furthermore, as the UK Biobank study includes a predominantly White population, future work is needed to further investigate imbalanced population data. Also, given the UK Biobank neck-to-knee acquisition,

measurement of whole-body muscle volume could not be achieved, thus limiting direct comparisons with some literature values [33]. We estimate that the current protocol lacks c.a. 9.75% of total muscle, corresponding to both arms and lower calves. However, as our findings were robust to the selection of muscle volume or quality measure, we consider it unlikely that results with a whole body measure would be dramatically different.

397

398 Conclusions

399

We have presented a fully automated method that enables the measurement of muscle volumes and quality suitable for application to large population-based studies. We have reported that while the choice of muscle measurement may have an impact on the ability to identify disease, most provide consistent differences relating to the detection of the impact of age, sex, and clinical conditions on muscularity.

405

406 **Declarations**

407

408 **Competing of Interests**

M.C., R.S, and E.P.S. are employees of Calico Life Sciences LLC. Y.L. is a former employee
of Calico Life Sciences LLC. M.T., N.B., B.W., J.D.B. and E.L.T. declare no competing
interests.

412

413 Ethics approval and consent to participate

The data resources used in this study have approval from ethics committees. Full anonymised images and participants metadata from the UK Biobank cohort was obtained through UK Biobank Access Application number 44584. The UK Biobank has approval from the North West Multi-Centre Research Ethics Committee (REC reference: 11/NW/0382), and obtained written informed consent from all participants prior to the study. All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations as presented by the relevant

420	authorities, including the Declaration of Helsinki https://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/learn-more-
421	about-uk-biobank/about-us/ethics.
422	
423	Consent for publication
424	Not applicable.
425	
426	Availability of data and materials
427	The UK Biobank resource is available to bona fide researchers for health-related research in
428	the public interest. All researchers who wish to access the research resource must register
429	with UK Biobank by completing the registration form in the Access Management System (AMS
430	- https://bbams.ndph.ox.ac.uk/ams/).
431	
432	Funding
433	This study was funded by Calico Life Sciences LLC.
434	
435	Author Contributions
436	J.D.B., E.L.T., M.T. and M.C. conceived the study. J.D.B., B.W., E.L.T., N.B. and M.T.
437	designed the study. M.T., N.B., B.W., Y.L., E.P.S. and M.C. implemented the methods and
438	performed the data analysis. M.T. defined the disease categories. M.T. performed the
439	statistical analysis. E.L.T., B.W., M.T., J.D.B., R.S. and N.B. drafted the manuscript. All
440	authors read and approved the manuscript.
441	
442	
443	Acknowledgements
444	This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application Number
445	44584.
446	

447 **References**

- 448 1. Zillikens MC, Demissie S, Hsu Y-H, Yerges-Armstrong LM, Chou W-C, Stolk L, et al.
- 449 Large meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies identifies five loci for lean body
- 450 mass. Nat Commun. 2017;8:80. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00031-7.
- 451 2. Hofsteenge GH, Chinapaw MJM, Weijs PJM. Fat-free mass prediction equations for
- 452 bioelectric impedance analysis compared to dual energy X-ray absorptiometry in obese
- 453 adolescents: a validation study. BMC Pediatr. 2015;15:158. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-
- 454 <u>015-0476-7</u>.
- 455 3. Scafoglieri A, Clarys JP. Dual energy X-ray absorptiometry: gold standard for muscle
- 456 mass? J. Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2018. p. 786–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcsm.12308.
- 457 4. Gallagher D, Kuznia P, Heshka S, Albu J, Heymsfield SB, Goodpaster B, et al. Adipose
- tissue in muscle: a novel depot similar in size to visceral adipose tissue. Am J Clin Nutr.
- 459 2005;81:903–10. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/81.4.903</u>.
- 460 5. Linge J, Borga M, West J, Tuthill T, Miller MR, Dumitriu A, et al. Body Composition
- 461 Profiling in the UK Biobank Imaging Study. Obesity . 2018;26:1785–95.
- 462 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.22210</u>.
- 463 6. Schweitzer L, Geisler C, Pourhassan M, Braun W, Glüer C-C, Bosy-Westphal A, et al.
- 464 What is the best reference site for a single MRI slice to assess whole-body skeletal muscle
- 465 and adipose tissue volumes in healthy adults? Am J Clin Nutr. 2015;102:58–65.
- 466 <u>https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.115.111203</u>.
- 467 7. Fitzpatrick JA, Basty N, Cule M, Liu Y, Bell JD, Thomas EL, et al. Large-scale analysis of
- 468 iliopsoas muscle volumes in the UK Biobank. Sci Rep. 2020;10:20215.
- 469 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-77351-0</u>.
- 470 8. Linge J, Heymsfield SB, Dahlqvist Leinhard O. On the Definition of Sarcopenia in the

- 471 Presence of Aging and Obesity-Initial Results from UK Biobank. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med
- 472 Sci. 2020;75:1309–16. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glz229</u>.
- 473 9. Ungar A, Marchionni N. Cardiac Management in the Frail Elderly Patient and the Oldest
- 474 Old. Springer; 2017. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43468-1</u>.
- 475 10. Sizoo D, de Heide LJM, Emous M, van Zutphen T, Navis G, van Beek AP. Measuring
- 476 Muscle Mass and Strength in Obesity: a Review of Various Methods. Obes Surg.
- 477 2021;31:384–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11695-020-05082-2.
- 478 11. Dodds RM, Granic A, Robinson SM, Sayer AA. Sarcopenia, long-term conditions, and
- 479 multimorbidity: findings from UK Biobank participants. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle.
- 480 2020;11:62–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jcsm.12503</u>.
- 481 12. Hanlon P, Nicholl BI, Jani BD, Lee D, McQueenie R, Mair FS. Frailty and pre-frailty in
- 482 middle-aged and older adults and its association with multimorbidity and mortality: a
- 483 prospective analysis of 493 737 UK Biobank participants. Lancet Public Health.
- 484 2018;3:e323–32. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(18)30091-4</u>.
- 485 13. Linge J, Ekstedt M, Dahlqvist Leinhard O. Adverse muscle composition is linked to poor
- 486 functional performance and metabolic comorbidities in NAFLD. JHEP Rep. 2021;3:100197.
- 487 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhepr.2020.100197</u>.
- 488 14. Littlejohns TJ, Holliday J, Gibson LM, Garratt S, Oesingmann N, Alfaro-Almagro F, et al.
- 489 The UK Biobank imaging enhancement of 100,000 participants: rationale, data collection,
- 490 management and future directions. Nat Commun. 2020;11:2624.
- 491 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15948-9</u>.
- 492 15. Liu Y, Basty N, Whitcher B, Bell JD, Sorokin EP, van Bruggen N, et al. Genetic
- 493 architecture of 11 organ traits derived from abdominal MRI using deep learning. Elife
- 494 [Internet]. 2021;10. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.65554</u>.

- 495 16. Wood JC, Enriquez C, Ghugre N, Tyzka JM, Carson S, Nelson MD, et al. MRI R2 and
- 496 R2* mapping accurately estimates hepatic iron concentration in transfusion-dependent
- thalassemia and sickle cell disease patients. Blood. 2005;106:1460–5.
- 498 <u>https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2004-10-3982</u>.
- 499 17. O'Donnell J, Smith-Byrne K, Velardo C, Conrad N, Salimi-Khorshidi G, Doherty A, et al.
- 500 Self-reported and objectively measured physical activity in people with and without chronic
- 501 heart failure: UK Biobank analysis. Open Heart. 2020;7:e001099.
- 502 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/openhrt-2019-001099</u>.
- 503 18. Bradbury KE, Guo W, Cairns BJ, Armstrong MEG, Key TJ. Association between physical
- activity and body fat percentage, with adjustment for BMI: a large cross-sectional analysis of
- 505 UK Biobank. BMJ Open. 2017;7:e011843. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011843</u>.
- 506 19. Dodds RM, Syddall HE, Cooper R, Benzeval M, Deary IJ, Dennison EM, et al. Grip
- 507 strength across the life course: normative data from twelve British studies. PLoS One.
- 508 2014;9:e113637. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0113637</u>.
- 20. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyère O, Cederholm T, et al. Sarcopenia:
- 510 revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing. 2019;48:16–31.
- 511 <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afz046</u>.
- 512 21. Wilkinson L. ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis by WICKHAM, H [Internet].
- 513 Biometrics. 2011. p. 678–9. Available from: <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-</u>
- 514 <u>0420.2011.01616.x</u>.
- 515 22. Venables WN, Ripley BD. Modern Applied Statistics with S-PLUS. Springer Science &
- 516 Business Media; 2013. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3121-7</u>.
- 517 23. Schisterman EF, Cole SR, Platt RW. Overadjustment bias and unnecessary adjustment
- 518 in epidemiologic studies. Epidemiology. 2009;20:488–95.
- 519 <u>https://doi.org/10.1097%2FEDE.0b013e3181a819a1</u>.

- 520 24. Robin X, Turck N, Hainard A, Tiberti N, Lisacek F, Sanchez J-C, et al. pROC: an open-
- 521 source package for R and S+ to analyze and compare ROC curves. BMC Bioinformatics.
- 522 2011;12:1–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-12-77</u>.
- 523 25. Harrell FE. Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic
- 524 Regression, and Survival Analysis. Springer Science & Business Media; 2013.
- 525 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19425-7.
- 526 26. Kalyani RR, Corriere M, Ferrucci L. Age-related and disease-related muscle loss: the
- 527 effect of diabetes, obesity, and other diseases. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2014;2:819–29.
- 528 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(14)70034-8</u>.
- 529 27. Sparks LM, Goodpaster BH, Bergman BC. The Metabolic Significance of Intermuscular
- 530 Adipose Tissue: Is IMAT a Friend or a Foe to Metabolic Health? Diabetes. 2021;70:2457–67.
- 531 <u>https://doi.org/10.2337/dbi19-0006</u>.
- 532 28. Kim JE, Dunville K, Li J, Cheng JX, Conley TB, Couture CS, et al. Intermuscular Adipose
- 533 Tissue Content and Intramyocellular Lipid Fatty Acid Saturation Are Associated with Glucose
- Homeostasis in Middle-Aged and Older Adults. Endocrinol Metab (Seoul). 2017;32:257–64.
- 535 <u>https://doi.org/10.3803/EnM.2017.32.2.257</u>.
- 536 29. Lyall DM, Quinn T, Lyall LM, Ward J, Anderson JJ, Smith DJ, et al. Quantifying bias in
- 537 psychological and physical health in the UK Biobank imaging sub-sample. Brain Commun.
- 538 2022;4:fcac119. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/braincomms/fcac119</u>.
- 30. Bouchard DR, Dionne IJ, Brochu M. Sarcopenic/Obesity and Physical Capacity in Older
- 540 Men and Women: Data From the Nutrition as a Determinant of Successful Aging (NuAge)—
- the Quebec Longitudinal Study. Obesity . 2009;17:2082–8.
- 542 <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/oby.2009.109</u>.
- 543 31. Kiss N, Prado CM, Daly RM, Denehy L, Edbrooke L, Baguley BJ, et al. Low muscle
- mass, malnutrition, sarcopenia, and associations with survival in adults with cancer in the UK

- 545 Biobank cohort. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle [Internet]. 2023; Available from:
- 546 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jcsm.13256</u>.
- 547 32. Munafò MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Davey Smith G. Collider scope: when
- 548 selection bias can substantially influence observed associations. Int J Epidemiol.
- 549 2018;47:226–35. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyx206</u>.
- 550 33. Karlsson A, Rosander J, Romu T, Tallberg J, Grönqvist A, Borga M, et al. Automatic and
- 551 quantitative assessment of regional muscle volume by multi-atlas segmentation using whole-
- body water-fat MRI. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2015;41:1558–69.
- 553 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.24726</u>.
- 554

555	Table	1. Demograph	ics of the	participants	(N=44,520)), separated	by sex.
					· · · ·		

	Full cohort	Female	Male	p-values
N	44,520	23,013	21,507	-
White (N)	43,059	22,277	20,782	-
Asian (N)	476	175	301	-
Black (N)	297	164	133	-
Chinese (N)	133	80	53	-
Others (N)	438	265	173	-
Age (yrs.)	64.21 ± 7.73	63.54 ± 7.58	64.93 ± 7.83	$p < 10^{-16}$
Weight (kg)	75.99 ± 15.10	68.88 ± 13.03	83.60 ± 13.35	$p < 10^{-16}$
Height (cm)	169.17 ± 9.27	162.72 ± 6.25	176.06 ± 6.64	$p < 10^{-16}$
BMI (kg/m²)	26.47 ± 4.37	26.02 ± 4.72	26.95 ± 3.90	$p < 10^{-16}$
Waist Circumference (cm)	88.37 ± 12.69	82.78 ± 11.83	94.34 ± 10.71	$p < 10^{-16}$

All rights	reserved.	No reuse	allowed	without	permission.

Hip Circumference (cm)	100.76 ± 8.71	100.81 ± 9.83	100.70 ± 7.34	1.4×10^{-9}
Waist-to-Hip Ratio	0.88 ± 0.09	0.82 ± 0.07	0.94 ± 0.06	$p < 10^{-16}$
Dominant HGS (kg)	31.17 ± 10.60	23.98 ± 6.12	38.82 ± 8.85	$p < 10^{-16}$
Walking MET (hours/week)	9.16 ± 7.23	9.18 ± 7.33	9.15 ± 7.12	0.385
Moderate MET (hours/week)	8.55 ± 7.81	8.61 ± 7.88	8.49 ± 7.74	0.995
Vigorous MET (hours/week)	6.86 ± 7.94	6.25 ± 7.68	7.52 ± 8.16	$p < 10^{-16}$
Total MET (hours/week)	24.58 ± 17.49	24.03 ± 17.51	25.16 ± 17.47	8.7×10^{-13}
Townsend deprivation				
index	-1.88 ± 2.73	-1.83 ± 2.74	-1.93 ± 2.72	1.6×10^{-6}
Alcohol frequency (N)				
Daily	7,585	3,118	4,467	-
1-4 times per week	24,014	11,802	12,212	-
1-3 times per month	5,130	3,081	2,049	-
Occasionally or never	7,469	4,841	2,628	-
Smoking status (N)				
Never	27,481	15,035	12,446	-
Previous	15,067	7,068	7,999	-
Current	1,518	657	861	-
VAT (L)	3.95 ± 2.31	2.82 ± 1.57	5.16 ± 2.36	$p < 10^{-16}$
ASAT (L)	8.47 ± 4.12	9.82 ± 4.37	7.01 ± 3.27	$p < 10^{-16}$

556

Values are reported as mean and standard deviation for continuous variables and counts (N) 557 for categorical variables. Significance refers to the p-value for a Wilcoxon rank-sums test, where the null hypothesis is the medians between the two groups (male and female 558 559 participants) being equal. BMI: Body mass index; HGS: Hand grip strength; MET: Metabolic

- 560 equivalents of task; VAT: Visceral adipose tissue; ASAT: Abdominal subcutaneous adipose
- 561 tissue.
- 562 **Table 2.** Summary statistics for muscle volume and quality IDPs.

	Full cohort	Female	Male	
	(N = 44,520)	(N = 23,013)	(N = 21,507)	p-values
Muscle volume IDPs				
Total Muscle Volume				
(L)	17.79 ± 4.62	14.04 ± 1.95	21.80 ± 3.00	$p < 10^{-16}$
Total Muscle Volume				
Index (L/m²)	6.14 ± 1.12	5.30 ± 0.62	7.03 ± 0.81	$p < 10^{-16}$
Thigh Muscle Volume				
(L)	8.45 ± 2.23	6.68 ± 1.01	10.34 ± 1.53	$p < 10^{-16}$
Thigh Muscle Volume				
Index (L/m²)	2.91 ± 0.54	2.52 ± 0.31	3.33 ± 0.40	$p < 10^{-16}$
Mid-thigh Muscle				
Volume (L)	2.28 ± 0.55	1.87 ± 0.28	2.73 ± 0.41	$p < 10^{-16}$
lliopsoas Muscle				
Volume (L)	0.64 ± 0.17	0.51 ± 0.08	0.78 ± 0.12	$p < 10^{-16}$
lliopsoas Muscle				
Volume Index (L/m²)	0.22 ± 0.04	0.19 ± 0.02	0.25 ± 0.03	$p < 10^{-16}$
Muscle quality IDPs				
Thigh IMAT Volume (L)	0.77 ± 0.34	0.71 ± 0.29	0.84 ± 0.37	$p < 10^{-16}$
Thigh IMAT Volume				
Index (mL/m²)	269.82 ± 114.91	266.61 ± 109.33	273.24 ± 120.49	0.00039

Mid-thigh IMAT				
Volume (mL)	51.57 ± 44.67	48.19 ± 38.40	55.19 ± 50.27	$p < 10^{-16}$
Mid-thigh IMAT/Muscle				
(%)	2.24 ± 1.87	2.48 ± 1.86	1.97 ± 1.84	$p < 10^{-16}$
Paraspinal Muscle				
PDFF (%)	7.38 ± 3.88	7.84 ± 4.03	6.88 ± 3.64	$p < 10^{-16}$
Paraspinal Muscle Iron				
Concentration (mg/g)	1.20 ± 0.12	1.20 ± 0.13	1.19 ± 0.10	$p < 10^{-16}$

Values are reported as mean and standard deviation. Significance refers to the p-value for a
Wilcoxon rank-sums test, where the null hypothesis is the medians between the two groups
(male and female participants) being equal. IMAT: Intermuscular adipose tissue; PDFF: Proton
density fat fraction.

567

568 **Table 3.** Regression coefficients between sarcopenia and the anthropometric covariate and569 muscle and fat IDPs.

	Models - Sarcopenia							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
	1.527**	1.673**	1.551**	1.672**	1.558**	1.582**	1.715**	
Age	(1.463, 1.594)	(1.604, 1.745)	(1.487, 1.619)	(1.603, 1.744)	(1.492, 1.628)	(1.515, 1.652)	(1.644, 1.789)	
	4.269**	1.779**	3.740**	1.801**	2.514**	2.608**	1.341**	
Male	(3.688, 4.941)	(1.576, 2.008)	(3.262, 4.288)	(1.605, 2.020)	(2.220, 2.847)	(2.291, 2.969)	(1.205, 1.493)	
	1.377*	1.855**	1.496*	1.907**	1.702*	1.504*	1.938**	
Asian	(1.026, 1.822)	(1.387, 2.445)	(1.115, 1.976)	(1.426, 2.512)	(1.271, 2.245)	(1.122, 1.986)	(1.449, 2.552)	
	0.607	0.567	0.680	0.633	0.682	0.453*	0.456*	
Black	(0.272, 1.163)	(0.255, 1.082)	(0.305, 1.305)	(0.284, 1.212)	(0.306, 1.305)	(0.204, 0.865)	(0.205, 0.870)	
	1.075	1.440	1.139	1.464	1.339	1.154	1.467	

Chinese	(0.554, 1.902)	(0.744, 2.544)	(0.587, 2.016)	(0.756, 2.588)	(0.691, 2.366)	(0.595, 2.043)	(0.757, 2.591)
	0.892	1.016	0.935	1.043	1.020	0.875	0.980
Others	(0.590, 1.299)	(0.674, 1.473)	(0.619, 1.359)	(0.692, 1.512)	(0.676, 1.481)	(0.580, 1.271)	(0.651, 1.419)
Alcohol frequency	0.681**	0.662**	0.693**	0.672**	0.684**	0.673**	0.664**
[Daily]	(0.601, 0.770)	(0.585, 0.749)	(0.612, 0.784)	(0.594, 0.760)	(0.604, 0.774)	(0.594, 0.761)	(0.587, 0.750)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.765**	0.746**	0.774**	0.754**	0.766**	0.764**	0.748**
4 times per week]	(0.694, 0.844)	(0.677, 0.822)	(0.703, 0.854)	(0.685, 0.831)	(0.696, 0.845)	(0.694, 0.842)	(0.679, 0.824)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.780*	0.772*	0.785*	0.777*	0.784*	0.784*	0.775*
3 times per month]	(0.679, 0.895)	(0.672, 0.885)	(0.683, 0.901)	(0.677, 0.891)	(0.683, 0.899)	(0.683, 0.900)	(0.675, 0.888)
Smoking status	0.966	0.955	0.950	0.947	0.955	0.933	0.935
[Previous]	(0.891, 1.046)	(0.882, 1.034)	(0.877, 1.029)	(0.874, 1.025)	(0.881, 1.034)	(0.861, 1.010)	(0.863, 1.012)
Smoking status	0.996	1.001	0.949	0.967	0.958	0.960	0.984
[Current]	(0.794, 1.236)	(0.799, 1.240)	(0.756, 1.177)	(0.771, 1.198)	(0.764, 1.189)	(0.765, 1.190)	(0.785, 1.218)
Townsend	1.055*	1.066*	1.054*	1.066*	1.061*	1.054*	1.064*
deprivation index	(1.016, 1.094)	(1.028, 1.106)	(1.016, 1.094)	(1.027, 1.106)	(1.023, 1.101)	(1.016, 1.094)	(1.025, 1.104)
	0.846**	0.838**	0.849**	0.843**	0.842**	0.836**	0.830**
MET	(0.813, 0.880)	(0.806, 0.872)	(0.816, 0.884)	(0.810, 0.877)	(0.810, 0.876)	(0.804, 0.870)	(0.798, 0.863)
	0.392**						
Total Muscle Volume	(0.361, 0.426)						
Total Muscle Volume		0.665**					
Index		(0.623, 0.710)					
			0.416**				
Thigh Muscle Volume			(0.385, 0.449)				
				0.650**			

Thigh Muscle	Volume							
Index					(0.611, 0.692)			
Mid-thigh	Muscle					0.522**		
Volume						(0.487, 0.560)		
lliopsoas	Muscle						0.519**	
Volume							(0.482, 0.558)	
lliopsoas	Muscle							0.789**
Volume Index								(0.745, 0.835)
		0.041**	0.068**	0.044**	0.067**	0.055**	0.055**	0.080**
Constant		(0.037, 0.046)	(0.061, 0.076)	(0.039, 0.049)	(0.060, 0.074)	(0.049, 0.061)	(0.049, 0.061)	(0.072, 0.088)
Observations		41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943
AIC		20854.5	21229.4	20857.8	21195.1	21038.9	21057.6	21318.7
570		4						

	Models - Sarcopenia (Continued)							
	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		
	1.784**	1.761**	1.781**	1.752**	1.753**	1.804**		
Age	(1.713, 1.859)	(1.690, 1.835)	(1.710, 1.856)	(1.682, 1.826)	(1.681, 1.828)	(1.732, 1.880)		
	0.948	0.965	0.954	1.016	0.998	0.973		
Male	(0.878, 1.024)	(0.895, 1.041)	(0.885, 1.030)	(0.942, 1.097)	(0.925, 1.077)	(0.902, 1.049)		
	2.197**	2.157**	2.191**	2.127**	2.149**	2.179**		
Asian	(1.646, 2.887)	(1.616, 2.835)	(1.641, 2.879)	(1.592, 2.797)	(1.609, 2.825)	(1.633, 2.864)		
	0.437*	0.427*	0.428*	0.430*	0.449*	0.452*		
Black	(0.197, 0.833)	(0.192, 0.813)	(0.193, 0.816)	(0.193, 0.820)	(0.202, 0.854)	(0.203, 0.860)		
	1.657	1.706	1.664	1.690	1.646	1.590		
Chinese	(0.856, 2.926)	(0.881, 3.012)	(0.860, 2.937)	(0.873, 2.984)	(0.850, 2.908)	(0.821, 2.805)		

	1.015	1.013	1.018	1.023	1.010	1.002
Others	(0.675, 1.470)	(0.673, 1.467)	(0.676, 1.473)	(0.679, 1.481)	(0.671, 1.463)	(0.666, 1.450)
Alcohol frequency	0.668**	0.668**	0.671**	0.670**	0.675**	0.674**
[Daily]	(0.591, 0.756)	(0.590, 0.755)	(0.593, 0.758)	(0.592, 0.758)	(0.597, 0.763)	(0.595, 0.762)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.746**	0.749**	0.748**	0.752**	0.751**	0.746**
4 times per week]	(0.677, 0.822)	(0.680, 0.826)	(0.679, 0.824)	(0.682, 0.828)	(0.682, 0.827)	(0.678, 0.822)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.770*	0.772*	0.772*	0.774*	0.774*	0.770*
3 times per month]	(0.671, 0.883)	(0.673, 0.885)	(0.672, 0.885)	(0.674, 0.888)	(0.674, 0.887)	(0.671, 0.882)
Smoking status	0.925	0.912*	0.920*	0.912*	0.926	0.939
[Previous]	(0.854, 1.002)	(0.842, 0.988)	(0.849, 0.996)	(0.842, 0.988)	(0.855, 1.003)	(0.867, 1.016)
Smoking status	0.997	0.984	0.997	0.986	0.998	1.004
[Current]	(0.796, 1.234)	(0.786, 1.219)	(0.796, 1.234)	(0.787, 1.221)	(0.797, 1.236)	(0.802, 1.243)
Townsend deprivation	1.063*	1.058*	1.060*	1.057*	1.061*	1.066*
index	(1.024, 1.103)	(1.020, 1.098)	(1.022, 1.100)	(1.019, 1.097)	(1.023, 1.101)	(1.027, 1.106)
	0.831**	0.843**	0.836**	0.844**	0.833**	0.821**
MET	(0.799, 0.865)	(0.810, 0.877)	(0.803, 0.869)	(0.811, 0.879)	(0.801, 0.866)	(0.790, 0.854)
	1.060*					
Thigh IMAT Volume	(1.022, 1.098)					
Thigh IMAT Volume		1.129**				
Index		(1.091, 1.168)				
Mid-thigh IMAT			1.099**			
Volume			(1.062, 1.136)			
Mid-thigh				1.162**		
IMAT/Muscle				(1.123, 1.201)		

Paraspinal Muscle					1.094**	
PDFF					(1.059, 1.130)	
Paraspinal Muscle						1.057*
Iron Concentration						(1.021, 1.094)
	0.096**	0.095**	0.095**	0.092**	0.093**	0.094**
Constant	(0.087, 0.104)	(0.086, 0.103)	(0.087, 0.104)	(0.084, 0.100)	(0.085, 0.101)	(0.086, 0.103)
Observations	41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943	41,943
AIC	21376.3	21339.9	21357.6	21313.7	21357.1	21376.3

Values are presented as odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) in parentheses. 571 572 * indicate statistically significant for p < 0.05, ** indicate statistically significant after Bonferroni 573 correction ($p = 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$). Models 1-7 were adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, alcohol intake 574 frequency, smoking status, Townsend deprivation index, MET, as well as each muscle IDPs, 575 separately. *(1) - Total Muscle Volume; (2) - Total Muscle Volume Index; (3) - Thigh Muscle 576 Volume; (4) - Thigh Muscle Volume Index; (5) - Iliopsoas Muscle Volume; (6) - Mid-thigh 577 Muscle Volume; (7) - Iliopsoas Muscle Volume Index; (8) - Thigh IMAT Volume; (9) - Thigh 578 IMAT Volume Index; (10) - Mid-thigh IMAT Volume; (11) - Mid-thigh IMAT/Muscle; (12) -579 Paraspinal Muscle PDFF; (13) - Paraspinal Muscle Iron Concentration.

581 **Table 4.** Regression coefficients between frailty and the anthropometric covariate and muscle582 and fat IDPs.

	Models - Frailty								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)		
	1.179**	1.234**	1.167**	1.215**	1.199**	1.159**	1.206**		
Age	(1.157, 1.201)	(1.212, 1.256)	(1.145, 1.189)	(1.193, 1.236)	(1.176, 1.222)	(1.137, 1.181)	(1.185, 1.228)		
	1.228**	0.841**	1.336**	0.960	1.058	1.373**	1.015		

Male	(1.148, 1.309)	(0.774, 0.908)	(1.261, 1.412)	(0.896, 1.024)	(0.988, 1.127)	(1.300, 1.446)	(0.955, 1.076)
	1.473*	1.646**	1.445*	1.582**	1.547**	1.398*	1.567**
Asian	(1.277, 1.669)	(1.451, 1.842)	(1.249, 1.640)	(1.387, 1.777)	(1.351, 1.742)	(1.202, 1.595)	(1.371, 1.762)
	1.295*	1.116	1.367*	1.172	1.246	1.262	1.228
Black	(1.038, 1.552)	(0.859, 1.373)	(1.109, 1.625)	(0.914, 1.429)	(0.989, 1.503)	(1.005, 1.518)	(0.973, 1.484)
	1.001	1.094	0.980	1.065	1.047	0.957	1.057
Chinese	(0.632, 1.369)	(0.726, 1.462)	(0.611, 1.349)	(0.697, 1.433)	(0.679, 1.415)	(0.588, 1.326)	(0.689, 1.425)
	1.160	1.155	1.164	1.160	1.170	1.130	1.170
Others	(0.956, 1.364)	(0.952, 1.359)	(0.960, 1.368)	(0.956, 1.364)	(0.966, 1.373)	(0.926, 1.334)	(0.966, 1.374)
Alcohol frequency	0.541**	0.543**	0.543**	0.541**	0.541**	0.540**	0.541**
[Daily]	(0.471, 0.612)	(0.473, 0.614)	(0.472, 0.614)	(0.470, 0.611)	(0.471, 0.612)	(0.470, 0.611)	(0.471, 0.612)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.618**	0.617**	0.621**	0.616**	0.618**	0.620**	0.617**
4 times per week]	(0.562, 0.675)	(0.560, 0.674)	(0.564, 0.677)	(0.560, 0.673)	(0.561, 0.674)	(0.564, 0.677)	(0.560, 0.674)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.794**	0.790**	0.796**	0.791**	0.792**	0.796**	0.792**
3 times per month]	(0.718, 0.870)	(0.714, 0.866)	(0.719, 0.872)	(0.715, 0.867)	(0.716, 0.869)	(0.720, 0.872)	(0.716, 0.868)
Smoking status	1.156**	1.142**	1.156**	1.149**	1.152**	1.152**	1.151**
[Previous]	(1.112, 1.200)	(1.099, 1.186)	(1.113, 1.200)	(1.105, 1.192)	(1.108, 1.195)	(1.109, 1.196)	(1.107, 1.194)
Smoking status	1.277**	1.273**	1.268**	1.279**	1.274**	1.268**	1.276**
[Current]	(1.163, 1.391)	(1.159, 1.387)	(1.154, 1.382)	(1.165, 1.392)	(1.161, 1.388)	(1.154, 1.382)	(1.162, 1.390)
Townsend	1.056**	1.057**	1.055**	1.057**	1.057**	1.054**	1.057**
deprivation index	(1.035, 1.077)	(1.036, 1.078)	(1.035, 1.076)	(1.036, 1.078)	(1.036, 1.077)	(1.034, 1.075)	(1.036, 1.078)
	0.865**	0.855**	0.867**	0.859**	0.862**	0.865**	0.861**
МЕТ	(0.844, 0.886)	(0.834, 0.876)	(0.846, 0.888)	(0.837, 0.880)	(0.841, 0.883)	(0.844, 0.886)	(0.840, 0.882)
	0.905**						
Total Muscle Volume	(0.864, 0.945)						

Total Muscle Volume		1.141**					
Index		(1.107, 1.174)					
			0.858**				
Thigh Muscle Volume			(0.820, 0.896)				
Thigh Muscle Volume				1.051*			
Index				(1.019, 1.083)			
Mid-thigh Muscle					0.987		
Volume					(0.951, 1.022)		
lliopsoas Muscle						0.842**	
Volume						(0.805, 0.879)	
lliopsoas Muscle							1.013
Volume Index							(0.983, 1.044)
	1.241**	1.028	1.296**	1.096*	1.152**	1.309**	1.129**
Not Frail Pre Frail	(1.238, 1.243)	(1.028, 1.028)	(1.293, 1.299)	(1.095, 1.097)	(1.15, 1.153)	(1.305, 1.312)	(1.127, 1.13)
	75.47**	62.636**	78.958**	66.648**	69.984**	79.821**	68.579**
		(60.173,	(75.682,	(63.988,	(67.159,	(76.502,	
Pre Frail Frail	(72.37, 78.702)	65.201)	82.375)	69.418)	72.928)	83.285)	(65.824, 71.45)
Observations	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841
AIC	57565.3	57529.9	57526.8	57579.7	57588.3	57505.4	57588.1

	Models - Frailty (Continued)							
	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)		
	1.163**	1.141**	1.172**	1.143**	1.124**	1.203**		
Age	(1.142, 1.184)	(1.120, 1.163)	(1.150, 1.193)	(1.122, 1.164)	(1.103, 1.146)	(1.182, 1.223)		

	0.929*	1.027	0.993	1.148**	1.128**	1.035
Male	(0.887, 0.971)	(0.985, 1.068)	(0.951, 1.034)	(1.106, 1.190)	(1.086, 1.170)	(0.994, 1.076)
	1.552**	1.477*	1.535**	1.454*	1.467*	1.557**
Asian	(1.356, 1.748)	(1.280, 1.673)	(1.339, 1.731)	(1.257, 1.650)	(1.270, 1.664)	(1.362, 1.752)
	1.154	1.127	1.142	1.203	1.275	1.231
Black	(0.896, 1.413)	(0.868, 1.386)	(0.882, 1.401)	(0.944, 1.461)	(1.017, 1.533)	(0.975, 1.486)
	1.245	1.236	1.178	1.170	1.160	1.052
Chinese	(0.876, 1.614)	(0.867, 1.606)	(0.809, 1.547)	(0.801, 1.540)	(0.790, 1.530)	(0.684, 1.420)
	1.197	1.177	1.185	1.194	1.192	1.169
Others	(0.992, 1.402)	(0.971, 1.383)	(0.980, 1.390)	(0.989, 1.399)	(0.987, 1.396)	(0.965, 1.373)
Alcohol frequency	0.522**	0.522**	0.530**	0.529**	0.542**	0.541**
[Daily]	(0.451, 0.593)	(0.450, 0.593)	(0.459, 0.601)	(0.458, 0.601)	(0.470, 0.613)	(0.470, 0.611)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.615**	0.617**	0.618**	0.620**	0.625**	0.617**
4 times per week]	(0.558, 0.672)	(0.559, 0.674)	(0.561, 0.675)	(0.563, 0.678)	(0.568, 0.682)	(0.560, 0.674)
Alcohol frequency [1-	0.789**	0.790**	0.791**	0.795**	0.798**	0.792**
3 times per month]	(0.712, 0.866)	(0.714, 0.867)	(0.715, 0.868)	(0.718, 0.871)	(0.721, 0.874)	(0.716, 0.868)
Smoking status	1.094**	1.085*	1.102**	1.101**	1.118**	1.151**
[Previous]	(1.050, 1.138)	(1.041, 1.129)	(1.058, 1.146)	(1.057, 1.145)	(1.074, 1.162)	(1.107, 1.194)
Smoking status	1.211*	1.202*	1.230*	1.222*	1.249*	1.276**
[Current]	(1.096, 1.325)	(1.087, 1.317)	(1.116, 1.345)	(1.108, 1.337)	(1.134, 1.363)	(1.162, 1.389)
Townsend	1.047**	1.042*	1.045**	1.043**	1.045**	1.057**
deprivation index	(1.026, 1.067)	(1.021, 1.063)	(1.024, 1.065)	(1.022, 1.064)	(1.024, 1.066)	(1.036, 1.078)
	0.900**	0.908**	0.895**	0.902**	0.888**	0.861**
МЕТ	(0.879, 0.922)	(0.887, 0.929)	(0.874, 0.917)	(0.881, 0.923)	(0.867, 0.910)	(0.841, 0.882)

	1.328**					
Thigh IMAT Volume	(1.306, 1.350)					
Thigh IMAT Volume		1.396**				
Index		(1.374, 1.418)				
Mid-thigh IMAT			1.349**			
Volume			(1.327, 1.372)			
Mid-thigh				1.408**		
IMAT/Muscle				(1.383, 1.432)		
Paraspinal Muscle					1.350**	
PDFF					(1.327, 1.372)	
Paraspinal Muscle						0.995
Iron Concentration						(0.975, 1.015)
	1.054	1.104*	1.095*	1.175**	1.183**	1.139**
Not Frail Pre Frail	(1.053, 1.054)	(1.102, 1.105)	(1.094, 1.096)	(1.173, 1.177)	(1.181, 1.185)	(1.138, 1.14)
	66.512**	70.934**	69.906**	75.93**	75.815**	69.211**
Pre Frail Frail	(63.859, 69.276)	(68.062, 73.927)	(67.085, 72.845)	(72.808, 79.186)	(72.699, 79.066)	(66.425, 72.114)
Observations	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841	40,841
AIC	56936.6	56672.4	56892.5	56787.1	56861.3	57588.6

585 Values are presented as odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) in parentheses. 586 * indicate statistically significant for p < 0.05, ** indicate statistically significant after Bonferroni 587 correction ($p = 8.6 \times 10^{-5}$). Models 1-7 were adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, alcohol intake 588 frequency, smoking status, Townsend deprivation index, MET, as well as each muscle IDPs, 589 separately. *(1) - Total Muscle Volume; (2) - Total Muscle Volume Index; (3) - Thigh Muscle 590 Volume; (4) - Thigh Muscle Volume Index; (5) - Iliopsoas Muscle Volume; (6) - Mid-thigh 591 Muscle Volume; (7) - Iliopsoas Muscle Volume Index; (8) - Thigh IMAT Volume; (9) - Thigh

- 592 IMAT Volume Index; (10) Mid-thigh IMAT Volume; (11) Mid-thigh IMAT/Muscle; (12) -
- 593 Paraspinal Muscle PDFF; (13) Paraspinal Muscle Iron Concentration.











Lean



Sarcopenia

