Bioelectrical impedance analysis versus reference methods in the assessment of body composition in athletes

Published Version:
Campa F., Gobbo L.A., Stagi S., Cyrino L.T., Toselli S., Marini E., et al. (2022). Bioelectrical impedance analysis versus reference methods in the assessment of body composition in athletes. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED PHYSIOLOGY, 122(3), 561-589 [10.1007/s00421-021-04879-y].

Availability:
This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/861948 since: 2023-10-31

Published:
DOI: http://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-021-04879-y

Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis versus Reference Methods in the Assessment of Body Composition in Athletes ~~A Systematic Review~~

Francesco Campa[1], Luis Alberto Gobbo[2], Silvia Stagi[3], Leticia Trindade Cyrino, Stefania Toselli[4], Elisabetta Marini[3], Giuseppe Coratella[5*]

[1] Department for Life Quality Studies, Università degli Studi di Bologna, Rimini, Italy. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3028-7802

[2] Department of Physical Education, São Paulo State University, Presidente Prudente, SP, Brazil. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7523-9102

[3] Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Cagliari, Cittadella Universitaria, Monserrato, Cagliari, Italy. ORCID iD (Marini): https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8779-8745. ORCID iD (Stagi): https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6469-4334.

[4] Department of Biomedical and Neuromotor Sciences, Università degli Studi di Bologna, Bologna, Italy. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5478-2499

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7980-6749

[5] Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7523-9102

* Corresponding author: Giuseppe Coratella

Department of Biomedical Sciences for Health, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy. Mail address: via Giuseppe Colombo 71, 20133, Milano, Italy.

Email address: Giuseppe.coratella@unimi.it

Funding: This research project received no external funding.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest. Availability of data and material: Not applicable

Ethics approval: Not applicable

Abstract

The present systematic review aimed to compare the accuracy of Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis (BIA) and Bioelectrical Impedance Vector Analysis (BIVA) vs. reference methods for the assessment of body composition in athletes. Studies were identified based on a systematic search of internationally electronic databases (PubMed and Scopus) and hand searching of the reference lists of the included studies. In total, 42 studies published between 1988 and 2021 were included. The methodological quality was assessed using the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-sectional Studies as recommended by the National Institute of Health. Twenty-three studies had an overall good rating in terms of quality, while 13 were rated as fair and six as poor, resulting in a low to moderate risk of bias. Fat mass was inconsistently determined using BIA vs. the reference methods, regardless of the BIA-technology. When using the foot to hand technology with predictive equations for athletes, a good agreement between BIA and the reference methods was observed for fat-free mass, total body, intra and extra cellular water. However, an underestimation in fat-free mass and body fluids was found when using generalized predictive equations. Classic and *Specific* BIVA represented a valid approach for assessing body fluids (Classic BIVA) and percentage of fat mass (*Specific* BIVA). The present systematic review suggests that BIA and BIVA can be used for assessing body composition in athletes, provided that foot-to-hand technology, predictive equations, and BIVA references for athletes are used.

Keywords: Bioimpedance vector analysis; Classic BIVA; *Specific* BIVA; Phase angle; Tolerance ellipses; Resistance training; Nutrition

Abbreviations

BIA	Bioelectrical impedance analysis
BIVA	Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis
BIS	Bioelectrical spectroscopy analysis
DXA	Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry
ECW	Extracellular water
FM	Fat mass
FFM	Fat free mass
ICW	Intracellular water
LST	Lean soft tissue
R	Resistance
Xc	Reactance
TBW	Total body water
UWW	Underwater weighting
4C	Four compartment model

Introduction

Body composition describes the amount of the various components of the human body, such as fat (FM) and muscle mass or body fluids (Heymsfield et al. 2005). However, the assessment of body composition through direct procedures is not possible in humans (Heymsfield et al. 2005). For this reason, a number of indirect methods have been developed and implemented over the years, allowing to assess a wide range of body composition parameters (Heymsfield et al. 2005). Among these methods, some are considered as the gold standard for certain parameters, such as the dilution techniques for the body fluids assessment (Heymsfield et al. 2005). Other methods including energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), underwater weighing (UWW), air displacement plethysmography, magnetic resonance, and computed tomography are also classified as indirect approaches and used as reference methods in the body composition evaluation (Heymsfield et al. 2005).

However, most of the aforementioned techniques are expensive and require long procedures and highly specialized personnel (Campa et al. 2021b). For this reason, double-indirect methods have been implemented for obtaining estimations derived from indirect methods such as DXA, UWW or dilution techniques through validated regression equations. Over the recent years, ~~the~~ bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) has been identified as a possible alternative for assessing body composition. Although BIA is classified as a double-indirect approach, being noninvasive, portable, relatively low-cost, and technologically friendly, its use has gained attention in clinical and practical, as well as in research contexts (Lukaski and Raymond-Pope 2021). BIA is based on the different impedance of fat and lean tissues when a weak electric current flows through the body and several technologies have been designed and commercialized to date. These technologies include hand to hand, leg to leg, foot to hand direct or segmental approach, implying profound differences in both testing procedures (e.g., body position and electrodes placement) and final outcomes (Dellinger et al. 2021; Stratton et al. 2021). The hand to hand technology measures the upper body impedance, the foot to foot measures the lower body impedance, and the foot to hand measures the right hemisoma impedance, all estimating the remaining body sections through dedicated algorithms; on the contrary, the direct segmental technology measures the whole-body impedance (Campa et al. 2021b). Based on these four technologies, many devices have been produced by the manufacturers, working at a wide range of sampling frequency (from 1 to 1000 kHz), albeit the 50 kHz frequency has been identified as the most appropriate for measuring bioimpedance in humans (Kyle et al. 2004a, b).

The traditional BIA approach allows the quantification of both absolute (kg or L) or relative amount (%) of a number of body composition parameters through predictive equations, thanks to the different conductance properties of each biological tissue. In fact, FM shows poor conductive proprieties, while fat-free mass (FFM), including the lean soft tissue (LST) and body fluids, is a good electrical conductor (Lukaski and Piccoli 2012). Following the procedures, the devices may either provide the quantitative estimation of body composition parameters using predictive equations set by the manufacturer or provide the raw resistance (R) and reactance (Xc) to be inserted into specific formulas up to the operator (Campa et al. 2021b). In this regard, most of the formulas have been developed for non-athletic populations, and formulas for athletes have been designed recently (Campa et al. 2021b). This may have an impact on the final outcomes, as shown in athletes samples (Pichard et al. 1997; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Matias et al. 2016a,b; Deminice et al. 2016; Shiose et al. 2020; Coratella et al. 2021). However, these studies examined the difference in body composition outcomes comparing BIA vs. reference methods considering only a single BIA technology or a given body composition parameter (e.g., FM and FFM or body fluids) in athletes. Notwithstanding, many studies have compared the BIA vs. reference methods in athletes using different BIA-technologies, predictive equations, and devices. All these studies have not been systematically reviewed so far, in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the literature.

A further approach when using bioimpedance parameters is the bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA), proposed by Piccoli et al. (Piccoli et al. 1994) in 1994 and modified by Buffa et al. (Buffa et al. 2013) in 2013. The initial approach (Classic BIVA) consists of the simultaneous evaluation of R and Xc adjusted for the stature, plotting them as a vector within a graph (Piccoli et al. 1994). The later approach (*Specific* BIVA), consists of the concurrent adjustment of R and Xc for the stature and for the cross-sectional area of the arm, waist, and calf (Buffa et al. 2013). Classic and *Specific* BIVA were developed with the aim to determine total body water (TBW) and %FM, respectively. The change in vector length reflects the change in TBW (Classic BIVA) or %FM (*Specific* BIVA), while the lateral displacement of the vector reflects the bioelectrical phase angle for both BIVA approaches, graphically represented as the angle between the vector and the x-axis (Stahn et al. 2012). Particularly, the phase angle has been proposed as an indicator of cellular health, cell membrane integrity (Stahn et al. 2012; Lukaski and Raymond-Pope 2021) and faithfully reflects the intracellular/extracellular water (ICW/ECW) ratio (Marini et al. 2020; Campa et al. 2021b). As such, BIVA allows a qualitative assessment of body composition, avoiding the use of prediction equations to estimate the different parameters. Additionally, although BIVA does not quantify each component, the vector position can be evaluated within tolerance ellipses drawn for each population, representing their percentile within that population distribution (Campa et al. 2019). The use of BIVA in athletes has been implemented quite recently, and a few studies have assessed body composition in athletes using both BIVA and reference methods. Some authors have systematically reviewed the use of BIVA in sports practice (Castizo-Olier et al. 2018), albeit they did not focus on the comparison of BIVA vs. reference methods. In this regard, this was not possible at that time, given that the first studies comparing BIVA vs. reference method in athletes was only published in 2020 (Campa et al. 2020; Marini et al. 2020). Figure 1 depicts the key concepts of BIA and the application of BIVA.

Insert Figure 1 next here

Therefore, the main purposes of the present systematic review were to summarize the results of studies that compared i) BIA vs. reference methods in the estimation of body composition parameters in athletes and ii) BIVA vs. reference methods in the qualitative assessment of body composition parameters in athletes. Furthermore, we aimed to provide appropriate strategies to assess body composition in athletes using BIA or BIVA, considering the different technologies and predictive equations.

Methods

Search strategy and eligibility criteria

The present study was carried out following the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al. 2021). The bibliographic search was performed on August 15th, 2021, using Scopus and PubMed online databases. The search query was applied to the source title, abstract, and keywords, and included combinations of at least one of the terms identifying body composition, with at least one of the terms identifying the bioimpedance techniques applied, a term on the reference technique, and a term on the field of application. The resulting search query was:

(“body composition” OR “fat mass” OR “fat free mass” OR “muscle mass” OR “lean mass” OR “total body water” OR “extracellular water” OR “intracellular water” OR FM OR FFM OR TBW OR ECW OR ICW) AND (BIA OR bioimpedance OR “bioelectrical impedance” OR BIVA OR “bioelectrical impedance vector analysis” OR “vector analysis” OR biavector) AND (DXA OR DEXA OR densitometry OR imaging OR CT OR tomography OR MRI OR MRT OR magnetic OR RMT OR RM OR “dilution techniques” OR “deuterium dilution” OR “isotope dilution” OR UWW OR hydrodensitometry OR “underwater weight” OR "BOD POD” OR ADP OR “air-displacement plethysmography” OR “criterion method” OR “standard technique” OR “direct technique” OR “reference technique”) AND (sport OR athletes). To identify additional relevant papers, hand searching of the reference lists of the included papers was performed.

The inclusion criteria were:

- Peer-reviewed articles that assessed body composition in athletes involved in individual or team sports using BIA or BIVA and reference techniques.
- Accessible in English full text.
- Individuals aged above 16 years, and with no chronic diseases or health problems.

The exclusion criteria were:

- Reviews and case studies.
- Articles aimed to develop predictive equations without a cross-validation group.

Study selection and data processing

Based on the initial titles retrieved, duplicates were removed. Abstracts identified from the literature searches were screened for potential inclusion by two authors (F.C. and G.C.) and a third author (L.G.) when there was a disagreement between the first two. Data extraction included information about each article, such as: authors, year, study design, participants' information (sex, age), ~~type of~~ sports code, bioimpedance methodology and devices, reference technique, outcome measures and main results.

Quality assessment

Methodological quality was assessed using the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-sectional Studies in observational studies (NIH 2014) recommended by the National Institute of Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The tool consists of 14 criteria that are used to assess quality, including whether the population studied was clearly specified and defined, whether the outcome assessors were blinded, and an assessment of the participation rate. The criteria were classified as "yes", "no", "unclear", or "not applicable". Quality rates were good, fair, or poor as judged by two independent observers (F.C. and L.G.) following the instructions given by the National Institute of and Human Services.

Results

Search outcomes

The literature search resulted in 554 articles. After removal of duplicates (n= 242) and abstract screening, 43 studies were considered relevant. After the full text screening, 11 were further excluded, so that a total of 32 studies fully met the eligibility criteria. Ten additional studies were included after a hand searching of the reference lists of the included articles.

The PRISMA flow chart is shown in Figure 1. Finally, 42 studies published between 1988 and 2021 were considered. Out of these 42 articles, 37 presented a cross-sectional and five a longitudinal study design.

Insert Figure 2 next here

Participants

A total of 2978 subjects (1962 men and 1016 women) participated in the selected studies. Regarding sports code, N=534 participants were involved in team sports, N=339 in individual sports, while the exact number of subjects for each sport modality was not reported for N=2105 participants.

Risk of bias

The risk of bias resulted as low to moderate, as summarized in Supplementary Table 1. Measurement procedures (e.g., electrodes placement, hydration status, food and fluid intake before the test or time from the last exercise) of BIA were sometimes not completely described. Furthermore, the predictive equations used to estimate body composition parameters were not always reported. Twenty-three studies had an overall good rating in terms of quality, while 13 were rated as fair and 6 as poor (Table S1).

Bioelectrical devices and technologies

The selected articles included different devices and technologies as shown in Figure 2. Considering the four different technologies, 4 articles used the hand to hand (Esco et al. 2011; Loenneke et al. 2013; Graybeal et al. 2020; Syed-Abdul et al. 2021), 6 the leg to leg (Civar et al. 2003, 2006; Dixon et al. 2005; Loenneke et al. 2013; Domingos et al. 2019; Graybeal et al. 2020), 29 the foot to hand (Birzniece et al. 2015; Colville et al. 1989; Lukaski et al. 1990; Kirkendall et al. 1991; Hortobágyi et al. 1992; Pichard et al. 1997; Williams and Bale 1998; Fornetti et al. 1999; De Lorenzo et al. 2000; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Andreoli et al. 2004; Svantesson et al. 2008; Company and Ball 2010; Matias et al. 2016a, b, 2021; Deminice et al. 2016; Krzykała et al. 2016; Arias Téllez et al. 2019; Campa et al. 2020, 2021; Marini et al. 2020; Graybeal et al. 2020; Silva et al. 2020; Sardinha et al. 2020; Shiose et al. 2020; Stagi et al. 2021; Francisco et al. 2021; Coratella et al. 2021), and 9 the direct segmental technology (Loenneke et al. 2012, 2013; Esco et al. 2015; Krzykała et al. 2016; Raymond et al. 2018; Brewer et al. 2019; Hartmann Nunes et al. 2020; Graybeal et al. 2020; Lee et al. 2021). Particularly, more than one technology was used in some studies and for each technology, different devices were used. Considering the dependent variables, 30 articles (Birzniece et al. 2015; Colville et al. 1989; Lukaski et al. 1990; Kirkendall et al. 1991; Hortobágyi et al. 1992; Pichard et al. 1997; Williams and Bale 1998; Fornetti et al. 1999; De Lorenzo et al.

2000; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Civar et al. 2003, 2006; Andreoli et al. 2004; Dixon et al. 2005; Svantesson et al. 2008; Company and Ball 2010; Esco et al. 2011, 2015; Loenneke et al. 2012, 2013; Krzykała et al. 2016; Raymond et al. 2018; Arias Téllez et al. 2019; Domingos et al. 2019; Brewer et al. 2019; Hartmann Nunes et al. 2020; Graybeal et al. 2020; Sardinha et al. 2020; Lee et al. 2021; Matias et al. 2021; Syed-Abdul et al. 2021) assessed FM and FFM comparing BIA with reference methods, although seven additional studies used more than one technology, resulting in 37 comparisons. A total of 7 studies (Birzniece et al. 2015; Matias et al. 2016b, a; Deminice et al. 2016; Shiose et al. 2020; Coratella et al. 2021; Francisco et al. 2021) assessed body fluids comparing BIA with reference methods, using the foot to hand technology. A total of 5 articles (Campa et al. 2020, 2021a; Marini et al. 2020; Silva et al. 2020; Stagi et al. 2021) assessed body composition comparing BIVA with reference methods, using the foot to hand technology.

Insert Figure 3 next here

BIA vs. reference methods: FM and FFM

Table 1 shows the study design, demographic information, bioimpedance methodology, reference methods, and the main results for each study. Considering the 16 studies that used a foot to hand technology for assessing FM, eight (Colville et al. 1989; Hortobágyi et al. 1992; Pichard et al. 1997; Williams and Bale 1998; Boileau and Horswill 2000; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Andreoli et al. 2004; Company and Ball 2010) showed an overestimation of the %FM obtained by BIA, five studies an underestimation of %FM (Lukaski et al. 1990; De Lorenzo et al. 2000; Arias Téllez et al. 2019) and FM (Svantesson et al. 2008; Birzniece et al. 2015), while three studies showed an agreement in the estimated %FM (Pichard et al. 1997; Krzykała et al. 2016) and FM (Graybeal et al. 2020). Birzniece et al. (Birzniece et al. 2015) observed both a cross-sectional and longitudinal underestimation of %FM obtained by BIA. Of these studies, only seven (Colville et al. 1989; Lukaski et al. 1990; Pichard et al. 1997; De Lorenzo et al. 2000; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Andreoli et al. 2004; Company and Ball 2010) reported the predictive equations used. Considering the 10 studies that used a foot to hand technology for assessing FFM, four studies showed a good agreement between BIA and reference methods (Lukaski et al. 1990; Fornetti et al. 1999; Graybeal et al. 2020; Matias et al. 2021), three studies showed an underestimation (Colville et al. 1989; Hortobágyi et al. 1992; Pichard et al. 1997) and three studies showed an overestimation of FFM (De Lorenzo et al. 2000; Svantesson et al. 2008; Birzniece et al. 2015). Birzniece et al. (Birzniece et al. 2015) observed both a cross-sectional and longitudinal overestimation of FFM obtained by BIA. Of these studies, only seven (Colville et al. 1989; Lukaski et al. 1990; Pichard et al. 1997; Fornetti et al. 1999; De Lorenzo et al. 2000; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Matias et al. 2021) reported the predictive equations used. LST of the arm and legs was estimated by only one study (Sardinha et al.

2020), which showed an excellent agreement between BIA and the reference method and reported the predictive equations.

Nine studies used a direct segmental technology for assessing FM, albeit Lee et al. (Lee et al. 2021) utilized three different devices for a total of 11 comparisons. Six studies reported an overestimation of FM (Brewer et al. 2019; Hartmann Nunes et al. 2020; Graybeal et al. 2020; Lee et al. 2021) and %FM (Loenneke et al. 2013; Lee et al. 2021). Of these six studies, one used a regional approach for investigating the legs FM (Brewer et al. 2019), and one assessed the visceral FM (Hartmann Nunes et al. 2020). Three studies (Esco et al. 2015; Krzykała et al. 2016; Raymond et al. 2018) showed an underestimation of %FM, and one of them used a regional approach measuring the arms and legs FM (Raymond et al. 2018), three studies (Raymond et al. 2018; Brewer et al. 2019; Graybeal et al. 2020) showed no difference between BIA and the reference methods. The study by Graybeal et al. (Graybeal et al. 2020) found higher %FM only in men, while they reported a good agreement in women. None of these nine studies using the direct segmental technique reported the equations. Five studies used a direct segmental technology for assessing FFM. Four studies showed an underestimation compared with the reference method. Of these four studies, Graybeal et al. (Graybeal et al. 2020) found this result only in men, while Raymond et al. (Raymond et al. 2018) referred to arms and Brewer et al. (Brewer et al. 2019) to arms and legs FFM. Two studies reported an overestimation in FFM (Loenneke et al. 2012; Esco et al. 2015), and two studies reported no difference in the FFM, but only when measuring women (Graybeal et al. 2020) or the trunk FFM (Raymond et al. 2018). None of these five studies using the direct segmental technique reported the equations. Esco et al. (Esco et al. 2015) was the only study that using a regional approach for assessing arm, leg, and trunk LST, reported a good agreement between the methods.

Six studies used a leg to leg technology for assessing FM, albeit Loenneke et al. (Loenneke et al. 2013) utilized two different predictive equations, as reported in Table 1, for a total of seven comparisons. Three of them reported an underestimation in %FM (Civar et al. 2003; Loenneke et al. 2013) and FM (Dixon et al. 2005), two studies an overestimation in FM (Domingos et al. 2019; Graybeal et al. 2020), while three studied showed no difference (Civar et al. 2006; Loenneke et al. 2013; Graybeal et al. 2020). Considering the Graybeal et al. (Graybeal et al. 2020) study, higher FM was found only in men, while no difference was reported for women. In the Loenneke et al. (Loenneke et al. 2013) study, no difference was found when the device was set on the “non-athlete” mode, while FM was underestimated using the “athletes” modality. Only Graybeal et al. (Graybeal et al. 2020) assessed FFM and reported a good agreement with the reference method for women and an underestimation for men. No study involving leg to leg BIA-technologies reported the predictive equations used.

Four studies used a hand to hand technology and reported an underestimation in %FM (Esco et al. 2011; Loenneke et al. 2013; Graybeal et al. 2020; Syed-Abdul et al. 2021), albeit Loenneke et al. (Loenneke et al. 2013) and Syed-Abdul et al. (Syed-Abdul et al. 2021) utilized different predictive equations, as reported in Table 1, for a total of eight comparisons. Of these four studies, Loenneke et al. (Loenneke et al. 2013) and Syed-Abdul et al. (Syed-Abdul et al. 2021) reported lower %FM when the devices were set on the “athlete” modality, and a good agreement when the devices were set on the “non-athlete” modality. Graybeal et al. (Graybeal et al. 2020) overestimated %FM in men, while no difference for women was found; additionaly, FFM was underestimated in men and a good agreement for women was found. No studies involving hand to hand BIA technologies reported the predictive equations used.

Insert Table 1 next here

BIA vs. reference methods: Body fluids estimations

Table 2 shows the study design, demographic information, bioimpedance methodology, reference methods, and the main results for each study. All seven studies assessing TBW were performed using the foot to hand technology, albeit different devices (Matias et al. 2016a) and procedures (Matias et al. 2016b; Deminice et al. 2016; Shiose et al. 2020; Coratella et al. 2021) for a total of 31 comparisons. Five studies reported no difference in TBW assessed by BIA vs. reference methods (Matias et al. 2016b, a; Shiose et al. 2020; Coratella et al. 2021; Francisco et al. 2021), four studies an underestimation (Matias et al. 2016a, b; Deminice et al. 2016; Coratella et al. 2021), and one study an overestimation (Matias et al. 2016a). Five studies used the foot to hand technology to assess ECW, albeit different devices (Matias et al. 2016a) and procedures (Matias et al. 2016a,b; Coratella et al. 2021) for a total of 12 comparisons. Five studies reported no difference in ECW assessed by BIA vs. reference methods (Birzniece et al. 2015; Matias et al. 2016a, b; Coratella et al. 2021; Francisco et al. 2021), four studies an underestimation (Birzniece et al. 2015; Matias et al. 2016a, b; Coratella et al. 2021), and no study reported an overestimation. Three studies (Matias et al. 2016a, b; Francisco et al. 2021) used the foot to hand technology to assess ICW, albeit different devices (Matias et al. 2016a) for a total of four comparisons. All comparisons showed no difference in ICW assessed by BIA vs. reference techniques. Only five out of these seven studies (Matias et al. 2016a, b; Deminice et al. 2016; Shiose et al. 2020; Coratella et al. 2021) reported the predictive equations used.

Insert Table 2 next here

BIVA vs. reference methods

Five studies compared the BIVA's outcomes with body composition measurements obtained from reference methods, as shown in Table 3. All the analyzed studies were conducted using a foot to hand technology. Two studies were conducted with a cross-sectional design (Marini et al. 2020; Stagi et al. 2021), and showed that the *specific* vector length was correlated positively with %FM and the classic vector negatively with TBW, both at the whole body (Marini et al. 2020) and the segmental level (Stagi et al. 2021). These findings were also confirmed in three longitudinal studies (Campa et al. 2020, 2021a; Silva et al. 2020), which highlighted the effectiveness of BIVA in assessing changes in body composition over time. In addition to the vector length evaluation, its position along the minor axis of the BIVA ellipses, that is mainly due to phase angle variations, has been associated with the ICW/ECW ratio (Campa et al. 2020, 2021a; Marini et al. 2020; Silva et al. 2020).

Insert Table 3 next here

Discussion

The present systematic review aimed to compare i) BIA vs. reference methods in the estimation of body composition parameters in athletes and ii) BIVA vs. reference methods in the qualitative assessment of body composition parameters in athletes. Forty-two studies were included in the review, for a total of 2978 athletes involved in team or individual sports. Overall, most of the studies included used the foot to hand technology, allowing to draw a detailed picture of the BIA or BIVA vs. reference methods for FM FFM and body fluids, quantitative and qualitative assessment, respectively. The remaining hand to hand, leg to leg, and direct segmental technologies were used in few studies, and none of these assessed body fluids, so that the comparison is incomplete.

BIA vs. reference methods: FM and FFM

The studies that assessed FM and FFM using BIA vs. reference methods resulted in inconsistent findings. Concerning the FM, BIA showed poor accuracy vs. the reference methods, regardless of the technology used. However, while in some studies the authors used a direct formula to determine %FM (Colville et al. 1989; Pichard et al. 1997), in other studies FM was indirectly derived as the difference between the body mass and FFM (De Lorenzo et al. 2000; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Andreoli et al. 2004; Company and Ball 2010). In addition, although the same predictive equations were used (Oppliger et al. 1991), different reference methods were chosen to determine %FM, such as 4C (Andreoli et al. 2004) or

DXA (De Lorenzo et al. 2000). However, a lack of agreement between 4C and DXA was later observed when assessing %FM in athletes (Santos et al. 2010), making the comparison between BIA and the reference methods challenging. To further entangle this picture, several studies that used the foot to hand (Kirkendall et al. 1991; Hortobágyi et al. 1992; Williams and Bale 1998; Houtkoopr et al. 2001; Svantesson et al. 2008; Birzniece et al. 2015; Krzykała et al. 2016; Arias Téllez et al. 2019; Graybeal et al. 2020), and all the studies that used the hand to hand, the leg to leg and the direct segmental technology, did not report the predictive equations used for determining %FM. Interestingly, two studies (Loenneke et al. 2013; Syed-Abdul et al. 2021) that used hand to hand devices found no difference between BIA and the reference methods when the device was set on the "non-athlete" mode, while an underestimation in %FM was observed when the "athlete" mode was set. According to the manufacturer of the device used by Loenneke et al. (Loenneke et al. 2013), the “athletic” mode is utilized for individuals who have exercised at least 10 hours a week consistently for at least 6 months, or who have a resting heart rate of 60 bpm or less. These factors may not exclude that an athlete may have different characteristics. In this regard, an actual definition of athlete is advocated, so to define clearly when a specific or generalized equation or modality should be used.

Using the foot to hand technology coupled with predictive equations developed for athletes, BIA showed no difference with reference methods for estimating FFM (Lukaski et al. 1990; Fornetti et al. 1999; Graybeal et al. 2020; Matias et al. 2021) and its LST component (Sardinha et al. 2020). On the contrary, when generalized equations were used, inconclusive findings were observed. Regarding the direct segmental technology, BIA showed an underestimation of FFM compared to the reference methods. Only one study assessed FFM using the leg to leg and hand to hand technology, reporting underestimation in men and good agreement in women for both technologies (Graybeal et al. 2020). In conclusion, the present state of the art needs to be implemented with procedures including the gold standard procedure for determining %FM and FFM (4C) and predictive equations for athletes, reported in the protocol. Considering that the Matias et al. (Matias et al. 2021) equation is the only one developed with 4C, its use should be preferred when assessing FFM in athletes.

BIA vs. reference methods: body fluids estimations

All the studies comparing BIA vs. reference methods to assess body fluids were conducted using the foot to hand technology and the dilution techniques as the reference method. Such a consistency allows more robust outcomes when summarizing the results. Considering all the studies, the use of predictive equations for athletes (Matias et al. 2016b) resulted in good agreement with the dilution techniques. Notably, the Matias’ equations (Matias et al. 2016b) were developed for the foot to hand technology at a 50 kHz frequency, and are to date the only available ones. In contrast, the use of generalized predictive equations (Kushner and Schoeller 1986; Van Loan and Mayclin 1987; Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988; Kushner et al. 1992; Sergi et al. 1994; Schoeller and Luke 2000; Morgenstern et al. 2002; Sun et al. 2003) led to an overall underestimation of the body fluids. Lastly, BIA was also shown to be a valid method for assessing body fluids in person with varying hydration status (Francisco et al. 2021).

BIVA vs. reference methods.

BIVA is an alternative method to qualitatively assess body composition in athletes. It allows the analysis of the ICW/ECW ratio and the amount of TBW (Classic BIVA) or %FM (Specific BIVA) (Campa et al. 2021b). Since these techniques are based on raw data, BIVA does not require the use of predictive equations, avoiding possible errors due to their improper application. On the other hand, BIVA does not provide estimates of volume or mass, but a classification (e.g., more or less body fluids or %FM) and ranking (e.g., better or worse after treatment or intervention) tool (Lukaski and Raymond-Pope 2021). In this regard, a rightward or leftward displacement of the BIVA vector is interpreted as a decrease or increase in the ICW/ECW ratio, respectively; moreover, longer vectors corresponds to lower TBW (Classic BIVA) or higher %FM (*Specific* BIVA) and vice versa (Campa et al. 2021b). All the selected studies agree in suggesting BIVA as a valid method for assessing body composition in athletes compared to the reference methods. Specifically, the standard reference methods were 4C (Marini et al. 2020), dilution techniques (Marini et al. 2020; Campa et al. 2020; Silva et al. 2020) and DXA (Marini et al. 2020; Stagi et al. 2021; Campa et al. 2021a). Notably, BIVA was derived from the foot to hand technology only. This leads to some considerations. In first instance, the reference tolerance ellipses for athletes have been designed for the foot to hand technology, so that different technology should not be used due to the lack of agreement between the technologies (Silva et al. 2019; Dellinger et al. 2021; Stratton et al. 2021). Secondly, when the aim of the research is to compare an athlete with his peers, the tolerance ellipses have been designed for some athletic populations, such as soccer (Micheli et al. 2014; Bongiovanni et al. 2020), volleyball (Campa and Toselli 2018), cycling (Giorgi et al. 2018), or endurance, sports team or power/velocity (Campa et al. 2019) athletes. All other sports should be redirected to the tolerance ellipses for generic athletic population (Campa et al. 2019).

Limitations of the review and future perspectives

A few limitations to this review should be acknowledged. Firstly, we classified the results according to the BIA technology used in the selected studies. However, even within the same technology, there could be confounding factors. For example, the positioning of the electrodes used in the foot to hand technologies and their typology could lead to different outcomes, increasing the variability within the results. In this regard, recent guidelines have been proposed to avoid inconsistent procedures (Campa et al. 2021b). Secondly, several devices have been considered, which could have different characteristics that may represent a further confounding factor, such as the amperage and their reliability. Furthermore, regardless of the BIA-devices and technologies used, the athlete's evaluation must consider numerous factors such as the hours since last exercise and the nutrition prior to the test (Lukaski et al. 1990). A number of future perspectives also arise from these results. For example, future longitudinal studies are warrantied, assessing the responsiveness of different BIA technologies in comparison with the reference methods. Moreover, further studies are needed to understand which factors (e.g., amperage, body segments measured, experimental conditions) other than technologies increase the between-device variability. Lastly, authors are encouraged to provide raw bioelectrical data to a more transparent assessment of body composition through BIA and BIVA.

Conclusions

Regardless of the BIA-technology, the assessment of FM% results in lack of agreement with the reference methods. When estimating FFM using predictive equations developed for athletes and the foot to hand technology, a good agreement with the reference methods has been observed. Generalized equations lead to an underestimation of FFM. Similarly, body fluids are accurately estimated using predictive equations for athletes and the foot to hand technology, while overall underestimated using generalized equations. Regarding BIVA, Classic and *Specific* approaches represented two valid methods for assessing body fluids (Classic BIVA) and percentage of fat mass (*Specific* BIVA). The present systematic review suggests that BIA and BIVA could be used for assessing body composition in athletes, provided that equations and BIVA references developed for athletes are used. Figure 4 summarizes the main finding of the present systematic review.

Insert Figure 4 next here

References

Andreoli A, Melchiorri G, Volpe SL, et al (2004) Multicompartment model to assess body composition in professional water polo players. J Sports Med Phys Fitness 44:38–43

Arias Téllez MJ, Carrasco F, España Romero V, et al (2019) A comparison of body composition assessment methods in climbers: Which is better? PLoS One 14:e0224291. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224291

Birzniece V, Khaw C-H, Nelson AE, et al (2015) A critical evaluation of bioimpedance spectroscopy analysis in estimating body composition during GH treatment: comparison with bromide dilution and dual X-ray absorptiometry. Eur J Endocrinol 172:21–28. https://doi.org/10.1530/EJE-14-0660

Boileau RA, Horswill CA (2000) Body composition in sports: Measurement and applications for weight gain and loss. In: Garret Jr WE, Kinkendall DT (eds) Exercise and Sport Science. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Philadelphia: Saunders, pp 319–338

Bongiovanni T, Mascherini G, Genovesi F, et al (2020) Bioimpedance Vector References Need to Be Period-Specific for Assessing Body Composition and Cellular Health in Elite Soccer Players: A Brief Report. J Funct Morphol Kinesiol 5: https://doi.org/10.3390/jfmk5040073

Brewer GJ, Blue MNM, Hirsch KR, et al (2019) Appendicular Body Composition Analysis: Validity of Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis Compared With Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry in Division I College Athletes. J strength Cond Res 33:2920–2925. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000003374

Buffa R, Saragat B, Cabras S, et al (2013) Accuracy of specific BIVA for the assessment of body composition in the United States population. PLoS One 8:e58533. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0058533

Campa F, Matias C, Gatterer H, et al (2019) Classic Bioelectrical Impedance Vector Reference Values for Assessing Body Composition in Male and Female Athletes. Int J Environ Res Public Health 16: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16245066

Campa F, Matias CN, Marini E, et al (2020) Identifying athlete body fluid changes during a competitive season with bioelectrical impedance vector analysis. Int J Sports Physiol Perform 15:361–367. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2019-0285

Campa F, Matias CN, Nunes CL, et al (2021a) Specific Bioelectrical Impedance Vector Analysis Identifies Body Fat Reduction after a Lifestyle Intervention in Former Elite Athletes. Biology (Basel) 10:https://doi.org/10.3390/biology10060524

Campa F, Toselli S (2018) Bioimpedance Vector Analysis of Elite, Sub-Elite and Low-Level Male Volleyball Players. Int J Sports Physiol Perform 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2018-0039

Campa F, Toselli S, Mazzilli M, et al (2021b) Assessment of Body Composition in Athletes: A Narrative Review of Available Methods with Special Reference to Quantitative and Qualitative Bioimpedance Analysis. Nutrients 13:. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13051620

Castizo-Olier J, Irurtia A, Jemni M, et al (2018) Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) in sport and exercise: Systematic review and future perspectives. PLoS One 13:e0197957. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197957

Civar S, Aktop A, Tercan E, et al (2006) Validity of leg-to-leg bioelectrical impedance measurement in highly active women. J strength Cond Res 20:359–365. https://doi.org/10.1519/R-15884.1

Civar S, Ozer M, Aktop A, et al (2003) Validity of leg-to-leg bioelectrical impedance measurement in higly active males. Biol Sport 20:

Colville B, Heyward V, Sandoval W (1989) Comparison of Two Methods for Estimating Body Composition of Bodybuilders. J Strength Cond Res 3:5W_61

Company J, Ball S (2010) Body Composition Comparison: Bioelectric Impedance Analysis with Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry in Adult Athletes. Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci 14:186–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2010.497449

Coratella G, Campa F, Matias CN, et al (2021) Generalized bioelectric impedance-based equations underestimate body fluids in athletes. Scand J Med Sci Sports. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.14033

De Lorenzo A, Andreoli A, Matthie J, Withers P (1997) Predicting body cell mass with bioimpedance by using theoretical methods: a technological review. J Appl Physiol 82:1542–1558. https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1997.82.5.1542

De Lorenzo A, Bertini I, Iacopino L, et al (2000) Body composition measurement in highly trained male athletes. A comparison of three methods. J Sports Med Phys Fitness 40:178–183

Dellinger JR, Johnson BA, Benavides ML, et al (2021) Agreement of bioelectrical resistance, reactance, and phase angle values from supine and standing bioimpedance analyzers. Physiol Meas

Deminice R, Rosa FT, Pfrimer K, et al (2016) Creatine Supplementation Increases Total Body Water in Soccer Players: a Deuterium Oxide Dilution Study. Int J Sports Med 37:149–153. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1559690

Deurenberg P, Kusters CS, Smit HE (1990) Assessment of body composition by bioelectrical impedance in children and young adults is strongly age-dependent. Eur J Clin Nutr 44:261–268

Deurenberg P, van der Kooy K, Leenen R, et al (1991) Sex and age specific prediction formulas for estimating body composition from bioelectrical impedance: a cross-validation study. Int J Obes 15:17–25

Dixon CB, Deitrick RW, Pierce JR, et al (2005) Evaluation of the BOD POD and leg-to-leg bioelectrical impedance analysis for estimating percent body fat in National Collegiate Athletic Association Division III collegiate wrestlers. J strength Cond Res 19:85–91. https://doi.org/10.1519/14053.1

Domingos C, Matias CN, Cyrino ES, et al (2019) The usefulness of Tanita TBF-310 for body composition assessment in Judo athletes using a four-compartment molecular model as the reference method. Rev Assoc Med Bras 65:1283–1289. https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9282.65.10.1283

Esco M, Olson MS, Williford H, et al (2011) The Accuracy of Hand-to-Hand Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis in Predicting Body Composition in College-Age Female Athletes. J Strength Cond Res 25:1040–1045

Esco MR, Snarr RL, Leatherwood MD, et al (2015) Comparison of total and segmental body composition using DXA and multifrequency bioimpedance in collegiate female athletes. J strength Cond Res 29:918–925. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000000732

Fornetti WC, Pivarnik JM, Foley JM, Fiechtner JJ (1999) Reliability and validity of body composition measures in female athletes. J Appl Physiol 87:1114–1122. https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1999.87.3.1114

Francisco R, Jesus F, Gomes T, et al (2021) Validity of water compartments estimated using bioimpedance spectroscopy in athletes differing in hydration status. Scand J Med Sci Sports 31:1612–1620. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13966

Giorgi A, Vicini M, Pollastri L, et al (2018) Bioimpedance patterns and bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA) of road cyclists. J Sports Sci 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1470597

Graves JE, Pollock ML, Colvin AB, et al (1989) Comparison of different bioelectrical impedance analyzers in the prediction of body composition. Am J Hum Biol Off J Hum Biol Counc 1:603–611. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.1310010511

Graybeal AJ, Moore ML, Cruz MR, Tinsley GM (2020) Body Composition Assessment in Male and Female Bodybuilders: A 4-Compartment Model Comparison of Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry and Impedance-Based Devices. J strength Cond Res 34:1676–1689. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002831

Hannan WJ, Cowen SJ, Freeman CP, Wrate RM (1993) Can bioelectrical impedance improve the prediction of body fat in patients with eating disorders? Eur J Clin Nutr 47:741–746

Hartmann Nunes RF, de Souza Bezerra E, Orssatto LB, et al (2020) Assessing body composition in rugby players: agreement between different methods and association with physical performance. J Sports Med Phys Fitness 60:733–742. https://doi.org/10.23736/S0022-4707.20.10487-0

Heitmann BL (1990) Evaluation of body fat estimated from body mass index, skinfolds and impedance. A comparative study. Eur J Clin Nutr 44:831–837

Heymsfield S, Lohman T, Wang Z, Going S (2005) Human body composition, 2nd edn. Human Kinetics, Leeds in Champaign, IL

Hortobágyi T, Israel RG, Houmard JA, et al (1992) Comparison of four methods to assess body composition in black and white athletes. Int J Sport Nutr 2:60–74. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsn.2.1.60

Houtkoopr L, Mullins VA, Going SB, et al (2001) Body composition profiles of elite American heptathletes. Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab 11:162–173. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsnem.11.2.162

Kirkendall DT, Grogan JW, Bowers RG (1991) Field comparison of body composition techniques: hydrostatic weighing, skinfold thickness, and bioelectric impedance. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 13:235–239. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.1991.13.5.235

Kotler DP, Burastero S, Wang J, Pierson Jr RN (1996) Prediction of body cell mass, fat-free mass, and total body water with bioelectrical impedance analysis: effects of race, sex, and disease. Am J Clin Nutr 64:489S-497S.

https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/64.3.489S

Krzykała M, Konarski JM, Malina RM, et al (2016) Fatness of female field hockey players: Comparison of estimates with different methods. Homo 67:245–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchb.2016.03.003

Kushner R, Schoeller DA, Fjeld CR, Danford L (1992) Is the Impedance index (ht2/R) significant in predicting total body water? Am J Clin Nutr 56:835–839. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/56.5.835

Kushner RF, Schoeller DA (1986) Estimation of total body water by bioelectrical impedance analysis. Am J Clin Nutr 44:417–424. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/44.3.417

Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, et al (2004a) Bioelectrical impedance analysis--part I: review of principles and methods. Clin Nutr 23:1226–1243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2004.06.004

Kyle UG, Bosaeus I, De Lorenzo AD, et al (2004b) Bioelectrical impedance analysis-part II: utilization in clinical practice. Clin Nutr 23:1430–1453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2004.09.012

Lee L-C, Hsu P-S, Hsieh K-C, et al (2021) Standing 8-Electrode Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis as an Alternative Method to Estimate Visceral Fat Area and Body Fat Mass in Athletes. Int J Gen Med 14:539–548. https://doi.org/10.2147/IJGM.S281418

Loenneke JP, Wilson JM, Wray ME, et al (2012) The estimation of the fat free mass index in athletes. Asian J Sports Med 3:200–203. https://doi.org/10.5812/asjsm.34691

Loenneke JP, Wray ME, Wilson JM, et al (2013) Accuracy of field methods in assessing body fat in collegiate baseball players. Res Sports Med 21:286–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/15438627.2013.792087

Lohman TG (1992) Advances in body composition assessment. Cad. Saude Publica 9:S116–S117

Lukaski H, Bolonchuk W (1987) Theory and validation of the tetrapolar bioelectrical impedance method to assess human body composition

Lukaski H, Raymond-Pope CJ (2021) New Frontiers of Body Composition in Sport. Int J Sports Med. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1373-5881

Lukaski HC, Bolonchuk WW (1988) Estimation of body fluid volumes using tetrapolar bioelectrical impedance measurements. Aviat Space Environ Med 59:1163–1169

Lukaski HC, Bolonchuk WW, Hall CB, Siders WA (1986) Validation of tetrapolar bioelectrical impedance method to assess human body composition. J Appl Physiol 60:1327–1332. https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1986.60.4.1327

Lukaski HC, Bolonchuk WW, Siders WA, Hall CB (1990) Body composition assessment of athletes using bioelectrical impedance measurements. J Sports Med Phys Fitness 30:434–440

Lukaski HC, Johnson PE, Bolonchuk WW, Lykken GI (1985) Assessment of fat-free mass using bioelectrical impedance measurements of the human body. Am J Clin Nutr 41:810–817. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/41.4.810

Lukaski HC, Piccoli A (2012) Bioelectrical impedance vector analysis for assessment of hydration in physiological states and clinical conditions. In: Preedy V (ed) Handbook of Anthropometry. Springer, London, pp 287–305

Marini E, Campa F, Buffa R, et al (2020) Phase angle and bioelectrical impedance vector analysis in the evaluation of body composition in athletes. Clin Nutr 39:447–454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2019.02.016

Matias CN, Campa F, Santos DA, et al (2021) Fat-free Mass Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis Predictive Equation for Athletes using a 4-Compartment Model. Int J Sports Med 42:27–32. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1179-6236

Matias CN, Júdice PB, Santos DA, et al (2016a) Suitability of Bioelectrical Based Methods to Assess Water Compartments in Recreational and Elite Athletes. J Am Coll Nutr 35:413–421. https://doi.org/10.1080/07315724.2015.1058198

Matias CN, Santos DA, Júdice PB, et al (2016b) Estimation of total body water and extracellular water with bioimpedance in athletes: A need for athlete-specific prediction models. Clin Nutr 35:468–474. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2015.03.013

Micheli ML, Pagani L, Marella M, et al (2014) Bioimpedance and impedance vector patterns as predictors of league level in male soccer players. Int J Sports Physiol Perform 9:532–539. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2013-0119

Moissl UM, Wabel P, Chamney PW, et al (2006) Body fluid volume determination via body composition spectroscopy in health and disease. Physiol Meas 27:921–933. https://doi.org/10.1088/0967-3334/27/9/012

Morgenstern BZ, Mahoney DW, Warady BA (2002) Estimating total body water in children on the basis of height and weight: a reevaluation of the formulas of Mellits and Cheek. J Am Soc Nephrol 13:1884–1888. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.asn.0000019920.30041.95

NIH (2014) National Institution of Health: U. S Department of Health and Human Services. Quality assessment tool for observational cohort and cross- sectional studies

Oppliger RA, Nielsen D, Hoegh J, Vance C (1991) Bioelectrical impedance prediction of fat free mass for high school wrestlers validated. Med Sci Sports Exerc 23:S73

Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al (2021) The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 372:n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

Piccoli A, Rossi B, Pillon L, Bucciante G (1994) A new method for monitoring body fluid variation by bioimpedance analysis: the RXc graph. Kidney Int 46:534–539

Pichard C, Kyle UG, Gremion G, et al (1997) Body composition by x-ray absorptiometry and bioelectrical impedance in female runners. Med Sci Sports Exerc 29:1527–1534. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005768-199711000-00021

Raymond CJ, Dengel DR, Bosch TA (2018) Total and Segmental Body Composition Examination in Collegiate Football Players Using Multifrequency Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis and Dual X-ray Absorptiometry. J strength Cond Res 32:772–782. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002320

Santos DA, Silva AM, Matias CN, et al (2010) Accuracy of DXA in estimating body composition changes in elite athletes using a four compartment model as the reference method. Nutr Metab (Lond) 7:22. https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-7075-7-22

Sardinha LB, Correia IR, Magalhães JP, et al (2020) Development and validation of BIA prediction equations of upper and lower limb lean soft tissue in athletes. Eur J Clin Nutr 74:1646–1652. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41430-020-0666-8

Schoeller DA, Luke A (2000) Bioelectrical impedance analysis prediction equations differ between African Americans and Caucasians, but it is not clear why. Ann N Y Acad Sci 904:225–226. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06456.x

Segal KR, Van Loan M, Fitzgerald PI, et al (1988) Lean body mass estimation by bioelectrical impedance analysis: a four-site cross-validation study. Am J Clin Nutr 47:7–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/47.1.7

Sergi G, Bussolotto M, Perini P, et al (1994) Accuracy of bioelectrical impedance analysis in estimation of extracellular space in healthy subjects and in fluid retention states. Ann Nutr Metab 38:158–165. https://doi.org/10.1159/000177806

Shiose K, Kondo E, Takae R, et al (2020) Validity of Bioimpedance Spectroscopy in the Assessment of Total Body Water and Body Composition in Wrestlers and Untrained Subjects. Int J Environ Res Public Health 17: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17249433

Silva AM, Matias CN, Nunes CL, et al (2019) Lack of agreement of in vivo raw bioimpedance measurements obtained from two single and multi-frequency bioelectrical impedance devices. Eur J Clin Nutr 73:1077–1083. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41430-018-0355-z

Silva AM, Nunes CL, Matias CN, et al (2020) Usefulness of raw bioelectrical impedance parameters in tracking fluid shifts in judo athletes. Eur J Sport Sci 20:734–743. https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2019.1668481

Stagi S, Irurtia A, Rosales Rafel J, et al (2021) Segmental body composition estimated by specific BIVA and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry. Clin Nutr 40:1621–1627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2021.02.043

Stahn A, Terblanche E, Gunga H-C (2012) Use of Bioelectrical Impedance: General Principles and Overview. In: Preedy VR (ed) Handbook of Anthropometry: Physical Measures of Human Form in Health and Disease. Springer New York, New York, NY, pp 49–90

Stolarczyk LM, Heyward VH, Hicks VL, Baumgartner RN (1994) Predictive accuracy of bioelectrical impedance in estimating body composition of Native American women. Am J Clin Nutr 59:964–970. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/59.5.964

Stratton MT, Smith RW, Harty PS, et al (2021) Longitudinal agreement of four bioimpedance analyzers for detecting changes in raw bioimpedance during purposeful weight gain with resistance training. Eur J Clin Nutr 75:1060–1068. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41430-020-00811-3

Sun SS, Chumlea WC, Heymsfield SB, et al (2003) Development of bioelectrical impedance analysis prediction equations for body composition with the use of a multicomponent model for use in epidemiologic surveys. Am J Clin Nutr 77:331–340. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/77.2.331

Svantesson U, Zander M, Klingberg S, Slinde F (2008) Body composition in male elite athletes, comparison of bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy with dual energy X-ray absorptiometry. J Negat Results Biomed 7:1. https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-5751-7-1

Syed-Abdul MM, Soni DS, Barnes JT, Wagganer JD (2021) Comparative analysis of BIA, IBC and DXA for determining body fat in American Football players. J Sports Med Phys Fitness 61:687–692. https://doi.org/10.23736/S0022-4707.21.11278-2

Van Loan M, Mayclin P (1987) Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis: Is It a Reliable Estimator of Lean Body Mass and Total Body Water? Hum Biol 69:299–309

Williams CA, Bale P (1998) Bias and limits of agreement between hydrodensitometry, bioelectrical impedance and skinfold calipers measures of percentage body fat. Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol 77:271–277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004210050332

Figure captions

Figure 1. Key concepts of bioelectrical impedance analysis.

Figure 2. PRISMA Flow chart of the studies' selection.

Figure 3. Bioelectrical devices and technologies involved in the selected studies.

Figure 4. Bioelectrical impedance analysis (BIA) vs. reference methods in athletes.

Figure


What does BIA measure?
How can BIA values be used?
What does BIA provide?
Impedance
Resistance (R)
Reactance (Xc)
Insert it into predictive equations to estimate body composition
Directly evaluated by bioelectrical impedance vector analysis (BIVA)
Quantification of body composition parameters
Bivariate interpretation of R and Xc against the reference population percentiles

Figure

Click here to access/download;Figure;Figure 2.png



	Hand to hand	Leg to leg	Foot to hand	Direct segmental
Number of articles using this technology	4	6	29	9
Devices and number of articles where they were used	• Omron HBF-306 (n=3) • Omron HBF-300 (n=1)	• Tanita 310 (n=3) • Tanita TBF-300A (n=2) • Tanita TBF-350 (n=1)	• Akern 101 Anniversary (n=10) • ImpediMed SFB7 (n=4)* • Xitron 4000b (n=1)* • Xitron Hydra 4200 (n=4)* • RJL 101 (n=3) • Valhalla 1990B (n=2) • Biodynamics 310E (n=1) • Eugédia BIO-Z (n=1) • ImpediMed DF50 (n=1)* • RJL 103 (n=1) • RJL Spectrum II (n=1) • QuadScan 4000 (n=1)	• InBody 770 (n=4) • Omron HBF-500 (n=2) • InBody 720 (n=1) • InBody 230 (n=1) • Jawon Medical IOI353 (n=1) • Seca mBCA 514/515 (n=1) • Tanita BC418 (n=1)
Number of articles comparing FM and FFM with reference methods	4	6	18	9
Number of articles comparing body fluids with reference methods	0	0	7	0
Number of articles comparing BIVA with reference methods	0	0	5	0

* Bioimpedance spectroscopy device

Figure Click here to access/download;Figure;FIgure 4.png



Table

Table 1. Articles comparing bioimpedance outcomes with fat and fat-free mass and lean soft tissue derived using a reference method.

Authors	Study design	Participants	Bioimpedance device / method	Sampling frequency (kHz) / Current (µA)	Analytical procedure	Reference method	Main results
(Colville et al. 1989)	Cross-sectional	21 bodybuilders (men: n = 9, age 27.8 ± 5.7 y and women: n = 12, age 28.7 ± 7.2 y)	103, RJL Systems, Detroit, MI / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 800	RJL Systems equation for men: %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = 1.1554 – 0.0841*(Wt*R)/ S^2 and for women: %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = 1.113 – 0.00556*(Wt*R)/S^2	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 7.5 %) and underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -4.8) in athletes considered as an entire group
(Lukaski et al. 1990)	Cross-sectional	104 athletes (men: n = 58, age 20.7 ± 0.3 y and women: n = 46, age 19.8 ± 0.2 y) involved in different sports and divided into controlled and uncontrolled condition groups	101, RJL Systems, Detroit, MI / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 800	(Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1987): FFM = 0.734*S^2/R + 0.116*Wt + 0.096*Xc + 0.876*Sex – 4.03, where 0 if female and 1 if male FM = Wt – FFM	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA showed no difference for the FFM estimation in controlled (difference mean value: 0.2 kg) and uncontrolled condition groups (difference mean value: 2.2 kg) BIA underestimated %FM in controlled (difference mean value: 0.2 %) and uncontrolled condition groups (difference mean value: 3.0 %)
(Kirkendall et al. 1991)	Cross-sectional	29 male football players (age 27.0 ± 2.6 y)	Valhalla 1990B, Valhalla, San Diego, CA/ BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 500	Equations owned by manufacturer	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 5.0 %)
(Hortobágyi et al. 1992)	Cross-sectional	90 men American football players: 55 blacks (age 19.4 ± 1.2 y) and whites (age 19.7 ± 1.5 y)	Spectrum II System, RJL Systems, Detroit, MI / BIA using a foot to hand	50 / 800	Equations owned by manufactures	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA overestimated %FM (blacks: difference mean value: 5.4 %; whites: difference mean value: 3.2 %) and underestimated FFM (blacks: difference mean value: 5.0 kg; whites: difference mean value: 3.3 kg)

			technology at single frequency				
(Pichard et al. 1997)	Cross-sectional	17 female runners (age 26.5 ± 1.4 y)	BIO-Z, Eugédia, Paris, France / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 800	RJL Systems: %FM = 1 - (0.3981*S^2/R + 0.3068*Wt + 0.095299) *(S – 100) + 0.7414/Wt) *100 RJL Systems: FFM = 5.091 + 0.6483*S^2/R + 0.1699*Wt (Lukaski et al. 1985): FFM = 3.04 + 0.85*S^2/R (Lukaski et al. 1986): FFM = 4.917 + 0.821*S^2/R (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1987): FFM = 0.734*S^2/R + 0.116*Wt + 0.096*Xc + 0.876*Sex – 4.03, where 0 if female and 1 if male (Van Loan and Mayclin 1987): FFM = 17.7868 + 0.00098 (S^2) + 0.3736*Wt – 0.0238* R – 4.2921*Sex – 0.1531*Age, where 0 if female and 1 if male	DXA	RJL Systems equation overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 3.1 %) RJL Systems equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -0.8 kg) Lukaski's equation (Lukaski et al. 1985) underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -2.4 kg) Lukaski et al. equation (Lukaski et al. 1986) underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -1.9 kg) Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1987) equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -1.9 kg) Van Loan and Mayclin (Van Loan and Mayclin 1987) equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -2.8) Segal et al. (Segal et al. 1988) equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -2.8 kg) Graves et al. (Graves et al. 1989) equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -1.8 kg) Heitmann's equation (Heitmann 1990) underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -2.0 kg) Deurenberg et al. (Deurenberg et al. 1991) equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -4.9 kg)

	(Segal et al. 1988): FFM = 10.4349 + 0.000646*(S^2) – 0.01397*R + 0.42087*Wt (Graves et al. 1989): FFM = 5.49 + 0.475*S^2/R + 0.295*Wt (Heitmann 1990): FFM = total body water/0.72*100, with TBW = 11.03 + 0.266*S^2/R + 0.186*Wt + 4.702*Sex – 0.081*Age, where 0 if female and 1 if male (Deurenberg et al. 1991): FFM = S^2/R*0.34 + 0.1534*S + 0.273*Wt – 0.127*Age + 4.56*Sex – 12.44, where 0 if female and 1 if male (Hannan et al. 1993): %FM = + 7.32 – 0.572*S^2/R + 0.664*Wt (Stolarczyk et al. 1994): FFM = 0.0012454*S^2 – 0.09404*R + 0.1555*Wt + 0.1417*Xc – 0.0833*Age + 20.05	Hannan et al. (Hannan et al. 1993) equation showed no difference in the %FM estimation (difference mean value: 0.6 %). Stolarczyk et al. (Stolarczyk et al. 1994) equation underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -3.6 kg)

(Williams and Bale 1998)	Cross-sectional	232 athletes (men: n = 117, age 21.2 ± 1.2 y and women: n = 115, age 21.1 ± 1.3 y) involved in different sports	101, RJL Systems, Detroit, MI / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 800	Equations owned by manufacturer	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA overestimated %FM in men (difference mean value: 0.9 %; LoA: -6.2 to 3.8) and women (difference mean value: 1.2 %; LoA: -3.2 to 4.8)
(Fornetti et al. 1999)	Cross-sectional	132 female athletes (age 20.4 ± 1.5 y) involved in different sports	101, RJL Systems, Detroit, MI / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 800	FFM = (0.282*S) + (0.415*Wt) – (0.037*R) + (0.096*Xc) – 9.734	DXA	BIA's equation showed no difference in the FFM estimation (difference mean value: -0.1 kg)
(De Lorenzo et al. 2000)	Cross-sectional	43 male athletes (19 water polo, 9 judo, 15 karate) aged 18 -34 y	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	(Oppliger et al. 1991): %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = 1.949 + (0.701*Wt) + 0.186* (S^2/R)	DXA	BIA underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -2.5 %; LoA: -8.0 to 3.0) and overestimated FFM (difference mean value: 2.4 kg; LoA: -4.5 to 9.0)
(Houtkoopr et al. 2001)	Cross-sectional	19 female heptathletes (age 25.5 ± 3.5 y)	Valhalla 1990B, Valhalla, San Diego, CA/ BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 800	(Lohman 1992): %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = [0.73*(S^2/R)] + (0.16*Wt) + 2.0 (Lohman 1992): %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = [0.666 (S^2/R)] + (0.217*Xc) + (0.164*Wt) – 8.78 Equation owned by Valhalla Impedance Analyzer Corp.	DXA	Lohman's (Lohman 1992) equation overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 2.1 %) Lohman's (Lohman 1992) equation overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 1.8 %) Equation owned by Valhalla Impedance Analyzer Corp. overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 5.5 %) Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1987) equation overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 4.4 %)

					(Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1987): %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = $0.734*S^2/R + 0.116*Wt + 0.096*Xc + 0.876*Sex – 4.03$, where 0 if female and 1 if male		
(Civar et al. 2003)	Cross-sectional	99 male (age 21.87 ± 2.04 y) athletes involved in different sports	Tanita 310, Tanita Inc., Tokyo, Japan / BIA using a leg to leg technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufactures	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA underestimated %FM (difference mean value: 3.2 %)
(Andreoli et al. 2004)	Cross-sectional	10 male (age 21.0 ± 4.3 y) water polo athletes.	Xitron 4000b, Xitron technologies, San Diego, CA / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	50 / 500	(Oppliger et al. 1991): %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = $1.949 + (0.701*Wt) + 0.186*(S^2/R)$	4C according to the Withers et al. (1998) equation	BIS overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 12.1 %)
(Dixon et al. 2005)	Cross-sectional	25 male wrestlers (age 19.2 ± 1.2 y)	TBF-300A, Tanita Corp., Arlington Heights, IL / BIA using a leg to leg technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	"Athletic" equation owned by manufactures	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA underestimated FM (difference mean value: - 2.2 kg; LoA: -5.0 to 9.4)
(Civar et al. 2006)	Cross-sectional	60 female (age 20.70 ± 1.43 y) athletes involved in different sports	Tanita 310, Tanita Inc., Tokyo, Japan / BIA using a leg to leg technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufactures	Hydrostatic weighing	BIA showed no difference in the FM estimation (difference mean value: 0.2 kg)

(Svantesson et al. 2008)	Cross-sectional	33 male athletes: 16 ice hockey players (age 15.6 ± 6.1 y) and 17 soccer players (age 24.1 ± 3.8 y)	Hydra 4200, Xitron technologies, San Diego, CA / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	5 - 1000 / 800	Equations owned by manufactures	DXA	BIS underestimated FM (difference mean value: - 2.8 kg) and overestimated FFM (difference mean value: 2.0 kg)
(Company and Ball 2010)	Cross-sectional	80 male athletes: 40 endurance athletes (age 30.4 ± 1.3 y) and 40 short distance runners (age 23.1` ± 0.7 y)	DF50, ImpediMed, San Diego, CA / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 200	(Lukaski et al. 1986): %FM = [(Wt – FFM)/Wt] * 100, with FFM = 4.917 + 0.821*S^2/R	DXA	BIA overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 6.4 %)
(Esco et al. 2011)	Cross-sectional	40 female athletes (21.1 ± 2.3) involved in different sports	HBF-300, Omron Helthcare, Kyot, Japan / BIA using a hand to hand technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufacturer	DXA	BIA underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -5.1 %, LoA: -2.2 to 12.3) and overestimated FFM (difference mean value: 3.4 kg, LoA: -2.4 to 8.4)
(Loenneke et al. 2012)	Cross-sectional	33 male (age 20.0 ± 1.0 y) baseball players and 16 female (age 20.0 ± 1.0 y) gymnasts	HBF-500, Omron Helthcare, Kyoto, Japan / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	FFM index = FFM/S^2, with FFM estimated using an equation owned by manufactures	DXA	BIA underestimated FFM index in men (difference mean value: 0.5 kg/m^2) and women (difference mean value: 1.2 kg/m^2)
(Loenneke et al. 2013)	Cross-sectional	35 male (age 20.1 ± 1.0 y) baseball players	i) TBF-350, Tanita Corp., Arlington Heights, IL / BIA using a leg to leg technology at multifrequency	i) N/A / N/A ii) N/A / N/A iii) N/A / N/A	Two predictive equations provided by the manufacturer (“athletes” and “non-athletes”) Two predictive equations provided by the manufacturer	DXA	Leg to leg BIA with the “athletes” equation underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -5.5 %), while no difference was found using the “non-athletes” equation (difference mean value: 0.2 %) Hand to hand BIA with the “athletes” equation underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -5.7 %), while no difference was

			ii) HBF-306, Omron Helthcare, Kyoto, Japan / BIA using a hand to hand technology at multifrequency ii) HBF-500, Omron Helthcare, Kyoto, Japan / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency		(“athletes” and “non-athletes”) Equation owned by the manufacturer		found using the “non-athletes” equation (difference mean value: 0.6 %) Direct segmental BIA overestimated %FM (difference mean value: 2.0 %)
(Birzniece et al. 2015)	Longitudinal	71 athletes (men: n = 43, age 27.1 ± 0.8 y and women: n = 28, age 29.4 ± 1.2 y) involved in different sports	SFB7, ImpediMed, Brisbane, Australia / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	4 – 1000 / 200	FFM = total body water/0.732, with TBW estimated using an equation owned by the manufacturer FM = Wt – FFM	DXA	BIS underestimated FM (difference mean value: -3.9 kg, LoA: -2.5 to 15.0) and overestimated FFM (difference mean value: 7.2 kg, LoA: -17.0 to 0.1) at baseline considering the athletes as an entire group BIS underestimated change in FM (difference mean value: -1.2 kg, LoA: -4.5 to 11.0) and overestimated change in FFM (difference mean value: 1.0 kg, LoA: -11.0 to 4.0) considering the athletes as an entire group
(Esco et al. 2015)	Cross-sectional	45 female athletes (age 21.2 ± 2.0 y) involved in different sports.	InBody 770, Biospace, Co, Seoul. Korea / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency	5 – 500 / N/A	Equations owned by manufacturers	DXA	BIA underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -3.3 %, LoA: 2.3 to -8.9) and overestimated FFM (difference mean value: 2.2 kg, LoA: -1.6 to -0.1) BIA showed no difference in the arms (difference mean value: 0.1 kg, LoA: 0.7 to -0.8), legs (difference mean value: 0.3 kg, LoA: 2.2 to -3.0), trunk (difference mean value: 0.1 kg, LoA: 3.3 to -3.0), and total LST (difference mean value: 0.2 kg, LoA: 4.0 to -4.4) estimation.

(Krzykała et al. 2016)	Cross-sectional	31 female field hockey players (age 19.5 ± 3.6 y)	i) 101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency ii) BC418, Tanita Corp., Arlington Heights, IL / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency	i) 50 / 400 ii) N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufacturers	DXA	Foot to hand BIA showed no difference in the %FM estimation (difference mean value: 0.1 %, LoA: 8.0 to -8.5) Direct segmental BIA underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -4.9 %, LoA: 2.0 to -11.0).
(Raymond et al. 2018)	Cross-sectional	44 male (age 19.0 ± 1.0 y) American football athletes	InBody 770, Biospace, Co, Seoul. Korea / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency	1 – 1000 / N/A	Equations owned by manufactures	DXA	BIA underestimated arms FM (difference mean value: -0.4 kg, LoA: -1.1 to 1.8), arms %FM (difference mean value: -1.9 %, LoA: -7.9 to 11.9), and arms FFM (difference mean value: -1.4 kg, LoA: -0.4 to 3.2) BIA underestimated legs FM (difference mean value: -2.8 kg, LoA: 3.3 to 11.3), legs %FM (difference mean value: -3.9 %, LoA: -1.0 to 6.7), and legs FFM (difference mean value: -5.4 kg, LoA: 0.7 to 9.9) BIA showed no difference in FM (difference mean value: 0.2 kg, LoA: -6.2 to 5.7) and FFM (difference mean value: -0.4 kg, LoA: -4.3 to 5.1) and in %FM estimation (difference mean value: 0.9 %, LoA: -10.0 to 8.7) of the trunk BIA underestimated FM (difference mean value: -3.0 kg, LoA: -4.4 to 10.4) and %FM (difference mean value: -2.5 %, LoA: -

							7.9 to 12.9), and overestimated FFM (difference mean value: 2.5 kg, LoA: -11.3 to 6.4)
(Brewer et al. 2019)	Cross-sectional	160 athletes involved in different sports: 44 men and 116 women (aged from 18 to 23 y)	InBody 770, Biospace, Co, Seoul. Korea / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufacturer	DXA	BIA underestimated legs (men: difference mean value: -6.6 kg; LoA: -15.3 to 3.2; women: difference mean value: -2.7 kg; LoA: -5.9 to 0.4) FM, while showed no difference in arms FM (men: difference mean value: 0.6 kg; LoA: -2.4 to 3.5; women: difference mean value: -0.1 kg; LoA: -0.9 to 0.8) BIA underestimated arms (men: difference mean value: -1.3 kg; LoA: -3.1 to 0.5; women: difference mean value: -0.4 kg; LoA: -1.4 to 0.5) and legs (men: difference mean value: -6.6 kg; LoA: -15.3 to 3.2; women: difference mean value: -2.7 kg; LoA: -5.9 to 0.4) FFM
(Domingos et al. 2019)	Cross-sectional	29 male (age 23.1 ± 3.4 y) judo athletes	TBF-310 Tanita, Tanita Corp., Tokyo, Japan / BIA using a leg to leg technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Equation owned by manufactures	4C according to the Withers et al. (1998) equation	BIA overestimated FM (difference mean value: 1.2 kg, LoA: -6.7 to 7.0)
(Arias Téllez et al. 2019)	Cross-sectional	30 male climbers (age 26.1 ± 4.9 y)	QuadScan 4000, Bodystat, Douglas, UK / BIA using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Two predictive equations owned by the manufacturer (“athletes” and “non-athletes”)	DXA	The “athletes” equation underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -6. %2, LoA: -11.8 to -0.7). The “non-athletes” equation underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -9.2 %, LoA: -13.6 to -4.74)
(Graybeal et al. 2020)	Cross-sectional	27 bodybuilders (men: n = 17, age 26.0 ± 6.5 y and women: n = 10, age 25.8 ± 5.4 y).	i) SFB7, ImpediMed, Carlsbad, CA, USA / BIS using a foot to hand technology at	i) 3 - 1000 / 200 ii) N/A / N/A iii) N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufacturers	4C according to the Wang et al. (2002) equation	BIS showed no difference in the FM (men: difference mean value: -0.9 kg; women: difference mean value: -0.8) and FFM estimation (men: difference mean value: -0.4 kg; women: difference mean value: 1.3)

			multifrequency ii) mBCA 514/515, Seca, Hamburg, Germany / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency iii) TBF-300A Tanita, Tanita Corp., Tokyo, Japan / BIA using a leg to leg technology at multifrequency iv) HBF-306, Omron, Kyota, Japan / BIA using a hand to hand technology at multifrequency	iv) N/A / N/A			Direct segmental BIA overestimated FM (difference mean value: 4.3 kg) in men and showed no difference for women (difference mean value: 0.6 kg). Direct segmental BIA underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -4.3 kg) in men and showed no difference for women (difference mean value: -0.6 kg). Leg to leg BIA overestimated FM (difference mean value: 5.1 kg) in men and showed no difference for women (difference mean value: 2.3 kg). Leg to leg BIA underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -4.3 kg) in men and showed no difference for women (difference mean value: -1.8 kg). Hand to hand BIA overestimated FM (difference mean value: 3.3 kg) in men and showed no difference for women (difference mean value: 0.2 kg). Hand to hand BIA underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -3.3 kg) in men and showed no difference for women (difference mean value: 0.7 kg).
(Hartmann Nunes et al. 2020)	Cross-sectional	19 male rugby players (age 25.2 ± 3.6 y)	InBody 720, Biospace, Co, Seoul. Korea / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Equations owned by manufacturer	ADP DXA	BIA overestimated FM (difference mean value: -0.8 kg; LoA: -13.5 to 11.5) and underestimated FFM (difference mean value: - 0.9 kg; LoA: -13.7 to 11.7) compared to ADP BIA overestimated FM (difference mean value: 4.3 kg; LoA: -2.8 to 11.7) and underestimated FFM (difference mean value: -8.1 kg; LoA: -16.4 to 0.3) compared to DXA

(Sardinha et al. 2020)	Cross-sectional	88 athletes (men: n = 56, age 22.3 ± 4.3 y and women: n = 32, age 22.9 ± 5.2 y) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	Arms LST = 0.940*Sex + 0.042*Wt + 0.080*S^2/R + 0.024*Xc − 3.927, where Sex is 1 if female or 0 if male Legs LST = 1.983*Sex + 0.154*Wt + 0.127*S^2/R − 1.147, where Sex is 1 if female or 0 if male	DXA	BIA's equations showed no difference in the arms (difference mean value: 0.1 kg, LoA: -1.1 to 1.3) and legs (difference mean value: 0.1 kg, LoA: -3.8 to 3.9) LST estimation
(Lee et al. 2021)	Cross-sectional	95 athletes (men: n = 50, age 23.0 ± 1.6 y and women: n = 45, age 24.0 ± 3.6 y) involved in different sports	i) IOI353, Jawon Medical, Gyeongsan, Korea / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency ii) InBody 230, Biospace, Co, Seoul. Korea / BIA using a direct segmental technology at multifrequency iii) InBody 770, Biospace, Co, Seoul. Korea / BIA using a direct segmental	i) 5 - 250 / 250 ii) 20 -100 / 330 iii) 1 -1000 / 80	Equations owned by manufacturer	DXA Computed tomography	Two direct segmental devices overestimated %FM (IOI353: difference mean value: 0.6 %, LoA: -2.9 to 4.3; InBody 230: difference mean value: -0.7 %, LoA: -3.2 to 3.8) compared to DXA in men All the direct segmental devices overestimated %FM (IOI353: difference mean value: 2.2 %, LoA: -7.5 to 3.2; InBody 230: difference mean value: -1.6 %, LoA: -5.6.0 to 2.6; InBody 770: difference mean value: 2.4 %, LoA: -6.4 to -2.0) compared to DXA in women All the direct segmental devices overestimated absolute visceral body fat compared to computed tomography in men (IOI353: difference mean value: 21.0 kg, LoA: -20.6 to 62.6; InBody 230: difference mean value: 10.1 kg, LoA: -29.6 to 49.7; InBody 770: difference mean value: 9.2 kg, LoA: -33.4 to 55.0) and in women (IOI353: difference mean value: 9.9 kg, LoA: -20.6 to 62.6; InBody 230: difference mean value: 23.4 kg, LoA: -29.6 to 49.7; InBody 770: difference mean value: 31.2 kg, LoA: -33.4 to 55.0)

			technology at multifrequency				
(Matias et al. 2021)	Cross-sectional	47 athletes (men: n = 33, age 21.9 ± 4.7 and women: n = 14, age 24.9 ± 6.0) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	FFM = −2.261 + 0.327*S²/R + 0.525*Wt + 5.462*Sex, where Sex is 1 if female or 0 if male.	4C according to the Wang et al. (2002) equation	BIA's equations showed no difference in the FFM estimation (difference mean value: -1.5 kg, LoA: -7.8 to 4.7)
(Syed-Abdul et al. 2021)	Cross-sectional	104 male American football players (age 19.6 ± 1.5 y)	HBF-306, Omron, Kyota, Japan / BIA using a hand to hand technology at multifrequency	N/A / N/A	Two predictive equations owned by the manufacturer ("athletes" and "non-athletes")	DXA	The "athletes" equation underestimated %FM (difference mean value: -4.7 %, LoA: -14.1 to 4.7) The "non-athletes" equation showed no difference in the %FM estimation (difference mean value: -0.4 %, LoA: -8.5 to 7.7)

Note: Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation. BIA: bioimpedance analysis; BIS: bioimpedance spectroscopy; N/A: not available; LoA: limits of agreements; DXA: Dual-energy X-ray Absorptiometry; ADP: Air displacement plethysmography; R: resistance; Xc: reactance; LST: lean soft tissue; FFM: fat-free mass; FM: fat mass; TBW: total body water; Wt: weight in kilograms; S: stature in meters; 4C: four-component model.

Table

Table 2. Articles comparing bioimpedance outcomes with total body, extra and intra cellular water derived using a reference method.

Authors	Study design	Participants	Bioimpedance device / method	Sampling frequency (kHz) / Current (μA)	Analytical procedure	Reference method	Main results
(Birzniece et al. 2015)	Longitudinal	71 athletes (men: n = 34, age 27.1 ± 0.8 y and women: n = 37, age 29.4 ± 1.2 y) involved in different sports	SFB7, ImpediMed, Brisbane, Australia / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	4 – 1000 / N/A	Equation owned by the manufacturer	Bromide dilution	BIS underestimated ECW (difference mean value: -3.5 L, LoA: -3.5 to 3.0) considering the athletes as an entire group BIS showed no difference in the estimation of ECW change considering the athletes as an entire group
(Deminice et al. 2016)	Longitudinal	13 male soccer players (age 18.2 ± 0.8 y) divided into creatine supplementation and placebo groups	310E, Biodynamics, Seattle, USA / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / N/A	(Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988): TBW = $0.372*S^2/R + 3.05*Sex + 0.142*Wt – 0.069*Age$, where Sex is 1 if men and 0 if female* (Kushner and Schoeller 1986): TBW = $8.399 + 0.396*S^2/R + 0.143*Wt$ (Kushner et al. 1992): TBW = $0.59* S/R + 0.065*Wt + 0.04$ (Deurenberg et al. 1990): TBW = $6.53 + 0.36740*S^2/impedance + 0.17531*Wt – 0.11 + Age + 2.83*Sex$, where Sex is 1 if men and 0 if female*	Deuterium dilution	Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988) equation underestimated change in TBW in control (difference mean value: -1.2 L) and creatine supplementation groups (difference mean value: -1.1 L) Kushner and Schoeller (Kushner and Schoeller 1986) equation underestimated change in TBW in control (difference mean value: -1.0 L) and creatine supplementation groups (difference mean value: -1.1 L) Kushner et al. (Kushner et al. 1992) equation underestimated change in TBW in control (difference mean value: -1.2 L) and creatine supplementation groups (difference mean value: -0.9 L) Deurenberg et al. (Deurenberg et al. 1990) equation underestimated change in TBW in control (difference mean value: -1.3 L) and creatine supplementation groups (difference mean value: -1.1 L)

					(Morgenstern et al. 2002): $TBW = 0.0758*0.84^{[if\ female]}*(S*Wt)^{0.69}$ (Sun et al. 2003): $TBW = 1.20 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.18*Wt$		Morgenstern et al. (Morgenstern et al. 2002) equation underestimated change in TBW in control (difference mean value: -0.2 L) and creatine supplementation groups (difference mean value: -1.9 L) Sun et al. (Sun et al. 2003) equation underestimated change in TBW in control (difference mean value: -1.0 L) and creatine supplementation groups (difference mean value: -1.1 L)
(Matias et al. 2016a)	Cross-sectional	184 athletes (men: n = 127, age 16 –38 y and women: n =57, age 16 –35 y) involved in different sports	i) 101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency ii) Hydra 4200, Xitron Technologies, San Diego, CA / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	i) 50 / 400 ii) 50 / 800	Equation used by BIA: BodygramPRO3.0 (Akern Systems, Italy) predictive equations for the TBW, ECW, and ICW estimations (Kushner and Schoeller 1986): $TBW = 8.399 + 0.396*S^2/R + 0.143*Wt$ (Van Loan and Mayclin 1987): $TBW = 9.9868 + 0.000724*S^2 + 0.2822*Wt - 0.0153*R - 2.3313*Sex - 0.1319*Age$ (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988): $TBW = 0.377* S^2/R + 0.14*Wt - 0.08*age + 2.9*Sex + 4.65$, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; ECW	Deuterium and bromide dilution	BodygramPRO3.0 predictive equations showed no difference for the TBW (difference mean value: 0.1 L, LoA: -3.7 to 3.9), ECW (difference mean value: -0.3 L, LoA: -3.0 to 2.4), and ICW (difference mean value: 0.6 L, LoA: -3.4 to 4.7) estimations in women, while underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -1.2 L, LoA: -5.9 to 3.4), ECW (difference mean value: -0.4 L, LoA: -3.9 to 3.0), and ICW (difference mean value: -0.7 L, LoA: -6.2 to 4.7) in men Kushner and Schoeller (Kushner and Schoeller 1986) equation overestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: 1.7 L, LoA: -2.2 to 5.7), while showed no difference for the TBW estimation in men (difference mean value: 0.4 L, LoA: -5.2 to 5.9) Van Loan and Mayclin (Van Loan and Mayclin 1987) equation overestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: 2.6 L, LoA: 2.3 to 7.6), while underestimated TBW in men (difference mean value: -5.3 L, LoA: -11.5 to 0.8) Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -3.4 L, LoA: -7.3 to -0.5) and men (difference mean

	= $0.189*(S^2/R) + 0.052*Wt - 0.0002*(S^2/Xc) + 1.03$	value: -5.1 L, LoA: -9.9 to -0.1). Lukaski and Bolonchuk (1988) equation underestimated ECW in women (difference mean value: -0.7 L, LoA: -3.0 to -1.6) and men (difference mean value: -0.4 L, LoA: -3.3 to 2.4)
	(Kushner et al. 1992): $TBW = 0.59* S/R + 0.065*Wt + 0.04$	Kushner et al. (Kushner et al. 1992) equation showed no difference in the TBW estimation in women (difference mean value: -0.1 L, LoA: -4.2 to 3.9), while underestimated TBW in men (difference mean value: -1.2 L, LoA: -7.0 to 4.6).
	(Schoeller and Luke 2000): $TBW = 0.499*S^2/R + 0.080*Wt + 2.9$	Schoeller and Luke (Schoeller and Luke 2000) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -1.0 L, LoA: -4.8 to 2.0) and men (difference mean value: -3.7 L, LoA: -9.0 to 1.5).
	(Sun et al. 2003): $TBW = 1.20 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.18*Wt$ for men and $TBW = 3.75 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.11*Wt$ for women	Sun et al. (Sun et al. 2003) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -0.8 L, LoA: -4.6 to 2.9) and men (difference mean value: -1.4 L, LoA: -6.2 to 3.5)
	(Sergi et al. 1994) :$ECW = -5.22 + 0.2*S^2/R + 0.005/Xc + 0.08*Wt + 1.9 + 1.86*Sex$, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male	Sergi et al. (Sergi et al. 1994) equation underestimated ECW in women (difference mean value: -2.7 L, LoA: -5.0 to 0.1), while showed no difference in men (difference mean value: 0.0 L, LoA: -4.0 to 3.9)
	Equations used by BIS: Equations owned by manufacturer for the TBW, ECW, and ICW estimations	BIS underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -0.3 L, LoA: -2.0 to 1.4) while showed no difference in men. BIS underestimated ECW in women (difference mean value: -0.6 L, LoA: -2.7 to 1.5) while showed no difference in men. BIS showed no difference in the ICW estimation in men and women.

(Matias et al. 2016b)	Cross-sectional	69 athletes (men: n = 46, age 22.5 ± 5.3 y and women: n = 23, age 20.8 ± 5.4 y) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	(Matias et al. 2016b): $TBW = 0.286 + 0.195*S^2/R + 0.385*Wt + 5.086*Sex$, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; $ECW = 1.579 + 0.055* S^2/R + 0.127*Wt + 0.006* S^2/Xc + 0.932*Sex$, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; $ICW = TBW − ECW$ (Kushner and Schoeller 1986): $TBW = 8.399 + 0.396*S^2/R + 0.143*Wt$ (Van Loan and Mayclin 1987): $TBW = 9.9868 + 0.000724*S^2 + 0.2822*Wt − 0.0153*R − 2.3313*Sex – 0.1319*Age$ (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988): $TBW = 0.377* S^2/R + 0.14*Wt − 0.08*age + 2.9*Sex+ 4.65$, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; $ECW = 0.189*(S^2/R) + 0.052*Wt − 0.0002*(S^2/Xc) + 1.03$	Deuterium and bromide dilution	Matias et al. (Matias et al. 2016b) equation showed no difference in the TBW (difference mean value: -0.0 L, LoA: -5.6 to 5.6), ECW (difference mean value: 0.2 L, LoA: -3.6 to 4.0), and ICW (difference mean value: -0.2 L, LoA: -6.5 to 6.1) estimations Kushner and Schoeller (Kushner and Schoeller 1986) equation showed no difference in the TBW estimation (difference mean value: 0.3 L, LoA: -5.8 to 6.3) Van Loan & Mayclin (Van Loan and Mayclin 1987) equation underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -3.1 l, LoA: -13.1 to 7.0) Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988) equation underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -3.6 L, LoA: -8.5 to 13.0) and ECW (difference mean value: -0.8 L, LoA: -4.7 to 3.0) Kushner et al. (Kushner et al. 1992) equation underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -1.5 L, LoA: -7.7 to 4.7) Schoeller and Luke (Schoeller and Luke 2000) equation underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -3.5 L, LoA: -9.9 to 3.0) Sun et al. (Sun et al. 2003) equation underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -1.6 L, LoA: -6.9 to 3.8)

					(Kushner et al. 1992): TBW = 0.59* S/R + 0.065*Wt + 0.04 (Schoeller and Luke 2000)TBW = 0.499*S^2/R + 0.080*Wt + 2.9 (Sun et al. 2003): TBW = 1.20 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.18*Wt for men and TBW = 3.75 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.11*Wt for women (Sergi et al. 1994): ECW = − 5.22 + 0.2*S^2/R + 0.005/Xc + 0.08*Wt + 1.9 + 1.86*Sex, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male		Sergi et al. (Sergi et al. 1994) equation underestimated TBW (difference mean value: -0.9 L, LoA: -4.6 to 3.1)
(Shiose et al. 2020)	Cross-sectional	18 male wrestler (age 21.0 ± 1.0 y)	SFB7, ImpediMed, Pinkenba, Australia / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	3 – 1000 / 200	(De Lorenzo et al. 1997): TBW = ECW + ICW, with ECW = 1/1000*[(4.3^2*40.5^2)/(1.05%10^{-3})]$^{1/3}$*[(√Wt*S^2)/^{extracellular})$^{2/3}$ and ICW = 1 + $(ICF^{bis}/ECW)^{5/2}$ = [(^{extracellular}R + ^{intracellular}R)/^{extracellular}R)*[1 + (273.9/40.5)*(ICF^{bis}/ECW)] (Moissl et al. 2006): TBW = ECW + ICW, with ECW =	Deuterium dilution	De Lorenzo et al. (De Lorenzo et al. 1997) equation showed no difference in the TBW estimation (difference mean value: 0.3 L, LoA: -1.1 to 1.7) Moissl et al. (Moissl et al. 2006) equation showed no difference for the TBW estimation (difference mean value: 0.2 L, LoA: -1.0 to 1.4)

					[(0.188/BMI) + 0.2883]*[(S^2 *$Wt^{1/2}$)/^{extracellular} R)$^{2/3}$ and ICW = [(0.58758/BMI) + 0.4194]*[(S^2 *$Wt^{1/2}$)/^{intracellular} R)$^{2/3}$		
(Francisco et al. 2021)	Cross-sectional	201 athletes (134 men, 67 women) with mean age 21.4 ± 5.1y divided into well-hydrated, euhydrated and dehydrated groups	Hydra 4200, Xitron Technologies, San Diego, CA / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	50 / 800	Equations owned by manufacturer for the TBW, ECW, and ICW estimations	Deuterium and bromide dilution	BIS showed no difference for the TBW estimation in well-hydrated (difference mean value: -0.2 L, LoA: -3.1 to 2.7), euhydrated (difference mean value: -0.3 L, LoA: -2.8 to 2.2), and dehydrated (difference mean value: 0.0 L, LoA: -1.9 to 2.0) athletes BIS showed no difference for the ECW estimation in well-hydrated (difference mean value: -0.1 L, LoA: -3.3 to 3.0), euhydrated (difference mean value: -0.1 L, LoA: -3.4 to 3.6), and dehydrated (difference mean value: -1.2 L, LoA: -6.2 to 3.7) athletes BIS showed no difference for the ICW estimation in well-hydrated (difference mean value: -0.1 L, LoA: -4.3 to 4.1), euhydrated (difference mean value: -0.1 L, LoA: -4.1 to 3.9), and dehydrated (difference mean value: 1.2 L, LoA: 3.7 to 6.3) athletes
(Coratella et al. 2021)	Cross-sectional	185 athletes (men: n = 132, age 21.7 ± 5.1 y; women: n = 53, age 20.3 ± 4.5 y) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	(Matias et al. 2016b): TBW = 0.286 + 0.195* S^2/R + 0.385*Wt + 5.086*Sex, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; ECW = 1.579 + 0.055* S^2/R + 0.127*Wt + 0.006* S^2/Xc + 0.932*Sex,	Deuterium and bromide dilution	Matias et al. (Matias et al. 2016b) equation showed no difference for the TBW estimation in women (difference mean value: -0.3 L, LoA: -2.9 to 2.3) and men (difference mean value: 0.1 L, LoA: -2.3 to 2.4). Matias et al. (Matias et al. 2016b) equation showed no difference for the ECW estimation in women (difference mean value: -0.3 L, LoA: -1.4 to 1.7) and men (difference mean value: -0.6 L, LoA: -2.7 to 1.5).

	where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; ICW = TBW − ECW (Sun et al. 2003): $TBW = 1.20 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.18*Wt$ for men and $TBW = 3.75 + 0.45*S^2/R + 0.11*Wt$ for women (Schoeller and Luke 2000): $TBW = 0.499*S^2/R + 0.080*Wt + 2.9$ (Kushner et al. 1992): $TBW = 0.59* S/R + 0.065*Wt + 0.04$ (Kotler et al. 1996): TBW = Male: $0.58*(S^{1.62}/impedance^{0.7})* (1/1.35) + 0.32*Wt − 3.66$ and Female: $0.76*(^{S1.99}/impedance^{0.58})* (1/18.91) + 0.14*Wt − 0.86$ (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988): $TBW = 0.377* S^2/R + 0.14*Wt − 0.08*age + 2.9*Sex+ 4.65$, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male; $ECW = 0.189*(S^2/R) + 0.052*Wt − 0.0002*(S^2/Xc) + 1.03$	Sun et al. (Sun et al. 2003) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -1.5 L, LoA: -5.1 to 2.1) and men (difference mean value: -1.8 L, LoA: -6.9 to 3.3). Schoeller and Luke (Schoeller and Luke 2000) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -1.7 L, LoA: -5.3 to 2.0) and men (difference mean value: -4.1 L, LoA: -9.5 to 1.3). Kushner et al. (Kushner et al. 1992) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -0.7 L, LoA: -4.3 to 2.3) and men (difference mean value: -1.4 L, LoA: -6.7 to 3.9). Kotler et al. (Kotler et al. 1996) showed no difference for the TBW estimation in women (difference mean value: 0.5 L, LoA: -3.4 to 4.1) and men (difference mean value: -1.6 L, LoA: -7.1 to 3.4). Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988) equation underestimated TBW in women (difference mean value: -4.1 L, LoA: -8.1 to 0.2) and men (difference mean value: -5.4 L, LoA: -11.3 to 0.4). Lukaski and Bolonchuk (Lukaski and Bolonchuk 1988) equation underestimated ECW in women (difference mean value: -1.9 L, LoA: -3.6 to 0.1), while showed no difference in men (difference mean value: -0.1 L, LoA: -3.5 to 3.4). Sergi et al. (Sergi et al. 1994) underestimated ECW in women (difference mean value: -2.3 L, LoA: -4.1 to 0.6) and men (difference mean value: -1.8 L, LoA: -5.4 to 1.2).

		(Sergi et al. 1994)ECW = − 5.22 + 0.2*S^2/R + 0.005/Xc + 0.08*Wt + 1.9 + 1.86*Sex, where Sex is 0 if female and 1 if male

Note: Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation. BIA: bioimpedance analysis; BIS: bioimpedance spectroscopy; N/A: not available; LoA: limits of agreements; R: resistance; Xc: reactance; TBW: total body water; ECW: extracellular water; ICW: intracellular water; Wt: weight in kilograms; S: stature in meters.

Table

Table 3. Articles comparing bioimpedance vector outcomes with total body water and percentage of fat mass using a reference method.

Authors	Study design	Participants	Bioimpedance device / method	Sampling frequency (kHz) / Current (µA)	Analytical procedure	Reference method	Main results
(Campa et al. 2020)	Longitudinal	58 athletes (men: n = 39, age 18.7 ± 4.0 y; women: n = 19, age 19.2 ± 6.0 y) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	R and Xc adjusted according to the Classic BIVA approach (adjusted for S)	Deuterium and bromide dilution	Reductions in vector length were associated with increases in TBW ($r = -0.718$, $p < 0.01$) considering the athletes as an entire group Phase angle was positively correlated with the change in ICW/ECW ratio ($r = 0.436$, $p < 0.01$) considering the athletes as an entire group
(Marini et al. 2020)	Cross-sectional	202 athletes (men: n = 139 age 21.5 ± 5.0 y; women: n = 63 age 20.7 ± 5.1 y) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	R and Xc adjusted according to the Classic BIVA (adjusted for S) and the *Specific* BIVA (adjusted for body geometries) approaches	DXA Deuterium and Bromide dilution and 4C according to the Wang et al. (2002) equation	*Specific* vector length was positively correlated with %FM (men: $r = 0.569$, $p < 0.001$; women: $r = 0.773$, $p < 0.001$). Classic vector length was negatively correlated with TBW (men: $r = -0.880$, $p < 0.001$; women: $r = -0.829$, $p < 0.001$) Phase angle was positively correlated with the ICW/ECW ratio (men: $r = 0.493$, $p < 0.001$; women: r 1=0.408, $p < 0.001$)
(Silva et al. 2020)	Longitudinal	27 male judo athletes (age 23.2 ± 2.8 y)	Hydra 4200, Xitron Technologies, San Diego, CA, US / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	50 / N/A	R and Xc adjusted according to the Classic BIVA approach	Deuterium and Bromide dilution	Decreases in TBW were accompanied by vector elongations (T^2=2.6, F=1.2, P=0.3, Mahalanobis distance= 0.39), and vice versa (T^2=4.1, F=1.8, P=0.2, Mahalanobis distance= 0.64) Phase angle was positively correlated with the ICW/ECW ratio (ß = 0.050, p=0.004)

(Campa et al. 2021a)	Longitudinal	80 athletes of different sports (age 43.9 ± 9.2 y) including 27 women and 53 men	Xitron 4000b, Xitron technologies, San Diego, CA / BIS using a foot to hand technology at multifrequency	50 / N/A	R and Xc adjusted according to the *Specific* BIVA approach	DXA	*Specific* vector length was associated with change in %FM ($r^2 = 0.246$; $p < 0.001$) considering the athletes as an entire group
(Stagi et al. 2021)	Cross-sectional	50 athletes (25 men: age 24.37 ± 4.79 y; 25 women: age 24.32 ± 4.43 y) involved in different sports	101 Anniversary, AKERN Systems; Florence, Italy / BIA using a foot to hand technology at single frequency	50 / 400	R and Xc adjusted according to *Specific* BIVA	DXA	Good agreement between DXA and BIVA ($F=14.89$, $p < 0.001$) in both sexes and all body segments. *Specific* vector length was positively correlated with $\%FM_{DXA}$ in the whole body and all body segments, and the phase angle was correlated with $FFMI_{DXA}$.

Note: Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation. BIA: bioimpedance analysis; BIS: bioimpedance spectroscopy; BIVA: bioelectrical impedance vector analysis; N/A: not available; R: resistance; Xc: reactance; TBW: total body water; ECW: extracellular water; ICW: intracellular water; FM: fat mass; Wt: weight in kilograms; S: stature in meters.

Table

Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Supplementary Table 1.docx

Funding: This research project received no external funding.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest. Availability of data and material:

Not applicable

Ethics approval: Not applicable