DOI: 10.1002/agm2.12186

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

- WILEY

Prevalence and factors contributing to primary sarcopenia in relatively healthy older Indians attending the outpatient department in a tertiary care hospital: A cross-sectional study

Rishal Rahman¹ | Benny Paul Wilson² | Thomas Vizhalil Paul³ | Bijesh Yadav⁴ | Gopinath Kango Gopal² | Surekha Viggeswarpu²

¹Department of Medicine for the Elderly and Stroke, University Hospitals Dorset, Bournemouth, UK

²Department of Geriatrics, Christian Medical College Vellore, Vellore, India

³Department of Endocrinology, Christian Medical College Vellore, Vellore, India

⁴Department of Biostatistics, Christian Medical College Vellore, Vellore, India

Correspondence

Surekha Viggeswarpu, Department of Geriatrics, Christian Medical College Vellore, Vellore, Pin Code – 632004, Tamil Nadu, India. Email: vsurekha@hotmail.com

Funding information

The project was funded by Christian Medical College Vellore Internal Research Grant

Abstract

Background: Literature is scarce on primary sarcopenia among Indian older adults. This study was aimed to estimate the prevalence of primary sarcopenia among older persons in India using the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in the Older People 2010 (EWGSOP) diagnostic criteria and to elucidate the factors leading to its development.

Methodology: Two hundred twenty-seven subjects over 60 years of age attending the geriatric outpatient clinic were recruited for the study. Sarcopenia was diagnosed based on set criteria for gait speed, handgrip, and skeletal muscle mass assessment by dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry.

Result: The prevalence of primary sarcopenia in the study population was 39.2% (n = 89). Male patients were more sarcopenic than women, 47% (n = 72) vs 23% (n = 17). Obese subjects (body mass index > 25 kg/m²) had a lower prevalence of sarcopenia (odds ratio = 0.10; 95% confidence interval = 0.05–0.19). There was no association between sarcopenia and other postulated risk factors like low vitamin D levels, dietary protein or carbohydrate intake, or sedentary lifestyle.

Conclusion: Contrary to published data, primary sarcopenia appears to be higher among older Indians using presently available guidelines. Community studies with validated cutoffs suited for the Indian subcontinent may yield a lower prevalence of primary sarcopenia.

KEYWORDS

dual energy x-ray absorptiometry, European Working Group on Sarcopenia in the Older People 2010, Indian population, outpatient healthy older adults, prevalence of primary sarcopenia

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made. © 2021 The Authors. Aging Medicine published by Beijing Hospital and John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.

WILEY-Aging Medicine

1 | INTRODUCTION

258

Sarcopenia is an age-related muscle condition associated with a progressive, generalized loss of muscle mass and performance that has a direct impact on an older person's functional status and mortality.¹ Sarcopenia can be broadly classified as "primary" or purely related to aging, and "secondary," as the name suggests, is a result of an intrinsic disease process.² Identifying and treating the underlying cause is essential in the management of secondary sarcopenia. The prevalence of sarcopenia differs widely due to variations in diagnostic protocols, cutoffs used in the assessments, study population, and ethnicity.³

To streamline the definition of sarcopenia, The European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People (EWGSOP) formulated a diagnostic algorithm for sarcopenia in 2010 for patient care and research settings.⁴ The EWGSOP consensus used a combination of criteria and sarcopenia was diagnosed in the presence of low muscle mass, along with either low muscle strength or low physical performance. In 2019, the revised consensus EWGSOP2 was published with updated guidelines on the definition, diagnosis, and the assessment of the severity of sarcopenia. Low muscle strength was considered a vital characteristic of sarcopenia. The presence of low muscle quantity or quality confirms the diagnosis of sarcopenia. Subjects with reduced physical performance were considered to have severe sarcopenia.⁵

Subsequently, the Asian Sarcopenia Working Group (ASWG) in 2014 published a consensus on the diagnosis of sarcopenia, which was further revised in 2019 for improved diagnostic accuracy.^{6,7}

Literature on sarcopenia among Indian older adults is scarce, both in the community and hospital settings. The diagnosis of sarcopenia among older Indian adults is challenging due to the lack of normative data on parameters from which cutoffs can be defined to assess muscle quantity, strength, and performance in the Indian setting. Using published data from the west can lead to over- or underestimation of the burden of sarcopenia in our country.

The main objective of this study was to estimate the prevalence of primary sarcopenia among healthy older outpatient attendees. The secondary objective was to assess the association between sarcopenia and factors, such as dietary patterns, exercise routine, vitamin D levels, and body mass index (BMI).

2 | METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1 | Study design, population, and setting

This was a prospective cross-sectional study conducted between January 2015 and January 2016 in the Department of Geriatrics, Christian Medical College, a tertiary care hospital. Consenting participants, aged 60 years and over, attending the Geriatric outpatient clinic were recruited for the study. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Christian Medical College approved the study protocol, IRB no. 9078, dated June 10, 2014.

All participants had to have a comprehensive geriatric assessment and appropriate investigations. Subjects with chronic obstructive lung disease, congestive cardiac failure, chronic liver disease, chronic kidney disease, moderate to severe osteoarthritis, symptomatic peripheral neuropathy, neurodegenerative disorders (including cognitive impairment), underlying malignancies, ongoing untreated or uncontrolled medical conditions, and recurrent falls were excluded from the study, as these conditions are conventional causes of secondary sarcopenia.⁵ In addition, patients who presented with conditions causing acute pain, participants hospitalized in the last 10 weeks or those admitted for more than 7 days during the previous 6 months were excluded, as their underlying illnesses could have compromised assessments.⁸



FIGURE 1 European Working Group on Sarcopenia in the Older People (EWGSOP) 2010 diagnostic protocol for sarcopenia

2.2 | Sarcopenia diagnosis and determinants

The EWGSOP 2010 diagnostic criteria was used to diagnose sarcopenia in the study subjects (Figure 1). The subjects walked at a regular pace through a 6-meter course – he/she accelerated in the first meter; the gait speed was measured in the mid four meter zone and the subject decelerated in the final meter. The best result of the two trials were taken. Subjects with a gait speed of < 0.8 m/s were considered to have a reduced gait speed. Grip strength measurement was performed using a JAMAR Mg4800 digital handheld dynamometer, and a decreased grip strength was defined as < 30 and < 20 kg for men and women respectively. Skeletal Muscle Mass Index (SMM) was measured using Discovery A dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) machine. A coefficient of variation (CV) of 3% was noted. SMM of below 7.26 kg/m² in men and 5.5 kg/m² in women was the cutoff used for reduced muscle mass.⁴

Other relevant data, including demographic profile, exercise routine using the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ),⁹ occupational status, socioeconomic status (as per the modified Kuppuswamy scale), BMI, and underlying comorbidities, were collected for all study participants. A nutrition expert documented a detailed dietary pattern with particular emphasis on protein intake of these individuals. Good protein intake was defined as consumption of more than 0.8 g/kg/day. Serum vitamin D levels, thyroidstimulating hormone (TSH), hemoglobin, creatinine, and HbA1c was estimated for all participants.

2.3 | Statistical analysis

We assumed the prevalence of sarcopenia to be 20% based on a systematic review by Cruz-Jentoft et al.³ A sample size of 250 was calculated, for a precision of 5% and a 95% confidence level.

Data entry was done using EpiData software and analyzed using SPSS Statistics version 18. Pearson's chi-square test was used to analyze differences in demographic and other characteristics for categorical parameters. Independent samples *t* test was used for normally distributed continuous data, and the Mann–Whitney *U* test was used for non-normally distributed continuous data. Evaluation and identification of risk factors of sarcopenia were analyzed using simple and multiple regression analyses. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, medians, and interquartile range, were used to summarize the various characteristics of the study participants. A *P* value of < 0.05 was regarded as being statistically significant.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Study population characteristics

During the study period, 11,604 patients visited the Geriatric outpatient department. Based on the exclusion criteria, 9996 (86%) patients were excluded. Of the remaining patients, only 252 (2.2%) WILEV

participants could be enrolled as 658 (5.7%) did not give consent, and 698 (6.0%) could not be included, as they could not undergo skeletal muscle mass assessment. Ultimately, 227 (1.95%) subjects were included in the final analysis as six did not meet the study protocol, and SMM data were missing for 19 participants (Figure 2). We were not able to assess vitamin D levels and dietary patterns for 5 and 10 participants, respectively. However, they were included in the final calculation of the prevalence of sarcopenia in the study population.

The mean age of the subjects was 65.1 ± 4.4 years (range of 60-84 years). Around 23 (10%) of the subjects were over 70 years of age and 154 (68%) men were included in the study. Gait speed was reduced in 195 (85.9%) of the subjects. Among participants with normal gait speed (n = 32), only three had normal handgrip strength (HGS). Participants with reduced gait speed and low HGS underwent SMM assessment (Figure 1).

None of the participants belonged to the lower socioeconomic status, and only 6% were illiterate. All subjects were independent for Activities of Daily Living as per the Barthel index. The IPAQ questionnaire showed that only 18% of subjects indulged in regular physical activity, whereas none of the subjects complied with Health-Enhancing Physical Activity (HEPA; Table 1).

Based on the Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA), none of the participants were malnourished. According to the World Health Organization (WHO) Body Mass Index criteria, only 10 (4%) and 18 (8%) were underweight (BMI < 18.5 kg/m²) and obese (BMI > 30 kg/m²), respectively, whereas 112 (49.3%) had normal BMI and 87 (38.3%) were overweight. Hypertension was prevalent in 94 subjects (41%), whereas diabetes mellitus was seen in 76 (56%) subjects.

3.2 | Primary and secondary objectives

The overall prevalence of sarcopenia was 39.2% (n = 89) using the EWGSOP 2010 consensus. A higher proportion of men were sarcopenic compared with women, 47% (n = 72) vs 23% (n = 17 *P* value < 0.001). On applying the SMM-DXA EWGSOP 2018 criteria (cutoffs for men and women being < 7.0 kg/m² and < 5.5 kg/m², respectively), the prevalence of sarcopenia was 29% (n = 67). Using ASWG (2014 and 2019) criteria, the prevalence was 28% (n = 63; Table 2). The prevalence of sarcopenia among the male subjects declined to 32% using these cutoffs. In women, however, the prevalence declined to 18% when the ASWG criteria (2014 and 2019) were applied (Table 2).

Univariate analysis failed to show a significant association between sarcopenia and increasing age, educational status, socioeconomic class, social support status, comorbidities, and addictions using both EWGSOP 2010 and EWGSOP 2018 criteria. Based on the EWGSOP 2010 criteria, sarcopenia was more prevalent among men (47% vs 23%, P value < 0.001). However, this gender difference ceased to exist when EWGSOP 2018 criteria was used. (Tables 1 and 3). Sarcopenia was seen in fewer subjects with higher BMI (> 25 kg/ m²) on univariate (P < 0.001) and multivariate analyses (odds ratio = 0.10; 95% confidence interval [CI] = 0.05–0.19) after adjusting for age, sex, and vitamin D levels (Table 3).



Normal levels of vitamin D and consumption of a good quantity of protein daily does not protect one from sarcopenia (Table 3).

4 | DISCUSSION

This is the first study of its kind which looked at the prevalence of primary sarcopenia among older Indian outpatient attendees. Although the ASWG 2014 diagnostic criteria was available when the study was conducted, we used the EWGSOP 2010 consensus, as it was the most widely used criteria for defining sarcopenia when this study commenced.

In our study, nearly a third of the study population had primary sarcopenia using EWGSOP 2018 SMM-DXA cutoffs. Published community prevalence data for sarcopenia varied from 1% to 29%.³ An Indian study published in 2019 among outpatients found that

53% had sarcopenia using ASWG 2014 criteria.¹⁰ However, it is noteworthy that most of the research on sarcopenia has included subjects with secondary sarcopenia. A meta-analysis published in 2020 also concluded that sarcopenia is highly prevalent among older adults with chronic disease conditions.¹¹ However, a recent outpatient study done in Thailand among older adults using ASWG criteria reported a 10% prevalence of primary sarcopenia.¹²

EWGSOP 2010 and 2018 reference cutoffs for assessing muscle strength, muscle quantity/quality, and physical performance are derived mainly from Western population studies and may not be suitable for use in older Indian adults. For example, in this study of apparently healthy older individuals, almost 86% were found to have reduced gait speed, suggesting that the gait speed cutoff used may not accurately reflect poor physical performance. In another Indian outpatient based study, a lower cutoff for gait speed of 0.6 m/s was suggested, which may have been more appropriate in our context.¹³ TABLE 1 Study population characteristics

Aging Medicine

261

-WILEY-

Age: y 649 ± 42 65 ½ ± 7. 0.287 Age: ctagory, y 70 20 0.265 65-70 54 (58.7) 38 (41.3) 2 * 70 10 (0.97) 38 (41.3) 2 * 70 10 (0.97) 38 (41.3) 2 Sex		Nonsarcopenic subjects n = 138(%)	Sarcopenic subjects n = 89(%)	P value
Appe category, yAACorrelyACorrelyACorrelyACorrelyACorrely<	Age, y	64.9 ± 4.2	65.7 ± 4.7	0.287
60-6470 (62.5)42 (37.5)0.83865-7045 (85.7)36 (41.3)6714 (6.0)9 (33)5ex56 (76.7)17 (23.6)6.6 (1.5 (1.5 (2.2))70 (24.6.8)70 (24.6.8)6.6 (1.5 (1.5 (2.2))17 (23.6.9)70 (24.6.8)6.6 (1.5 (1.5 (2.5 (2.2))17 (23.6.9)70 (24.6.8)6.6 (1.5 (1.5 (2.5 (2.5 (2.5 (2.5 (2.5 (2.5 (2.5 (2	Age category, y			
65-70 38 (45.7) 38 (41.3) *70 14 (60.7) 9 (37) Sr 7 7 40.001 Gells apeed, (n = 73) 50 (7.7) 7 (24.8) <0.001	60-64	70 (62.5)	42 (37.5)	0.858
≥7014 (60.7)9 (39.1)SexMalc (n = 154)22 (52.7)72 (46.8)<.0.001	65-70	54 (58.7)	38 (41.3)	
<table-container>SetMaic n 154)(25/2)(24.64)(24.64)Fanale (n 154)(25.62)(24.64)(24.64)Gait speed, (n/4)(24.64)(24.64)(24.64)2 < (26.1 n 23)</table-container>	≥ 70	14 (60.9)	9 (39.1)	
Male (n = 154)22 (52 2)72 (46.8)<0.001Freme (n = 73)0 5 (76.7)72 (37.3)72Gat speed, (n = 159)12 (62.4)73 (37.4)0.241> 0.8 (n = 23)16 (50)16 (50)0.21Education17 (30.9)0.22172Primary education (n = 55)38 (69.1)17 (30.9)0.221Social speed, (n = 169)35 (50.7)34 (49.3)72Social support status332 (13.2)0.208Education12 (92.7)34 (40.3)0.201Social support status12 (19.7)70 (0.3)0.208Upper and middle class (n = 160)10 (55.7)64 (64.6)0.009Upper and middle class (n = 160)0 (55.7)64 (64.6)0.009Upper and middle class (n = 160)0 (50.7)0.0380.0123Index (n = 67)11 (63.21)67 (64.6)0.123Index (n = 67)11 (63.21)0.0500.123Index (n = 67)11 (63.21)0.0500.123Index (n = 67)15 (55.5)3 (10.4)0.354Index (n = 76)15 (52.5)3 (14.0.2)0.364Index (n = 76)15 (62.2)10 (37.1)0.364Index (n = 76)15 (62.5)10 (37.1)0.364Index (n =	Sex			
<table-container>Fende (n = 73)56 / 76 / 707 (2 / 3 / 3 / 7 / 7)Gale (n = 73)12 / 2 / 2 / 2 / 3 / 3 / 7 / 3 / 5 / 70.2 / 1 / 3 / 3 / 7 / 3 / 7 / 7Sole (n = 2)16 / 5 / 7 / 7 / 7 / 7 / 7 / 7 / 7 / 7 / 7</table-container>	Male (n = 154)	82 (53.2)	72 (46.8)	<0.001
Gait speed, (m/s) 22 (62. 6) 73 (37.4) 0.241 < 0.8 (n = 195)	Female (n = 73)	56 (76.7)	17 (23.3)	
< 0.8 (n = 19)122 (82.6)73 (37.4)0.241> 0.0 (n = 32)16 (50)16 (50)EducationPrimary education (n = 55)38 (94)117 (30.9)0.221Primary education and above (n = 69)35 (50.7)34 (49.3)2000Social support statusU10 (18.2)0.208Living with spouse or children (n = 129)129 (59.7)37 (40.3)0.208Social support statusU10 (18.2)0.208Living with spouse or children (n = 129)129 (59.7)37 (40.3)0.509Oper and middle class (n = 160)95 (59.4)65 (40.6)0.509Upper and middle class (n = 160)0000Exercise level based on IPAQ118 (63.1)67 (63.9)0.123Indicity (n = 187)128 (62.4)37 (37.4)0.354Minimally active (n = 40)20 (50)0.1230.341Disters (n = 76)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.342Mutation (n = 59)55 (58.5)31 (40.8)0.342Disters (n = 77)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.342Disters (n = 78)15 (62.2)70 (37.8)0.342Alcohol consumption (n = 20)125 (58.5)19 (45.2)0.361No alcohol consumption (n = 20)126 (59.8)22 (24.2)0.301No alcohol consumption (n = 20)126 (59.8)22 (23.2.3.0.9)0.001No alcohol consumption (n = 20)127 (59.8)22 (23.2.3.0.9)0.001Nomal (18.5-24.9.n = 112)64 (41.1)66 (56.9)0.001 <td>Gait speed, (m/s)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Gait speed, (m/s)			
> 0.8 (n = 32)16 (50)16 (50)Finary education (n = 57)38 (621)37 (30.9)0.221Secondary and higher secondary education64 (62.1)39 (37.9)0Graduation and above (n = 69)35 (50.7)34 (49.3)0.208Social support statusLiving alone (n = 11)9 (91.8)2 (18.2)0.208Sociale constructions20 (59.7)35 (40.3)0.509Upper and middle class (n = 160)95 (59.4)65 (40.6)0.509Opper lower class (n = 67)40 (59.7)27 (40.3)0.509Upper lower class (n = 67)40 (59.7)27 (40.3)0.123Lower class (n = 187)118 (63.1)65 (30.6)0.123Inactive (n = 187)120 (50.7)31 (40.8)0.354Oscomorbidities (n = 99)62 (62.6)37 (37.4)0.354Diabetes (n = 76)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.337Diabetes (n = 76)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.347Diabetes (n = 76)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.347Diabetes (n = 76)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.347Diabetes (n = 76)23 (54.8)19 (45.2)0.367No comorbidities (n = 99)62 (62.6)37 (37.4)0.354Diabetes (n = 76)23 (54.8)19 (45.2)0.367No history of smaking history (n = 42)23 (54.8)19 (45.2)0.367No history of smaking (n = 185)10 (69.6)0.0010.001No aciohal consumption (n = 204)12 (59.8)22 (40.2)	< 0.8 (n = 195)	122 (62.6)	73 (37.4)	0.241
Elucation Interpretation (n = 55) 36 (69.1) 17 (30.9) 0.221 Prinary education (n = 55) 36 (69.1) 17 (30.9) 0.221 Secondary and higher secondary education (n = 40) 36 (50.7) 34 (49.3) Cardation and above (n = 69) 35 (50.7) 34 (49.3) 0.208 Secondary and higher secondary education (n = 129) 12 (50.7) 87 (40.3) 0.208 Correctors status 12 (50.7) 87 (40.3) 0.208 Correctors class (n = 61) 95 (59.4) 65 (40.6) 0.509 Upper and middle class (n = 160) 95 (59.4) 65 (40.6) 0.509 Upper and middle class (n = 160) 95 (59.4) 67 (40.3) 0.212 Upper and middle class (n = 160) 10 (50.7) 0.216 0.212 Correct class (n = 61) 10 (60.7) 0.216 0.216 Correct class (n = 61) 10 (60.2) 0.216 0.216 Correct class (n = 61) 21 (62.6) 31 (40.3) 0.351 Diabetes (n = 79) 62 (62.6) 31 (40.3) 0.361 Diabetes (n = 79) 51	> 0.8 (n = 32)	16 (50)	16 (50)	
Primary education (n = 55)38 (69.1)17 (30.9)0.211Secondary and higher secondary education (n = 103)44 (62.1)39 (37.9)Graduation and above (n = 69)35 (50.7)34 (49.3)Social support status2 (18.2)0.208Living alone (n = 11)9 (81.8)2 (18.2)0.208Living alone (n = 110)95 (59.4)0.5 (40.4)0.509Upper and middle class (n = 160)95 (59.4)0.5 (40.4)0.509Upper lower class (n = 610)95 (59.4)0.2010Lower class (n = 610)95 (59.4)0.2010Lower class (n = 610)0.5090.2120.212Lower class (n = 187)118 (63.1)69 (63.9)0.123Minally active (n = 187)118 (63.1)69 (63.9)0.3123Minally active (n = 619)62 (62.6)37 (37.4)0.354Diabetes (n = 76)45 (59.2)31 (40.8)0.337Jubates (n = 76)55 (55.5)39 (41.5)0.462Sourceut moking or past smoking history (n = 42)215(4.8)19 (45.2)0.387I current smoking ne fast smoking history (n = 23)115 (62.2)7 (30.4)0.500No alcobel consumption (n = 23)11 (69.6)7 (30.4)0.500Na chord snoking (n = 185)115 (62.2)7 (30.4)0.501Na chord snoking (n = 183)12 (59.8)82 (40.2)101Liver (n = 187, no miniting (n = 204)12 (59.8)82 (40.2)101Minder (n = 204)12 (59.8)82 (40.2)101	Education			
Secondary and higher secondary education (n = 103)64 (62.1)92 (37.9)Graduation above (n = 69)35 (50.7)34 (49.3)Social support status(18.2)0.208Living alone (n = 11)9 (81.8)2 (18.2)0.208Discipation with spouse or children (n = 129)95 (57.4)65 (40.4)0.509Discipation status(19.7)27 (40.3)0.509Upper and middle class (n = 60)000Exercise level based on IPAQ18 (63.1)69 (69.6)0.123Inactive (n = 187)118 (63.1)69 (69.6)0.359Minimally active (n = 400)20 (50)20 (50)0Comorbidities (n = 79)18 (62.4)37 (37.4)0.354Diabetes (n = 76.7)18 (50.2)39 (40.8)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)55 (55.5)39 (41.6)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.354Diabetes (n = 76.7)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.364Current smoking hightory (n = 4.2)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)16 (69.6)70.30.40.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)15 (62.2)70 (37.4)0.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)16 (69.6)70.30.40.364Diabetes (n = 76.7)16 (69.6)70.400.364Dia	Primary education ($n = 55$)	38 (69.1)	17 (30.9)	0.221
fn = 103) Ir and above (n = 69) 35(50,7) 34(49.3) Social support status 128.8) 2(18.2) 0.208 Living with spouse or children (n = 129) 129 (59.7) 87(40.3) 0.208 Social support status 5000000000000000000000000000000000000	Secondary and higher secondary education	64 (62.1)	39 (37.9)	
Graduation and above (n = 69) 35 (50.7) 44 (49.3) Social support status 9 (81.8) 2 (18.2) 0.208 Living with spouse or children (n = 129) 129 (59.7) 37 (40.3) 0.208 Socioeconomic status 2 (19.5) 37 (40.3) 0.509 Jupper and middle class (n = 160) 95 (59.4) 65 (40.6) 0.509 Lover class (n = 67) 40 (59.7) 27 (40.3) 0.123 Lover class (n = 67) 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 0.123 Minimally active (n = 187) 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 0.123 Minimally active (n = 40) 20 (50) 20 (50) 0.123 Socorobidities (n = 79) 18 (63.2) 37 (37.4) 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.367 Diabetes (n = 76) 116 (62.2) 37 (37.4) 0.502 Normer thorking or past smoking history (n = 42) 13 (42.8) 14 (49.2) Norhitary of smacking (n = 125) 11 (62.2) 7 (30.4) 0.500 Norhitary (n = 204) 12 (2 (59.8) 2 (40.2) 2 (40.2)	(n = 103)			
Social support status j (k1.8) (18.2) (0.208 Living alone (n = 11) 9 (81.8) 2 (18.2) 0.208 Socioecomic status Upper and middle class (n = 160) 95 (59.4) 65 (40.6) 0.509 Upper alow class (n = 67) 40 (59.7) 27 (40.3) 0.509 Exercise level based on IPAQ 27 (40.3) 0.201 Exercise level based on IPAQ 20 (50) 0.201 Exercise level based on IPAQ 20 (50) 0.201 Comorbidities (n = 437) 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 0.123 Minimally active (n = 400 20 (50) 20 (50) 0.201 Comorbidities (n = 787) 118 (63.2) 37 (37.4) 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Miner past smoking history (n = 42) 25 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.367 No history of smoking (n = 185) 15 (62.2) 707.8) 0.201 Miner past smoking history (n = 42) 25 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.500 No history of smoking (n = 185) 15 (62.2) 703.7) 0.501	Graduation and above $(n = 69)$	35 (50.7)	34 (49.3)	
Living alone (n = 11) 9 (81.8) 2 (18.2) 0.208 Living with spouse or children (n = 129) 129 (59.7) 87 (40.3)	Social support status			
Living with spose or children (n = 129) 129 (59.7) 87 (40.3) Sociecconomic status	Living alone $(n = 11)$	9 (81.8)	2 (18.2)	0.208
Socioeconomi status Si (SA) Si (SA) <td>Living with spouse or children ($n = 129$)</td> <td>129 (59.7)</td> <td>87 (40.3)</td> <td></td>	Living with spouse or children ($n = 129$)	129 (59.7)	87 (40.3)	
Upper and middle class (n = 160) 95 (59.4) 65 (40.6) 0.509 Upper lower class (n = 67) 40 (59.7) 27 (40.3) Lower class (n = 0) 0 0 Exercise level based on IPAQ 59 (36.9) 0.123 Financi (n = 187) 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 0.123 Minimally active (n = 40) 20 (50) 0 0 Comorbidities 9 (36.9) 0.123 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Minimal y active (n = 187) 15 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Struent smoking on past smoking history (n = 42) 215 (48.2) 0.738 0.837 No history of smoking (n = 183) 15 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.500 No history of smoking (n = 183) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 12 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.011 Mirey (plat Class, n = 10) 100 9 (00 -0.011 Normal (16.5-24.7; n = 112)	Socioeconomic status			
Upper lower class (n = 67) 40 (59.7) 27 (40.3) Lower class (n = 0) 0 0 Exercise level based on IPAQ Exercise level based on IPAQ 69 (36.9) 6.123 Minimally active (n = 187) 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 6.123 Minimally active (n = 187) 20 (50 0 0 Comorbidities 20 (50 0.123 0.123 Diabetes (n = 76) 62 (62.6) 37 (37.4) 0.544 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Struent smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 13 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.637 No history of smoking (n = 185) 16 (62.0) 70 (37.8) 0.507 No lachol consumption (n = 204) 12 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.701 Mirror (Jast S-4.9; n = 10) 101 9 (90 <0.001	Upper and middle class (n $=$ 160)	95 (59.4)	65 (40.6)	0.509
Lower class (n = 0) 0 Exercise level based on IPAQ Inactive (n = 187) 118 (63.1) 69 (69.9) 0.123 Minimally active (n = 40) 00 (0) 00 (0) 0 Combridities 0 0.050 0.050 Combridities (n = 97) 62 (62.0) 31 (40.3) 0.363 Ibabes (n = 76) 62 (52.2) 31 (40.3) 0.363 Hyper on (n = 94) 55 (53.0) 30 (41.5) 0.626 Switch shory 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.367 No history of smoking instory (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.367 No history of smoking (n = 185) 12 (50.2) 70 (37.8) 0.367 No lacohol consumption (n = 204) 12 (50.8) 62 (40.2) 0.011 Normal (18.5-24.7) = 112) 12 (19.8) 62 (40.2) 0.011 Normal (18.5-24.7) = 112) 12 (19.8) 12 (32.1 4.6) 0.021 Normal (18.5-24.7) = 112) 12 (19.4) 12 (32.1 4.6) 0.021 Normal (18.5-24.7) = 112) 12 (19.4) 13 (2 1.4) 0.012 <td>Upper lower class (n = 67)</td> <td>40 (59.7)</td> <td>27 (40.3)</td> <td></td>	Upper lower class (n = 67)	40 (59.7)	27 (40.3)	
Exercise level based on IPAQ 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 0.123 Iniminally active (n = 40) 20 (50) 20 (50) Combridities 9 62 (62.6) 37 (37.4) 0.354 No comorbidities (n = 99) 62 (62.6) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.357 No instory of smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.337 No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.357 Acurrent smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 12 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.001 No alcohol consumption (n = 23) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 Normal (18.5-24.9; n = 10) 12 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.001 Inderweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	Lower class (n $=$ 0)	0	0	
Inactive (n = 187) 118 (63.1) 69 (36.9) 0.123 Minimally active (n = 40) 20 (50) 20 (50) Comorbidities 20 (50) 20 (50) Comorbidities (n = 99) 62 (62.6) 37 (37.4) 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Smoking history 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Surrent smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.837 No histor of smoking (n = 185) 12 (59.2) 70 (30.4) 0.500 No histor of smoking (n = 23) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.001 Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	Exercise level based on IPAQ			
Minimally active (n = 40) 20 (50) Comorbidities No comorbidities (n = 99) 62 (62.6) 37 (37.4) 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Smoking history 0.354 0.837 Current smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking (n = 185) 15 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.387 Alcohol consumption 12 (59.8) 32 (40.2) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.001 Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	Inactive (n = 187)	118 (63.1)	69 (36.9)	0.123
Convolution No comorbidities (n = 99) 62 (62.6) 37 (37.4) 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Swing history 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.387 Acuronation 12 70 (37.8) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 203) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.001 Muderweight (<18.5; n = 10)	Minimally active $(n = 40)$	20 (50)	20 (50)	
No comorbidities (n = 99) 62 (62.6) 37 (37.4) 0.354 Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Swoking history 2 2 31 (40.8) 0.837 Current smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.387 Alcohol consumption 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 203) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 0.001 Muderweight < 18.5; n = 10)	Comorbidities			
Diabetes (n = 76) 45 (59.2) 31 (40.8) 0.837 Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Smoking history 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) 70 (37.8) Alcohol consumption (n = 23) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 82 (40.2) Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10) 1(10) 9 (90) <0.001 Normal (18.5-24.9; n = 112) 66 (41.1) 66 (58.9) Overweight (> 25; n = 105) 91 (86.7) 13.2 ± 1.60 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 33.2 ± 1.50 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 0.31 ± 1.34 0.703 ± 11.4 0.012 0.177 TSH (N = 0.5-1.478 m IU/ml) 0.57 ± 0.24 0.471 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444	No comorbidities ($n = 99$)	62 (62.6)	37 (37.4)	0.354
Hypertension (n = 94) 55 (58.5) 39 (41.5) 0.642 Smoking history <	Diabetes (n = 76)	45 (59.2)	31 (40.8)	0.837
Smoking history 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) Alcohol consumption 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) Alcohol consumption (n = 23) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) BMI, kg/m ² 26.14 ± 3.54 22.32 ± 3.09 <0.001	Hypertension (n = 94)	55 (58.5)	39 (41.5)	0.642
Current smoking or past smoking history (n = 42) 23 (54.8) 19 (45.2) 0.387 No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8)	Smoking history			
No history of smoking (n = 185) 115 (62.2) 70 (37.8) Alcohol consumption Current/past consumption (n = 23) 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) 100 BMI, kg/m ² 26.14 ± 3.54 22.32 ± 3.09 <0.001	Current smoking or past smoking history ($n = 42$)	23 (54.8)	19 (45.2)	0.387
Alcohol consumption 16 (69.6) 7 (30.4) 0.500 No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) BMI, kg/m ² 26.14 \pm 3.54 22.32 \pm 3.09 <0.001	No history of smoking ($n = 185$)	115 (62.2)	70 (37.8)	
Current/past consumption (n = 23)16 (69.6)7 (30.4)0.500No alcohol consumption (n = 204)122 (59.8)82 (40.2) (0.01) BMI, kg/m²26.14 ± 3.5422.32 ± 3.09 (0.001) Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	Alcohol consumption			
No alcohol consumption (n = 204) 122 (59.8) 82 (40.2) BMI, kg/m ² 26.14 ± 3.54 22.32 ± 3.09 <0.001	Current/past consumption (n = 23)	16 (69.6)	7 (30.4)	0.500
BMI, kg/m²26.14 \pm 3.5422.32 \pm 3.09<0.001Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	No alcohol consumption ($n = 204$)	122 (59.8)	82 (40.2)	
Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	BMI, kg/m ²	26.14 ± 3.54	22.32 ± 3.09	<0.001
Normal (18.5-24.9; n = 112) 46 (41.1) 66 (58.9) Overweight (> 25; n = 105) 91 (86.7) 14 (13.3) Laboratory parameters Hemoglobin, g/dl 13.2 ± 1.50 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 23.3 ± 10.3 27.03 ± 11.4 0.012 Creatinine (N = 0.6-1.4 mg/dl) 0.87 ± 0.24 0.92 ± 0.24 0.177 TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Underweight (< 18.5; n = 10)	1 (10)	9 (90)	<0.001
Overweight (> 25; n = 105) 91 (86.7) 14 (13.3) Laboratory parameters 13.2 ± 1.50 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 23.3 ± 10.3 27.03 ± 11.4 0.012 Creatinine (N = 0.6-1.4 mg/dl) 0.87 ± 0.24 0.92 ± 0.24 0.177 TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Normal (18.5–24.9; n = 112)	46 (41.1)	66 (58.9)	
Laboratory parameters Hemoglobin, g/dl 13.2 ± 1.50 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 23.3 ± 10.3 27.03 ± 11.4 0.012 Creatinine (N = 0.6-1.4 mg/dl) 0.87 ± 0.24 0.92 ± 0.24 0.177 TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Overweight (> 25; n = 105)	91 (86.7)	14 (13.3)	
Hemoglobin, g/dl 13.2 ± 1.50 13.2 ± 1.46 0.793 Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 23.3 ± 10.3 27.03 ± 11.4 0.012 Creatinine (N = 0.6-1.4 mg/dl) 0.87 ± 0.24 0.92 ± 0.24 0.177 TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Laboratory parameters			
Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml) 23.3 ± 10.3 27.03 ± 11.4 0.012 Creatinine (N = 0.6-1.4 mg/dl) 0.87 ± 0.24 0.92 ± 0.24 0.177 TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Hemoglobin, g/dl	13.2 ± 1.50	13.2 ± 1.46	0.793
Creatinine (N = 0.6-1.4 mg/dl) 0.87 ± 0.24 0.92 ± 0.24 0.177 TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Vitamin D levels (N = 30-75 ng/ml)	23.3 ± 10.3	27.03 ± 11.4	0.012
TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml) 3.15 ± 2.88 3.52 ± 2.36 0.464 HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	Creatinine (N = $0.6-1.4 \text{ mg/dl}$)	0.87 ± 0.24	0.92 ± 0.24	0.177
HbA1c, % 6.41 ± 1.34 6.57 ± 1.24 0.247	TSH (N = 0.55-4.78 m IU/ml)	3.15 ± 2.88	3.52 ± 2.36	0.464
	HbA1c, %	6.41 ± 1.34	6.57 ± 1.24	0.247

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Nonsarcopenic subjects n = 138(%)	Sarcopenic subjects n = 89(%)	P value
1756 ± 379.1	1749.8 ± 321.4	0.877
53.7 ± 17.7	50.8 ± 15.1	0.229
306.9 ± 95.8	304.8 ± 73.7	0.858
36.4 ± 12.33	35.7 ± 10.9	0.625
	Nonsarcopenic subjects n = 138(%) 1756 ± 379.1 53.7 ± 17.7 306.9 ± 95.8 36.4 ± 12.33	Nonsarcopenic subjects n = 138(%)Sarcopenic subjects n = 89(%) 1756 ± 379.1 1749.8 ± 321.4 53.7 ± 17.7 50.8 ± 15.1 306.9 ± 95.8 304.8 ± 73.7 36.4 ± 12.33 35.7 ± 10.9

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; IPAQ, International Physical Activity Questionnaire

	EWGSOP 2010 ^a n (%)	EWGSOP 2018 ^b n (%)	ASWG 2014 AND 2019 ^c n (%)
Prevalence of sarcopenia	89 (39.2)	67 (29.5)	63 (27.8)
Prevalence in men	72 (46.8)	50 (32.5)	50 (32.5)
Prevalence in women	17 (23.3)	17 (23.3)	13 (17.8)

 TABLE 2
 Prevalence of sarcopenia

 based on different SMM – DXA cutoffs, as
 suggested by different guidelines

Abbreviations: ASWG, Asian Sarcopenia Working Group; DXA, dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry; EWGSOP, European Working Group on Sarcopenia in the Older People; SMM, Skeletal Muscle Mass Index.

 a SMM (ASM/ht²) (kg/m²) cutoff by using DXA – EWGSOP 2010 – men < 7.26 and women < 5.5.

^bEWGSOP 2018 male < 7.0 and women < 5.5.

^cASWG 2014 and 2019 - men < 7.0 women < 5.4.

A study done by Marwaha et al¹⁴ among 1045 healthy Indian women using DXA suggested that a cutoff < 5.11 kg/m^2 (< 20th centile) to diagnose reduced SMM in Indian women was appropriate. This is lower than EWGSOP and ASWG cutoffs. Therefore, normative data for deriving the cutoffs of sarcopenia determinants are needed to diagnose sarcopenia in different geographic populations accurately.

Muscle mass and strength have been shown to peak between the second and third decade in White subjects.¹⁵ However, a community study concluded that peak muscle mass and strength was achieved only in the third and fourth decades of life in Indians, and the mean muscle mass and muscle strength were reduced compared to White subjects.¹⁶ Thus, ethnicity and race have a role to play in the pathophysiology of sarcopenia. Variations in demographic profile, nutritional status, chronic disease conditions, lifestyle, diet, and cultural practices have an influence on peak skeletal muscle mass and the rate of muscle loss and function, thus leading to a wide variation in the observed prevalence of sarcopenia across different population groups.^{4,5,17-20}

In our study, we found that men were more sarcopenic than women, as per the EWGSOP 2010 consensus (P < 0.001). Nevertheless, when the current cutoffs were applied, it failed to show an association between gender and the prevalence of sarcopenia (Table 3). An Indian hospital-based study published in 2020 which looked at computerized tomogram assessment of sarcopenia showed men were eight times more likely to be sarcopenic than women.²¹ Similar findings were reported from a Chinese community study (19.2% men vs 8.6% women).²² Possible reasons include the rapid decline in muscle mass due to age-dependent reduction in testosterone and insulin-like growth factor-1 levels in men.²³

Sarcopenia was seen in fewer patients who were overweight, as compared with those who were said to be normal or underweight, as per the WHO criteria for body mass. This is consistent with recent data reported from Asian populations.^{24,25} A high BMI may not always imply increased fat, but may indicate improved lean skeletal mass to fat ratio. Therefore, it may be prudent to measure adiposity when BMI is elevated, in the presence of sarcopenia, to diagnose sarcopenic obesity.²⁴

Similar to an Indian study done by Anbalagan et al among young diabetics, the daily dietary protein intake did not differ significantly between sarcopenic and healthy subjects (P = 0.229).²⁶ Nevertheless, many cohort studies had shown a reduction in the rate of decline in muscle mass with aging when protein supplementation was provided to older adults.^{27,28} Prior and ongoing consumption of good quality protein is essential to maintain muscle bulk and prevent loss of muscle function.²⁹⁻³¹ Indian diets are predominantly cereal-based and possess relatively poor-quality protein when compared with legumes, meat, milk, or milk-based products. One of the reasons for an increase in the burden of sarcopenia in India is probably due to an insufficient quantity and quality of protein intake at a younger age, leading to a lower baseline muscle mass.³²

Exercise levels did not correlate with sarcopenia in this study (P = 0.12). Previous studies have shown that regular moderate to vigorous physical activity can prevent and aid in treating sarcopenia.^{33,34} However, in this study, only a small number of subjects maintained an active lifestyle. Hence, we feel that more extensive studies are required to ascertain the relation between exercise levels and sarcopenia.

In this study, low vitamin D levels did not contribute to the development of sarcopenia (P = 0.146). Although this vitamin has an established biological effect on skeletal muscle physiology, previous experimental studies have produced conflicting results regarding

	EWGSOP 2010 ^a					EWGSOP 2018 ^b				
	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysi	S	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysi	S
	Groups n (%)					Groups n (%)				
Parameters	Nonsarcopenic	Sarcopenic	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value	Nonsarcopenic	Sarcopenic	P value	OR (95% CI)	P value
Age, y										
60-64	70 (62.5)	42 (37.5)	0.858	1.26 (0.41–3.88)	0.69	83 (74.1)	29 (25.9)	0.475	1.29 (0.42–3.98)	0.653
65-70	54 (58.7)	38 (41.3)		1.29 (0.42-3.91)	0.66	61 (66.3)	31 (33.7)		0.99 (0.32-3.07)	0.991
> 70	14 (60.9)	9 (39.1)		Reference		16 (69.6)	7 (30.4)		Reference	
Gender										
Male	82 (53.2)	72 (46.8)	< 0.001	2.950 (1.41-6.16)	0.004	104 (67.5)	50 (32.5)	0.165	1.29 (0.61-2.71)	0.506
Female	56 (76.7)	17 (23.3)		Reference		56 (76.7)	17 (23.3)		Reference	
Vitamin D levels, ng/	/ml									
≤ 20	50 (67.6)	24 (32.4)	0.146	1.01 (0.53 -2.26)	0.805	55 (74.3)	19 (25.7)	0.436	0.92 (0.42-1.98)	0.824
> 20	84 (56.8)	64 (43.2)		Reference		101 (68.2)	47 (31.8)		Reference	
BMI, kg/m ²										
< 25	47 (38.5)	75 (61.5)	< 0.001	Reference	< 0.001	63 (51.6)	59 (48.4)	< 0.001	Reference	< 0.001
≥ 25	91 (86.7)	14 (13.3)		0.094 (0.05-0.19)		97 (92.4)	8 (7.6%)		0.081 (0.034-0195)	
Protein intake per da	٨٢									
Reduced protein intake	64 (58.2)	46 (41.8)	0.579	0.93 (0.49–1.76)	0.823	75 (68.2)	35 (31.8)	0.461	0.95 (0.48–1.88)	0.889
Good protein intake	67 (56.4)	40 (37.4)		Reference		78 (72.9)	29 (27.1)		Reference	
<i>Note:</i> Statistically sign Abbreviations: BMI, b Skeletal Muscle Mass	ificant <i>P</i> values < 0.05 ody mass index; Cl, co Index.	i are in bold. Infidence interval;	DXA, dual-ene	rgy x-ray absorptiomet	ry; EWGSOP,	European Working Gr	oup on Sarcopenia	in the Older Pe	ople; OR, odds ratio; S	MM,

hased on FWGSOP 2010* and FWGSOP 2018** se with odde ratio for underlying factors ź 2 TABLE 3 University

^a As per the study protocol. ^bUsing the revised DXA SMM cutoffs.

263 -WILEY-

vitamin D treatment or supplementation in the prevention or treatment of sarcopenia.³⁵⁻³⁷

4.1 | Limitations

264

This was a relatively small study. Second, this was a hospital-based study, and the results may not be applicable to the general population. However, it is pertinent to note that the participants were active community-dwelling adults. Third, the study population did not include subjects from lower socioeconomic or lower literacy groups. This was a selection bias, as this hospital is a private hospital where people have to pay for services.

5 | CONCLUSION

There is an urgent need for comprehensive community-based studies to obtain normative data to accurately address the burden of sarcopenia among older Indians. Based on available cutoffs, primary sarcopenia appears to be common among older Indian adults, especially in men and individuals with lower BMI. Larger studies are required to assess the role of vitamin D and exercise levels on the prevention of sarcopenia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Departments of Endocrinology, Clinical Dietetic Services and Clinical Biochemistry of Christian Medical College and Hospital, Vellore for the assistance provided during the study.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Nothing to disclose.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Rahman, Viggeswarpu, and Paul contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection, and analysis were performed by Rahman and Yadav. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Wilson and all authors commented on subsequent versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

Obtained from each of the study participants at the time of enrollment.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Obtained from each of the study participants at the time of enrollment.

ORCID

Benny Paul Wilson b https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9943-317X Gopinath Kango Gopal https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7115-6465 Surekha Viggeswarpu https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5945-3771

REFERENCES

- Morley JE, Baumgartner RN, Roubenoff R, Mayer J, Nair KS. Sarcopenia. J Lab Clin Med. 2001;137(4):231-243. doi:10.1067/ mlc.2001.113504
- Santilli V, Bernetti A, Mangone M, Paoloni M. Clinical definition of sarcopenia. Clin Cases Miner Bone Metab. 2014;11(3):177-180.
- Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Landi F, Schneider SM, et al. Prevalence of and interventions for sarcopenia in ageing adults: a systematic review. Report of the International Sarcopenia Initiative (EWGSOP and IWGS). Age Ageing. 2014;43(6):748-759. 10.1093/ageing/afu115
- Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, et al. Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis: Report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. Age Ageing. 2010;39(4):412-423. doi:10.1093/ageing/afq034
- Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, et al. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing. 2019;48(1):16-31. doi:10.1093/ageing/afy169
- Chen L-K, Liu L-K, Woo J, et al. Sarcopenia in Asia: consensus report of the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2014;15(2):95-101. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2013.11.025
- Chen L-K, Woo J, Assantachai P, et al. Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia: 2019 Consensus Update on Sarcopenia Diagnosis and Treatment. J Am Med Direct Assoc. 2020;21(3):300-307.e2. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2019.12.012
- Welch C, Hassan-Smith ZK, Greig CA, Lord JM, Jackson TA. Acute sarcopenia secondary to hospitalisation - an emerging condition affecting older adults. *Aging Dis.* 2018;9(1):151-164. doi:10.14336/ AD.2017.0315
- Lee PH, Macfarlane DJ, Lam TH, Stewart SM. Validity of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire Short Form (IPAQ-SF): a systematic review. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2011;8:115. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-8-115
- Singhal S, Dewangan GC, Bansal R, et al. Sarcopenia and its Association with Geriatric Syndromes and Quality of Life in Older Indian Outpatients - A Cross-sectional Pilot Observational Study. J Indian Acad Geriatr. 2019;15(2):66. doi:10.35262/jiag.v15i2.66-74
- 11. Pacifico J, Geerlings MAJ, Reijnierse EM, Phassouliotis C, Lim WK, Maier AB. Prevalence of sarcopenia as a comorbid disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Exp Gerontol*. 2020;131:110801. doi:10.1016/j.exger.2019.110801
- Therakomen V, Petchlorlian A, Lakananurak N. Prevalence and risk factors of primary sarcopenia in community-dwelling outpatient elderly: a cross-sectional study. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10(1):19551. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-75250-y
- Gunasekaran V, Banerjee J, Dwivedi SN, Upadhyay AD, Chatterjee P, Dey AB. Normal gait speed, grip strength and thirty seconds chair stand test among older Indians. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2016;67:171-178. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2016.08.003
- Marwaha RK, Garg MK, Bhadra K, Mithal A, Tandon N. Assessment of lean (muscle) mass and its distribution by dual energy Xray absorptiometry in healthy Indian females. Arch Osteoporos. 2014;9:186. doi:10.1007/s11657-014-0186-z
- Metter EJ, Lynch N, Conwit R, Lindle R, Tobin J, Hurley B. Muscle quality and age: cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons. J Gerontol. 1999;54(5):B207-B218. doi:10.1093/geron a/54.5.B207
- Pal R, Aggarwal A, Singh T, et al. Diagnostic cut-offs, prevalence, and biochemical predictors of sarcopenia in healthy Indian adults: The Sarcopenia-Chandigarh Urban Bone Epidemiological Study (Sarco-CUBES). Eur Geriatr Med. 2020;11(5):725-736. doi:10.1007/ s41999-020-00332-z
- Jeng C, Zhao L-J, Wu K, Zhou Y, Chen T, Deng H-W. Race and socioeconomic effect on sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in the Louisiana Osteoporosis Study (LOS). JCSM Clin Rep. 2018;3(2):e00027.

- Garatachea N, Lucía A. Genes and the ageing muscle: a review on genetic association studies. *Age (Dordr)*. 2013;35(1):207-233. doi:10.1007/s11357-011-9327-0
- Kalyani RR, Corriere M, Ferrucci L. Age-related and disease-related muscle loss: the effect of diabetes, obesity, and other diseases. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2014;2(10):819-829. doi:10.1016/S2213 -8587(14)70034-8
- Silva AM, Shen W, Heo M, et al. Ethnicity-Related skeletal muscle differences across the lifespan. Am J Hum Biol. 2010;22(1):76-82. doi:10.1002/ajhb.20956
- Sreepriya PR, Pillai SS, Nair ANKK, Rahul A, Pillai S, Nair ATS. Prevalence and associated factors of sarcopenia among patients underwent abdominal CT scan in Tertiary Care Hospital of South India. J Frailty Sarcopenia Falls. 2020;5(3):79-85. doi:10.22540/ JFSF-05-079
- Du Y, Wang X, Xie H, et al. Sex differences in the prevalence and adverse outcomes of sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in community dwelling elderly in East China using the AWGS criteria. BMC Endocr Disord. 2019;19(1):109. doi:10.1186/s12902-019-0432-x
- Yamada M, Nishiguchi S, Fukutani N, et al. Prevalence of sarcopenia in community-dwelling Japanese older adults. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2013;14(12):911-915. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2013.08.015
- Pang BWJ, Wee S-L, Lau LK, et al. Prevalence and Associated Factors of Sarcopenia in Singaporean Adults—The Yishun Study. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2021;22(4):885.e1-885.e10. doi:10.1016/j. jamda.2020.05.029
- Tey SL, Chew STH, How CH, et al. Factors associated with muscle mass in community-dwelling older people in Singapore: findings from the SHIELD study. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(10):e0223222. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0223222
- Anbalagan VP, Venkataraman V, Pradeepa R, Deepa M, Anjana RM, Mohan V. The prevalence of presarcopenia in Asian Indian individuals with and without type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2013;15(9):768-775. doi:10.1089/dia.2013.0068
- Houston DK, Nicklas BJ, Ding J, et al. Dietary protein intake is associated with lean mass change in older, community-dwelling adults: the Health, Aging, and Body Composition (Health ABC) Study. Am J Clin Nutr. 2008;87(1):150-155. doi:10.1093/ajcn/87.1.150
- Scott D, Blizzard L, Fell J, Giles G, Jones G. Associations between dietary nutrient intake and muscle mass and strength in community-dwelling older adults: the Tasmanian Older Adult Cohort Study. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2010;58(11):2129-2134. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03147.x

- 29. Yanai H. Nutrition for Sarcopenia. *J Clin Med Res.* 2015;7(12):926-931. doi:10.14740/jocmr2361w
- Bauer J, Biolo G, Cederholm T, et al. Evidence-based recommendations for optimal dietary protein intake in older people: a position paper from the PROT-AGE Study Group. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2013;14(8):542-559. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2013.05.021
- Montiel-Rojas D, Nilsson A, Santoro A, et al. Fighting Sarcopenia in Ageing European Adults: the importance of the amount and source of dietary proteins. *Nutrients*. 2020;12(12):3601. doi:10.3390/ nu12123601
- Minocha S, Thomas T, Kurpad AV. Dietary protein and the healthnutrition-agriculture connection in India. J Nutr. 2017;147(7):1243-1250. doi:10.3945/jn.116.243980
- Sánchez-Sánchez JL, Mañas A, García-García FJ, et al. Sedentary behaviour, physical activity, and sarcopenia among older adults in the TSHA: isotemporal substitution model. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2019;10(1):188-198. doi:10.1002/jcsm.12369
- Mijnarends DM, Koster A, Schols JMGA, et al. Physical activity and incidence of sarcopenia: the population-based AGES-Reykjavik Study. Age Ageing. 2016;45(5):614-620. doi:10.1093/ageing/ afw090
- Remelli F, Vitali A, Zurlo A, Volpato S. Vitamin D deficiency and sarcopenia in older persons. *Nutrients*. 2019;11(12):2861. doi:10.3390/ nu11122861
- Uchitomi R, Oyabu M, Kamei Y. Vitamin D and sarcopenia: potential of vitamin D supplementation in sarcopenia prevention and treatment. Nutrients. 2020;12(10):3189. doi:10.3390/nu12103189
- Shea MK, Fielding RA, Dawson-Hughes B. The effect of vitamin D supplementation on lower-extremity power and function in older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr.* 2019;109(2):369-379. doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqy290

How to cite this article: Rahman R, Wilson BP, Paul TV, Yadav B, Kango Gopal G, Viggeswarpu S. Prevalence and factors contributing to primary sarcopenia in relatively healthy older Indians attending the outpatient department in a tertiary care hospital: A cross-sectional study. *Aging Med*. 2021;4:257–265. doi:10.1002/agm2.12186