European Geriatric Medicine
https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-022-00674-w

EDITORIAL

Sarcopenic obesity: a hot yet under considered evolving concept

Gülistan Bahat[1]

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to European Geriatric Medicine Society 2022

Keywords Sarcopenic obesity · Obesity · Sarcopenia · Concept

Sarcopenic obesity (SO) is the concomitant presence of sarcopenia plus obesity. The term was first described by Heber et al. in 1996 [1] and first operationally defined by Baumgartner in 2000 [2]. In this first operational definition, sarcopenia component was considered as low skeletal muscle mass (a muscle mass index < mean-2 standard deviations of the sex-specific reference for a young, healthy population). Davison et al. defined SO using anthropometrics and bioelectrical impedance [3]. In evolution of sarcopenia, recently, muscle strength became the key characteristics (sine qua non) of sarcopenia diagnosis [4]. As such, contemporarily, SO definitions are based on muscle strength.

Sarcopenic obesity (SO) concept has been a hot concept in recent years with subsequent accumulating researches. As discrete concepts, sarcopenia is related to increased morbidity and mortality in all individuals and obesity in young adults and in some older adults [5–9]. Their co-presence have customarily been assumed to exert an additive effect on the adverse outcomes, such as disability/functional impairments, metabolic impairments, co-morbidities, such as osteoarthritis, type 2 diabetes, cancer mortality, quality of life and health-related costs [10]. Various researches have supported this theory [11, 12]. In opposite to custom belief, there are other studies reporting sarcopenia alone (pure sarcopenia) may be harmful to the individual while obesity may attenuate adverse consequences of concomitant sarcopenia and hence, may exert a more favorable profile in older adults [10, 13].

SO has been defined in different ways in accordance with the integrated definition of sarcopenia and obesity. As such, a broad range of SO prevalence has been reported, ranging between 2.1 and 12% [10, 13]. To date, there has been a lot discussion focused on the way of its definition and applied diagnostic method as well. Each approach possesses its own pros and cons. As a cornerstone in its history, at the 26th year of introduction of the SO, term the European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism (ESPEN) and the European Association for the Study of Obesity (EASO) compromised on a very recent consensus to yield the very first consensus operational definition and diagnostic criteria for SO [14]. This is a significant step because this will aid in speaking the same language among researches and enable comparison and interpret several study findings.

In this ESPEN/EASO SO consensus [14], at-risk individuals were recommended to be should screened with 'body mass index (BMI)' or 'waist circumference' for obesity, and with 'consideration of risk factors and clinical symptoms', or 'validated questionnaires' for sarcopenia. In case of positive SO screening, the recommended diagnostic methods are assessment of skeletal muscle function (with preferably handgrip strength) at first. Following positive low muscle strength finding, the assessment of body composition by use of dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) or bioelectrical impedance analyzer (BIA) is recommended to confirm or exclude low muscle mass with 'total or appendicular skeletal muscle mass (SMM) adjusted for body weight" and excess adiposity with 'fat mass percentage' parameter. As for staging, stage 1 is defined as SO with no accompanying clinical complications and stage 2; as SO+ complications. In addition, the group preferred to provide available cut-offs for recommended parameters. They suggested that that age, sex and ethnicity specific cut-offs are required [14].

While evaluating low muscle mass of sarcopenia, rather than the absolute muscle mass, muscle mass adjusted for body size is required. Body size of an individual is determined by the height and weight components. Indeed, skeletal muscle mass (SMM) adjusted for height square has been the usual method to assess low muscle mass (skeletal muscle

✉ Gülistan Bahat
gbahatozturk@yahoo.com

[1] Division of Geriatrics, Department of Internal Medicine, Istanbul University Istanbul Medical School, Capa, 34093 Istanbul, Türkiye

Published online: 13 July 2022

mass index, SMMI). Nonetheless, SMMI (height^2) underestimates low muscle mass in obese individuals because gain in overall weigh goes in parallel with gain in muscle mass [15, 16]. This harmony is maintained by gravity stimulating the mechanoreceptors in muscle that amend the production of growth factors [17]. Hence, when the weight component of the muscle mass is not considered in an obese individual, muscle mass adjusted by height^2 will fail to recognize relative inadequacy of the skeletal muscle mass for that level of body weight. The consensus group recommended use of SMM adjusted by weight [SMMI (weight)]. Considering the determination of body size not only with body weight but height as well, one can suggest that adjustment of muscle mass shall be better to be performed by weight and height together, i.e., body mass index (BMI). Regarding this view, SMM adjusted for BMI has been shown as associated with functionality, physical performance or frailty much better than SMM adjusted by height^2 or weight [18]. Comparative studies will clarify this issue in the coming years and will be important contributions to the evolving definition of SO.

Funding None.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest There are no relationships/conditions/circumstances that present a potential conflict of interest.

Ethical approval This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals.

Informed consent For this type of study, formal consent is not required.

References

1. Heber D, Ingles S, Ashley JM, Maxwell MH, Lyons RF, Elashoff RM (1996) Clinical detection of sarcopenic obesity by bioelectrical impedance analysis. Am J Clin Nutr 64:472S-S477
2. Baumgartner RN (2000) Body composition in healthy aging. Ann N Y Acad Sci 904:437–448
3. Davison KK, Ford ES, Cogswell ME, Dietz WH (2002) Percentage of body fat and body mass index are associated with mobility limitations in people aged 70 and older from NHANES III. J Am Geriatr Soc 50:1802–1809
4. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J et al (2019) Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing 48:16–31
5. Choi KM (2016) Sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity. Korean J Intern Med 31:1054–1060
6. Bahat G, Tufan F, Saka B et al (2012) Which body mass index (BMI) is better in the elderly for functional status? Arch Gerontol Geriatr 54:78–81
7. Boateng GO, Adams EA, Odei Boateng M, Luginaah IN, Taabazuing MM (2017) Obesity and the burden of health risks among the elderly in Ghana: a population study. PLoS ONE 12:e0186947
8. Bahat G, Muratlı S, İlhan B et al (2015) Body mass index and functional status in community dwelling older Turkish males. Aging Male 18:228–232
9. Bahat G, Soyluk O, Tufan F, Karan MA (2015) Might excess body weight be beneficial for the community-dwelling older people? Disabil Health J 8:467–468
10. Batsis JA, Villareal DT (2018) Sarcopenic obesity in older adults: aetiology, epidemiology and treatment strategies. Nat Rev Endocrinol 14:513–537
11. Farmer RE, Mathur R, Schmidt AF et al (2019) Associations between measures of sarcopenic obesity and risk of cardiovascular disease and mortality: a cohort study and mendelian randomization analysis using the UK biobank. J Am Heart Assoc 8:e011638
12. Stenholm S, Mehta NK, Elo IT, Heliövaara M, Koskinen S, Aromaa A (2014) Obesity and muscle strength as long-term determinants of all-cause mortality—a 33-year follow-up of the Mini-Finland Health Examination Survey. Int J Obes (Lond) 38:1126–1132
13. Bahat G, Kilic C, Ozkok S, Ozturk S, Karan MA (2021) Associations of sarcopenic obesity versus sarcopenia alone with functionality. Clin Nutr 40:2851–2859
14. Donini LM, Busetto L, Bischoff SC et al (2022) Definition and diagnostic criteria for sarcopenic obesity: ESPEN and EASO consensus statement. Obes Facts 15:321–335
15. Bahat G, Kilic C, Topcu Y, Aydin K, Karan MA (2020) Fat percentage cutoff values to define obesity and prevalence of sarcopenic obesity in community-dwelling older adults in Turkey. Aging Male 23:477–482
16. Kemmler W, Teschler M, Weißenfels A, Sieber C, Freiberger E, von Stengel S (2017) Prevalence of sarcopenia and sarcopenic obesity in older German men using recognized definitions: high accordance but low overlap! Osteoporos Int 28:1881–1891
17. Stenholm S, Harris TB, Rantanen T, Visser M, Kritchevsky SB, Ferrucci L (2008) Sarcopenic obesity: definition, cause and consequences. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care 11:693–700
18. Bahat G, Kilic C, Ilhan B, Karan MA, Cruz-Jentoft A (2019) Association of different bioimpedanciometry estimations of muscle mass with functional measures. Geriatr Gerontol Int 19:593–597

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.