

## Rejuvenation of the term Sarcopenia

Bulow, Jacob; Ulijaszek, Stanley J; Holm, Lars

DOI:

[10.1152/jappphysiol.00400.2018](https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00400.2018)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Bulow, J, Ulijaszek, SJ & Holm, L 2018, 'Rejuvenation of the term Sarcopenia', *Journal of Applied Physiology*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00400.2018>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Final version of record available at: <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00400.2018>

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **Title Page**  
2  
3 **Title**  
4 Rejuvenation of the term Sarcopenia  
5  
6 **Running head**  
7 Rejuvenation of the term Sarcopenia  
8  
9 **Authors**  
10 Jacob Bülow MD<sup>1</sup>, Stanley J. Ulijaszek PhD<sup>2</sup>, Lars Holm PhD<sup>3,4</sup>  
11  
12 **Author affiliations**  
13 <sup>1</sup>Institute of Sports Medicine Copenhagen, Department of Orthopedic Surgery M, Bispebjerg Hospital,  
14 Copenhagen, Denmark  
15 <sup>2</sup>Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Oxford, United Kingdom  
16 <sup>3</sup>Dept. of Biomedical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Denmark  
17 <sup>4</sup>School of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom  
18  
19 **Corresponding Author**  
20 Jacob Bülow  
21  
22 Mailing address:  
23 Institute of Sports Medicine Copenhagen M81,  
24 Bispebjerg Hospital (Building 8, level 1),  
25 Nielsine Nielsens Vej 11  
26 2400 Copenhagen NV  
27 Denmark  
28  
29 Tel: +45 38 63 53 98  
30  
31 e-mail: jacob.bulow@live.dk  
32  
33 **Sources of support**  
34 Grant provided by P. Carl Petersen Fond, Stipend from RegionH.  
35  
36 **Word count**  
37 1200 word excluding references.  
38  
39 **Conflict of interest declaration**  
40 None of the authors declared any conflict of interest.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46    **Rejuvenation of the term Sarcopenia**

47    It is our viewpoint that the recent consensus definitions of Sarcopenia are dysfunctional for clinical and  
48    experimental practice as well as in theory. In 1989 the term Sarcopenia was introduced to describe the  
49    phenomenon of age related loss of lean body mass(10). Since 2010 six consensus definitions have been  
50    presented, and in 2016 it was assigned its own ICD-10 code(1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11). A comparison of the  
51    original definition with the new consensus definitions clarifies how the term Sarcopenia no longer describes  
52    the phenomenon it originally addressed. Rather, the term is now caught in tautological association, which  
53    causes confusion and hinders rather than helps understanding of this condition.

## 54    **The original definition**

55    In 1989, Rosenberg observed that the phenomenon of decreasing lean body mass with older age had not been  
56    given the scientific attention it deserved, and drew attention to it, in suggesting a name combining the two  
57    words *sarco* (meaning flesh) and *penia* (meaning loss), in accordance with the characteristic that it  
58    described(10). The focus of this original definition was the loss of muscle mass as a discrete phenomenon,  
59    with a leading interest in legitimizing clinical and scientific attention to it(10). This definition of Sarcopenia  
60    was used descriptively with the purpose of defining and articulating the loss of skeletal muscle mass, as a  
61    concrete object.

## 62    **The new consensus definitions**

63    Between 2011 and 2014, six consensus definitions of Sarcopenia were agreed (3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11). These  
64    shifted the focus from the original phenomenon of loss of skeletal muscle mass to that of physical function.  
65    All of these definitions employ an algorithm with the same logic. Physical function capability is initially  
66    assessed (gait speed or grip strength), and only if function is impaired below a cut-point, is muscle mass (as  
67    the appendicular lean mass (ALM)) secondarily evaluated. Hence, low muscle mass is not a single stand-  
68    alone determinant by which Sarcopenia is defined, and having only a low muscle mass is not an adequate  
69    criterion by which to be defined as being Sarcopenic. Physical function is not synonymous with muscle  
70    function although the concepts are sometimes used interchangeable in the six consensus articles. Physical

71 function is an interplay between multiple organ systems that can be estimated through tests like gait speed  
72 whereas skeletal muscle, besides having the capability of contracting and allowing movement, has many  
73 functions in metabolism and as an endocrine organ.  
74 The consensus definitions were made by working groups, with representatives from different Societies  
75 within the geriatric field, in Europe, the United States and Asia, two of them receiving partial funding from  
76 the pharmaceutical industry. Discussion surrounding these definitions focusses most strongly on  
77 determination of the exact cut-off values for both physical function tests and muscle mass measurements.  
78 Surprisingly, the theoretical framework underpinning the definitions is not discussed thoroughly in any of the  
79 articles and arguments for the inclusion of physical function is found in only three(5, 8, 11) of the six  
80 papers. They share one main argument only, that the original definition is not clinically relevant.

81

## 82 **Questioning the reasoning for changing the definition**

83 The main argument for including physical function in the definition is at least two-fold. Firstly, if a well-  
84 defined phenomenon is not clinically relevant, changing the definition does not make it become clinically  
85 relevant. Instead, it changes the phenomenon under consideration. Secondly, every definition can become  
86 clinically relevant by adding a criterion that is clinically relevant, as in this case with physical function. The  
87 linking of loss of skeletal muscle mass to physical function reflects the logic behind the change of focus in  
88 the research field of sarcopenia, which is notably absent from the consensus articles. During the 1990s there  
89 was a research drive to develop operational criteria for cutoff values for categorizing adults as suffering from  
90 Sarcopenia. The initial suggestion for an operational criterion and cutoff value was established by  
91 Baumgartner in 1998, who legitimized the criterion by showing its association with a decrease in physical  
92 function and mortality(2). This initiated the shift in focus from muscle mass to physical function. From  
93 around 2000, the research focus shifted to considerations of how muscle strength and physical function such  
94 as gait speed have stronger association than low muscle mass to a decrease in physical function and  
95 mortality. Instead of concentrating on the loss of muscle mass, research interest centered on the robustness of  
96 the phenomenon's association with decreased physical function and mortality, thereby making physical  
97 function the primary object of interest.

98

99 From a clinical perspective it appears reasonable to focus on the phenomenon with the strongest association  
100 to a negative health outcome. However, in this case the outcome and the phenomenon is almost, if not  
101 exactly, identical, and the argument for the change of focus from muscle mass to physical function is a  
102 tautology – arguing that there should be a change in focus from decreased muscle mass to decreased physical  
103 function, since a decrease in physical function has a stronger association with a decrease in physical  
104 function.

105

106 There are several consequences of the change in definition. According to the algorithms used in the  
107 consensus definitions, skeletal muscle is only of value to the definitions if it is associated with bodily  
108 movement. If gait speed is not reduced, presence of a low muscle mass is irrelevant according to the  
109 consensus definitions. This is despite the fact that skeletal muscle is the largest metabolic organ of the body,  
110 and is crucial in the endocrine regulation of metabolism as well as being the body's largest reservoir of  
111 amino acids(7). Such functions are likely to be overlooked clinically when the primary inclusion criterion for  
112 sarcopenia is physical function and not muscle mass. Likewise, physical function is at risk of being reduced  
113 to the question of muscle mass when both are directly coupled in the definition(4). Further, it reduces the  
114 relevance of the term in other clinical specialties such as nephrology and endocrinology, where muscle mass  
115 per se could be of clinical importance for both categorizing patients as well as in selecting treatment. Beside  
116 the reductionist understanding of the two different phenomena, the new definitions also lead to general  
117 confusion of what is meant by the term Sarcopenia, since it no longer covers one but two phenomena.

118

## 119 **Conclusion**

120 Since the reasoning behind the change in definition of sarcopenia rests upon a tautological association, and  
121 that the meaning of the term has become misleading as it no longer corresponds with the phenomenon that it  
122 addresses, we suggest a return to the use of the original definition for future research. 'Sarcopenia' should  
123 exclusively be used as a descriptive term addressing age-related loss of muscle mass. This would return  
124 focus onto uncovering the causes and consequences of the phenomenon, and clinicians will hereby have an

125 unambiguous and useful term. Perhaps returning to the original definition could cause confusion in relation  
126 to acceptance of age related loss of muscle mass as a clinical relevant phenomenon. However, the theoretical  
127 foundations of the consensus definitions are tautological, and we anticipate that the consequences of these  
128 definitions would continue to create confusion. There may be other and better definitions than the original  
129 but since nobody will benefit from the current consensus definitions, breaking out of the tautology is  
130 necessary to allow science and clinical practice to move on.

131

## 132 References

133

- 134 1. **Anker SD, Morley JE, von Haehling S.** Welcome to the ICD-10 code for sarcopenia. *J Cachexia*  
 135 *Sarcopenia Muscle* 7: 512–514, 2016.
- 136 2. **Baumgartner RN, Koehler KM, Gallagher D, Romero L, Heymsfield SB, Ross RR, Garry PJ,**  
 137 **Lindeman RD.** Epidemiology of sarcopenia among the elderly in New Mexico. *Am J Epidemiol* 147:  
 138 755–63, 1998.
- 139 3. **Chen L-K, Liu L-K, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung T-W, Bahyah KS, Chou M-Y, Chen L-Y,**  
 140 **Hsu P-S, Krairit O, Lee JSW, Lee W-J, Lee Y, Liang C-K, Limpawattana P, Lin C-S, Peng L-**  
 141 **N, Satake S, Suzuki T, Won CW, Wu C-H, Wu S-N, Zhang T, Zeng P, Akishita M, Arai H.**  
 142 Sarcopenia in Asia: consensus report of the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia. *J Am Med Dir*  
 143 *Assoc* 15: 95–101, 2014.
- 144 4. **Clark BC, Manini TM.** Sarcopenia  $\neq$  dynapenia. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 63: 829–34, 2008.
- 145 5. **Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, Boirie Y, Cederholm T, Landi F, Martin FC, Michel**  
 146 **J-P, Rolland Y, Schneider SM, Topinkova E, Vandewoude M, Zamboni M, European Working**  
 147 **Group on Sarcopenia in Older People.** Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and  
 148 diagnosis: Report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. *Age Ageing* 39:  
 149 412–423, 2010.
- 150 6. **Fielding RA, Vellas B, Evans WJ, Bhasin S, Morley JE, Newman AB, Abellan van Kan G,**  
 151 **Andrieu S, Bauer J, Breuille D, Cederholm T, Chandler J, De Meynard C, Donini L, Harris T,**  
 152 **Kannt A, Keime Guibert F, Onder G, Papanicolaou D, Rolland Y, Rooks D, Sieber C, Souhami**  
 153 **E, Verlaan S, Zamboni M.** Sarcopenia: an undiagnosed condition in older adults. Current consensus  
 154 definition: prevalence, etiology, and consequences. International working group on sarcopenia. *J Am*  
 155 *Med Dir Assoc* 12: 249–56, 2011.
- 156 7. **Janssen I, Ross R.** Linking age-related changes in skeletal muscle mass and composition with  
 157 metabolism and disease. *J Nutr Health Aging* 9: 408–19.
- 158 8. **Morley JE, Abbatecola AM, Argiles JM, Baracos V, Bauer J, Bhasin S, Cederholm T, Coats**

- AJS, Cummings SR, Evans WJ, Fearon K, Ferrucci L, Fielding RA, Guralnik JM, Harris TB, Inui A, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Kirwan B-A, Mantovani G, Muscaritoli M, Newman AB, Rossi-Fanelli F, Rosano GMC, Roubenoff R, Schambelan M, Sokol GH, Storer TW, Vellas B, von Haehling S, Yeh S-S, Anker SD, Society on Sarcopenia, Cachexia and Wasting Disorders Trialist Workshop TS on, Workshop C and WDT. Sarcopenia with limited mobility: an international consensus. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 12: 403–9, 2011.
9. Muscaritoli M, Anker SD, Argilés J, Aversa Z, Bauer JM, Biolo G, Boirie Y, Bosaeus I, Cederholm T, Costelli P, Fearon KC, Laviano A, Maggio M, Rossi Fanelli F, Schneider SM, Schols A, Sieber CC. Consensus definition of sarcopenia, cachexia and pre-cachexia: joint document elaborated by Special Interest Groups (SIG) “cachexia-anorexia in chronic wasting diseases” and “nutrition in geriatrics.” *Clin Nutr* 29: 154–9, 2010.
10. Rosenberg IH. Summary Comments. *Am J Clin Nutr* 50: 1231–1233, 1989.
11. Studenski SA, Peters KW, Alley DE, Cawthon PM, McLean RR, Harris TB, Ferrucci L, Guralnik JM, Fragala MS, Kenny AM, Kiel DP, Kritchevsky SB, Shardell MD, Dam T-TL, Vassileva MT. The FNIH Sarcopenia Project: Rationale, Study Description, Conference Recommendations, and Final Estimates. *Journals Gerontol Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci* 69: 547–558, 2014.