Clinical Nutrition xxx (2013) 1-7



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Clinical Nutrition



journal homepage: http://www.elsevier.com/locate/clnu

Original article

Accuracy of predictive equations for the measurement of resting energy expenditure in older subjects

M. Siervo^{a,*}, S. Bertoli^b, A. Battezzati^b, J.C. Wells^c, J. Lara^a, C. Ferraris^d, A. Tagliabue^d

^a Human Nutrition Research Centre, Institute for Ageing and Health, Newcastle University, Campus for Ageing and Vitality, Newcastle upon Tyne NE4 5PL, UK ^b International Center for the Assessment of Nutritional Status, (ICANS), Department of Food, Environmental and Nutritional Science (DeFENS), Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Colombo 60, 20133 Milano, Italy

^c Childhood Nutrition Research Centre, UCL Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London WC1N 1EH, UK

^d Human Nutrition and Eating Disorders Research Centre, Department of Public Health, Experimental and Forensic Medicine, University of Pavia, Via Bassi 21, 27100 Pavia, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 13 April 2013 Accepted 17 September 2013

Keywords: Ageing Resting energy expenditure Prediction equations Indirect calorimetry

SUMMARY

Background and aims: The measurement of resting energy expenditure (REE) is important to assess individual total energy requirements in older subjects. The validity of REE prediction equations in this population has not been thoroughly evaluated and therefore the main aim of this analysis was to assess the accuracy of REE prediction equations in older subjects.

Methods: Weight, height and body mass index (BMI) were measured. REE was measured by indirect calorimetry (IC) in 68 older subjects (age: 60-94 years, M/F: 13/55, BMI: 26.3 ± 5.0 kg/m²). Measured REE was compared to 14 equations for the calculation of REE estimates. In addition, two novel approaches (Aggregate model and meta-regression equations) for the prediction of REE were evaluated. Paired *t* test and Bland–Altman method were used to assess the agreement of the equations.

Results: The average measured REE was 1298 \pm 264 kcal/day. The equation with the smallest bias was proposed by Muller (Bias \pm 2SD = $+3 \pm$ 294 kcal/day) whereas the Mifflin equation was associated with the largest error (Bias \pm 2SD = $-172 \pm$ 282 kcal/day). The Aggregate, Muller, Harris–Benedict and Fredrix equations were characterised by a prediction within \pm 10% of measured REE in more than 60% of subjects. Of the four algorithms, only the Aggregate equation did not show a significant association of the measurement bias with age, BMI and gender.

Conclusions: The Aggregate algorithm was characterised by a higher, overall accuracy for the prediction of REE in older subjects and its use should be advocated in older subjects. However, due to the large variability of the estimates, the measurement of REE by IC is still recommended for an accurate assessment of individual REE.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd and European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism.

1. Introduction

The measurement of individual total energy expenditure (TEE) is a critical component of diagnostic protocols for the assessment of nutritional status. Resting energy expenditure (REE) contributes to approximately 70% of the TEE and therefore is routinely used as the primary step to define total energy requirements after accounting for physical activity energy expenditure (PAEE) and thermic effect of food (TEF).¹ REE can be precisely measured using indirect calorimetric systems but the instruments are expensive and, as a result, the measurements are still confined to specialised settings.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: mario.siervo@ncl.ac.uk (M. Siervo).

Predictive equations based on demographic (age, sex, ethnicity), anthropometric (weight, height) and body composition variables (fat free mass, fat mass) have been developed over the last century to allow simple and rapid calculations of REE.

However, new prediction equations are continuously developed using a variety of socio-demographic factors (age, ethnicity, BMI, gender) as predictors and applied in different physiological states (growth, menopause, physical activity level) and disease processes (acute and chronic diseases). Therefore, the growing number of equations makes difficult the selection of a specific equation that will work well in different contexts.

Ageing-related changes in body composition and cellular energy metabolism influence total energy expenditure and its subcomponents. The decrease in REE is mainly related to the progressive, reciprocal changes in higher (fat-free mass (FFM),

0261-5614/\$ - see front matter © 2013 Elsevier Ltd and European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2013.09.009

2

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Siervo et al. / Clinical Nutrition xxx (2013) 1-7

decrease) and less metabolically active (fat mass (FM), increase) tissues, which appears to be due to a reduction in organ mass and specific metabolic rates of individual tissues.² Hence, REE predictions equations validated in young populations may not be applicable to older subjects, particularly to the very old (>80 y). The applications of these equations may lead to an increased measurement error, inaccurate estimation of energy requirements and, particularly in frail older individuals, development of inadequate nutritional interventions to maintain an optimal nutritional status. Three prediction equations have been specifically developed in geriatric populations but the association of the measurement bias with age has not been evaluated. In addition, two novel approaches have been recently proposed. Wells et al.³ developed an "Aggregate" approach based on the hypothesis that pooling together independent REE estimates derived from different algorithms would improve accuracy and reduce error variability. The Aggregate approach showed greater accuracy compared to other prediction equations in a population of young women but the accuracy of this approach has not been evaluated in older subjects. Secondly, a new array of 20 algorithms taking into account weight, age (young, old), gender (male, female) and ethnicity (White Caucasian, African American, Asian, Hispanics) has been derived from a meta-regression of 47 algorithms published in the literature.⁴ Neemalat et al. have recently evaluated the accuracy of REE predictive equations in hospitalised malnourished older patients and reported a proportional bias of predictive equations, with overestimation of low REE values and underestimation of high REE values.⁵ The accuracy of the REE algorithms has not been tested in an independent sample of non-hospitalised older subjects.

The main aim of this study was to evaluate the accuracy of established (Harris–Benedict,⁶ Owen,⁷ Mifflin,⁸ Bernstein, Muller,⁹ Fredrix,¹⁰ WHO,¹ EU,¹¹ Luhrmann,¹² De Lorenzo,¹³ Korth,¹⁴ Scho-field¹⁵) and novel equations (Aggregate³ and meta-regression⁴) for the measurement of REE in older subjects. We have also evaluated whether the bias of each individual equation is influenced by age, gender and BMI.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects

Subjects were recruited consecutively among patients who attended the International Center for the Assessment of Nutritional Status (ICANS, University of Milan) for body composition evaluation between 2009 and 2010. Eligible for the study were white Caucasian subjects of both genders fulfilling the following criteria: 1) age ≥ 60 years; 2) body mass index (BMI) \leq 50 kg/m²; 3) absence of significant cardiovascular or pulmonary diseases, uncontrolled metabolic disease (diabetes, anaemia or thyroid disease), cancer or inflammatory conditions, any use of drugs (corticosteroids, hormones, etc.) that might interfere with REE 4) absence of weight loss or gain (>5 kg) in the last year and 5) no treatment with special diets. All measurements were performed, in the same morning, in 84 subjects, including seven smokers, after an overnight fast. Sixteen subjects were excluded from the final analysis due to: 1) a respiratory quotient outside the expected physiological range (0.71–1.00) (11 subjects), BMI less than 18.0 kg/m² (3 subjects) and measured REE greater than \pm 3SD (2 subjects). Sixty-eight subjects (Male/Female: 13/55) were included in the final analysis. The higher prevalence of female subjects is representative of the higher number of female subjects attending our outpatient nutritional clinic. The study procedures were approved by the local Ethical Committee and all subjects gave informed consent. The STROBE statement for crosssectional studies¹⁶ has been adopted to provide detailed information on the study design and sample characteristics.

2.2. Measurements

2.2.1. Anthropometry

Measurements were collected by the same operator, according to standardised procedures.¹⁷ Body weight (WT, Kg) and Height (HT, cm) were measured to the nearest 0.1 kg and 0.5 cm, respectively. BMI was calculated using the formula: BMI (Kg/m²) = WT (Kg)/HT² (m).

2.2.2. Measured REE

An open-circuit ventilated-hood system indirect calorimetry was used (Sensor Medics 29, Anaheim, CA, USA). Resting VO₂ and VCO₂ measurements were taken in the early morning, after an overnight fast, under standardised conditions, with the person lying awake and emotionally undisturbed, completely at rest and comfortably supine on a bed, their head under a transparent ventilated canopy, in a thermally neutral environment (24–26 °C), and after at least 8 h of sleep. Respiratory gas samples were taken by a ventilated hood system, every minute for 30-40 min and the data collected during the first 5-10 min were discarded, as recommended by Isbell et al.¹⁸ This allowed the subjects to acclimatize to the canopy and instrument noise. The calorimeter was calibrated daily before starting the tests, using a two-point calibration method based on two separate mixtures of known gas content. The flow rate was calibrated with a 3-liter syringe, according to the calorimeter manufacturer's instructions. The average of the last 20 min of measurements was used to determine 24 h REE according to standard abbreviated Weir equation.¹⁹

2.2.3. Predicted REE

The measured REE was then compared to the following published REE prediction equations: 1) Harris–Benedict,⁶ 2) Owen,⁷ 3) Mifflin,⁸ 4) Bernstein,²⁰ 5) World Health Organization (WHO),²¹ 6) Fredrix,¹⁰ 7) Livingston,²² 8) Muller,⁹ 9) Luhrmann,¹² 10) Schofield,¹⁵ 11) European Community,¹¹ 12) Henry,²³ 13) Korth,¹⁴ 14) De Lorenzo.¹³ In addition two recent computational approaches based on metaregression of data from 47 published studies and on the calculation of the Aggregate estimates of REE were also evaluated. The first approach⁴ provides meta-regression equations with different independent factors, including those that only rely on a subset of easily measured covariates (weight, age, height, gender and race). This procedure incorporates the coefficients or slopes of previously developed equations into a single slope. The latter approach³ is based on the assumption that the REE predictions are independent of one another; that the individual predictions are based on different underlying assumptions and that these independent predictions are then aggregated. Under these conditions, the error will not be correlated across the predictions, but will rather be randomly distributed across them and hence tend to cancel out, increasing the accuracy of the REE Aggregate prediction. The algorithm of each equation for the prediction of REE is reported in Table 1. The difference between measured and predicted REE (Δ REE) was expressed in absolute values (kcal/day, mean bias) and percentage (%, relative bias). Relative Bias (%) was calculated as: $(\Delta REE_{Mean Bias})/REE_{Measured})$ *100. A measurement was considered inaccurate when the relative bias was greater than $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE; the number of subjects with an inaccurate prediction was calculated together with the maximal overestimation (MOE) and maximal underestimation (MUE) for REE. The association between age, BMI and gender with REE estimates was evaluated to indicate whether these factors had a significant influence on the measurement bias.

2.2.4. Statistical analysis

The data are reported as mean \pm SD. The Bland–Altman method was used to evaluate the agreement between measured and

CLE

M. Siervo et al. / Clinical Nutrition xxx (2013) 1-7

Table 1			
Characteristics of equations	for the prediction	of resting energy	expenditure (REE).

REE turnst-headerN = 239 (136 M, 103 F) Age : 203 = 14 y Age : 203 = 14 yREE = 655 + 9.5*WT + 1.9*HT - 4.7*AGE M : EEE = WT*10.2 + 879 F. REE = WT*10.2 + 879 F. REE = WT*10.2 + 879 F. REE = 9.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 166*SEX - 161 M : 264 = 9.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 166*SEX - 161 M : 264 = 9.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 166*SEX - 161 M : 264 = 9.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 166*SEX - 161 M : 264 = 0.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 166*SEX - 161 M : 264 = 0.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 1032 M : 264 = 0.99*WT + 6.25* HT - 4.92*AGE + 1032 M : 264 = 0.99*WT + 0.42* HT - 5.8*AGE - 1032 M : 264 = 0.94*WT - 0.42* HT - 5.8*AGE - 1032 M : 264 = 203*SEX mon BM : 27.5 y = 25 kgm² REE House and BM : 27.5 kgm² REE House and bm is 1.000 subjects. H : 265 = 203*WT + 487 REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21 Cross sublifaction: 1046 (358 M : 658 F) age - 663 ± 5.1 y, BM = 26.3 ± 3.1 kgm² REE House and troppic and the two and schedied functions including European, M : REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : 27.73 REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : 27.73 REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : 27.74 REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : 27.75 REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : 27.75 REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 746*SEX M : 27.75 REE = 0.047*W		Characteristics	Prediction equation
Age = 29 ± 14 yrHiREFownN = 104 (50 M, 44 F)H: REE = WT*10.2 + 879RAY ange = 18 - 82 yF: REE = WT*10.2 + 879N = 295 (25 M, 248 F)REE = 999 'WT+6.25' HT - 4.92'ACE + 166'SEX - 161N = 206 (25 M, 124 F)REE = 999 'WT+6.25' HT - 4.92'ACE + 166'SEX - 161N = 206 (28 M, 154 F)REE = 999 'WT+6.25' HT - 4.92'ACE + 166'SEX - 1032REE persuteinN = 206 (28 M, 154 F)REE persuteinN = 206 (28 M, 154 F)REE persuteinN = 206 (28 M, 154 F)REE = 65.18 yrRem age = 65.18 yrREE persuteinN = 655 (29 M, 356 F)REE = 059 'WT*6.25' HT - 4.92'ACEREE and BM = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE and BM = 27.9 kg/m²REE and BM = 28.9 kg/m²<	REE _{Harris-Benedict}	N = 239 (136 M, 103 F)	REE = 655 + 9.5*WT + 1.9*HT - 4.7*AGE
REE Core Age range $1 = 32$ yrH: REE $-WT^{10,2} + 379$ Age range $1 = 32$ yrH: REE $-WT^{10,2} + 379$ REE $-WT^{10,2} + 370$ REE $-WT^{10,2} + 370$ REE -1032 WT^{10,23} + 10.23 + 11.02 + 10.23 + 11.02 + 11		Age = 29 ± 14 y	
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	REEOwen	N = 104 (60 M, 44 F)	M: $REE = WT^*10.2 + 879$
REE AutimaN = 498 (251 M, 248 F) N = 254 obese (122 M, 112 F) N = 234 obese (122 M, 112 F) N = 234 obese (122 M, 112 F) M = 236 grant age = 40 y mean BM = 37 kg/m²REE = 11.02*WT + 10.22*HT = 5.8*AGE = 1032 M: REE = 11.02*WT + 10.22*HT = 5.8*AGE = 1032 M: REE = 1041 + 10.7*WT = 9*AGE + 844 mean age = 40 y mean BM = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE_breadme M = 255 (250 M, 356 F) age range = 18-95 y Large database including = 11.000 subjects. REE (2009) Sast F) age range = 18-95 y Large database including = 11.000 subjects. REE (2009) Sast F) age 5-80 y mean BM = 27.8 (m² REE (2012 M, 1501 F) mean BM = 27.8 (m² REE (2012 M, 1501 F) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.1 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.1 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.1 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.1 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age 669 ± 5.1 y BMI = 26.4 ± 3.1 kg/m²) REE allog + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX N = 7173 Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m² M = 660 ± 5.1 y RMI = 20.4 ± 3.1 kg/m² M = 7174 M = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m² REE allog + 10.0*WT + 557 REE allog + 10.0*WT + 557 REE allog + 10.0*WT + 577 REE allog + 10.0*WT + 577 <td>onen</td> <td>Age range = $18 - 82$ y</td> <td>F: $REE = WT^*7.18 + 795$</td>	onen	Age range = $18 - 82$ y	F: $REE = WT^*7.18 + 795$
N = 264 normal weight (129 M, 135 F), N = 230 bese (122 M, 135 F), N = 202 (48 M, 154 F) mean age = 19 - 78 y, BMI = 17 - 42 kg/m²N = 264 normal weight (12 F) 	REEMifflin	N = 498 (251 M, 248 F)	REE = 9.99*WT + 6.25*HT - 4.92*AGE + 166*SEX - 161
N = 234 obese (122 M, 112 F)N = 234 obese (122 M, 112 F)REE BernsteinN = 202 (48 M, 154 F)M: EEE = 11.02*WT + 10.22*HT - 5.8*AGE - 1032mean age = 40 yW: FREE = 7.48*WT - 0.42*HT - 3*AGE + 844mean age = 40 yW: FREE = 7.48*WT - 0.42*HT - 3*AGE + 844mean age = 40 yW: FREE = 7.48*WT - 0.42*HT - 3*AGE + 844mean age = 65:8 yW: ReE = 1641 + 10.7*WT - 9*AGE - 203*SEXmean BMI = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE age range = 18-95 yREELovingstonN = 655 (290 M, 356 F)REELovingstonM: REE = 293*WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92*AGEbod weight range = 33-278 kgH: REE = 203*WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92*AGEREELoving tonBased on Schofield equation.Large database including > 11,000 subjects.F: REE = 208*WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92*AGEREE_toringDevelopment: N = 2528 (1027 M, 1501 F)REE_toringREE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age 5 -80 ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE_toringD10 M (age e69 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE_schofiedD12 from several populations including European. North American and tropical countries N = 7173Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REEE BUREEE BUREEE BUNorth American and tropical countries where selected data tache from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Schofield tacket mas sobtained from 166 separate investigations.REE_businerN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²		N = 264 normal weight (129 M 135 F)	
Age range = 19 - 72 y, BMT = 17 - 42 kg/m²REE_BernateinN = 202 (48 M, 154 F) mean get = 40 y mean BMT = 37 kg/m²REE = 11.02*WT + 10.23*HT - 5.8*ACE - 1032 F. REE = 7.48*WT - 0.42*HT - 3*ACE + 844REE_FreedrixN = 40 (18 M, 22 F) mean BMT = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE = 1641 + 10.7*WT - 9*ACE - 203*SEX mean BMT = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE_EvenceN = 655 (299 M, 336 F) age range = 18 - 95 y body weight range = 33 - 278 kgKEE = 233*WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92*ACE F. REE = 248*WT ^{0.0330} - 5.92*ACE body weight range = 33 - 278 kgREE_EvenceBased on Schofiel equation. 0.90 weight range = 33 - 278 kgK: REE = 248*WT ^{0.0330} - 5.92*ACE F. REE = 248*WT ^{0.0330} - 5.92*ACE body weight range = 33 - 278 kgREE_AuderDarge database including ~ 11.000 subjects. 0.90 weight range = 31.027 M, 1501 F) weigh range = 33 - 278 kgREE_AuderDarge database including ~ 11.000 subjects. 0.90 subjects. y age 5 -80 y weigh range = 65.9 ± 5.7 y. BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE_banderDarge database including European. Nort Anmerican and tropical countries N = 7173REEscholledData from several populations including European. Nort Anmerican and tropical countries N = 7173REEscholledData from several populations including European. Nort Anmerican and tropical countries N = 7173REEscholledData from several populations including European. N = 7173REEscholledM = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMT range = 13-44 kg/m²REEscorth I rale at was obtained from 166 separate investigations.K: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*ACE + 487 F: REE = 709 = 13*WT + 567 F: REE = 63.22*WT + 15		N = 234 obese (122 M 112 F)	
REE BernsteinN = 202 (48 M, 154 F) mean age = 40 y mean BM = 37 kg/m²M: REE = 11.02*WT + 10.23*WT = 5.8*ACE = 1032 F. REE = 7.48*WT - 0.42*HT = 3*ACE = 1032 F. REE = 7.48*WT - 0.42*HT = 3*ACE = 1032 F. REE = 1641 + 10.7*WT = 9*ACE = 203*SEX mean BM = 25.5 $\pm 2.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ REE to mean BM = 25 kg/m²REE = 1641 + 10.7*WT = 9*ACE = 203*SEX mean BM = 25.5 $\pm 2.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ REE to mean BM = 25.5 $\pm 2.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$ N: REE = 248*WT ^{0.4330} = 5.92*ACE body weight range = 33-278 kgREE write body weight range = 33-278 kgN: REE = 248*WT ^{0.4330} = 5.92*ACE body weight range = 33-278 kgREE write body weight range = 33-278 kgN: REE_stoy = 10.5*WT + 487 F. REE = 248*WT ^{0.4330} = 5.92*ACE body weight range = 33-278 kgREE write age 5 = 60 y mean BM = 27 kg/m²N: REE_stoy = 10.5*WT + 487 F. REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 746*SEXREE to mean BM = 27 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 746*SEXREE to mean BM = 27 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 746*SEXREE schottedData from several populations including kuropean, N orth American and tropical countries N = 7173REE to mean BM range of studies: $21-24 \text{ kg/m²}$ REE tiltThese equations are based on the WH0 and Schoffeld kq dua to the two ider groups where selected data taken from Schoffeld have been amplified by data collected on Schoffel		Age range = $19-78 \text{ y BMI} = 17-42 \text{ kg/m}^2$	
Incommutantmean age = 40 y mean 8MI = 37 kg/m²F: REE = 7.48°WT - 0.42°HT = 3°ACE + 844REE predixmean age = 65=8 y mean 8MI = 255 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE = 1641 + 10.7°WT - 9°ACE - 203°SEXREE biody weight range = 33-278 kgREE = 248°WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92°ACE age range = 18-95 y body weight range = 33-278 kgREE biody weight range = 33-278 kgREE = 248°WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92°ACE age range = 10.5°WT + 487REE biody weight range = 33-278 kgM: REE = 248°WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92°ACE age range = 10.5°WT + 487REE biody weight range = 33-278 kgM: REE = 0.047°WT - 0.01452°ACE + 1.009°SEX + 3.21 Cross vuldation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age 5-80 y mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE biody mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0°BW - 15.3°ACE + 746°SEX 107 M (age = 663 + 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE biody mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0°BW - 15.3°ACE + 746°SEX 107 M (age = 663 + 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE biody mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0°BW - 15.3°ACE + 746°SEX 107 M (age = 663 + 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE biody mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0°BW - 15.3°ACE + 746°SEX 107 M (age = 663 + 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE biody mean sectored of data on the wolder groups where selected data tach from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Schofied Have been amplified by data collected on	RFFn	N = 202 (48 M 154 F)	M: RFE – 11 02*WT + 10 23*HT – 5 8*ACE – 1032
mean BMI = 37 kg/m²REEREE_Predix $N = 40 (18 M, 22 F)$ mean age = 65±8 y mean BMI = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REEREE_twington $N = 65 (299 M, 356 F)$ age range = 18-95 y body weight range = 33-278 kgREE = 1641 + 10.7*WT - 9*AGE - 203*SEXREE_twingtonBased on Schöfeld equation. Large database including ~ 11.000 subjects. Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age = 6.5 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_twingtonBased on Schöfeld equation. Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age = 6.5 ± 9.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_twingtonT07 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) T07 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_twingtonT07 M (age = 6.5 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) T07 M (age = 6.5 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_twingtonNorth American and tropical countries Where selected data taken from Schöfeld requires where selected data taken from Schöfeld have been amplifted by data collected on Schöfield have been amplifted by data collected on Schöfeld The data was obtained from 166 Stop = 13.7WT + 567 The data was obtained from 166 W: REE_570y = 13.7WT + 624REE tenrowN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 40.322:WT + 15.74*HT - 107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2 age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²REE tenrowN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 40.322:WT + 5057*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 70y = 13.7WT + 481 F: REE = 70	RedeBernstein	$m_{ean} = 262 (10 \text{ M}, 10 \text{ H})$	F: RFF $- 7.48^{*}$ WT $- 0.42^{*}$ HT $- 3^{*}$ ACF $+ 844$
REE PredixN = 40 (18 M, 22 F) mean BMI = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE = 1641 + 10.7°WT - 9°AGE - 203°SEX mean BMI = 25.9 ± 2.5 kg/m²REE toingstonN = 655 (29 M, 356 F) age range = 18-95 y body weight range = -33-278 kgN: REE = 248°WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92°AGE body weight range = -33-278 kgREE witoBased on Schofiel dequation. age carge = 18-95 y body weight range = -33-278 kgN: REE_scoy = 13.5°WT + 487 REE_scoy = 10.5°WT + 596REE witoBased on Schofiel dequation. age 5-80 y mean BMI = 27 kg/m²N: REE_scoy = 10.5°WT + 596 REE = 0.047°WT - 0.01452°AGE + 1.009°SEX + 3.21 REE = 0.047°WT - 0.01452°AGE + 746°SEXREE tabuta107 F (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) North American and tropical countries N = 7173REE = 3169 + 50.0°BW - 15.3°AGE + 746°SEXREE scheldData from several populations including European. North American and tropical countries where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Schofield have been M: REE_scoy = 13.7°WT + 624REE tetterN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE_scoy = 13.7°WT + 481 F: REE_scoy = 10.2°WT + 557 F: REE_scoy = 10.2°WT + 557 F: REE_scoy = 10.2°WT + 530°HC + 117.4°ESZ - 19.1°AGE - 1731.2 age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²REE kee tetterN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 117-40 kg/m²REE kee hilf and ge = 10-40 kg/m²M: REE = 63.22°WT + 15.74°HT - 15.66°AGE - 944REE hilf ange = 21-68		mean BMI – 37 kg/m ²	
NathreimIN = 40 (10 m, 24 1) mean BMI = 25.9 ± 25 kg/m²IRCL = 101 + 107 MI = 3 Not = 203 StX mean BMI = 25.9 ± 25 kg/m²REE trigger ange = 13 = 95 y age range = 13 = 95 y body weight range = 33 - 278 kgIRCL = 293 WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92*ACE F. REE = 248*WT ^{0.4356} - 5.09*ACE P. REE = 248*WT ^{0.4356} - 5.09*ACEREE WHOBased on Schofield equation. Large database including ~ 11.000 subjects. Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)IRCL = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21 Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE tuber179 F (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) Mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 746*SEXNorth American and tropical countries N = 7173F: REE_stop = 11.711*WT + 587.7 Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE2 tuberMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²M: REE_stop = 11.711*WT + 587.7 F: REE_stop = 11.711*WT + 587.7 F: REE_stop = 20.82*WT + 658.5 N = 7173REE2 tuberMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²M: REEstop = 10.2*WT + 658.5 M: REEstop = 20.2*WT + 624REE2 tuberMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²M: REEstop = 11.711*WT + 567 F: REEstop = 0.2*WT + 624REE4 tuberN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-68 y BMI range = 17-69 kg/m²M: REE = 43.22*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*ACE + 487 F: REE = 43.22*WT + 10.74*SEX - 19.1*ACE - 1731.2 BMI range = 17-69 kg/m²REE be locationM = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-69 kg/	REF	N = 40 (18 M 22 F)	PEE = 16/1 + 10.7*WT = 0*ACE = 203*SEY
International of the second	KLL Fredrix	M = 40 (10 M, 22 I) mean are $-65\pm8 y$	REL = 1041 + 10.7 WI = 5 MGL = 205 SEX
Refer WirdN = 655 (299 M, 356 F)K: REE = 238"WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92"AGEReferag range = 18-95 yF: REE = 248"WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92"AGEbdy weight range = 33-278 kgK: REE = 248"WT ^{0.4330} - 5.92"AGEReferLarge database including ~ 11.000 subjects.F: REE_stoy = 10.5"WT + 487ReferDevelopment: N = 2528 (1027 M, 1501 F)REE = 0.04"VWT - 0.01452"AGE + 1.009"SEX + 3.21ReferCross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F)Referage 5-80 ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 0.16"SWW - 15.3"AGE + 746"SEX179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0"BW - 15.3"AGE + 746"SEX107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0"BW - 15.3"AGE + 746"SEXNorth American and tropical countriesF: REE_stoy = 11.711"WT + 587.7North American and tropical countriesF: REE_stoy = 9.082"WT + 658.5N = 7173Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REEfulThese equations are based on the WH0 and SchofieldM: REEgo-74y = 11.9"WT + 700REEfulRefuenceN: REE_stop-for the data on the two older groupsF: REEgo-74y = 9.8"WT + 624amplified by data collected on Scottish and talain elderly subjectsF: REEgo-70y = 13"WT + 567REEfuenceN = 104 (50 M, 54 F)KEE Equ-70y = 10"WT + 577REEkorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F)KEE = 32.284"WT + 20.957"HT - 23.859"AGE + 487REEbe LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 133 F)M: REE = 53.284"WT + 20.957"HT - 23.859"AGE + 487REEbe LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 133 F)M: REE = 64.322"WT + 15.74"HT - 16.66"AGE - 944REEbe Loren		$m_{\text{can}} = 0.5 \pm 0 \text{ y}$ $m_{\text{can}} = 25.0 \pm 2.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$	
REE_livingsionIN = 0.53 (239 M, 300 r)M. RXE = 238 W1 - 332 AGEage range = 18 - 95 yF: REE = 238 W1 - 335 Gbody weight range = 33 - 278 kgF: REE = 248 WT - 4356 - 5.09 AGEREE_WHOBased on Schofeld equation.M: REE_sop = 10.5*WT + 487Large database including ~ 11,000 subjects.F: REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21Cross vuldation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F)age 5 - 80 yage 5 - 80 ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE_tuhman179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE_schofeldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries N = 7173REE_3uThese equations are based on the WHO and Schofield equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected dat taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Schofield fave been amplified by data	DEE	M = (55, (200 M, 256 F))	M. DEE 202*M/T0.4330 E 02*A/CE
adge tallage = 18-35 yP: REE = 248 W1 -3.09 AGEbody weight range = 33-278 kgREE_witoBased on Schofeld equation.W: REE_ $60y$ = 13.5"WT + 487Large database including ~11.000 subjects.F: REE_ $60y$ = 13.5"WT + 487REE_MullerDevelopment: N = 2528 (1027 M, 1501 F)REE_MullerDevelopment: N = 2528 (1027 M, 1501 F)age 5-80 ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE_Luhman179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE_Luhman107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE_SchofieldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countriesMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE_60y = 11.711"WT + 587.7REE_LuhmanF: REE_60y = 0.822"WT + 658.5Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²W: REE_60y = 9.082"WT + 658.5Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²W: REE_60-74y = 11.9"WT + 700REE_Ruequations except for the data on the two older groups where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsF: REE_60-74y = 9.2"WT + 688REE_HenryN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284"WT + 20.957"HT - 23.859"AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322"WT + 15.744"HT - 16.66"AGE - 944REE_henraN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 63.284"WT + 20.957"HT - 23.859"AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322"WT + 15.744"HT - 16.66"AGE - 944REE_he	KEE Livingston	N = 000 (299 M, 500 F)	WI. REE = 295 WI = -5.92 AGE E. DEE $-2.40^{\pm}MT0.4356$ = $-0.0^{\pm}A.CE$
Dody Weight Tange = 33-278 kgREE_WroteM: REE_wroteLarge database including ~ 11.000 subjects.F: REE_sooy = 13.5°WT + 487REE_MullerDevelopment: $N = 2528$ (1027 M, 1501 F)Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F)age 5-80 ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE_uhrman179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)To f (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE_schofedData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countriesF: REE_sooy = 11.711*WT + 587.7F: REE_sooy = 9.082'WT + 658.5N = 7173Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE2 We equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected dat taken from Schofield have been 		age range = $18-95$ y	$F; REE = 248 \text{ W} \text{I}^{-1} - 5.09 \text{ AGE}$
REE_WritoBased on Scholeid equation.M: REE_sop. = 1.3. *W1 + 487Large database including ~ 11,000 subjects.F: REE_sop. = 1.5. *W1 + 487REE_MullerDevelopment: N = 2528 (1027 M, 1501 F)REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21 $age c5 - 80$ ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21REE_Lahrman179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEX 107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_schofeldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries N = 7173N: REE_sop. = 11.711*WT + 587.7 F: REE_sop. = 9.082*WT + 658.5REE_3UMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²N: REE_0-74y = 11.9*WT + 700 F: REE_o74y = 9.2*WT + 688Where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsN: REE_60-74y = 9.2*WT + 624REE_HearyN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 63.322*WT + 15.7*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations.M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations.M: REE = 63.22*WT + 15.74*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contai	DEE	body weight range = $33-278$ kg	
Large database including ~ 11,000 subjects.F: REE_{600} = 10.5^{\circ}WT + 596REE_MullerDevelopment: N = 2528 (1027 M, 1501 F) age 5-80 y mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE = 0.047*WT - 0.01452*AGE + 1.009*SEX + 3.21REE_Luhrman179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) 107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_SchofeldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries N = 7173 Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²M: REE_60y = 11.711*WT + 587.7 F: REE_60y = 9.082*WT + 658.5 N = 7173 Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE $_{B10}^2$ These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected data taken from Schofeld have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and talian elderly subjectsF: REE _{600-74y} = 11.9*WT + 700 F: REE _{600-74y} = 9.2*WT + 624 W: REE _{600-74y} = 9.2*WT + 624 W: REE _{600-70y} = 13*WT + 567 The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: REE _{600-70y} = 13*WT + 567 W: REE _{600-70y} = 13.7*WT + 572 W: REE _{600-70y} = 13.7*WT + 350*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2REE_Nether BMI range = 18-41 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.74*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE_hete are proved by binch contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations.M: REE = 63.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.74*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE MBI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 63.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.74*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE MBI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 63.284*	REEWHO	Based on Schofield equation.	M: $\text{REE}_{>60y} = 13.5^{\circ}\text{W1} + 487$
REE_MullerDevelopment: $N = 2528 (1027 \text{ M}, 1501 \text{ F})$ REE (1027 \text{ M}, 1501 \text{ F})REE (1027 \text{ M}, 1501 \text{ F}) $Cross validation: 1046 (388 \text{ M}, 658 \text{ F})$ age 5-80 ymean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE_Lahman179 F (age = 67.8 \pm 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 \pm 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 746*SEX107 M (age = 66.9 \pm 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 \pm 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*ACE + 746*SEXNorth American and tropical countriesM: REE_60y = 11.711*WT + 587.7North American and tropical countriesF: REE_60y = 9.082*WT + 658.5N = 7173Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE4uMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE4uThese equations are based on the WH0 and Schofield waveenwhere selected data taken from Schofield have beenM: REE _{60-74y} = 9.2*WT + 658amplified by data collected on Scottish and talain elderly subjectsF: REE _{60-70y} = 0.3*WT + 624REE4enryN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*ACE + 487 F: REE = 41.5*WT + 15.74*HT - 16.66*ACE - 944REEAeta RegressionThe analysis included 7 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.REEAeta RegressionThe analysis included 7 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equation information for develo		Large database including $\sim 11,000$ subjects.	F: $REE_{>60y} = 10.5^{*}WI + 596$
Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F) age 5–80 y mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE age 5–80 y mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE_tuhrman179 F (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) 107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 ± 50.0°BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_schofieldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries N = 7173N: REE_schoy = 11.711*WT + 587.7 F: REE_schoy = 9.082*WT + 658.5REE $_{21}^{3}$ Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²N: REE $_{600y} = 9.082*WT + 658.5$ REE $_{21}^{3}$ These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield equations except for the data on the two older groups train elderly subjectsN: REE $_{60-74y} = 9.2*WT + 688$ N = 7173REEMean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²N: REE $_{60-74y} = 9.2*WT + 688$ where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsN: REE_ $_{275y} = 8.4*WT + 819$ N = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F).REEN = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F).M: REE_ $_{60-70y} = 13*WT + 567$ F: REE $_{60-70y} = 10*WT + 577$ REE age range = 18-41 kg/m²REEN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²REE = 41.5*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2 REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE_be LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²N: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 633.224*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations w	REE _{Muller}	Development: $N = 2528 (1027 \text{ M}, 1501 \text{ F})$	$REE = 0.047^{*}WT - 0.01452^{*}AGE + 1.009^{*}SEX + 3.21$
age 5-80 y mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REF (37 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_Luhrman107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREESchofieldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countriesM: REE_>60y = 11.711*WT + 587.7North American and tropical countriesF: REE_>60y = 9.082*WT + 658.5N = 7173Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE3These equations are based on the WHO and SchofieldM: REE_{60-74y} = 11.9*WT + 700equations except for the data on the two older groupsF: REE60-74y = 9.2*WT + 688where selected data taken from Schofield have been tatian elderly subjectsR: REE_75y = 8.4*WT + 819REE4N = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F).M: REE60-70y 10.2*WT + 567The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.F: REE60-70y = 13*WT + 567REE4N = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-51 yR: REE = 41.5*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2REE6LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 18-59 yK: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: Rea = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: Rea estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.An online BMR prediction torol is available at:: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		Cross validation: 1046 (388 M, 658 F)	
mean BMI = 27 kg/m²REE Luhrman179 F (age = 67.8 \pm 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 \pm 3.7 kg/m²) 107 M (age = 66.9 \pm 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 \pm 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 \pm 50.0*BW $-$ 15.3*AGE \pm 746*SEXREE_schofieldData from several populations including European, N orth American and tropical countries N = 7173M: REE_scoy = 11.711*WT \pm 587.7 F: REE_scoy = 9.082*WT \pm 658.5 N = 7173REE $_{21}^{3}$ Mean BMI range of studies: 21–24 kg/m²M: REE_scoy = 9.082*WT \pm 658.5 N = 7173REE $_{21}^{3}$ Mean BMI range of studies: 21–24 kg/m²REE $_{21}^{4}$ These equations except for the data on the two older groups equations except for the data on the two older groups amplified by data collected on Scottish and Ital an elderly subjectsM: REE_scoy = 9.2*WT \pm 658 M: REE_sroy = 9.2*WT \pm 648REE_HenryN = 10.552 (5794 M, 4702 F). The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: REE_sroy = 13*WT \pm 567 F: REE_60-709 \pm 13*WT \pm 567 F: REE_60-709 \pm 13*WT \pm 572 separate investigations.REE_KorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 121-68 y BMI range = 18-51 y BMI range = 18-59 y BMI range = 18-59 y BMI range = 18-59 y BMI range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT \pm 20.957*HT $-$ 23.859*AGE \pm 487 BMI range = 17-40 kg/m² BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed triving the se studies, meta-equations were developedMin range = 17-40 kg/m²BMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, ra		age 5-80 y	
REE Luhrman179 F (age = 67.8 ± 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 ± 3.7 kg/m²) 107 M (age = 66.9 ± 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 ± 3.1 kg/m²)REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE_schofieldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries $N = 7173$ Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²REE = 3169 + 50.0*BW - 15.3*AGE + 746*SEXREE $_{3U}$ Data from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries $N = 7173$ Mean BMI range of studies: 21-24 kg/m²M: REE _{>60y} = 11.711*WT + 587.7 F: REE _{>60y} = 9.082*WT + 658.5REE $_{3U}$ These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsM: REE_ $_{75y} = 8.4^{*}WT + 700$ F: REE $_{275y} = 9.8^{*}WT + 624REEHenryN = 10552 (5794 M, 4702 F).The data was obtained from 166separate investigations.M: REE_{0-70y} = 13.7^{*}WT + 567T: REE_{0-70y} = 13.7^{*}WT + 481F: REE_{0-70y} = 13.7^{*}WT + 481F: REE_{-70y} = 13.7^{*}WT + 481F: REE_{-70y} = 10^{*}WT + 577REEMEELorenzoN = 104 (50 M, 54 F)age range = 18-59 yBMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REEMETMEEMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range of range of range of range range equationsafter user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.An online BMR pre$		mean BMI = 27 kg/m^2	
$ \begin{array}{c} 107 \ M (age = 66.9 \pm 5.1 \ y, BMI = 26.3 \pm 3.1 \ kg/m^2) \\ \mbox{Pterson} \\ $	REE _{Luhrman}	179 F (age = 67.8 \pm 5.7 y, BMI = 26.4 \pm 3.7 kg/m ²)	$REE = 3169 + 50.0^*BW - 15.3^*AGE + 746^*SEX$
REE SchofieldData from several populations including European, North American and tropical countries N = 7173 Mean BMI range of studies: $21-24 \text{ kg/m}^2$ M: REE Se0y = 9.082*WT + 658.5 F: REE Se0y = 9.082*WT + 658.5REE BUMean BMI range of studies: $21-24 \text{ kg/m}^2$ M: REE Se0y = 9.082*WT + 658.5 F: REE Ge0y = 9.082*WT + 688 M: REE Se0y = 9.2*WT + 688 M: REE Se0y = 9.2*WT + 648REE BUMis collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsM: REE Se0y = 9.2*WT + 624REE HenryN = 10.552 (5794 M, 4702 F). The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: REE Se0_70y = 13*WT + 567 F: REE Se0_70y = 13*WT + 572 M: REE Separate investigations.REE Ket BMI range = 18 - 41 kg/m²M: REE Se0_70y = 10*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2 age range = 18 - 59 y BMI range = 18 - 59 y BMI range = 17 - 40 kg/m²REE MEE MEE MEE MIN REE Age range = 17 - 40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE MEI range = 17 - 40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE MIN range = 17 - 40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range = 17 - 40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range - 17 - 40 kg/m²M: REE - 50 - 22*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range - 17 - 40 kg/m²BMI range - 17 - 40 kg/m²REE MEI range - 17 - 40 kg/m²BMI range - 17 - 4		107 M (age = 66.9 \pm 5.1 y, BMI = 26.3 \pm 3.1 kg/m ²)	
North American and tropical countries $N = 7173$ F: REE_{>60y} = 9.082*WT + 658.5REE $_{3U}^3$ Mean BMI range of studies: $21-24$ kg/m²REE $_{EU}^3$ These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsM: REE_ $_{275y} = 9.2*WT + 688$ M: REE_ $_{275y} = 8.4*WT + 819$ F: REE_ $_{275y} = 8.4*WT + 819$ M: REE_ $_{275y} = 9.8*WT + 624REEHennyN = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F).The data was obtained from 166separate investigations.M: REE__{270y} = 13*WT + 567F: REE__{0-70y} = 13*WT + 572M: REE__{270y} = 10.2*WT + 572separate investigations.REEKorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F)age range = 21-68 yBMI range = 18-49 yBMI range = 18-49 kg/m²REE = 41.5*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2REEDe LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F)age range = 18-59 yBMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²BMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equationafter user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html$	REESchofield	Data from several populations including European,	M: $REE_{>60y} = 11.711*WT + 587.7$
$ \begin{array}{ll} N = 7173 \\ \text{Mean BMI range of studies: } 21-24 \text{ kg/m}^2 \\ \text{REE}_{EU}^3 & \text{These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield} \\ equations except for the data on the two older groups \\ equations except for the data on the two older groups \\ \text{where selected data taken from Schofield have been} \\ \text{amplified by data collected on Scottish and} \\ \text{Italian elderly subjects} \\ \text{REE}_{Henry} & N = 10,552 (5794 \text{ M}, 4702 \text{ F}). \\ \text{The data was obtained from 166} \\ \text{separate investigations.} \\ \text{REE}_{Korth} & N = 104 (50 \text{ M}, 54 \text{ F}) \\ \text{age range } = 21-68 \text{ y} \\ \text{BMI range } = 18-41 \text{ kg/m}^2 \\ \text{REE}_{De \text{ Lorenzo}} & N = 320 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F}) \\ \text{age range } = 18-59 \text{ y} \\ \text{BMI range } = 17-40 \text{ kg/m}^2 \\ \text{REE}_{Meta \text{ Regression}} & \text{The adatysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations.} \\ \text{Weils may be the studies, meta-equations were developed information for development of meta-regression equations.} \\ \text{Weils may be set studies, meta-equations were developed} \\ \text{Mi Regression} & \text{Mi Resc}_{Rete} = 00 \text{ coreline regression} \\ \text{Misc}_{Rete} = 0 coreline reg$		North American and tropical countries	F: $\text{REE}_{>60y} = 9.082^*\text{WT} + 658.5$
Mean BMI range of studies: $21-24 \text{ kg/m}^2$ REE $_{EU}^3$ These equations are based on the WHO and SchofieldM: REE $_{60-74y} = 11.9^*WT + 700$ equations except for the data on the two older groupsF: REE $_{60-74y} = 9.2^*WT + 688$ where selected data taken from Schofield have beenM: REE $_{275y} = 8.4^*WT + 819$ amplified by data collected on Scottish andF: REE $_{275y} = 9.8^*WT + 624$ Italian elderly subjectsM: REE_ $_{0-70y} = 13^*WT + 567$ REE HenryN = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F).M: REE $_{60-70y} = 13^*WT + 577$ Ret awas obtained from 166F: REE $_{60-70y} = 13.7^*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{>70y} = 10^*WT + 577$ REE = 41.5*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2age range = 21-68 yBMI range = 18-41 kg/m²REE_De LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F)M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487age range = 18-59 yF: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²BMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equationafter user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sd.lise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		N = 7173	
REE $_{EU}^3$ These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsM: REE $_{275y} = 8.4^*WT + 688$ M: REE $_{275y} = 9.4^*WT + 624$ Italian elderly subjectsREE HenryN = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F). The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: REE $_{60-70y} = 13^*WT + 567$ F: REE $_{60-70y} = 13^*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{570y} = 13.7^*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{570y} = 13.7^*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{570y} = 13.7^*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{570y} = 10.7^*WT + 577$ REE Age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-41 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284^*WT + 20.957^*HT - 23.859^*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322^*WT + 15.744^*HT - 16.66^*AGE - 944REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed transtruct to 20 mericing ensemble to 20 mericing ensem		Mean BMI range of studies: 21–24 kg/m ²	
equations except for the data on the two older groups where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsF: REE $_{60-74y} = 9.2*WT + 688$ M: REE $_{275y} = 8.4*WT + 819$ F: REE $_{275y} = 9.8*WT + 624$ REE HenryN = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F). The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: REE $_{60-70y} = 13*WT + 567$ F: REE $_{60-70y} = 13.*WT + 572$ M: REE $_{60-70y} = 13.*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{570y} = 10.*WT + 577$ REE KorthREE KorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-41 kg/m²M: REE = 51.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedBMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html	REE ³ _{EU}	These equations are based on the WHO and Schofield	M: $REE_{60-74v} = 11.9*WT + 700$
where selected data taken from Schofield have been amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsM: $REE_{275y} = 8.4^*WT + 819$ REE HenryN = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F). The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: $REE_{60-70y} = 13^*WT + 567$ REE KorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-41 kg/m²M: $REE = 53.284^*WT + 20.957^*HT - 23.859^*AGE + 487$ REE De LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 17-40 kg/m²M: $REE = 53.284^*WT + 10.744^*HT - 16.66^*AGE - 944$ REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedM: REE = 60.22^*WT + 15.744^*HT - 16.66^*AGE - 944BMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdLise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		equations except for the data on the two older groups	F: $REE_{60-74v} = 9.2*WT + 688$
amplified by data collected on Scottish and Italian elderly subjectsF: $REE_{\geq 75y} = 9.8*WT + 624$ REE Henry $N = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F)$.M: $REE_{\geq 70y} = 13*WT + 567$ The data was obtained from 166F: $REE_{60-70y} = 13*WT + 572$ separate investigations.M: $REE_{>70y} = 13.7*WT + 481$ REE KorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F) age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-41 kg/m²REE = 41.5*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2REE De LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: $REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487$ F: $REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944$ REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedBMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdLise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		where selected data taken from Schofield have been	M: $REE_{>75y} = 8.4^{*}WT + 819$
Italian elderly subjectsM: EE_{Henry} N = 10,552 (5794 M, 4702 F).M: $REE_{60-70y} = 13^*WT + 567$ The data was obtained from 166F: $REE_{60-70y} = 10.2^*WT + 572$ separate investigations.M: $REE_{-70y} = 13.7^*WT + 481$ REE_KorthN = 104 (50 M, 54 F)age range = 21-68 yBMI range = 18-41 kg/m ² REE_De LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F)age range = 18-59 yBMI range = 18-59 yBMI range = 17-40 kg/m ² REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedHeat RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedHeat RegressionThe analysis included to 20 exception for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedHeat RegressionThe analysis included to 20 exception for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedHeat RegressionThe analysis included to 20 exception for meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedHeat RegressionThe analysis included to 20 exception for meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedHeat RegressionThe analysis included to 20 exception for exception for the 20 exception for the 20 exception for the 20 exception for the 20 exception for exception for the		amplified by data collected on Scottish and	F: $REE_{>75v} = 9.8*WT + 624$
REE Henry $N = 10,552 (579 \text{ M}, 4702 \text{ F}).$ The data was obtained from 166 separate investigations.M: REE_{60-70y} = 13*WT + 567 F: REE_{60-70y} = 13.7*WT + 481 F: REE_{>70y} = 13.7*WT + 481 F: REE_{>70y} = 10*WT + 577REE Korth $N = 104 (50 \text{ M}, 54 \text{ F})$ age range = 21-68 y BMI range = 18-41 kg/m² $REE = 41.5*WT + 35.0*HT + 1107.4*SEX - 19.1*AGE - 1731.2REEDe LorenzoN = 320 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F})age range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REEMeta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailedinformation for development of meta-regression equations.Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedtranstit the 20 consider action swere developedM: REE estimated based on the most appropriate equationafter user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdLise.vt.edu/tutorials.html$		Italian elderly subjects	<u> </u>
The data was obtained from 166F: REE_{60-70y} 10.2*WT + 572separate investigations.M: $REE_{>70y} = 13.7$ *WT + 481F: REE_{Korth} $N = 104 (50 M, 54 F)$ age range = 21-68 yBMI range = 18-41 kg/m²REE_De Lorenzo $N = 320 (127 M, 193 F)$ age range = 18-59 yBMI range = 18-59 yBMI range = 17-40 kg/m²REE_Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed travertic the 20 stream of the 20 stream	REEHenry	N = 10.552 (5794 M, 4702 F).	M: $REE_{60-70y} = 13*WT + 567$
separate investigations.M: REE_ $_{70y} = 13.7^*WT + 481$ F: REE $_{70y} = 13.7^*WT + 577$ REE Korth $N = 104 (50 \text{ M}, 54 \text{ F})$ age range $= 21-68 \text{ y}$ BMI range $= 18-41 \text{ kg/m}^2$ REE $_{=} 41.5^*WT + 35.0^*HT + 1107.4^*SEX - 19.1^*AGE - 1731.2$ REE De Lorenzo $N = 320 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F})$ age range $= 18-59 \text{ y}$ BMI range $= 17-40 \text{ kg/m}^2$ M: REE $= 53.284^*WT + 20.957^*HT - 23.859^*AGE + 487$ F: REE $= 46.322^*WT + 15.744^*HT - 16.66^*AGE - 944$ REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedBMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html	nemy	The data was obtained from 166	F: REE _{60, 70y} 10.2^* WT + 572
Retermining product intersystemRetermin $N = 104 (50 \text{ M}, 54 \text{ F})$ age range $= 21-68 \text{ y}$ BMI range $= 18-41 \text{ kg/m}^2$ F: REE $_{70y} = 10^{\circ}\text{WT} + 577$ REE $= 41.5^{\circ}\text{WT} + 35.0^{\circ}\text{HT} + 1107.4^{\circ}\text{SEX} - 19.1^{\circ}\text{AGE} - 1731.2$ $REE_{De Lorenzo}$ Retermin $N = 320 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F})$ age range $= 18-59 \text{ y}$ BMI range $= 17-40 \text{ kg/m}^2$ M: REE $= 53.284^{\circ}\text{WT} + 20.957^{\circ}\text{HT} - 23.859^{\circ}\text{AGE} + 487$ $F: REE = 46.322^{\circ}\text{WT} + 15.744^{\circ}\text{HT} - 16.66^{\circ}\text{AGE} - 944ReterminThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailedinformation for development of meta-regression equations.Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedthe restrict for acrossific across$		separate investigations	M: REE, $70^{\circ} = 13.7^{\circ}$ WT + 481
REE Korth $N = 104 (50 \text{ M}, 54 \text{ F})$ age range $= 21-68 \text{ y}$ BMI range $= 18-41 \text{ kg/m}^2$ REE $= 41.5^*\text{WT} + 35.0^*\text{HT} + 1107.4^*\text{SEX} - 19.1^*\text{AGE} - 1731.2$ REE $= 41.5^*\text{WT} + 35.0^*\text{HT} + 1107.4^*\text{SEX} - 19.1^*\text{AGE} - 1731.2$ M: REE $= 53.284^*\text{WT} + 20.957^*\text{HT} - 23.859^*\text{AGE} + 487$ F: REE $= 46.322^*\text{WT} + 15.744^*\text{HT} - 16.66^*\text{AGE} - 944$ REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developedBMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		separate investigations.	$F RFE_{700} - 10^*WT + 577$
REE Meta Regression $N = 10-(30 \text{ m}, 941)$ $N = 10-(30 \text{ m}, 941)$ REE Meta Regression $N = 20 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F})$ $M: \text{REE} = 41.5 \text{ WT} + 55.6 \text{ m} + 1107.4 \text{ SEX} = 15.1 \text{ MdE} = 1751.2 \text{ M}$ REE De Lorenzo $N = 320 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F})$ $M: \text{REE} = 53.284^*\text{WT} + 20.957^*\text{HT} - 23.859^*\text{AGE} + 487$ REE Meta Regression $N = 320 (127 \text{ M}, 193 \text{ F})$ $M: \text{REE} = 46.322^*\text{WT} + 15.744^*\text{HT} - 16.66^*\text{AGE} - 944$ BMI range = 17-40 kg/m ² $F: \text{REE} = 46.322^*\text{WT} + 15.744^*\text{HT} - 16.66^*\text{AGE} - 944$ BMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight.Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed to reported to 20 service for acretific acre	RFFigure	N = 104 (50 M 54 F)	$REE_{>70y} = 10 \text{ VM} + 377$ RFF = 41 5*W/T + 35 0*HT + 1107 4*SFX = 19 1*ACF = 1731 2
age range = 21-00 y BMI range = 18-41 kg/m2M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed 	REEKOTT	N = 104 (30 W, 54 F)	REE = 41.5 WI + 55.0 III + 1107.4 SEX = 15.1 RGE = 1751.2
Bit Hange = 10 41 49, mitREE De LorenzoN = 320 (127 M, 193 F) age range = 18-59 y BMI range = 17-40 kg/m²M: REE = 53.284*WT + 20.957*HT - 23.859*AGE + 487 F: REE = 46.322*WT + 15.744*HT - 16.66*AGE - 944REE Meta RegressionThe analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed transfer to 20 service acceleration and the 20 service for acceleration acceleration were for a constrained for acceleration acceleration after user-entry of individual age, race, gender and weight. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		$BMI range = 18 - 41 \text{ kg/m}^2$	
$REE_{Meta Regression} = 18-59 \text{ y}$ $REE_{Meta Regression} = 17-40 \text{ kg/m}^2$ $REE_{Meta Regression} = 10-40 \text{ kg/m}^2$ $REE_{Meta Regression} = 10-4$	DEE	$N = 220 (127 \text{ M} \cdot 102 \text{ F})$	M・DEE 52 39/*\\/T + 30 057*UT 32 950*//CE + /97
REE _{Meta Regression} REE _{Meta}	KEEDe Lorenzo	N = 520 (127 W, 195 F)	WI, $REE = 35,204$ WI + 20,537 III - 25,635 RGE + 467 E, $DEE = 46,2223$ WT + 15,744*UT = 16,66*ACE = 0.44
REE _{Meta Regression} The analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed transfer a service developed transfer a service developed transfer a service developed		$age range = 18 - 35 \text{ y}$ $BMI range = 17 - 40 \text{ kg/m}^2$	F, KEE = 40.322 WI + 13.744 III - 10.00 AGE - 544
REE_Meta Regression The analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed information for development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed BMR was estimated based on the most appropriate equation An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html	DEE	Dividing $e = 17-40$ kg/iii	DMD was activated based on the most engennists equation
Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed transition to development of meta-regression equations. Utilising these studies, meta-equations were developed transition to development of meta-regression equations. An online BMR prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html	KEE _{Meta} Regression	The analysis included 47 studies which contained detailed	Blink was estimated based on the most appropriate equation
Unising unese suuries, meta-equations were developed An online Bink prediction tool is available at: www.sdl.ise.vt.edu/tutorials.html		Information for development of meta-regression equations.	alter user-entry of individual age, face, gender and weight.
		terreted to 20 encode normalities are developed	An online bivik prediction tool is available at: www.sul.ise.Vt.edu/tutorials.html
targeted to 20 specific population groups.	DEE	Largered to 20 specific population groups.	Assessed of individual and distant DEP of all algorithms in all dedites the distance
REEAggregate based on model proposed by wells et al. (ref). Average of individual predicted KEE of all algorithms included in the database	REE Aggregate	based on model proposed by Wells et al. (Ter).	Average of individual predicted KEE of all algorithms included in the database

N = number of subjects; M = male; F = female; BMI = body mass index; WT = weight (kg); HT = height (cm); SEX = Male = 1, Female = 1. All algorithms calculate REE in kcal/day.

predicted REE.²⁴ The method entails the calculation of the mean bias and limits of agreements $(\pm 2SD)$ between measured REE and predicted REE. The paired t test was used to determine the statistically significant differences between the measured and predicted REE estimates. Pearson's correlation was used to assess the association of predicted and measured REE and to evaluate whether age and BMI were significantly associated with mean bias. The analysis was stratified by age in order to evaluate between-gender differences in the accuracy of the different equations. SPSS 17.0 for Windows was used (IBM) to conduct the statistical analysis. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05.

3. Results

Sixty-eight older aged men (N = 13) and women (N = 55) were included in the analysis for the assessment of accuracy of REE predictions. The mean age was 74.4 \pm 9.3 years and the mean BMI was 26.3 \pm 5.0 kg/m². The mean measured REE was 1298 ± 264 kcal/day (Table 2). REE was significantly higher in men than women (1654 \pm 218 kcal/day vs 1214 \pm 195 kcal/day, p < 0.001) but the differences were removed after adjustment for body weight (20 \pm 3 kcal/day vs 20 \pm 2 kcal/day, p > 0.05, respectively) (data not shown).

The absolute difference between predicted and measured REE (Table 3) showed that several equations^{3,4,6–10,12,13,15,23} were characterised by a non-significant bias compared to measured REE. The Muller's⁹ equation was associated with the smallest bias (Bias \pm 2SD = +3 \pm 294 kcal/day) whereas the Mifflin⁸ equation was characterised by the largest bias (Bias \pm 2SD = -172 \pm 282 kcal/day, p < 0.001). However, all equations showed wide limits of agreements (±2SD) which ranged from 279 kcal/day (Fredrix¹⁰) to 345 kcal/day (Bernstein). The analysis of the relative bias (%) showed a similar agreement pattern and relative bias ranged from 0.01% (De Lorenzo) to -12.0% (Mifflin) (Fig. 1A). Four

4

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Siervo et al. / Clinical Nutrition xxx (2013) 1-7

Table 2

Anthropometric characteristics and measured and predicted resting energy expenditure (REE) in 68 older subjects (F/M = 55/13).

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age (years)	74.4	9.3	60.0	94.0
Height (m)	158.4	10.3	138.0	184.0
Weight (kg)	66.4	15.7	44.3	115.0
BMI (kg/m ²)	26.3	5.0	18.1	48.1
REEIC	1297.9	264.2	756.0	1806.9
REE _{Harris-Benedict}	1271.1	242.8	941.2	2116.0
REE _{Owen}	1271.0	112.9	1113.1	1620.7
REE _{Mifflin}	1126.8	223.7	756.2	1806.9
REE _{Bernstein}	1184.1	131.1	979.5	1578.1
REE _{Fredrix}	1314.4	266.4	899.4	2071.5
REELivingston	1154.2	172.4	856.9	1620.1
REE _{WHO}	1403.9	135.8	1212.6	1821.6
REE _{Muller}	1301.9	257.9	969.9	2062.0
REE _{Luhrman}	1281.4	199.4	975.9	1880.6
REE _{Schofield}	1290.1	189.8	1060.8	1934.4
REE _{EU}	1329.0	223.3	1058.1	2068.5
REE _{Henry}	1289.9	231.0	1020.0	2062.2
REE _{Korth}	1280.8	321.0	839.0	2222.9
REE _{De Lorenzo}	1286.8	257.3	923.1	2117.6
REE _{Meta-Regression}	1293.3	277.2	945.0	2092.0
REE _{Aggregate}	1271.8	242.8	981.9	1934.3

$$\begin{split} BMI &= Body \ Mass \ Index. \ F=Female. \ M &= Male. \ IC &= Indirect \ Calorimetry. \\ WHO &= World \ Health \ Organization. \ REE \ estimates \ are \ in \ kcal/day. \end{split}$$

equations were characterised by a prediction within $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE in more than 60% of subjects, which include the Aggregate (63%), Muller (63%), Harris–Benedict (64%) and Fredrix (66%) algorithms (Fig. 1B). We explored the correlation between REE bias with age and BMI (Fig. 2A). Six equations showed a lack of differential bias. The Fredrix and Aggregate equations were the only two equations of the 4 equations with a higher accuracy that showed a non-significant association with age (Fredrix: r = -0.05; Aggregate: r = 0.15) and BMI (Fredrix: r = 0.18; Aggregate: r = 0.06). However, the REE prediction estimates of the Fredrix's equation were significantly influenced by gender since the mean bias was significant in men and not in women. The Aggregate equation was instead not significant in both men and women (Fig. 2B). The

Table 3

Calculation of mean absolute (kcal/day) and relative (%) differences (Δ) to test the accuracy of the prediction equations against measured Resting Energy Expenditure (REE_{IC}).

	1.000		N // UE	MOR	
	ΔREE	$\pm 2SD$	MUE	MOE	r
	kcal/day				
REE _{Harris-Benedict}	-26.7	282.4	-387.1	311.6	0.85
REE _{Owen}	-26.0	383.9	-439.3	453.0	0.76
REE _{Mifflin}	-171.5***	282.1	-566.6	176.5	0.85
REE _{Bernstein}	-113.9***	345.0	-494.4	306.2	0.82
REE _{Fredrix}	16.5	279.3	-380.0	317.3	0.86
REELivingston	-143.8***	309.6	-489.3	233.0	0.82
REE _{WHO}	105.2***	366.8	-284.2	577.0	0.76
REE _{Muller}	3.0	294.2	-362.2	364.9	0.84
REELuhrman	-16.4	311.1	-361.1	376.0	0.81
REE _{Schofield}	-7.2	314.5	-292.8	432.5	0.81
REE _{EU}	31.8	291.1	-289.0	441.8	0.83
REE _{Henry}	-8.7	305.0	-326.0	407.0	0.81
REE _{Korth}	-16.9	350.1	-486.7	522.9	0.84
REE _{De Lorenzo}	-11.9	288.8	-408.7	334.7	0.85
REE _{Meta-Regression}	-4.5	314.9	-401.0	351.4	0.83
REE _{Aggregate}	-26.0	283.3	-364.9	413.0	0.85

WHO = World Health Organization. $\Delta REE = REE_{Predicted}-REE_{IC}$; $MUE = Maximal \Delta REE$ underestimation; $MOE = Maximal \Delta REE$ overestimation; r: coefficient of correlation.

Paired *t*-test was performed to detect significant differences between measured REE and predicted. *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

All coefficients of correlation are statistically significant at p < 0.001.



Fig. 1. Accuracy of prediction equations for the measurement of REE. A: Percent bias of Resting Energy Expenditure (REE) prediction equations compared to measured REE. Mean Relative Bias (%) was calculated as: $(\Delta \text{REE}_{\text{Predicted}})/\text{REE}_{\text{Measured}})^*100$. Error bars are $\pm 95\%$ Cl. B: Percent of REE estimates with a Mean Relative Bias (%) within $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE for each prediction equation.

exclusion of the 6 active smokers from the analyses did not modify the results as the Fredrix and Aggregate equations were associated with the most accurate REE estimates (data not shown).

4. Discussion

We have conducted a comprehensive analysis of anthro pometry-based prediction equations for the measurement of REE in older men and women. Several equations showed a nonsignificant absolute (kcal/day) and relative (%) measurement bias compared to measured REE. However, more detailed analyses of their predictive accuracy identified four equations as being associated with a higher accuracy, calculated as the number of REE estimates within a $\pm 10\%$ level of accuracy. The prediction of REE using the Fredrix and the Aggregate equations was independent of age and BMI but Fredrix's REE estimates were influenced by gender. This analysis has included anthropometric algorithms frequently applied in clinical practice and cross-validated in



Fig. 2. Association of REE measurement bias with age, gender and BMI. A: Correlation between Mean Relative Bias (%) with age and Body Mass Index (BMI) is showed for each prediction equation. Dotted lines indicate threshold for statistical significance of the associations (r = 0.23, n = 68). The results did not change when absolute mean bias was included in the analyses (results not shown). B: Description of the differences between predicted and measured REE (mean bias) in men and women. The asterisks (*) indicate a significant difference (p < 0.05) of predicted REE compared to measured REE (paired *t* test).

previous research studies. In addition, we have included in our analyses prediction equations that were: 1) derived in older subjects; 2) included older subjects in the original sample and 3) frequently applied equations in clinical practice and validation studies. An important limitation of several predictive equations which question their applicability in older aged subjects is related to the small number of older subjects (60 y+) in the validation samples (for example the Harris–Benedict⁶ sample included only 9 subjects over 60 years of age).

The first two equations specifically validated for the prediction of REE in older subjects were proposed by Arciero^{25,26} and Fredrix.¹⁰ However, the former was not included in this analysis since the formula included parameters (chest skinfold and a measure of leisure physical activity) that were not measured in this study. The latter has been consistently identified in previous validation studies as one of the most accurate equations for the REE prediction in older subjects. A limitation of Fredrix's¹⁰ equation is the very small sample size (n = 40) and the age range (age: 51–82 y) which may introduce some reservations in regards to the statistical robustness of the equation and the applicability in the oldest old, respectively. More recently, Luhrmann et al.¹² has validated a new equation in older aged subjects. The study included a large sample size (n = 286) and was characterised by an age range between 60 and 85 years old. To our knowledge, this is the first study to externally validate the performance of the Luhrmann's equation in older aged subjects.

The Aggregate³ approach pools the prediction estimates of several equations under the assumption that each independent REE prediction contributes to minimise the prediction error. Wells et al.³ validated this approach in a population of young women by reporting a greater accuracy and less variability of the Aggregate approach compared to other REE equations. The results have been essentially confirmed in this analysis since the Aggregate approach was consistently associated with less variability, higher proportion of accurate measurements (within $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE) and age, BMI and gender-independent measurement bias. The Fredrix's¹⁰ equation was the only other equation that had a similar performance in our sample.

This study has followed a rigorous, phased analytical plan to identify the various components contributing to the ascertainment of the accuracy of a prediction equation. The application of a simple paired *t* test showed that several equations were associated with a non-significant measurement bias. However, the results of the t test can be misleading as they are based on the average of the estimates and a small measurement bias could be simply the result of large opposite errors counterbalancing each other. This scenario essentially justifies the application of other methods such as the Bland-Altman method²⁴ (differential bias association with mean REE and calculation of limits of agreements of the measurement bias $(\pm 2SD)$) and the calculation of the proportion of predictive estimates within $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE. Using this approach we were able to identify four accurate equations and we had not anticipated the presence in this group of the Harris–Benedict⁶ equation together with the Muller,⁹ Fredrix¹⁰ and Aggregate³ algorithms. The accuracy of the Harris-Benedict equation in older aged subjects has been previously reported in two other studies. Taaffe²⁷ showed that the mean measurement bias of the Harris-Benedict equation was about 116 kcal/day in older women. In healthy subjects over 70 years of age the Harris-Benedict showed the lowest mean measurement (-40.9 kcal/day) and the highest predictive accuracy having 72.4% of the cases within $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE. The final step of the analysis plan was to evaluate the absence of a differential measurement bias associated with age, BMI and gender. These analyses identified the Aggregate equations as the most accurate in our population since there was no evidence of a significant interaction with the aforementioned, potential confounding factors.

This analysis is the most comprehensive assessment of the accuracy of recognised REE prediction equations in older aged subjects. Additional strengths are the examination of the validity of two recently proposed algorithms for the REE prediction (Aggregate³ and Meta-Regression⁴) and the inclusion of 22 subjects over 80 years of age. The validity of prediction equations in the very old (aged 70–98 y) was tested in 116 healthy Caucasian subjects. Unexpectedly the Harris–Benedict⁶ was more accurate than the Luhrmann's¹² equation whereas a poor accuracy was reported for the Owen'⁷ and Mifflin's⁸ equations, which has been replicated in our analysis.

The results overall have shown that the performance of the equations, including the Aggregate algorithm, is relatively modest

6

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Siervo et al. / Clinical Nutrition xxx (2013) 1-7

as they were collectively able to provide predictions within $\pm 10\%$ of measured REE in about 65% of subjects. The limits of agreement of the estimates were also wide (range: 279–350 kcal/day), which has clear implications for the measurement of individual REE. This prompts again the canonical recommendation provided in the conclusions of the majority of previous studies, which essentially advocated for the direct measurement of energy expenditure by indirect calorimetry.

By definition, each published equation performed well in the population in which it was derived, but it may not necessarily perform well in other population. In the present study, the Fredrix equation performed well, but we cannot be sure whether this finding would generalise across other elderly populations. In contrast, the ability of the Aggregate approach to reduce error by randomising it across multiple equations indicates that this approach is expected to generalise across populations more successfully. Therefore, we recommend the Aggregate approach as the best option.

Resting energy expenditure accounts for most of TEE but a large variability in the contribution to TEE measurement in older aged subjects can be also attributed to PAEE. This could not be explored in this analysis but it provides the opportunity to discuss the approaches currently used for the prediction of total energy requirements.²⁸ Resting energy expenditure is an integral component of the factorial method to estimate TEE but it is associated with limitations in the assessment of both components (REE and PAEE). Goran²⁸ has proposed that a regression approach for TEE could improve accuracy as well as it could be more evidence based, easier to apply and more statistically and physiologically more appropriate. Prediction equations based on body composition measures were essentially excluded for two main reasons: 1) anthropometric equations are more easily applied in clinical practice and 2) a previous study reported the poor performance of a FFM-derived prediction equation²⁹ in older aged subjects. However, it is possible that inclusion of equations based on predicted FFM or indices of the fat/ FFM ratio might improve the overall Aggregate approach.

5. Conclusions

The Aggregate³ and Fredrix's¹⁰ equations appear to be the most accurate equations in older subjects. However, the REE estimates are still characterised by a large variability and their use should be limited to measurement of REE at group level and when direct measurement in not possible at individual level. Advanced statistical modelling techniques may help to refine the Aggregate approach and offers scope to improve the prediction of REE at individual level.

Funding sources

International Center for the Assessment of Nutrizional Status, (ICANS), University of Milan (internal funding).

Statement of authorship

MS analysed the data and wrote the manuscript. SB and AB contributed to the collection of the data and to the critical revision of the manuscript. JCW and JL contributed to the interpretation of the results and to the critical revision of the manuscript. CF and AT contributed to the design of the study and to the critical revision of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

None.

Acknowledgements

Jose Lara is a member of the LiveWell Programme which is funded by the Lifelong Health and Wellbeing Cross-Council Programme initiative in partnership with the UK Health Department: The LLHW Funding Partners are: Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, Economic and Social Research Council, Medical Research Council, Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health Directorates, National Institute for Health Research/The Department of Health, The Health and Social Care Research & Development of the Public Health Agency (Northern Ireland), and Wales Office of Research and Development for Health and Social Care, Welsh Assembly Government.

References

- 1. Food, Agricultural Organization of the United N, United Nations U, World Health O. *Human energy requirements.* Report of a Joint FAO/WHO/UNU Expert Consultation, Rome, 17–24 October 2001 (book with Cd-rom). Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations; 2004.
- 2. Manini TM. Energy expenditure and aging. Ageing Res Rev 2010;9(1):1-11.
- Wells JC, Williams JE, Haroun D, Fewtrell MS, Colantuoni A, Siervo M. Aggregate predictions improve accuracy when calculating metabolic variables used to guide treatment. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009;89(2):491–9 [Epub 2009/01/15].
- Sabounchi NS, Rahmandad H, Ammerman A. Best-fitting prediction equations for basal metabolic rate: informing obesity interventions in diverse populations. Int J Obes 15 January 2013. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ijo.2012.218.
- Neelemaat F, van Bokhorst de van der Schueren MAE, Thijs A, Seidell JC, Weijs PJM. Resting energy expenditure in malnourished older patients at hospital admission and three months after discharge: predictive equations versus measurements. *Clin Nutr (Edinb Scotl)* 2012;**31**(6):958–66.
- Harris JA, Benedict FG. A biometric study of basal metabolism in man. Carnegie Institution of Washington; 1919.
- Owen OE, Kavle E, Owen RS, Polansky M, Caprio S, Mozzoli MA, et al. A reappraisal of caloric requirements in healthy women. Am J Clin Nutr 1986;44(1):1-19 [Epub 1986/07/01].
- Mifflin MD, St Jeor ST, Hill LA, Scott BJ, Daugherty SA, Koh YO. A new predictive equation for resting energy expenditure in healthy individuals. *Am J Clin Nutr* 1990;51(2):241–7.
- Müller MJ, Bosy-Westphal A, Klaus S, Kreymann G, Lührmann PM, Neuhäuser-Berthold M, et al. World Health Organization equations have shortcomings for predicting resting energy expenditure in persons from a modern, affluent population: generation of a new reference standard from a retrospective analysis of a German database of resting energy expenditure. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2004;80(5):1379–90.
- Fredrix EW, Soeters PB, Deerenberg IM, Kester AD, von Meyenfeldt MF, Saris WH. Resting and sleeping energy expenditure in the elderly. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 1990;44(10):741-7 [Epub 1990/10/01].
- EU. Commission of the European Communities Nutrient and Energy intakes for the European Community. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities; 1993.
- Luhrmann PM, Edelmann-Schafer B, Neuhauser-Berthold M. Changes in resting metabolic rate in an elderly German population: cross-sectional and longitudinal data. J Nutr Health Aging 2010;14(3):232-6 [Epub 2010/ 03/02].
- De Lorenzo A, Tagliabue A, Andreoli A, Testolin G, Comelli M, Deurenberg P. Measured and predicted resting metabolic rate in Italian males and females, aged 18–59 y. Eur J Clin Nutr 2001;55(3):208–14 [Epub 2001/04/ 18].
- Korth O, Bosy-Westphal A, Zschoche P, Gluer CC, Heller M, Muller MJ. Influence of methods used in body composition analysis on the prediction of resting energy expenditure. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2006;**61**(5):582–9.
- Schofield WN, Schofield C, WPT J. Basal metabolic rate review and prediction, together with an annotated bibliography of source material human nutrition. *Clin Nutr* 1985;**39** C(Suppl. 1):1–96.
- Elm Ev, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ* 2007; 335(7624):806–8.
- 17. Lohman TG, Roche AF, Martorell R. Anthropometric standardization reference manual. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books; 1988. p. 177 vi.
- Isbell TR, Klesges RC, Meyers AW, Klesges LM. Measurement reliability and reactivity using repeated measurements of resting energy expenditure with a face mask, mouthpiece, and ventilated canopy. *J Parenter Enter Nutr* 1991; 15(2):165–8.
- Weir JBdV. New methods for calculating metabolic rate with special reference to protein metabolism. J Physiol 1949;109(1–2):1–9.

ARTICLE IN PRESS

M. Siervo et al. / Clinical Nutrition xxx (2013) 1-7

- Bernstein RS, Thornton JC, Yang MU, Wang J, Redmond AM, Pierson Jr RN, et al. Prediction of the resting metabolic rate in obese patients. Am J Clin Nutr 1983;37(4):595–602 [Epub 1983/04/01].
- FAO/WHO/UNU. Energy and protein requirements. Report of a Joint FAO/WHO/ UNU Expert Consultation. Technical report series No. 724. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1985.
- Livingston EH, Kohlstadt I. Simplified resting metabolic rate-predicting formulas for normal-sized and obese individuals. *Obes Res* 2005;13(7):1255–62 [Epub 2005/08/04].
- 23. Henry CJK. Basal metabolic rate studies in humans: measurement and development of new equations. *Public Health Nutr* 2005;**8**(7a):1133–52.
- 24. Bland J, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet* 1986;**12**:307–10.
- Arciero PJ, Goran MI, Gardner AM, Ades PA, Tyzbir RS, Poehlman ET. A practical equation to predict resting metabolic rate in older females. J Am Geriatr Soc 1993;41(4):389–95 [Epub 1993/04/01].
- Arciero PJ, Goran MI, Gardner AW, Ades PA, Tyzbir RS, Poehlman ET. A practical equation to predict resting metabolic rate in older men. *Metab Clin Exp* 1993;42(8):950–7.
- Taaffe DR, Thompson J, Butterfield G, Marcus R. Accuracy of equations to predict basal metabolic rate in older women. J Am Diet Assoc 1995;95(12):1387–92.
- Goran MI. Estimating energy requirements: regression based prediction equations or multiples of resting metabolic rate. *Public Health Nutr* 2005;8(7a):1184–6.
- Cunningham JJ. Body composition as a determinant of energy expenditure: a synthetic review and a proposed general prediction equation. Am J Clin Nutr 1991;54(6):963-9.