



Burton, R. F. (2020) Comments on the article “Optimum waist circumference-height indices for evaluating adult adiposity: an analytic review”: relationships to previous studies. *Obesity Reviews*, 21(3), e1982.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher’s version if you wish to cite from it.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Burton, R. F. (2020) Comments on the article “Optimum waist circumference-height indices for evaluating adult adiposity: an analytic review”: relationships to previous studies. *Obesity Reviews*, 21(3), e1982. (doi: [10.1111/obr.12982](https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12982))

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#).

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/204475/>

Deposited on: 02 December 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow\_  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/>

## Letter to the Editor

### Comments on the article “Optimum waist circumference-height indices for evaluating adult adiposity: An analytic review”: relationships to previous studies

**Richard Francis Burton**

To the editor

The recent review of Hwaung et al. provides a detailed and valuable account of the history and rationale of the body mass index (BMI) and of indices relating waist circumference (WC) to body height that take the form  $WC/height^\alpha$ .<sup>1</sup> I show here how their evidence and analysis are usefully supplemented with those of earlier studies.

The ratio  $WC/height$ , with  $\alpha = 1$ , is widely used, but the authors have concluded that the optimum value of  $\alpha$  is approximately 0.5, with this giving the strongest association with adiposity and the weakest correlation with height for men and women of four race/ethnic groups. Burton<sup>2</sup> also considered 0.5 to be an appropriate round-number value.

On dimensional grounds, one might choose a value of 1 for  $\alpha$ , making the index dimensionless, but data scatter associated with variable body shape must lower values of  $\alpha$  as estimated by regression analysis — just as it lowers the height exponent,  $p$ , of the Benn index,  $(\text{body mass})/height^p$ .<sup>2,3</sup> (Here I am applying the symbol “ $\alpha$ ” just to WC and not also to body mass as in the review.) Both  $\alpha$  and  $p$  necessarily correlate strongly with the respective correlation coefficients for WC and height and for body mass and height.<sup>2,4</sup> The negative value of  $\alpha$  for Korean women (-0.43) — unadjusted for age — must be associated with a negative correlation between WC and height (though  $R^2$  is positive). These negative values were also found by Han et al. for Europeans<sup>4</sup>. This, as well as Table 1<sup>1</sup>, illustrates the importance of age in considering the height dependences of WC and body mass and therefore both  $\alpha$  and  $p$ . In contrast, Table S9 in the supplementary material indicates that there is conveniently little

influence of age on correlations between WC and % fat and between body mass and % fat.

With increasing age, body mass tends generally to increase and height tends to decrease.<sup>4</sup>

Figure 2 of Burton<sup>2</sup> shows a strong correlation between  $p$  and  $\alpha$  (with  $\alpha$  there denoted  $q$ ) with most of the points being for data that were age-adjusted or grouped for age<sup>4</sup>. The tabulated results of Hwaung et al. show similar relationships, for values both un-adjusted and adjusted for age.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, their eight age-adjusted values, together with eight age-adjusted values of Han et al.<sup>4</sup>, show a single clear straight-line relationship, with a correlation coefficient of 0.91. This suggests a link beyond the obvious between  $WC/height^\alpha$  and  $(body\ mass)/height^p$  that has yet to be elucidated. The reduced major axis regression equation is:

$$\alpha = 0.69p - 0.78.$$

Hwaung et al. discussed the question of whether  $1/BMI$  and  $1/(WC/height^\alpha)$  are additive in multiple regression models for the prediction of % fat. Their Table S7 shows, for age-corrected values, that, for men,  $R^2$  for % fat and  $1/(WC/height^{0.5})$  is higher than for % fat and  $1/BMI$ , while the opposite is true for women. Multiple regression of % fat on both indices together did not increase  $R^2$  above the highest of the two values by more than 0.01. So the two indices are not usefully additive. As a correlate or predictor of % fat, the better index evidently differs between men and women and  $WC/height^{0.5}$  is only more appropriate than the BMI for men.

**Conflict of interest:** None

**Acknowledgements:** None

## REFERENCES

1. Hwaung P, Heo M, Kennedy S et al. Optimum waist circumference-height indices for evaluating adult adiposity: An analytic review. *Obes Revs.* 2019;Early View:1-13.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12947>

2. Burton RF. Waist circumference as an indicator of adiposity and the relevance of body height. *Med Hypoth.* 2010;75:115-119.
3. Burton RF. (2007) Why is the body mass index calculated as mass/height<sup>2</sup>, not as mass/height<sup>3</sup>? *Ann Hum Biol.* 2007;34(6):656-663.
4. Han TS, Seidell JC, Currall JEP, Morrison CE, Deurenberg P, Lean MEJ. The influences of height and age on waist circumference as an index of adiposity in adults. *Int J Obes.* 1997;21:83-89.