

## **Concurrent Validity of the Sahara Portable Bone Sonometer**

Anzalone AJ and Esposito P

Physical Activity & Developmental Disabilities Laboratory; Department of Kinesiology;  
Texas Christian University; Fort Worth, TX

---

*Category: Undergraduate*

*Advisor / Mentor: Esposito, Phil (p.esposito@tcu.edu)*

### **ABSTRACT**

Osteoporosis is a contemporary health issue in today's society. Bone mineral density tests have the ability to detect low bone density before a fracture occurs. Presently, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) is a common method used to measure bone mineral density. In recent years, quantitative ultrasonography (ultrasound) has been used as a screening device at health fairs and other venues to estimate bone mineral density. The use of ultrasound offers several advantages: it exposes individuals to no radiation, it is inexpensive, and requires less tester skill and oversight than DXA.

**PURPOSE:** To assess the accuracy of calcaneal ultrasound as a bone mineral density screening method compared to total body dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry.

**METHODS:** A total of 44 men between the ages of 18-25 years ( $21.6 \pm 1.41$ ) completed both a total body dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) (GE Lunar) scan and an ultrasound (Hologic Sahara) calcaneus scan in a single visit. Correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationship between the two devices. Independent sample t-tests were used to determine if the two devices produced significantly different raw values. Bland-Altman plots were used to visually display agreement between devices.

**RESULTS:** The ultrasound device had a weak relationship to the DXA ( $r = 0.514$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Comparing the absolute agreement between the two devices, the ultrasound device was consistently conservative. It provided mean values of  $0.689 \text{ g/cm}^2$  less than the DXA. It produced values significantly lower ( $1.31 \pm 0.13 \text{ g/cm}^2$  vs.  $0.62 \pm 0.14 \text{ g/cm}^2$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**CONCLUSIONS:** In this study, the ultrasound device produced values significantly lower than the values produced by the DXA. Ultrasound should not be used for individuals requiring a high degree of precision in their measurement. It could be useful, however, as a field device in the screening and estimating of bone mineral density.