1 Accepted manuscript. IJSNEM

# 2 Short Term Precision Error of Body Composition Assessment Methods in

- 3 **Resistance Trained Male Athletes**
- 4
- 5 Ava D Farley<sup>1</sup>, Gary J Slater<sup>1</sup>, Karen Hind<sup>2</sup>
- <sup>6</sup> <sup>1</sup>School of Health and Sport Sciences, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sippy Downs, 4556,
- 7 Queensland, Australia (ADF, GJS)
- 8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3HN, United
- 9 Kingdom (KH)
- 10
- 11 Address for correspondence:
- 12 Ava Farley
- 13 School of Health and Sport Sciences
- 14 University of the Sunshine Coast
- 15 Maroochydore DC 4558
- 16 Queensland, Australia
- 17 P: +61 7 5459 4605
- 18
- 19
- 20

#### 21 Abstract

22 Athletic populations require high precision body composition assessment to identify true change. Least Significant Change (LSC) determines technical error via same-day consecutive 23 24 tests but doesn't integrate biological variation, being more relevant for longitudinal 25 monitoring. The aim of this study was to assess biological variation using LSC measures from body composition methods used on athletes, including surface anthropometry (SA), air 26 27 displacement plethysmography (BOD POD), dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) and 28 bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy (BIS). Thirty-two athletic males (age: 31 ± 7yr; stature: 29 183 ± 7cm; mass 92 ± 10kg) underwent three testing sessions over two days using four methods. LSC values were calculated from differences in Day<sup>1</sup>Test<sup>1</sup> vs Day<sup>1</sup>Test<sup>2</sup> (same-day 30 precision), as well as Day<sup>1</sup>Test<sup>1</sup> vs Day<sup>2</sup> (consecutive-day precision). There was high 31 32 agreement between same-day and consecutive-day FM and FFM measurements for all 33 methods. Consecutive-day precision error (PE) in comparison to same-day, was 50% higher 34 for FM estimates from BIS (3607g vs 2331g), 25% higher from BODPOD (1943g vs 1448g) and DXA (1615g vs 1204g), but negligible from SA (442g vs 586g). Consecutive-day PE for 35 FFM was 50% higher from BIS (3966g vs 2276g) and SA (1159g vs 568g), and 25% higher 36 37 from BODPOD (1894g vs 1450g) and DXA (1967g vs 1461g) than same-day. PE in 38 consecutive-day analysis considers both technical error and biological variation, enhancing 39 identification of small, yet significant changes in body composition of resistance trained 40 male athletes. Given change in physique is likely to be small in this population, the use of DXA, BOD POD or SA is recommended. 41

*Key Words:* Body composition, least significant change, BOD POD, dual energy x-ray
absorptiometry, bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy, anthropometry, fat mass, fat free
mass.

45 Introduction

46 The association between athletic physique traits and competitive sporting success is well 47 established (Meyer et al., 2013; Olds, 2001). In sports requiring high force production, athletes with high levels of muscularity can gain a competitive advantage (Bilsborough, 48 49 Greenway, Livingston, Cordy, & Coutts, 2016; Gabbett, 2009; Olds, 2001) yet these athletes 50 tend to see only small adaptations or improvements in physique over time (Binkley, 51 Daughters, Weidauer, & Vukovich, 2015; Harley, Hind, & O'Hara, 2011; Lees et al., 2017; 52 Smart, Hopkins, & Gill, 2013). Given this, assessment methods with high precision are 53 required to measure body composition on a regular basis in these athletes. By accurately 54 quantifying changes in physique, more refined training and dietary interventions may be 55 implemented which can positively influence performance outcomes (Slater et al., 2005).

56

57 A variety of body composition assessment methods are available to quantify fat free mass 58 (FFM) and fat mass (FM) (Ackland et al., 2012; Kerr, Slater, & Byrne, 2017). Depending on 59 time and resources, the four most popular methods used on athletic populations are air displacement plethysmography (BODPOD), dual energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA), 60 61 bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy (BIS) and surface anthropometry (SA) (Meyer et al., 62 2013). Despite differences in technology, resources and technical expertise required, they 63 are all susceptible to technical error and biological variation (Ackland et al., 2012; Meyer et al., 2013), significantly affecting precision (Kerr et al., 2017; Ava Kerr, Slater, & Byrne, 64 65 2018). Technical error is influenced by quality control procedures such as subject clothing (D. A. Fields, Hunter, & Goran, 2000; Vescovi, Zimmerman, Miller, & Fernhall, 2002), and 66 67 positioning during assessment (Kerr, Slater, Byrne, & Nana, 2016; Lambrinoudaki et al., 68 1998; Tegenkamp, Clark, Schoeller, & Landry, 2011) level of technical expertise (Hume & Marfell-Jones, 2008; Ruiz, Colley, & Hamilton, 1971) and equipment calibration (Marfell-Jones, Stewart, & de Ridder, 2012). Biological variation may result from food and fluid ingestion or exercise prior to assessment and appears to influence most body composition methods albeit to different degrees (Bone et al., 2016; Kerr et al., 2017). Other biological variables known to impact on estimates of body composition include body temperature and skin moisture (Fields, Higgins, & Hunter, 2004), gastrointestinal contents (Bone et al., 2016) and muscle solutes (Rouillier, David-Riel, Brazeau, St-Pierre, & Karelis, 2015).

76

77 While quantification of precision error (PE) is frequently done by calculating differences in same-day repeat assessments of body composition (Hangartner, Warner, Braillon, 78 79 Jankowski, & Shepherd, 2013; Hind et al., 2018) using least significant change (LSC) values, 80 this fails to account for biological variability in the absence of controls, and can be evident 81 during longitudinal monitoring (Meyer et al., 2013). Given this, we have advocated for 82 identifying the LSC for same-day (technical error) and consecutive-day (biological variation) 83 precision in estimates of FM and FFM, finding a more accurate interpretation of true and 84 meaningful change (Zemski et al., 2019). Currently, the precision of BOD POD, BIS and SA 85 using LSC values for same-day and consecutive-day analysis has not been explored. 86 Therefore, aims of this study were to 1) to establish the same-day technical error of the four 87 methods and 2) determine the consecutive-day PE of the methods using LSC values to 88 determine the threshold of meaningful change in resistance trained male athletes.

89

90 Methods

91 Subjects

92

93 Thirty-two Caucasian volunteers participated in this study and met the inclusion criteria 94 which included being male gender, at least two or more years resistance training 95 experience, and with a BMI of  $\geq$ 25. Subjects were excluded from the study if they were >190 96 cm tall due to the limitation of the active scanning area of the DXA bed. Characteristics of all 97 individuals are presented in Table 1. All subjects were informed of the nature and possible 98 risks of the investigation before giving their written informed consent. This study was 99 conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki and all 100 procedures involving subjects were approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of 101 the University of the Sunshine Coast (Ethics Approval No. S/12/450).

102

103 Experimental design

104

105 Each subject underwent three testing sessions during a 24-h window over a two day period 106 (Fig. 1) with each measurement taken by the same technician. The sessions commenced 107 with body mass and stretch stature measured in minimal clothing, a total body DXA scan 108 immediately followed by a BIS estimation of total body water (TBW), a BOD POD test and an 109 assessment of subcutaneous FM via the skinfold technique, in that sequence. Each subject 110 undertook tests 1 (D1T1) and 2 (D1T2) on day 1 under standardised conditions (early morning, overnight fasted, well rested and bladder voided). D1T2 was undertaken 111 immediately after D1T1 and test 3 (D2) was undertaken the following morning, 24 hours 112 113 after D1T1. Comparison of these testing sessions allowed the calculation of typical error of 114 measurement (TEM), random consecutive-day biological variability, and the difference in 115 estimates of body composition data.

116

118

119 Guidance was provided on both days to encourage adherence to standardised presentation 120 for all three of the tests (D1T1, D1T2 and D2). Subjects were required to present overnight 121 fasted, bladder voided and well rested (no prior physical activity) on the mornings before 122 D1T1 and D2. They were asked to wear minimal fitted clothing with metal objects and 123 jewellery removed, plus clothing checked for metal zips or studs. Hydration status was 124 assessed by a mid-stream sample of urine provided by the subjects early on both mornings 125 before testing (D1T1 and D2). The specific gravity of the urine sample was measured using a 126 digital refractometer (UG-Alpha; Atago Corporation). All subjects voided their bladder 127 before tests.

128

129 Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry

130 All DXA scans were undertaken in the total body mode on a pencil beam DXA scanner (Lunar 131 DPX; GE Healthcare) with analysis performed using GE enCORE version 13.60 software (GE 132 Healthcare) with the combined Geelong/Lunar reference database. CV for the laboratory 133 being 0.1, 2.2, 0.6 and 1.0% for BM, FM, lean mass and BMC respectively. The DXA was 134 calibrated with phantoms as per the manufacturer's guidelines each day before 135 measurements were taken. All scans were conducted by the same Queensland Radiation Health licensed technician using the standard thickness mode as determined by the auto 136 137 scan feature in the software and all safety protocols as per the Institution's Radiation Safety Protection Plan were adhered to. The scans were performed according to a protocol 138 139 developed that emphasises a consistent positioning of subjects on the DXA scanning bed 140 (Alisa Nana, Gary J Slater, Will G Hopkins, & Louise M Burke, 2012a) as previously described (Alisa Nana, Gary J. Slater, Will G. Hopkins, & Louise M. Burke, 2012b). In addition, two Velcro straps were used to minimise any subject movement during the scan as well as provide a consistent body position for subsequent scans. One strap was secured around the ankles above the foot positioning pad and the other strap was secured around the trunk at the level of the mid forearms (Kerr et al., 2016). All scans were analysed automatically by the DXA software, but all regions of interest were reconfirmed before being included in the subsequent statistical analysis.

148

149 *Bioelectrical impedance spectroscopy* 

150

Immediately after each DXA scan, whilst the subjects were still positioned on the DXA 151 152 scanning bed, body composition derived from TBW obtained values, was measured using 153 the SFB7 BIS device (ImpediMed, Brisbane, Australia). Subject positioning was standardised 154 (Kyle et al., 2004) to ensure supine positioning on the non-conductive foam mattress 155 without contact to the metal side supports of the DXA scanner for a minimum of 15 min 156 before BIS measurements (Ward, Isenring, Dyer, Kagawa, & Essex, 2015). The BIS was 157 calibrated as per the manufacturer's instructions with each participant's stature, body mass, 158 age and sex programmed into the unit. Sites of attachment for the electrodes (ImpediMed) 159 were first shaved and cleaned with alcohol wipes before the dual-tab electrodes were attached as follows: one electrode was attached centrally on the top side of the wrist in 160 161 alignment with the ulnar head and 5 cm lower on the dorsal surface of the hand. The second electrode was attached centrally on the dorsal surface of the ankle between the 162 163 lateral and medial malleoli and 5 cm lower on the dorsal surface of the foot which is in 164 accordance with previous guidelines (Ava Kerr, Slater, Byrne, & Chaseling, 2015). The SFB7

measures impedance using 256 frequencies between 4 and 1024 kHz to estimate TBW based on a Cole-Cole plot (Cornish, Ward, Thomas, Jebb, & Elia, 1996). Three measurements were taken consecutively and the median of these used in subsequent analysis. The TBW value, as per the Pace et al model (Pace & Rathbun, 1945), was used to estimate body composition of FFM and FM by simple subtraction from body mass.

170

171 Air displacement plethysmography

172

Immediately after BIS measurement, assessment of body density was undertaken using the BOD POD (Life Measurement Instruments) following the recommended procedures of the manufacturer (Dempster & Aitkens, 1995) utilising a validated, predicted thoracic lung volume (VTG) estimation (McCrory, Molé, Gomez, Dewey, & Bernauer, 1998). Subjects wore Lycra clothing and a silicone swim cap, with all metal objects removed before measurement. Body density was calculated by the BOD POD's software system (COSMED version 5.3.2) as follows:

180

181 *D* (density) *Mass* (scale) = *Volume* (BOD POD)

182 An estimate of FM and FFM was obtained to calculate %BF as defined by the Siri equation183 (Siri, 1961), as follows:

184 %*BF* = (497.1/body density) – 451.9.

185

186 *Surface anthropometry* 

187

188 Immediately after completion of the BOD POD assessment, duplicate skinfold

measurements were taken according the International Society of the Advancement of
Kinanthropometry (ISAK) technique by the same technician certified by ISAK as previously
described (Norton et al., 1996).

192

The sum of eight skinfolds was determined following measurements of the triceps, biceps, sub scapulae, iliac crest, supra-spinale, abdominal, quadriceps and calf skinfold using a calibrated skinfold caliper (Harpenden; Baty International). Due to the similar procedure, equipment and population used, the 4C validated Evans equation of three skinfolds (triceps, abdominal and thigh) was utilised to calculate *%BF* as (Evans, Rowe, Misic, Prior, & Arngrímsson, 2005):

199

200 %BF = 8.997 + 0.24658 x (3SKF) – 6.343 x (gender) – 1.998 x (race),

201 Gender coded as 0 = female, 1 = male, and race coded as 0 = white, 1 = black.

202

203 Stretch stature was measured with a stadiometer (Harpenden; Holtain Limited) to the 204 nearest 0·1 cm. Body mass was measured on a calibrated scale to the nearest 0·01 kg (SECA 205 GMBH).

206

207 Statistical analysis

208

209 Data analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA). Descriptive 210 data are reported as the mean ± standard deviation (SD). The precision is reported as the 211 root mean-square SD (RMS SD) and percentage coefficient of variation (%CV). The resulting LSC with 95% confidence intervals (LSC\_95% CI) were calculated following the ISCD protocol 212 213 (Hangartner et al., 2013). The %CV was derived from the equation %CV= (SD/ mean) \* 100. 214 Coefficients of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) were calculated for measurements to establish the 215 relationship between same-day and consecutive-day measures. Paired t tests were utilized 216 to test for differences based on same-day versus consecutive-day test results and precision 217 for all techniques. Statistical significance was set at 0.05. Bland Altman plots were created to compare individual same-day and consecutive-day precision for all techniques. 218

219

#### 220 Results

Descriptive statistics for the participants in this study are given in Table 1. The mean differences between same-day (technical error) and consecutive-day (technical error and biological variation) for FM and FFM in all methods are shown in Table 2. Differences between same-day and consecutive-day testing demonstrating the LSC values for all methods are given in Figure 2.

226

Table 3 shows the PE for each method of testing, represented as the %CV, with the RMS-SD, LSC and %LSC. Strong agreement was found for all methods for same-day, and for consecutive-day FM regression analysis (SA R<sup>2</sup> = 1.00 - 1.00, BOD POD R<sup>2</sup> = 0.99 - 0.99, DXA R<sup>2</sup> = 1.00 - 0.99, BIS R<sup>2</sup> = 0.98 - 0.96) as shown in Figures 3 and 4. Regression analysis undertaken for same-day and consecutive-day FFM for all methods revealed strong relationships (SA R<sup>2</sup> = 1.00 - 1.00, BOD POD R<sup>2</sup> = 0.99 - 0.99, DXA R<sup>2</sup> = 0.99 - 0.99, BIS R<sup>2</sup> = 233 0.99 – 0.96) as shown in Figures 5 and 6.

234

235 Bland Altman analysis revealed SA had the smallest level of bias between same-day and 236 consecutive-day precision for FM (83 g) and FFM (178 g) with very low limits of agreement 237 (FM: -7 g to 173 g; FFM: -185 g to 172g). DXA and BOD POD had low levels of bias between 238 same-day and consecutive-day precision for FM (DXA: 226 g; BOD POD: 318 g) and FFM 239 (DXA: 309 g; BODPOD: 321 g) with low limits of agreement for DXA (FM: -365 g to 87 g; FFM: 240 -59 g to 558 g) and for BOD POD (FM: -275 g to 361 g; FFM: -251 g to 390 g). The largest 241 level of bias between same-day and consecutive-day precision came from BIS for FM (524 g) 242 and FFM (580 g) with wider limits of agreement (FM: -108 to 939 g; FFM: -930 g to 230 g) as 243 shown in Figures 7and 8.

244

#### 245 Discussion

246 To our knowledge this is the first study exploring both technical error and the short-term 247 biological variation within a 24-hour period, using four independent methods of body 248 composition assessment. The body composition PE was greater when quantified from 249 consecutive-day compared to same-day results on a resistance trained athletic male cohort. 250 This was evident across all body composition assessment techniques. Consecutive-day PE 251 was 25% higher for DXA and BOD POD (FM and FFM) estimations and nearly 50% higher for 252 BIS (FM and FFM) and SA (FFM) than same-day PE. It must be noted that same-day and 253 consecutive-day PE in SA (FFM) was lower than all other methods. In contrast the SA FM PE 254 for same-day and consecutive day analysis was lower for consecutive-day but only by 8% 255 and was not significantly different (p<0.5). This shows that biological variation affects 256 measurement precision even within very short time frames (24 hours), at least when using

257 BIS, DXA and BOD POD methodology. Therefore, the use of consecutive-day PE is advocated 258 as longitudinal monitoring of physique will always include both technical error and 259 biological variation.

260

261 Excellent SA same-day precision was found for estimations of FM (CV 1.0%) and FFM (CV 0.2%) as well as for consecutive-day testing with FM (CV 1.0%) and FFM (CV 0.3%) 262 263 respectively. Raw measurements from SA (mm) have been shown to be robust and 264 unaffected by biological variation caused by prior food and fluid ingestion or exercise (Kerr 265 et al., 2017) yet this study included body mass to obtain estimates of FM and FFM using the Evans equation (Evans et al., 2005). It would be expected then, that consecutive-day PE 266 267 would be larger given that body mass is acutely influenced by hydration status, 268 gastrointestinal tract contents and muscle glycogen stores (Rouillier et al., 2015). Due to 269 adopting previous recommendations of subject presentation including overnight fasting, 270 post bladder and bowel evacuation with body measurements taken early in the morning in 271 minimal clothing, the biological impact on precision was expected to be minimal (Kerr et al., 272 2017; Nana, Slater, Stewart, & Burke, 2015).

273

DXA is prone to biological variance due to changes in hydration, significantly affecting FFM estimates (Kerr et al., 2017). This is particularly noticeable in large muscular males with high levels of FFM (Barlow et al., 2015; J. C. Bilsborough et al., 2014). Previous literature and manufacturing guidance suggest that a standardized testing protocol be adopted to minimise technical error and biological variation (Kerr et al., 2016; Nana et al., 2012a). This is in agreement with the literature finding a CV of 0.5 and 1.5% respectively (De Lorenzo, Andreoli, & Candeloro, 1997; Nana et al., 2012a) and more recently, results from Zemski et 281 al with a consecutive-day FM CV of 2.9% and lean mass CV of 1.1% (Zemski et al., 2019). 282 Despite obtaining excellent precision from utilising a standardized presentation protocol 283 those authors found biological variance (consecutive-day) to be higher than technical error 284 (same-day) most probably due to short-term changes in hydration (Nana et al., 2012a), 285 sleep hygiene (Vitale, Owens, Hopkins, & Malhotra, 2019) and intramuscular solute levels 286 (Bone et al., 2016). These findings would support the results from this study with a FM and 287 FFM CV of 2.4 and 0.5% respectively. While current best practice guidance was followed, 288 this may not account for variance in muscle solute content which is known to influence 289 reliability. The impact of standardised training and diet on consecutive-day precision 290 warrants investigation.

291

292 Close comparisons between DXA and BODPOD were identified in this study with strong agreement found in same-day and consecutive-day FM PE (BOD POD  $R^2 = 0.99 - 0.99$ , DXA 293  $R^2 = 1.00 - 0.99$ ) and FFM (BOD POD  $R^2 = 0.99 - 0.99$ , DXA  $R^2 = 0.99 - 0.99$ ). In support, 294 295 previous research using DXA and BODPOD technology shows consistent results with this 296 study, with only small or trivial PE in FM and FFM estimates from consecutive-day testing 297 conducted under standardised presentation conditions (Kerr et al., 2017). Despite BOD POD 298 estimates of FM and FFM being subject to biological variation if unrestricted subject 299 presentation occurs (food and fluid intake plus physical activity), BOD POD precision in this study showed that very high resolution can be obtained if these variables are controlled for 300 301 (FM CV 2.8%, FFM CV 0.6%). A limitation of this study is that the DXA scanner used to 302 estimate body composition (GE Lunar DPX Pro) has been superseded by newer models with 303 enhanced precision. PE from the DPX estimations has been found to be twice as high as the 304 GE Lunar Prodigy in athletes (J. C. Bilsborough et al., 2014) whereas the iDXA model 305 resolution has improved bone edge detection thus allowing superior algorithms for body
306 composition estimation (Toombs, Ducher, Shepherd, & De Souza, 2012).

307

Factors that impact TBW such as prior food and fluid intake, physical activity or medical 308 309 conditions make BIS vulnerable to imprecision (Kyle et al., 2004). Additionally, variance in 310 fluid and electrolyte content will affect TBW (Saunders, Blevins, & Broeder, 1998) and 311 confound any change in physique traits inferred from BIS (O'brien, Young, & Sawka, 2002). 312 Given normal daily fluctuations in TBW, it is unsurprising that the change between same-day 313 and consecutive-day precision using BIS derived estimates of FM and FFM showed nearly a 314 50% increase in PE for both FM (3607 vs 2331 g) and FFM (3966 g vs 2276 g) estimates. BIS 315 also had the highest CV % of all methods for both same-day FM and FFM (5.2% and 0.6%) 316 and consecutive-day values (9.4% and 1.1%) respectively. This suggests that despite 317 implementing a rigorous athlete presentation protocol prior to testing, a lower tolerance 318 level for precision still occurs. Given this, the ability of BIS to accurately track small changes 319 in physique among athletic populations is questionable.

320

## 321 Conclusion

In conclusion, consecutive-day PE was larger than same-day for FM and FFM estimates obtained from DXA, BOD POD, and BIS (except for SA FM which was marginally lower) in a cohort of muscular resistance trained male athletes. This is despite PE limits for FM and FFM estimates being within acceptable precision thresholds, at least for DXA. Clearly all methods are subject to some imprecision due to daily biological fluctuations, especially BIS which calculates physique traits from a TBW estimation. Given that both technical error and biological variation contribute to precision, we recommend the use of LSC values calculated from consecutive-day analysis when interpreting longitudinal change for true changes in physique. Application of DXA, BOD POD or SA should be advocated over BIS for athletic populations where only small changes are observed over time.

332

333 Practical Implications

Adopting LSC values from consecutive-day analysis likely provide a more appropriate benchmark to assess meaningful change in body composition of athletic populations longitudinally.

337

# 338 Acknowledgements

The authors' responsibilities were as follows—AK and GJS: study concept and design; AK: 339 340 acquisition of data; AK and GJS: analysis and interpretation of data; AK: draft of manuscript; 341 AK, GJS and KH: critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; AK: 342 statistical analysis; and GJS: study supervision. AK had full access to all the data in the study 343 and takes responsibility for the integrity and the accuracy of the data analysis. The results of 344 this study are presented clearly, honestly, and without fabrication, falsification, or 345 inappropriate data manipulation. The authors have no financial or personal conflicts of 346 interest to declare. There were no funding sources for the present study.

347

### 348 References

349

Ackland, T. R., Lohman, T. G., Sundgot-Borgen, J., Maughan, R. J., Meyer, N. L., Stewart, A.
 D., & Müller, W. (2012). Current Status of Body Composition Assessment in Sport:
 Review and Position Statement on Behalf of the Ad Hoc Research Working Group on
 Body Composition Health and Performance, Under the Auspices of the I.O.C. Medical
 Commission. Sports Medicine, 42(3), 227-249.

- Barlow, M. J., Oldroyd, B., Smith, D., Lees, M. J., Brightmore, A., Till, K., . . . Hind, K. (2015).
   Precision Error in Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry Body Composition
   Measurements in Elite Male Rugby League Players. *Journal of Clinical Densitometry*, *18*(4), 546-550.
- Bilsborough, Greenway, K., Livingston, S., Cordy, J., & Coutts, A. J. (2016). Changes in
   Anthropometry, Upper-Body Strength, and Nutrient Intake in Professional Australian
   Football Players During a Season. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 11*(3), 290-300.
- Bilsborough, J. C., Greenway, K., Opar, D., Livingstone, S., Cordy, J., & Coutts, A. J. (2014).
  The accuracy and precision of DXA for assessing body composition in team sport athletes. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *32*(19), 1821-1828.
- Binkley, T. L., Daughters, S. W., Weidauer, L. A., & Vukovich, M. D. (2015). Changes in body
   composition in Division I football players over a competitive season and recovery in
   off-season. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research, 29*(9), 2503-2512.
- Bone, J. L., Ross, M. L., Tomcik, K. A., Jeacocke, N. A., Hopkins, W. G., & Burke, L. M. (2016).
   Manipulation of Muscle Creatine and Glycogen Changes DXA Estimates of Body
   Composition. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 49(5), 1029-1035.
- Cornish, B. H., Ward, L. C., Thomas, B. J., Jebb, S. A., & Elia, M. (1996). Evaluation of multiple
   frequency bioelectrical impedance and Cole-Cole analysis for the assessment of body
   water volumes in healthy humans. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 50*(3), 159 164.
- 376De Lorenzo, A., Andreoli, A., & Candeloro, N. (1997). Within-subject variability in body377composition using dual-energy X-rayabsorptiometry. Clinical Physiology, 17(4), 383-378388.
- Dempster, P., & Aitkens, S. (1995). A New Air Displacement Method for the Determination
  of Human Body Composition. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 27(12),
  1692-1697.
- Evans, E. M., Rowe, D. A., Misic, M. M., Prior, B. M., & Arngrímsson, S. Á. (2005). Skinfold
   prediction equation for athletes developed using a four-component model. *37*(11),
   2006-2011.
- Fields, Higgins, P., & Hunter, G. (2004). Assessment of body composition by air-displacement
   plethysmography: influence of body temperature and moisture. *Dynamic Medicine*,
   3(1), 3.
- Fields, D. A., Hunter, G. R., & Goran, M. I. (2000). Validation of the BOD POD with
  hydrostatic weighing: Influence of body clothing. *International Journal of Obesity*,
  24(2), 200-205.
- Gabbett, T. J. (2009). Physiological and anthropometric correlates of tackling ability in rugby
   league players. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 23(2), 540-548.
- Hangartner, T. N., Warner, S., Braillon, P., Jankowski, L., & Shepherd, J. (2013). The Official
  Positions of the International Society for Clinical Densitometry: Acquisition of DualEnergy X-Ray Absorptiometry Body Composition and Considerations Regarding
  Analysis and Repeatability of Measures. *Journal of Clinical Densitometry*, *16*(4), 520536.
- Harley, J. A., Hind, K., & O'Hara, J. P. (2011). Three-Compartment Body Composition
  Changes in elite Rugby League Players During a Super League Season, Measured by
  Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*,
  25(4), 1024-1029.

- Hind, K., Slater, G., Oldroyd, B., Lees, M., Thurlow, S., Barlow, M., & Shepherd, J. (2018).
  Interpretation of Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry-Derived Body Composition
  Change in Athletes: A Review and Recommendations for Best Practice. *Journal of Clinical Densitometry*, *21*(3), 429-443.
- Hume, P., & Marfell-Jones, M. (2008). The importance of accurate site location for skinfold
   measurement. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *26*(12), 1333-1340.
- Kerr, Slater, G. J., & Byrne, N. (2017). Impact of food and fluid intake on technical and
  biological measurement error in body composition assessment methods in athletes. *British Journal of Nutrition, 117*(4), 591-601.
- Kerr, Slater, G. J., Byrne, N., & Nana, A. (2016). Reliability of 2 Different Positioning Protocols
   for Dual-Energy X-ray Absorptiometry Measurement of Body Composition in Healthy
   Adults. Journal of Clinical Densitometry, 19(3), 282-289.
- Kerr, A., Slater, G., Byrne, N., & Chaseling, J. (2015). Validation of Bioelectrical Impedance
   Spectroscopy to Measure Total Body Water in Resistance-Trained Males.
   *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism, 25*(5), 494-503.
- 417 Kerr, A., Slater, G. J., & Byrne, N. M. (2018). Influence of subject presentation on
  418 interpretation of body composition change after 6 months of self-selected training
  419 and diet in athletic males. *118*(6), 1273-1286.
- Kyle, U. G., Bosaeus, I., De Lorenzo, A. D., Deurenberg, P., Elia, M., Manuel Gómez, J., . . .
  Pichard, C. (2004). Bioelectrical impedance analysis—part II: utilization in clinical practice. *Clinical Nutrition*, 23(6), 1430-1453.
- Lambrinoudaki, I., Georgiou, E., Douskas, G., Tsekes, G., Kyriakidis, M., & Proukakis, C.
  (1998). Body composition assessment by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry:
  Comparison of prone and supine measurements. *Metabolism: Clinical and Experimental*, 47(11), 1379-1382.
- Lees, M. J., Oldroyd, B., Jones, B., Brightmore, A., O'Hara, J. P., Barlow, M. J., . . . Hind, K.
  (2017). Three-compartment body composition changes in professional rugby union
  players over one competitive season: a team and individualized approach. *Journal of Clinical Densitometry*, 20(1), 50-57.
- 431 Marfell-Jones, M. J., Stewart, A., & de Ridder, J. (2012). *International standards for* 432 *anthropometric assessment*.
- McCrory, M. A., Molé, P. A., Gomez, T. D., Dewey, K. G., & Bernauer, E. M. (1998). Body
  composition by air-displacement plethysmography by using predicted and measured
  thoracic gas volumes. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, *84*(4), 1475-1479.
- Meyer, N. L., Sundgot-Borgen, J., Lohman, T. G., Ackland, T. R., Stewart, A. D., Maughan, R.
  J., . . Müller, W. (2013). Body composition for health and performance: a survey of
  body composition assessment practice carried out by the Ad Hoc Research Working
  Group on Body Composition, Health and Performance under the auspices of the IOC
  Medical Commission. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 47*(16), 1044-1053.
- Nana, A., Slater, G. J., Hopkins, W. G., & Burke, L. M. (2012a). Effects of daily activities on
  dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry measurements of body composition in active
  people. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 44(1), 180-189.
- Nana, A., Slater, G. J., Hopkins, W. G., & Burke, L. M. (2012b). Techniques for Undertaking
  Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry Whole-Body Scans to Estimate Body Composition
  in Tall and/or Broad Subjects. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism, 22*(5), 313-322.

- Nana, A., Slater, G. J., Stewart, A. D., & Burke, L. M. (2015). Methodology Review: Using
  Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DXA) for the Assessment of Body Composition in
  Athletes and Active People. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism, 25*(2), 198-215.
- 452 Norton, K., Whittingham, N., Carter, L., Kerr, D., Gore, C., & Marfell-Jones, M. (1996).
  453 Measurement techniques in anthropometry. In N. Kevin (Ed.), *Anthropometrica* (Vol.
  454 1st ed., pp. 25-75). Kensington, NSW: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.
- O'brien, C., Young, A., & Sawka, M. (2002). Bioelectrical impedance to estimate changes in
   hydration status. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 23(05), 361-366.
- 457 Olds, T. (2001). The evolution of physique in male rugby union players in the twentieth
   458 century. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *19*(4), 253-262.
- Pace, N., & Rathbun, E. N. (1945). Studies on body composition. 3. The body water and
  chemically combined nitrogen content in relation to fat content. *Journal of Biological Chemistry, 158,* 685-691.
- Rouillier, M. A., David-Riel, S., Brazeau, A. S., St-Pierre, D. H., & Karelis, A. D. (2015). Effect of
  an Acute High Carbohydrate Diet on Body Composition Using DXA in Young Men.
  Annals of Nutrition and Metabolism, 66(4), 233-236.
- Ruiz, L., Colley, J. R., & Hamilton, P. J. (1971). Measurement of triceps skinfold thickness. An
  investigation of sources of variation. *British Journal of Preventive and Social Medicine, 25*(3), 165-167.
- Saunders, M. J., Blevins, J. E., & Broeder, C. E. (1998). Effects of hydration changes on
  bioelectrical impedance in endurance trained individuals. *Medicine and Science in*Sports and Exercise, 30(6), 885-892.
- Siri, W. E. (1961). Body Composition from fluid spaces and density: analysis of methods.
   *Nutrition, 9*(5), 480-491.
- Slater, G. J., Rice, A. J., Mujika, I., Hahn, A. G., Sharpe, K., & Jenkins, D. G. (2005). Physique
  traits of lightweight rowers and their relationship to competitive success. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 39*(10), 736-741.
- Smart, D. J., Hopkins, W. G., & Gill, N. D. (2013). Differences and changes in the physical
  characteristics of professional and amateur rugby union players. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, *27*(11), 3033-3044.
- 479 Tegenkamp, M. H., Clark, R. R., Schoeller, D. A., & Landry, G. L. (2011). Effects of covert
  480 subject actions on percent body fat by air-displacement plethsymography. *Journal of*481 *Strength and Conditioning Research*, *25*(7), 2010-2017.
- Toombs, R. J., Ducher, G., Shepherd, J. A., & De Souza, M. J. (2012). The Impact of Recent
  Technological Advances on the Trueness and Precision of DXA to Assess Body
  Composition. *Obesity*, 20(1), 30-39.
- Vescovi, J. D., Zimmerman, S. L., Miller, W. C., & Fernhall, B. (2002). Effects of clothing on
  accuracy and reliability of air displacement plethysmography. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 34(2), 282-285.
- Vitale, K. C., Owens, R., Hopkins, S. R., & Malhotra, A. (2019). Sleep Hygiene for Optimizing
  Recovery in Athletes: Review and Recommendations. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 40(8), 535-543.
- Ward, L. C., Isenring, E., Dyer, J. M., Kagawa, M., & Essex, T. (2015). Resistivity coefficients
  for body composition analysis using bioimpedance spectroscopy: effects of body
  dominance and mixture theory algorithm. *Physiological Measurement, 36*(7), 15291550.

495 496 497 498	Zemski, A. J., Hind, K., Keating, S. E., Broad, E. M., Marsh, D. J., & Slater, G. J. (2019). Same- Day Vs Consecutive-Day Precision Error of Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry for Interpreting Body Composition Change in Resistance-Trained Athletes. <i>Journal of</i> <i>Clinical Densitometry</i> , 22(1), 104-114.
499	
500	
501	
502	Figure 1 Study design of three testing sessions conducted over 24 hours.
503	
504	Figure 2 Least significant change for DXA, BODPOD, BIS and SA for same-day
505	and consecutive-day measures.
506	
507	Figure 3 Regression analysis between measures of fat mass (FM) for same-day precision.
508	
509	Figure 4 Regression analysis between measures of fat mass (FM) for consecutive-day
510	precision.
511	
512	Figure 5 Regression analysis between measures of fat free mass (FFM) for same-day
513	precision.
514	
515	Figure 6 Regression analysis between measures of fat free mass (FFM) for consecutive-day
516	precision.
517	
518	Figure 7 Bland Altman plots for differences in same-day vs consecutive-day measures for fat
519	mass (FM).

- 521 Figure 8 Bland Altman plots for differences in same-day vs consecutive-day measures for fat
- 522 free mass (FFM).