HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

J Am Med Dir Assoc. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 November 08.

Published in final edited form as:

J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2011 July ; 12(6): 403–409. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2011.04.014.

Sarcopenia With Limited Mobility: An International Consensus

John E. Morley, MB, BCh, **Angela Marie Abbatecola, BS, MD, PhD**, **Josep M. Argiles, PhD**, **Vickie Baracos, BSc, PhD**, **Juergen Bauer, MD, PhD**, **Shalender Bhasin, MD**, **Tommy Cederholm, MD, PhD**, **Andrew J. Stewart Coats, DM, DSc**, **Steven R. Cummings, MD**, **William J. Evans, PhD**, **Kenneth Fearon, MD**, **Luigi Ferrucci, MD, PhD**, **Roger A. Fielding, PhD**, **Jack M. Guralnik, MD, PhD**, **Tamara B. Harris, MD, MS**, **Akio Inui, MD, PhD**, **Kamyar Kalantar-Zadeh, MD, PhD, MPH, FAAP, FACP, FAHA**, **Bridget-Anne Kirwan, FESC, MSc, PhD**, **Giovanni Mantovani, MD**, **Maurizio Muscaritoli, MD**, **Anne B. Newman, MD, MPH**, **Filippo Rossi-Fanelli, MD, FACN**, **Giuseppe M. C. Rosano, MD, PhD, FESC**, **Ronenn Roubenoff, MD, MHS**, **Morris Schambelan, MD**, **Gerald H. Sokol, MD, MSc, FCP**, **Thomas W. Storer, PhD**, **Bruno Vellas, MD, PhD**, **Stephan von Haehling, MD, PhD**, **Shing-Shing Yeh, MD, PhD**, **Stefan D. Anker, MD, PhD**, and **The Society on Sarcopenia, Cachexia and Wasting Disorders Trialist Workshop**

Division of Geriatric Medicine, Saint Louis University School of Medicine and GRECC, VA Medical Center, St. Louis, MO (J.E.M.); Scientific Direction at the Italian National Research Center on Aging (INRCA), Ancona, Italy (A.M.A.); Department of Biochemistry, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain (J.M.A.); Department of Oncology, University of Alberta, Alberta, Canada (V.B.); Geriatric Center Oldenberg, Germany, Department of Geriatric Medicine, University of Erlangen, Nuremberg, Germany (J.B.); Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts (S.B.); Clinical Nutrition and Geriatric Medicine, Uppsala University Hospital, Uppsala, Sweden (T.C.); Norwich Research Park, Professor–at–Large, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom (A.J.S.C.); San Francisco Coordinating Center and Departments of Medicine and Epidemiology, University of California, San Francisco, CA (S.R.C.); Muscle Metabolism Discovery Performance Unit, GlaxoSmithKline, and Departments of Medicine and Geriatrics, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina (W.J.E.); Surgical Oncology, Edinburgh University and Western General Hospital, Edinburgh, United Kingdom (K.F.); National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD (L.F., J.M.G., T.B.H.); Nutrition, Exercise Physiology and Sarcopenia Laboratory, Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging at Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, MA (R.A.F.); Department of Psychosomatic Internal Medicine, Kagoshima University Graduate School of Medical and Dental Sciences, Kagoshima, Japan (A.I.); Harold Simmons Center, Division of Nephrology, David Geffen UCLA School of Medicine and Harbor–UCLA Medical Center, Torrance and Los Angeles, CA (K.K.-Z.); SOCAR Research, Nyon, Switzerland (B.-A.K.); Department of Medical Oncology, University of Cagliari School of Medicine, Cagliari, Italy (G.M.); Internal Medicine and Clinical Nutrition Management Unit, La Sapienza University, Rome, Italy (M.M.); Epidemiology and Center for Aging and Population Health, Graduate School of Public Health, Pittsburgh, PA (A.B.N.); Internal

Address correspondence to John E. Morley, MB, BCh, Geriatric Medicine, Saint Louis University School of Medicine, 1402 S. Grand Boulevard, M238, St. Louis, MO 63104. morley@slu.edu.

Medicine and Clinical Medicine, University of Rome, Rome, Italy (F.R.-F.); Medical Sciences Center of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, IRCCS, San Raffael, Italy (G.M.C.R.); Translational Medicine, Musculoskeletal Diseases, Novartis Institutes for Biomedical Research, and Department of Medicine, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA (R.R.); Division of Endocrinology and Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, CA (M.S.); Radiation Oncology and Medical Oncology, Tampa General Hospital, Moffitt Cancer Center, and FDA, Tampa, FL (G.H.S.); Endocrinology, Diabetes and Nutrition, Exercise Physiology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA (T.W.S.); Internal Medicine and Geriatrics, Toulouse University Hospital, Toulouse, France (B.V.); Applied Cachexia Research, Department of Cardiology, Charité Medical School, Berlin, Germany (S.H.); Northport VAMC and Medicine, Stony Brook University Hospital, Stony Brook, NY (S.-S.Y.); Applied Cachexia Research, Dept of Cardiology, Charité Campus Virchow–Klinikum, Berlin, Germany (S.D.A.)

Abstract

A consensus conference convened by the Society of Sarcopenia, Cachexia and Wasting Disorders has concluded that “Sarcopenia, ie, reduced muscle mass, with limited mobility” should be considered an important clinical entity and that most older persons should be screened for this condition. “Sarcopenia with limited mobility” is defined as a person with muscle loss whose walking speed is equal to or less than 1 m/s or who walks less than 400 m during a 6-minute walk, and who has a lean appendicular mass corrected for height squared of 2 standard deviations or more below the mean of healthy persons between 20 and 30 years of age of the same ethnic group. The limitation in mobility should not clearly be a result of otherwise defined specific diseases of muscle, peripheral vascular disease with intermittent claudication, central and peripheral nervous system disorders, or cachexia. Clinically significant interventions are defined as an increase in the 6-minute walk of at least 50 meters or an increase of walking speed of at least 0.1 m/s.

> “A word is not a crystal, transparent and unchanged; it is the skin of a living thought and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and the time when it is used.”
>
> —Oliver Wendell Holmes

The loss of muscle mass with aging was first recognized by MacDonald Critchley. Rosenberg felt that “no decline with age is more dramatic or potentially more functionally significant than the decline in muscle mass” and suggested that it needed a name derived from the Greek—sarcopenia (ie, flesh loss).[1,2] Baumgartner et al[3] provided an operational definition using a definition based on muscle mass corrected for height, and defined, similarly to osteoporosis, as being 2 standard deviations below the level of healthy young persons. With the advent of an operational definition, consensus began to be lost. Generally it is recognized that sarcopenia is reduced muscle mass that leads to negative effects on function and clinical outcome.

Muscle mass declines at approximately 1% per year after the age of 30 years. Severe muscle loss (ie, 2 standard deviations below healthy young) is present in 5% to 13% of 60- to 70-year-olds and 11% to 50% of those 80 and older.[4–6] This loss of muscle mass has been shown to be associated with disability in some studies. However, the development of

disability is a complex area and is almost always multifactorial in older persons. At the end of 2010, more than 1000 publications had appeared in PubMed using the definition of sarcopenia, as age-related muscle loss below 2 standard deviations of the mean for young persons. Multiple factors leading to sarcopenia have been identified[7–17] (Figure 1).

Although the definition of sarcopenia based on loss of muscle mass alone has served the scientific community fairly well, it has been less satisfying for clinicians, the pharmaceutical industry, and regulatory agencies. Unlike the measurements of bone mineral density, the measurement of muscle mass has not been widely adopted by clinicians. Regulatory agencies have failed to accept that restoration of muscle mass is, of itself, a sufficient reason to allow a drug to be approved for use. It should be noted that this is not different from the situation with osteoporosis wherein reduced bone mineral density is recognized as a legitimate indication for treatment, but for regulatory considerations, drugs have had to show a reduction in fracture incidence before approval.[18–20] These factors/impediments have led to groups, originally from the European Union, and then from the European Union and the United States with industry support, to question the clinical feasibility of the original definition, and efforts to redefine sarcopenia have been advanced.[4,21,22]

In an attempt to find a consensus, the Society for Sarcopenia, Cachexia and Wasting Disorders convened a meeting in Washington, DC, in December 2010, with participants with multiple viewpoints. The purpose of the meeting was to find a definition or set of definitions that is universally acceptable and can lead to easily definable end points for clinical trials. It was hoped that the definition developed would

- Be a meaningful surrogate for clinically useful end points, eg, decline in activities of daily living, hospitalization, nursing home residence, injurious falls, or mortality.
- Allow for treatments that worked in ways different from increasing muscle mass.
- Include only measurements that have been demonstrated to lead longitudinally to clinically meaningful outcomes and have definable cut points based on data.
- Be independent of the molecular target(s) for drug development.

THE POWER-STRENGTH-MASS CONUNDRUM

Muscle mass is the primary determinant of strength. Males are generally stronger than females primarily because they have larger muscle mass. Loss of strength tends to track with loss of muscle mass with aging in physiological studies, although the decline in muscle strength is steeper than the decline in muscle mass.[23,24] However, interventions that increase muscle mass do not necessarily increase strength.[25] Conversely, changes in strength that occur with resistance training precede measurable changes in muscle mass temporally and exceed them in size.[26] Loss in strength is not necessarily present with voluntary weight loss despite the associated loss of skeletal muscle.[27] Correlations between change in muscle mass and change in strength in older adults are inconsistent and not very robust.[28]

One reason for this inconsistency is the infiltration into muscle by fat, which is a powerful predictor of future disability and mortality.[29] This has been designated as sarcopenic obesity, myosteatosis, or the "fat frail." [30–34] Infiltration of collagen into muscle with aging can also lead to a dichotomy in the relationship between muscle mass and strength.[35] Age-associated changes in neuromuscular activation that are superimposed on changes in muscle mass may further explain the dichotomy between mass and strength/power losses.[36,37] Finally, alterations in the angle of pennation by which tendons insert into muscle can markedly alter power.[38–40] Other changes in muscle leading to a loss of strength include deposition of abnormal proteins; contractile and structural protein misfolding; and mitochondrial, neuromuscular, and plaque dysfunction.

There is a logical series of classics-derived descriptions of muscle changes that result in loss of muscle mass (sarcopenia), loss of muscle strength (kratopenia, named for the Greek god of strength, Kratos), loss of power (dynopenia), and frailty (Table 1). Like sarcopenia, a number of different definitions for frailty have been developed (Table 2).[41–49] With the exception of the Rockwood et al[46] definition, all the definitions include both strength and weight loss.

A final problem with the definition of sarcopenia is the variety of measures available to measure muscle mass. Each of these leads to slightly different cutoffs for muscle mass and are indirect measures. As such, they can be influenced by adiposity and total body water.[50–52] These different measures are compared in Table 3. Newer mechanisms such as the ^{13}C-creatine dilution method may solve some of these problems.

VALIDITY OF END POINTS

A number of studies have shown that muscle mass less than 2 standard deviations of that of a healthy young adult is predictive of disability and mortality.[9,34,53–60] At present there is no clear consensus pertaining to the magnitude of change in muscle mass that is predictive of clinically meaningful outcomes. To determine appropriate appendicular muscle mass values to predict outcomes requires a standardization using each of the instruments used to measure muscle mass. Standardization against healthy young controls 20 to 30 years of age needs to be developed for individual ethnic groups, similar to those developed for osteoporosis in the FRAX Index (www.shef.ac.uk/FRAX). A minimum of 100 control individuals needs to be included in each cohort. Development of cut points needs to exclude persons with limb pain or substantial balance problems.

Usual gait speed over a variety of distances from 4 to 6 meters has been shown to be predictive for the onset of disability, severe mobility limitation, hospitalization, and mortality.[61–65] Gait speeds equal to or less than 1 m/s appear to be equally predictive of poor outcomes. A clinically significant improvement in gait speed is at least 0.1 m/s.[65–68]

The 6-minute walking test has been used as a measure for drug approval by several regulatory agencies for the assessment of drugs for the treatment of peripheral vascular disease and pulmonary hypertension. The 6-minute walk test is highly predictive of hospitalization and mortality in medically ill persons.[69–73] A cutoff of 400 m has been

established.[69,74,75] In persons who can walk at least 100 m, a clinically significant change has been found to be more than 50 meters.[69,76,77] (There was a viewpoint among the panel that this may be better expressed as a percentage of baseline.) There is evidence that the 400-m walking test may be equally valid.[78,79]

DEFINITION

It was decided that "sarcopenia with limited mobility" would be an acceptable term to define persons with a need for therapeutic interventions. This is a specific condition with clear loss of muscle mass and a clear target for intervention. As such, it differs from the more general concept of frailty. The definition is based on consensus and may change as additional data come available. "Sarcopenia with limited mobility" is a syndrome not a disease.

Sarcopenia with limited mobility is defined as a person with muscle loss whose walking speed is equal to or less than 1 m/s or who walks less than 400 m during a 6-minute walk. The person should also have a lean appendicular mass corrected for height squared of more than 2 standard deviations below that of healthy persons between 20 and 30 years of age of the same ethnic group. The cutoffs determined are arbitrary, as the associations with mass and gait speed with disability are continuous. The limitation in mobility should not be clearly attributable to the direct effect of specific disease, such as peripheral vascular disease with intermittent claudication, or central or peripheral nervous system disorders (such as stroke, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord disease, or motor neuron disease), dementia, or cachexia.[80–83] Interventions that are considered clinically significant are an increase in the 6-minute walk of 50 meters or an increase of gait speed of 0.1 m/s. Sarcopenia is generally believed to be age-associated and its prevalence increases with aging. Research needs to establish that change in gait speed owing to therapy aimed at sarcopenia will reduce disability and that the amount of change in gait speed will predict the improvement in outcome.

It is important to recognize that sarcopenia can overlap with many of the specifically excluded conditions; and that exercise, nutrition, and other treatments that decrease sarcopenia may be useful in these conditions.[84–86] There was no consensus among the panel of whether sarcopenia as a term should be limited to use in older persons (60+ years of age) or used as a general term for adults of any age. A minority support the use of the term "myopenia" to indicate the presence of clinically relevant muscle wasting owing to any illness at any age,[87,88] with "sarcopenia" being limited to use for older persons. Sarcopenia has been generally recognized as an age-related process of multiple etiologies; however, nephrologists tend to use the term for persons with chronic kidney disease and dialysis patients with protein energy wasting and muscle wasting regardless of age. Thus, although emphasizing that this is a common condition in older age, the panel was not comfortable in limiting the definition to only older persons. There is a need to determine the role of executive function decline in the development of sarcopenia with limited mobility.[89–91] At present, fast gait speed and inability to carry out "dual tasking" appear to separate executive function mobility disorders.

We recommend that all patients older than 60 years who are falling, who feel that their walking speed has decreased, who have had a recent hospitalization, who have been on prolonged bed rest, who have problems arising from a chair, or who need to use an assistive device for walking are screened for sarcopenia with mobility impairment. As has been previously suggested, gait speed or distance traveled during a 6-minute walk should be measured in all these patients, and this mobility measure should be separately reimbursed from the regular physician visit.[92] The decision about whether to treat should be based on absolute risk of an adverse clinical outcome, such as mobility disability, and the absolute decrease in risk from treatment. Sarcopenia may be only one of several risk factors to be used in treatment decisions. Although recognizing that clinical trials in older persons with "sarcopenia with limited mobility" are challenging, there is a wonderful opportunity to develop new drugs that may greatly enhance the quality of life of older persons.[93]

References

1. Rosenberg IH. Sarcopenia: origins and clinical relevance. J Nutr. 1997; 127:990S–991S. [PubMed: 9164280]
2. Evans WJ. What is sarcopenia? J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 1995; 50:5–8. [PubMed: 7493218]
3. Baumgartner RN, Koehler KM, Gallagher D, et al. Epidemiology of sarcopenia among the elderly in New Mexico. Am J Epidemiol. 1998; 147:755–763. [PubMed: 9554417]
4. Fielding, RA.; Vellas, B.; Evans, WJ., et al. Sarcopenia: An undiagnosed condition in older adults. J Am Med Dir Assoc; The International Sarcopenia Consensus Conference Working Group Meeting; 2011. p. 249-256.
5. von Haehling S, Morley JE, Anker SD. An overview of sarcopenia: Facts and numbers on prevalence and clinical impact. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2010; 1:129–133. [PubMed: 21475695]
6. von Haehling S, Anker SD. Cachexia as a major underestimated and un-met medical need: facts and numbers. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. 2010; 1:1–5. [PubMed: 21475699]
7. Dumurgier J, Elbaz A, Ducimetiere P, et al. Slow walking speed and cardiovascular death in well functioning elderly adults: Prospective cohort study. BMJ. 2009; 339:b4460. [PubMed: 19903980]
8. Janssen I, Heymsfield SB, Ross R. Low relative skeletal mass (sarcopenia) in older persons is associated with functional impairment and physical disability. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2002; 50:889–896. [PubMed: 12028177]
9. Janssen I, Baumgartner RN, Ross R, et al. Skeletal muscle cutpoints associated with elevated physical disability risk in older men and women. Am J Epidemiol. 2004; 159:413–421. [PubMed: 14769646]
10. Morley JE, Baumgartner RN, Roubenoff R, Mayer J, Nair KS. Sarcopenia. J Lab Clin Med. 2001; 137:231–243. [PubMed: 11283518]
11. Bauer JM, Kaiser MJ, Sieber CC. Sarcopenia in nursing home residents. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2008; 9:545–551. [PubMed: 19083287]
12. Rolland Y, Zerwinski S, Abellan van Kan G, et al. Sarcopenia: Its assessment, etiology, pathogenesis, consequences and future perspectives. J Nutr Health Aging. 2008; 12:433–450. [PubMed: 18615225]
13. Morley JE. Anorexia, sarcopenia and aging. Nutrition. 2001; 17:660–663. [PubMed: 11448592]
14. Boirie Y. Physiopathological mechanism of sarcopenia. J Nutr Health Aging. 2009; 13:717–723. [PubMed: 19657556]
15. Pahor M, Manini T, Cesari M. Sarcopenia: Clinical evaluation, biological markers and other evaluation tools. J Nutr Health Aging. 2009; 13:724–728. [PubMed: 19657557]
16. Studenski S. What are the outcomes of treatment among patients with sarcopenia? J Nutr Health Aging. 2009; 13:733–736. [PubMed: 19657559]

17. Roubenoff R, Hughes VA. Sarcopenia: Current concepts. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2000; 55:M716–M724. [PubMed: 11129393]
18. Cummings SR, Bates D, Black DM. Clinical use of bone densitometry: Scientific review. JAMA. 2002; 228:1889–1897.
19. Olszynski WP, Shawn Davison K, Adachi JD, et al. Osteoporosis in men: Epidemiology, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. Clin Ther. 2004; 26:15–28. [PubMed: 14996514]
20. Silverman SL, Cummings SR, Watts NB. Consensus Panel of the ASBMR, ISCD, and NOF. Recommendations for the clinical evaluation of agents for treatment of osteoporosis: consensus of an expert panel representing the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research (ASBMR), the International Society for Clinical Densitometry (ISCD), and the National Osteoporosis Foundation (NOF). J Bone Miner Res. 2008; 23:159–165. [PubMed: 17892379]
21. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, et al. Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis: Report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. Age Ageing. 2010; 39:412–423. [PubMed: 20392703]
22. Muscaritoli M, Anker SD, Argiles J, et al. Consensus definition of sarcopenia, cachexia and pre-cachexia: Joint document elaborated by Special Interest Groups (SIG) “cachexia-anorexia in chronic wasting diseases” and “nutrition in geriatrics”. Clin Nutr. 2010; 29:154–159. [PubMed: 20060626]
23. Frontera WR, Hughes VA, Fielding RA, et al. Aging of skeletal muscle: A 12-yr longitudinal study. J Appl Physiol. 2000; 88:1321–1326. [PubMed: 10749826]
24. Doherty TJ. The influence of aging and sex on skeletal muscle mass and strength. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2001; 4:503–508. [PubMed: 11706284]
25. Wittert GA, Chapman IM, Haren MT, et al. Oral testosterone supplementation increases muscle and decreases fat mass in health elderly males with low-normal gonadal status. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2003; 58:618–625. [PubMed: 12865477]
26. Sillanpaa E, Laaksonen DE, Hakkinen A, et al. Body composition, fitness, and metabolic health during strength and endurance training and their combination in middle-aged and older women. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2009; 106:285–296. [PubMed: 19266214]
27. Wang X, Miller GD, Messier SP, Nicklas BJ. Knee strength maintained despite loss of lean body mass during weight loss in older obese adults with knee osteoarthritis. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2007; 62:866–871. [PubMed: 17702878]
28. Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, et al. The loss of skeletal muscle strength, mass, and quality in older adults: The health, aging and body composition study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2006; 61:1059–1064. [PubMed: 17077199]
29. Visser M, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, et al. Muscle mass, muscle strength, and muscle fat infiltration as predictors of incident mobility limitations in well-functioning older persons. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2005; 60:324–333. [PubMed: 15860469]
30. Baumgartner RN, Wayne SJ, Waters DL, et al. Sarcopenic obesity predicts instrumental activities of daily living disability in the elderly. Obes Res. 2004; 12:1995–2004. [PubMed: 15687401]
31. Rolland Y, Lauwers-Cances V, Cristini C, et al. Difficulties with physical function associated with obesity, sarcopenia, and sarcopenic-obesity in community-dwelling elderly women: The EPIDOS (EPIDemiologie de l’OSteoporose) Study. Am J Clin Nutr. 2009; 89:1895–1900. [PubMed: 19369381]
32. Stephen WC, Janssen I. Sarcopenic-obesity and cardiovascular disease risk in the elderly. J Nutr Health Aging. 2009; 13:460–466. [PubMed: 19390754]
33. Bouchard, Dr; Dionne, IJ.; Brochu, M. Sarcopenic/obesity and physical capacity in older men and women: Data from the Nutrition as a Determinant of Successful Aging (NuAge)-the Quebec Longitudinal Study. Obesity (Silver Spring). 2009; 17:2082–2088. [PubMed: 19373219]
34. Lang T, Cauley JA, Tylavsky F, et al. Computed tomographic measurements of thigh muscle cross-sectional area and attenuation coefficient predict hip fracture: The health, aging, and body composition study. J Bone Miner Res. 2010; 25:513–519. [PubMed: 20422623]
35. Morse CI, Thom JM, Reeves ND, et al. In vivo physiological cross-sectional area and specific force are reduced in the gastrocnemius of elderly men. J Appl Physiol. 2005; 99:1050–1055. [PubMed: 15905324]

36. Clark DJ, Patten C, Reid KF, et al. Impaired voluntary neuromuscular activation limits muscle power in mobility-limited older adults. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2010; 65:495–502. [PubMed: 20156882]
37. Clark DJ, Patten C, Reid KF, et al. Muscle performance and physical function are associated with voluntary rate of neuromuscular activation in older adults. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2011; 66:115–121. [PubMed: 20829294]
38. Narici MV, Maffulli N, Maganaris CN. Ageing of human muscles and tendons. Disabil Rehabil. 2008; 30:1548–1554. [PubMed: 18608375]
39. Narici MV, Maganaris CN, Reeves N. Muscle and tendon adaptations to ageing and spaceflight. J Gravit Physiol. 2002:P137–P138. [PubMed: 15002518]
40. Narici MV, Maganaris CN, Reeves ND, Capodaglio P. Effect of aging on human muscle architecture. J Appl Physiol. 2003; 95:2229–2234. [PubMed: 12844499]
41. Abellan van Kan G, Rolland YM, Morley JE, Vellas B. Frailty: Toward a clinical definition. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2008; 9:71–72. [PubMed: 18261696]
42. Abellan van Kan G, Rolland Y, Bergman H, et al. The IANA Task Force on frailty assessment of older people in clinical practice. J Nutr Health Aging. 2008; 12:29–37. [PubMed: 18165842]
43. Morley JE. Developing novel therapeutic approaches to frailty. Curr Pharm Des. 2009; 15:3384–3395. [PubMed: 19860686]
44. Fried LP, Ferrucci L, Darer J, et al. Untangling the concepts of disability, frailty, and comorbidity: Implications for improved targeting and care. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2004; 59:255–263. [PubMed: 15031310]
45. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Cardiovascular Study Collaborative Research Group. Frailty in older adults: Evidence for a phenotype. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2001; 56:M146–M156. [PubMed: 11253156]
46. Rockwood K, Abeysundera MJ, Mitnitski A. How should we grade frailty in nursing home patients? J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2007; 8:595–603. [PubMed: 17998116]
47. Morley JE. Anabolic steroids and frailty. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2010; 11:533–536. [PubMed: 20889088]
48. Ensrud KE, Ewing SK, Cawthon PM, et al. A comparison of frailty indexes for the prediction of falls, disability, fractures and mortality in older men. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2009; 57:492–498. [PubMed: 19245414]
49. Ensrud KE, Ewing SK, Taylor BC, et al. Comparison of 2 frailty indexes for prediction of falls, disability fractures, and death in older women. Arch Intern Med. 2008; 168:382–389. [PubMed: 18299493]
50. Dumler F. Use of bioelectric impedance analysis and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry for monitoring the nutritional status of dialysis patients. ASAIO J. 1997; 43:256–260. [PubMed: 9152505]
51. Heyward VH. Evaluation of body composition. Current issues Sports Med. 1996; 22:146–156. [PubMed: 8883212]
52. Omran ML, Morley JE. Assessment of protein energy malnutrition in older persons, Part I: History, examination, body composition, and screening tools. Nutrition. 2000; 16:50–63. [PubMed: 10674236]
53. Evans CJ, Chiou C-F, Fitzgerald KA, et al. Development of a new patient-reported outcome measure in sarcopenia. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2011; 12:226–233. [PubMed: 21333926]
54. Melton LJ, Khosla S, Crowson CS, et al. Epidemiology of sarcopenia. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2000; 48:625–630. [PubMed: 10855597]
55. Krakauer JC, Franklin B, Kleerekoper M, et al. Body composition profiles derived from dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, total body scan, and mortality. Prev Cardiol. 2004; 7:109–115. [PubMed: 15249762]
56. Cesari M, Pahor M, Lauretani F, et al. Skeletal muscle and mortality results from the InCHIANTI Study. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2009; 64:377–384. [PubMed: 19181709]
57. Metter EJ, Talbot LA, Schrager M, Conwit R. Skeletal muscle strength as a predictor of all-cause mortality in health men. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2002; 57:B359–B365. [PubMed: 12242311]

58. Ferrucci L, Penninx BWJH, Volpato S, et al. Change in muscle strength explains accelerated decline of physical function in older women with high interleukin-6 serum levels. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2002; 50:1947–1954. [PubMed: 12473005]
59. Noori N, Kopple JD, Kovesdy CP, et al. Mid-arm muscle circumference and quality of life and survival in maintenance hemodialysis patients. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010; 5:2258–2268. [PubMed: 20947789]
60. Kalantar-Zadeh K, Streja E, Kovesdy CP, et al. The obesity paradox and mortality associated with surrogates of body size and muscle mass in patients receiving hemodialysis. Mayo Clin Proc. 2010; 85:991–1001. [PubMed: 21037042]
61. Abellan van Kan G, Rolland Y, Andrieu S, et al. Gait speed at usual pace as a predictor of adverse outcomes in community-dwelling older people in International Academy on Nutrition and Aging (IANA) Task Force. J Nutr Health Aging. 2009; 13:881–889. [PubMed: 19924348]
62. Studenski S, Perera S, Patel K, et al. Gait speed and survival in older adults. JAMA. 2011; 305:50–58. [PubMed: 21205966]
63. Afilalo J, Eisenberg MJ, Morin JF, et al. Gait speed as an incremental predictor of mortality and major morbidity in elderly patients undergoing cardiac surgery. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2010; 56:1668–1676. [PubMed: 21050978]
64. Blain H, Carriere I, Sourial N, et al. Balance and walking speed predict subsequent 8-year mortality independently of current and intermediate events in well-functioning women aged 75 years and older. J Nutr Health Aging. 2010; 14:595–600. [PubMed: 20818476]
65. Ries JD, Echternach JL, Nof L, Ganon Blodgett M. Test-retest reliability and minimal detectable change scores for the timed “up & go” test, and gait speed in people with Alzheimer disease. Phys Ther. 2009; 89:569–579. [PubMed: 19389792]
66. Tilson JK, Sullivan KJ, Cen SY, et al. Locomotor Experience Applied Post Stroke (LEAPS) Investigative Team. Meaningful gait speed improvement during the first 60 days poststroke: Minimal clinically important difference. Phys Ther. 2010; 90:196–208. [PubMed: 20022995]
67. What is a meaningful change in physical performance? Findings from a clinical trial in older adults (the LIFE-P study). J Nutr Health Aging. 2009; 13:538–544. [PubMed: 19536422]
68. Perera S, Mody SH, Woodman RC, Studenski SA. Meaningful change and responsiveness in common physical performance measures in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2006; 54:743–749. [PubMed: 16696738]
69. Miyamoto S, Nagaya N, Satoh T, et al. Clinical correlates and prognostic significance of six-minute walk test in patients with primary pulmonary hypertension. Comparison with cardiopulmonary exercise testing. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2000; 161:487–492. [PubMed: 10673190]
70. Reesink HJ, van der Plas MN, Verhey NE, et al. Six-minute walk distance as parameter of functional outcome after pulmonary endarterectomy for chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2007; 133:510–516. [PubMed: 17258590]
71. Mutikainen S, Rantanen T, Kauppinen M, et al. Walking ability and all-cause mortality in older women. Int J Sports Med. 2010; 32:216–222. [PubMed: 21165808]
72. Bean JF, Kiely DK, Leveille SG, et al. The 6-minute test in mobility-limited elders: What is being measured? J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2002; 57:M751–M756. [PubMed: 12403805]
73. Enfield K, Gammon S, Floyd J. Six-minute walk distance in patients with severe end-stage COPD: Association with survival after inpatient pulmonary rehabilitation. J Cardiopulm Rehabil Prev. 2010; 30:195–202. [PubMed: 20040883]
74. Holland AE, Hill CJ, Rasekaba T, et al. Updating the minimal important difference for six-minute walk distance in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2010; 91:221–225. [PubMed: 20159125]
75. Pinto-Plata VM, Cote C, Cabral H, et al. The 6-min walk distance: Change over time and value as a predictor of survival in severe COPD. Eur Respir J. 2004; 23:28–33. [PubMed: 14738227]
76. Du Bois RM, Weycker D, Albera C, et al. 6-Minute walk test in idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: Test validation and minimal clinically important difference. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2011; 183:1231–1237. [PubMed: 21131468]

77. Hwang CL, Chien CL, Wu YT. Resistance training increases 6-minute walk distance in people with chronic heart failure: A systematic review. J Physiother. 2010; 56:87–96. [PubMed: 20482475]
78. Lacasse Y, Goldstein R, Lasserson TJ, Martin S. Pulmonary rehabilitation for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2006; 4:CD003793.
79. Newman AB, Simonsick EM, Naydeck BL, et al. Association of long-distance corridor walk performance with mortality, cardiovascular disease, mobility limitation, and disability. JAMA. 2006; 295:2018–2026. [PubMed: 16670410]
80. Rasekaba T, Lee AL, Naughton MT, et al. The six-minute walk test: A useful metric for the cardiopulmonary patient. Intern Med J. 2009; 39:495–501. [PubMed: 19732197]
81. Evans WJ, Morley JE, Argiles J, et al. Cachexia: a new definition. Clin Nutr. 2008; 27:793–799. [PubMed: 18718696]
82. Kalantar-Zadeh K, Horich TB, Oreopoulos A, et al. Risk factor paradox in wasting diseases. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2007; 10:433–442. [PubMed: 17563461]
83. Argiles JM, Anker SD, Evans WJ, et al. Consensus on cachexia definitions. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2010; 11:229–230. [PubMed: 20439040]
84. Yeh SS, Blackwood K, Schuster MW. The cytokine basis of cachexia and its treatment: Are they ready for prime time? J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2008; 9:219–236. [PubMed: 18457797]
85. Morley JE, Argiles JM, Evans WJ, et al. Nutritional recommendations for the management of sarcopenia. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2010; 11:391–396. [PubMed: 20627179]
86. van Wetering CR, Hoogendoorn M, Broekhuizen R, et al. Efficacy and costs of nutritional rehabilitation in muscle-wasted patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease in a community-based setting: A prespecified subgroup analysis of the INTERCOM trial. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2010; 11:179–187. [PubMed: 20188315]
87. Morley JE. Weight loss in older persons: New therapeutic approaches. Curr Pharm Des. 2007; 13:3637–3647. [PubMed: 18220800]
88. Fearon K, Evans WJ, Anker SD. Myopenia—a new universal term for muscle wasting. J Sarcopenia Cachexia Muscle. 2011; 2:1–3.
89. Lui-Ambrose T, Davis JC, Nagamatsu LS, et al. Changes in executive functions and self-efficacy are independently associated with improved usual gait speed in older women. BMC Geriatr. 2010; 10:25. [PubMed: 20482830]
90. Voelcker-Rehage C, Godde B, Staudinger UM. Physical and motor fitness are both related to cognition in old age. Eur J Neurosci. 2010; 31:167–176. [PubMed: 20092563]
91. Coppin AK, Ferrucci L, Lauretani F, et al. Low socioeconomic status and disability in old age: Evidence from the InChianti study for the mediating role of physiological impairments. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2006; 61:86–91. [PubMed: 16456198]
92. Morley JE. Mobility performance: A high-tech test for geriatricians. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci. 2003; 58:712–714. [PubMed: 12902528]
93. Evans WJ. Drug discovery and development for ageing: Opportunities and challenges. Phil Trans R Soc B. 2011; 366:113–119. [PubMed: 21115538]



Fig. 1.
Factors involved in the pathophysiology of sarcopenia.

Table 1

Cascade Relationship between Loss of Muscle Mass and Disability

Condition	Definition	Measurements
Sarcopenia	Loss of muscle mass	DEXA MRI Computed tomography MAMC/Calf circumference Ultrasound Bioelectrical impedance * 13C-creatine dilution †
Kratopenia	Loss of force, ie, strength	Dynamometry (isometric) Isotonic or isokinetic strength tests
Dynapenia	Loss of power (Force 3 Velocity)	Walking speed Walking distance Stair climbing
Frailty	Increased risk of disability when stressed	CHS (Fried) criteria SOF criteria IANA criteria
Disability	Loss of function	Instrumental activities of daily living Activities of daily living Barthel Index Functional Index Measure

CHS, Cardiovascular Health Study; DEXA, dual-energy x-ray absorptiomety; IANA, International Academy on Nutrition and Aging; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; MAMC, mean arm muscle circumference; SOF, Study of Osteoporotic Fractures.

*The panel did not feel this measurement should be used in clinical trials.

†Other epidemiologically valid serum measurements of muscle mass are being explored.

Table 2

Comparison of 3 Definitions of Frailty

Cardiovascular Health Study	Study of Osteoporotic Fractures	International Association of Nutrition and Aging
• Unintentional Weight loss	• Weight loss	• Fatigue
• Poor grip strength	• Inability to raise from a chair 5 times without using arms	• Resistance (climb 1 flight of stairs)
• Reduced energy level	• Reduced energy level	• Aerobic (walk 1 block)
• Slow walking speed		• Illnesses (>5)
• Low level of physical activity		• Loss of weight

Table 3

Comparison of Methods Available to Assess Muscle Mass

	Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry	Computed Tomography	Magnetic Resonance Imagery	Ultrasound	Bioelectrical Impedance*
Method	Measures attenuation of free muscle mass	Density of muscle area	Density of muscle area	Visualization of cross-sectional area	Indirect measure of muscle mass
Precision	1%–4%	1%–3%	1%–3%	2%	2%–4%
Radiation exposure	1 mrem (10 μSv)	15 mrem (150 μSv)	None	None	None
Availability	Readily available	Readily available	Readily available	Readily available	Available
Cost	Low	Medium	High	Low	Low
Technical difficulty	Minimum but needs standardization	Moderate	High	Moderate	Minimum
Examples of possible reference values for sarcopenia¶	Males <7.26 kg/m^2 Females <5.45 kg/m^2	Males <55 cm^2/m^2† Females <39 cm^2/m^2	Males <176 cm^3 Females <93 cm^3	Males <11 mm‡ Females M10 mm	Males <14.6kg/m^2§ Females M11.4 kg/m^2

*Bioelectrical impedance was not recommended for use by the panel.

†Lumbar skeletal mass index.

‡Musculotendon torque for gastrocnemius medialis.

§Fat-free mass index without bone.

¶It is important to recognize these are limited studies often only in one ethnic group and are given purely as examples.