



HAL
open science

Muscle strength field-based tests to identify European adolescents at risk of metabolic syndrome: The HELENA study.

Jose Castro-Pinero, Kelly R Laurson, Enrique G Artero, Francisco B Ortega, Idoia Labayen, Azahara I Ruperez, Mahmoud Zaout, Yannis Manios, Jeremy Vanhelst, Ascension Marcos, et al.

► To cite this version:

Jose Castro-Pinero, Kelly R Laurson, Enrique G Artero, Francisco B Ortega, Idoia Labayen, et al.. Muscle strength field-based tests to identify European adolescents at risk of metabolic syndrome: The HELENA study.. Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 2019, 10.1016/j.jsams.2019.04.008 . hal-02433722

HAL Id: hal-02433722

<https://hal.univ-lille.fr/hal-02433722>

Submitted on 3 May 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Muscle strength field-based tests to identify European adolescents at risk of metabolic syndrome: The HELENA study

José Castro-Piñero^{a*}, Kelly R. Laurson^b, Enrique G. Artero^c, Francisco B Ortega^{d,e}, Idoia Labayen^f, Azahara I. Ruperez^g, Mahmoud Zaqout^h, Yannis Maniosⁱ, Jeremy Vanhelst^j, Ascension Marcos^k, Angela Polito^l, Marcela Gonzalez-Gross^m, Kurt Widhalmⁿ, Luis A Moreno^g, Angel Gutierrez ^o, Jonatan R Ruiz^{d,e}.

Affiliation:

^aDepartment of Physical Education, Faculty of Education Sciences, University of Cádiz, Puerto Real, Spain.

^bSchool of Kinesiology and Recreation, Illinois State University.

^cSPORT Research Group (CTS-1024), University of Almería, Almería, Spain.

^d PROMoting FITness and Health through Physical Activity Research Group (PROFITH), Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of Granada, Granada, Spain.

^eDepartment of Biosciences and Nutrition at NOVUM, Karolinska Institutet, Huddinge, Sweden.

^fDepartment of Health Sciences, Public University of Navarra, Pamplona, Spain.

^gGENUD (Growth, Exercise, NUtrition and Development) Research Group, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Instituto Agroalimentario de Aragón (IA2), Universidad de Zaragoza, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Aragón (IIS Aragón) and Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y Nutrición (CIBERObn), Spain.

^h Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.

ⁱ Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Harokopio University, Athens, Greece.

^j Univ. Lille, Inserm, CHU Lille, U995 - LIRIC - Lille Inflammation Research International Center, CIC 1403 - Centre d'investigation clinique, F-59000, Lille, France.

^k Immunonutrition Research Group, Department of Metabolism and Nutrition, Instituto del Frio, Institute of Food Science, Technology and Nutrition, Spanish National Research Council, Madrid Spain.

^l National Institute for Food and Nutrition Research, Rome, Italy.

^m ImFine Research Group. Facultad de Ciencias de la Actividad Física y del Deporte-INEF, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, and CIBER: CB12/03/30038 Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y la Nutrición, CIBERobn, Instituto de Salud Carlos III (ISCIII), Spain.

ⁿ Department of Pediatrics, Division of Clinical Nutrition, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.

^o Department of Medical Physiology, School of Medicine, University of Granada, Spain

Corresponding author:

José Castro-Piñero, Department of Physical Education, School of Education, University of Cádiz, 11519, Puerto Real, Spain, jose.castro@uca.es, telephone: +34 607704404.

Word count: 3578

Abstract word count: 233

Number of Table: 3

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Objectives:** To determine whether handgrip strength (HG) and/or standing long jump (SLJ) are
3 capable of detecting risk of metabolic syndrome (MetS) in European adolescents, and to identify
4 age- and sex-specific cut points for these tests.

5 **Design:** Cross-sectional study.

6 **Methods:** Participants included 969 (aged 12.5-17.5 years old) adolescents from 9 European
7 countries ($n=520$ girls). Absolute and relative HG and SLJ tests were used to assess upper and
8 lower muscle strength, respectively. MetS status was determined using the age- and sex-specific
9 cut points proposed by Jolliffe and Janssen's. Additionally, we computed a continuous
10 cardiometabolic risk index with the average z-score of four cardiometabolic risk factors: Waist
11 circumference, mean arterial pressure, triglycerides/high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and
12 fasting insulin.

13 **Results:** The prevalence of MetS was 3.1% in European adolescents. Relative HG and absolute
14 SLJ were the best tests for detecting the presence of MetS (Area under the receiver operating
15 characteristic (AUC)=0.799, 95%CI:0.773-0.824; and AUC =0.695 95%CI:0.665-0.724),
16 respectively) and elevated cardiometabolic risk index (AUC =0.873, 95%CI:0.838-0.902; and
17 AUC =0.728 95%CI:0.698-0.756), respectively) and, regardless of cardiorespiratory fitness. We
18 provide age- and sex-specific cut points of upper and lower muscle strength for European
19 adolescents to identify the presence of MetS and elevated cardiometabolic risk index.

20 **Conclusions:** The proposed health-related cut points could be used as a starting point to define
21 health-related levels of upper and lower muscle strength in adolescents. Likewise, the diagnostic
22 statistics provided herein can be used to offer feedback to adolescents, parents, and education
23 and health professionals about what it means to meet or fail test standards.

24 **Key words:** Muscle fitness. Cardiometabolic risk. Adolescents

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 **1. Introduction**

48 Metabolic syndrome (MetS) has become a major health challenge worldwide with its prevalence
49 increasing in concert with obesity and sedentary lifestyles.¹ MetS is defined as clustering of
50 dichotomous or continuous cardiometabolic risk factors, which includes dyslipidemia
51 (triglycerides and cholesterol), hypertension, glucose intolerance, and total and/or central
52 adiposity.¹ MetS affects both youth and adults and has been associated with cardiovascular
53 disease and type 2 diabetes,² as well as with all-cause mortality in non-diabetic individuals and in
54 adult populations.¹ Given that MetS and many of its features track from childhood into
55 adulthood,² early detection and diagnosis of MetS in youth is necessary to develop effective
56 prevention programs.

57 Both upper and lower body muscle strength levels are considered important markers of
58 cardiometabolic health in children and adolescents.³ Moreover, muscle strength is associated
59 with cardiometabolic risk factors, independently of cardiorespiratory fitness.⁴ The Institute Of
60 Medicine⁵ recommended that a survey of health-related physical fitness in youth should include
61 upper and lower body muscle strength measurements. Furthermore, this Institute called for the
62 need of determining health-related muscle strength cut points for children and adolescents for
63 identifying youth who may benefit from primary and secondary cardiometabolic prevention
64 programming.⁵

65 The Healthy Lifestyle in Europe by Nutrition in Adolescence (HELENA) study is a multicenter,
66 cross-sectional study performed in nine European countries primarily designed to obtain reliable
67 and comparable data on nutrition and health-related parameters of a relatively large sample of
68 European adolescents aged 12.5–17.5.⁶ The HELENA study collected data on upper and lower
69 body muscle strength measured by means of the handgrip strength (HG) and the standing long

70 jump (SLJ) tests. Both tests have been proposed to assess upper and lower body muscle strength
71 levels in European youth.⁷ In addition, the HELENA study also collected data on MetS and other
72 relevant clinical and socio-demographic features in a large sample of European adolescents, thus
73 providing a great opportunity (i) to determine whether the HG and/or SLJ tests are capable of
74 detecting risk of MetS in European adolescents, and (ii) to identify age- and sex-specific cut
75 points for these tests.

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88 **2. Methods**

89 Adolescents volunteered to participate in the HELENA study, a multicenter cross-
90 sectional study on lifestyle and nutrition, conducted in 10 European cities (cluster) from 9
91 European countries (Vienna, Ghent, Lille, Dortmund, Athens, Heraklion, Pécs, Rome, Zaragoza
92 and Stockholm).⁶

93 The HELENA study sample comprised 3,528 adolescents (52% girls) aged 12.5– 17.5
94 years old. Blood sampling was randomly performed in one-third of the recruited adolescents
95 ($n=1,089$). The present study included adolescents who had complete data on body mass index
96 (BMI), muscle strength, cardiorespiratory fitness, and the cardiometabolic risk factors considered
97 in these analyses: waist circumference (WC), diastolic and systolic blood pressure, triglycerides
98 (TG), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL), and fasting glucose and insulin levels. The
99 sample sizes vary by analysis (see all tables), but 1,574 and 1567 boys contributed physical
100 fitness data on HG and SLJ, respectively, and 1,718 and 1702 girls contributed physical fitness
101 data on HG and SLJ, respectively, whereas 449 boys and 520 girls also had blood data for the
102 analyses.⁸

103 The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committees of each study site, and was
104 performed following the ethical guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki 1964 (revision of
105 Edinburgh 2000). A written informed consent was obtained from the parents of the adolescents
106 and the adolescents themselves.

107 *Body mass index*

108 Body mass was measured in underwear without shoes using an electronic scale (Type
109 SECA 861, Hamburg, Germany) to the nearest 0.1 kg. Stature was measured barefoot to the
110 nearest 0.1 cm using the Frankfort horizontal plane and a stadiometer (Type SECA 225,

111 Hamburg, Germany). BMI was calculated as body mass (kg) / stature (m)². The International
112 Obesity Task Force BMI standards were used to categorize children as normal weight or
113 overweight/obese.⁹

114 *Physical Fitness*

115 Upper and lower body muscle strength levels were measured by the HG and the SLJ tests,⁷
116 respectively. Both test are valid¹⁰, reliable¹¹, feasible and safe¹² to be used both at population
117 level and in the school-setting.⁷ A hand dynamometer with an adjustable grip (TKK 5101 Grip
118 D, Takey, Tokyo, Japan) was used for the HG test. The adolescent squeezed the dynamometer
119 continuously for at least 2 seconds, alternatively with right and left hands, with the elbow in full
120 extension. The grip-span of the dynamometer was adjusted according to the hand size of the
121 adolescent. The test was performed twice, allowing a 1-minute rest between the measurements to
122 avoid local muscle fatigue, and the maximum score for each hand was recorded in kilograms as
123 described elsewhere.¹³ The average of the scores achieved by the left and right hands was used in
124 the analyses to have an overall measure of the handgrip strength.¹³ The SLJ was performed from
125 a starting position immediately behind a line, standing with feet approximately shoulder's width
126 apart, and the adolescent jumped as far forward as possible, landing with their feet together. The
127 test was performed twice, with 1-minute rest between the measurements, and the longest distance
128 achieved was recorded in centimeters. Before conducting the tests, adolescents had a
129 familiarization trial. Nevertheless, as these tests are commonly used in the school setting to
130 measure fitness performance, adolescents were rather familiarized. We converted HG and SLJ to
131 relative scores by expressing HG as strength divided by body mass [strength (kg) / body mass
132 (kg)] and expressing SLJ as jump distance multiplied by body mass [jump distance (cm) x body
133 mass (kg)].

134 In order to determine the potential influence of cardiorespiratory fitness (a well-known important
135 marker of health in adolescents³ on the association of HG and/or SLJ with the risk of MetS, we
136 decided to control the analysis by this variable. We assessed cardiorespiratory fitness by the 20
137 m shuttle run test and the maximum oxygen consumption (VO_{2max} , ml/kg/min) by the equation
138 reported by Léger et al.¹⁴ Each adolescent was grouped into a cardiorespiratory fitness status
139 (low or high) according to the FITNESSGRAM standards Healthy Fitness Zone as follows: low
140 corresponds to the “needs improvement” category, and high correspond to the “healthy fitness
141 zone”.¹⁵ All these fitness tests have shown to be valid and reliable in children and adolescents.<sup>10,
142 11</sup>

143 *Cardiometabolic risk factors*

144 Waist circumference was measured in triplicate using an anthropometric tape (SECA 200) as the
145 midpoint between the lowest rib and the iliac crest.¹⁶ Diastolic and systolic blood pressure were
146 measured after being seated in a quiet room for 10 min with their back supported and feet on the
147 ground. Two diastolic and systolic blood pressure readings were taken with a 10-min interval of
148 quiet rest. The lower value of the two measurements was used in the analysis. We calculated the
149 mean arterial pressure as [diastolic blood pressure + (0.333 x (systolic blood pressure - diastolic
150 blood pressure))]. A detailed description of the blood samples’ analysis has been reported
151 elsewhere.¹⁷ Venous blood was obtained by venipuncture after an overnight fast. Serum TG,
152 HDL, and fasting glucose were measured on a Dimension RxL clinical chemistry system (Dade
153 Behring, Schwalbach, Germany) using enzymatic methods. Fasting insulin concentrations were
154 measured by a solid-phase two-site chemiluminescent immunometric assay, using an Immulite
155 2000 analyzer (DPC Biermann GmbH, Bad Nauheim, Germany).

156 MetS status was also determined using WC, diastolic and systolic blood pressure, TG,
157 HDL, and fasting glucose with the definition by Jolliffe and Janssen reported in 2007.¹⁸ This
158 pediatric definition was created using growth curves to back-extrapolate the National Cholesterol
159 Education Program/Adult Treatment Panel II adult values for adolescents. The participants were
160 considered as having an individual elevated cardiometabolic risk factor if they had a high WC,
161 either systolic or diastolic blood pressure, TG, HDL, or fasting glucose. Adolescents with 3 or
162 more elevated cardiometabolic risk factors were considered as having MetS.

163 Additionally, all cardiometabolic risk factors were expressed as age- and sex-specific z-
164 scores based on the current sample to account for changes during growth and maturation.
165 Further, a continuous cardiometabolic risk index was computed as the average z-score of four
166 cardiometabolic risk factors (WC, mean arterial pressure, TG/HDL ratio, and fasting insulin).
167 The adolescents were categorized as having elevated cardiometabolic risk if their
168 cardiometabolic risk index was one standard deviation above the mean for each of the four
169 markers. This cardiometabolic risk index methodology has been previously validated in children
170 and adolescents.¹⁹

171 The descriptive data are shown as mean and standard deviation unless otherwise
172 indicated, and the sexes were compared with independent samples t-tests and chi-square tests of
173 independence. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses were completed for all four
174 muscle strength parameters: absolute HG, relative HG (HG / body mass), absolute SLJ, and
175 relative SLJ (SLJ x body mass). The Least Mean Square (LMS) method²⁰ was used to create age-
176 and sex-specific z-scores and were used in the main analysis.

177 In the current study, we constructed ROC curves to detect MetS and elevated
178 cardiometabolic risk index from the four muscle strength parameters. The resulting ROC curves

179 and data provide several key variables that aid in identifying appropriate thresholds, such as: area
180 under the ROC curve (*AUC*), sensitivity, specificity, Youden Index (i.e. the sum of sensitivity
181 and specificity minus one, and is the most commonly used indicator of an ideal cut point on the
182 ROC curve), positive predictive value (*PPV*), negative predictive value (*NPV*), and the
183 diagnostic odds ratio (*OR*).²¹ In terms of this analysis, *AUC* is a test of global discriminatory
184 accuracy indicating how well the muscle strength z-score can differentiate between MetS vs. no-
185 MetS and elevated vs. low cardiometabolic risk index.

186 The ROC curves were initially constructed separately by sex, and then for the total
187 sample to identify the impact of combining both sexes. After creating the curves, the four tests of
188 muscle strength were compared to identify the best tests/metrics to use for the intended purpose:
189 whether absolute or relative HG, and absolute or relative SLJ. Pairwise comparisons of the *AUC*
190 values were made using the methods outlined by Hanley and McNeil.²² Then, to select the ideal
191 cut points for each of the four tests, we primarily made decisions based on the Youden Index, but
192 we also gave consideration to the *PPV*, *NPV*, and diagnostic *OR* for each threshold. After
193 selecting the ideal cut points, to determine how the predictive utility of the thresholds would be
194 impacted by cardiorespiratory fitness, we used logistic regression to estimate the odds of MetS
195 and elevated cardiometabolic risk index in youth with muscle strength cut points (low vs. high
196 levels) in two models: unadjusted or adjusted for cardiorespiratory fitness status. The LMS
197 percentile curves and ROC curves were constructed using LMS ChartMaker Pro (version 2.3).
198 All other analyses were done using IBM SPSS (version 20.0). The alpha level for all analyses
199 was set at $p \leq 0.05$.

200

201

202 **3. Results**

203 Boys had higher levels of absolute and relative upper and lower body muscle strength
204 than girls (all $p < 0.05$), as well as higher WC, systolic blood pressure, mean arterial pressure,
205 and fasting glucose (all $p < 0.05$). However, girls had higher levels of TG and HDL than boys
206 (both $p < 0.05$). The prevalence of MetS as well as the elevated cardiometabolic risk index was
207 similar in boys and girls (**Table S1**).

208 **Table S2** shows the *AUC* and pairwise comparisons of the four muscle strength
209 parameters calculated. All *AUCs*, except for absolute HG to predict MetS in girls, were
210 significantly different from a non-informative test (all $p < 0.05$), indicating that any of the four
211 parameters could be used to differentiate between those with MetS and with elevated
212 cardiometabolic risk index. The *AUC* values were higher for boys than for girls, and the *AUC* for
213 specific curves ranged from moderately accurate (0.873 for boys' relative HG) to less accurate
214 (0.539 for girls' absolute HG). For both boys and girls, the relative HG was a significantly better
215 indicator of MetS, and the elevated cardiometabolic risk index (i.e., ≥ 1 z-score) than absolute
216 HG. Furthermore, there was no difference in the *AUC* between absolute and relative SLJ. In
217 general, the more informative iterations of the muscle strength parameters were relative HG and
218 absolute SLJ.

219 The selected thresholds for each muscle strength test to identify an elevated
220 cardiometabolic risk index are shown in **Table 1**. Each cut point selected as 'ideal' had the
221 highest Youden Index of the potential thresholds, except girls' absolute SLJ. For girls' absolute
222 SLJ, the highest Youden Index was found at a -0.0183 z-score (approximately the 49th
223 percentile). However, the 5th highest Youden Index (z-score = -0.846) had a higher specificity,

224 *PPV*, and diagnostic *OR*. Because it afforded these advantages and was still within the top 1% of
225 Youden Index scores it was selected instead.

226 **Table 2** depicts the selected thresholds for each muscle strength test to identify MetS.
227 Each ‘ideal’ cut point had the highest Youden Index available except two boys’ thresholds,
228 relative HG and absolute SLJ. For both, the cut point with the highest Youden Index was
229 relatively unbalanced, a very low specificity for relative HG (z-score = -0.4847) and a high
230 specificity for absolute SLJ (z-score = -1.5557). The relative HG and absolute SLJ cut points
231 selected for boys where those with the higher sensitivities, specificities, *PPV*, *NPV*, and odds
232 ratios (z-score = -1.127 and -0.890, respectively). Moreover, Youden Index scores were near the
233 top of the possible cut points. The diagnostic *ORs* were higher for boys than girls. It should be
234 noted that the cut points for absolute HG and relative SLJ are reversed from what would be
235 considered intuitive. Higher absolute HG and relative SLJ scores were more indicative of greater
236 odds of having MetS or an elevated cardiometabolic risk index.

237 **Table 3** outlines the selected age- and sex-specific scores for relative HG and absolute
238 SLJ for boys and girls derived in the current study. These approximate the 25th and 20th
239 percentiles using the LMS parameters for relative HG and absolute SLJ, respectively. These final
240 cut points are based on the ‘ideal’ cut points for boys and girls from **Tables 2 and 3**, where the
241 relative HG cut points for boys and girls were the 25.1th and 26.7th percentiles, and the absolute
242 SLJ cut points were the 21.5th and 21.3rd.

243 Adolescents with low relative HG scores were more likely to have MetS and elevated
244 cardiometabolic risk index (*OR*: 6.2, 95% *CI*: 2.9-13.4; and *OR*: 8.5, 95% *CI*: 5.0-14.7,
245 respectively) than those with scores at or above the determined cut points. Likewise, boys and
246 girls with low absolute SLJ scores were more likely to have MetS and elevated cardiometabolic

247 risk index (*OR*: 4.5, 95% *CI*: 2.3-9.4; and *OR*: 5.8, 95% *CI*: 3.5-9.6; respectively) than those with
248 scores at or above the determined cut points. However, these *ORs* were attenuated, but were still
249 statistically significant when adjusting for cardiorespiratory fitness status, for both relative HG
250 (*OR*: 5.2, 95% *CI*: 2.4-11.5 for MetS; and *OR*: 7.3, 95% *CI*: 4.2-12.7 for cardiometabolic risk
251 index) and absolute SLJ (*OR*: 3.6 95% *CI*: 1.7-7.7 for MetS; and *OR*: 4.7, 95% *CI*: 2.8-7.9 for
252 cardiometabolic risk index).

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267 4. Discussion

268 The aim of the present study was to determine whether HG and/or SLJ are capable of
269 detecting risk of MetS in European adolescents, and to identify age- and sex-specific cut points
270 for these tests. The main findings were that (1) the prevalence of MetS and elevated
271 cardiometabolic risk index was 3.1 and 7.2% in European adolescents from 9 countries,
272 respectively; (2) relative HG and absolute SLJ were the best muscle strength tests for detecting
273 MetS and elevated cardiometabolic risk; (3) the identified muscle strength for detecting MetS
274 and elevated cardiometabolic risk index were identical, which further reinforce the existence of a
275 muscle threshold associated with cardiovascular health in youth; (4) age- and sex-specific health-
276 related cut points were provided for European adolescents in order identify MetS and elevated
277 cardiometabolic risk, which seems to be more discriminative for boys than for girls. This is the
278 first study that establishes age- and sex-related health-related upper and lower muscle strength in
279 adolescents.

280 The prevalence of MetS in children and adolescents varied between 0% and 60%,
281 depending on the definition of MetS and the population examined.²³ For the pediatric population,
282 there is a lack of a uniform definition. Many different MetS criteria have been applied in
283 adolescents, and the components and cut points used to diagnose the MetS have varied
284 considerably among studies.^{18, 24} Several studies have used modified criteria based on the same
285 concept in adults, according to Program/Adult Treatment Panel III²⁵ and the International
286 Diabetes Federation.¹ These definitions are based on dichotomization of the cardiometabolic risk
287 factors, and to be clinically diagnosed with MetS at least three cardiometabolic risk factors must
288 be achieved, including obesity. However, other studies have established clustering of
289 cardiometabolic risk factors, using continuous scores. Recently, Andersen et al.²⁴ showed that

290 more children and adolescents had clustering of cardiometabolic risk factors (6.2% had 4 or
291 more cardiometabolic risk factors) than the number fulfilling the **International Diabetes**
292 **Federation** definition of MetS (less than 1%) for children and adolescents. In the present study,
293 we included both methods, MetS and cardiometabolic risk index. For the dichotomous method,
294 we used the model developed by Joliffe and Janssen,¹⁸ who created age-specific cut points and
295 MetS criteria for adolescents that were linked to the health-based **Program/Adult Treatment**
296 **Panel III** and **International Diabetes Federation** adult criteria. For the continuous method, we
297 chose the valid model by Martínez-Vizcaino et al.¹⁹ who used confirmatory factor analysis
298 comparing with other continuous methods. We observed that 3.1% had MetS and 7.2% European
299 adolescents had elevated cardiometabolic risk index, which concurs with the figures reported by
300 Andersen et al.²⁴

301 The present study examined whether either HG or SLJ tests were capable of detecting
302 elevated MetS and elevated cardiometabolic risk index in European adolescents. We selected the
303 relative HG and absolute SLJ because the *AUC* value was higher for relative HG than for
304 absolute HG. Moreover, although there was no difference in the *AUC* values between absolute
305 and relative SLJ, the other discriminatory parameters showed that absolute SLJ identified
306 thresholds to diagnose MetS and elevated cardiometabolic risk more accurately. Moreover, we
307 excluded absolute HG and relative SLJ thresholds from any further analyses because we found
308 positive associations with MetS and elevated cardiometabolic risk. If implemented (as part of a
309 fitness testing program), adolescents with higher absolute HG or higher relative SLJ scores
310 would actually be grouped in the ‘unhealthy zones’. It must be noted that heavier individuals
311 have higher levels of absolute HG and relative SLJ, and the prevalence of MetS is higher in
312 obese as opposed to normal weight children and adolescents, increasing with severity of

313 obesity.²⁶ In addition, regarding the validity of the muscle strength tests, it is assumed that only
314 non-weight-bearing fitness tests should be normalized by body mass.²⁷

315 We reported age- and sex-specific relative HG and absolute SLJ cut points selected as the
316 most accurate to detect MetS, and elevated cardiometabolic risk index in a relatively large
317 sample of European adolescents. Ramirez-Velez et al.²⁸ developed age group-sex-specific cut
318 points of relative HG for optimal cardiometabolic risk categorization in children (9-12.9 years
319 old) and adolescents (13-17.9 years old) from Bogota (Colombia). In adolescent boys, the cut
320 point reported by Ramirez-Velez et al. (0.447 kg/body mass) was similar to the one we
321 established for 13-year-old adolescent boys. However, in girls, the cut point reported by
322 Ramirez-Velez et al. (0.440 kg/body mass) was slightly higher than the ones we calculated for
323 our European girls. Moreover, Peterson et al.²⁹ reported a high-risk cardiometabolic threshold for
324 boys (≤ 0.33 kg/body mass) and girls (≤ 0.28 kg/body mass), an intermediate threshold (boys, $>$
325 0.33 and ≤ 0.45 kg/body mass; girls, > 0.28 and ≤ 0.36 kg/body mass), as well as a low-risk
326 threshold for boys (> 0.45 kg/body mass) and girls (> 0.36 kg/body mass) in American
327 adolescents. It is important to note that although the dichotomous (MetS) and continuous method
328 (cardiometabolic risk index) used in this study showed different prevalence, both methods
329 developed identical muscle strength cut points in the diagnosis. Moreover, these age- and sex-
330 specific health-related cut points represented the percentile 25th and the 20th for relative HG and
331 absolute SLJ. Boys and girls with relative HG or/and absolute SLJ scores below these percentiles
332 had greater odds for MetS and elevated cardiometabolic risk index compared with those reaching
333 the adequate percentiles, independently of cardiorespiratory fitness status. This finding reinforces
334 the idea that an increased cardiometabolic risk is associated with the lowest quartile-quintile of
335 muscle strength in adolescents.³⁰

336 The **Assessing Levels of PHysical Activity** study developed a valid, reliable, feasible, and
337 safe health-related fitness test battery for children and adolescents.⁷ This study included, besides
338 the HG test, the SLJ test to assess skeletal muscle strength. It is also important to highlight that
339 both the HG and SLJ tests are the most used to assess muscle strength in children and
340 adolescents. In fact, these tests are included in a number of field-based fitness test **batteries**.¹⁰

341 The observations of the present study are limited by the cross-sectional design nature, and
342 causality cannot be determined. Also, there is a lack of consensus in youth regarding the
343 definition of MetS. We decided to include both dichotomous and continuous methods so that the
344 health-related cut points developed were the most accurate, regardless of the chosen method.
345 Using one method or another could bias the results of the study, given the limitations of each
346 method. However, in the present study, the resulting health-related cut points were the same for
347 each model. Advantages of this study are the proper statistical analysis used (i.e. LMS method
348 and ROC analysis) and the relative large sample of European adolescents, which allow providing
349 age- and sex-specific health-related cut points of upper and lower body muscle strength. **It**
350 **should be noted that although ROC analyses are often used to create diagnostic tests, the first**
351 **aim of the current study was to identify thresholds that demarcate inadequate/adequate strength**
352 **relative to cardiometabolic risk factors rather than suggest that strength tests can be used to**
353 **'diagnose' MetS.**

354

355 **5. Conclusions**

356 Relative HG and absolute SLJ were the best tests for detecting MetS in European adolescents.
357 Moreover, relative HG appears to be a slightly better test than absolute SLJ to this end. Age- and
358 sex-specific health-related cut points of upper and lower body muscle strength are provided for

359 European adolescents, which were still predictive of cardiometabolic risk after adjusting for
360 **cardiorespiratory fitness**. These health-related cut points could be used as a starting point to
361 define adequate levels of upper and lower muscle strength, and the diagnostic statistics provided
362 herein can be used to offer feedback to adolescents, parents, and education and health
363 professionals about what it means to meet or fail the test standards.
364

365 **6. Practical implications**

- 366 • The present study identifies age- and sex-related health-related upper and lower muscle
367 strength associated with risk of metabolic syndrome in European adolescents.
- 368 • Risk of metabolic syndrome is associated with the lowest quartile-quintile of muscle
369 strength in adolescents.
- 370 • These health-related cut points might be used as a screening tool to identify
371 adolescents with risk of metabolic syndrome who may benefit from primary and
372 secondary cardiovascular prevention programming.

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388 **REFERENCES**

- 389 1. Eckel RH, Grundy SM, Zimmet PZ. The metabolic syndrome. *Lancet* 2005;
390 365(9468):1415-1428.
- 391 2. Magnussen CG, Koskinen J, Chen W et al. Pediatric metabolic syndrome predicts
392 adulthood metabolic syndrome, subclinical atherosclerosis, and type 2 diabetes mellitus
393 but is no better than body mass index alone: the Bogalusa Heart Study and the
394 Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns Study. *Circulation* 2010; 122(16):1604-1611.
- 395 3. Ruiz JR, Castro-Pinero J, Artero EG et al. Predictive validity of health-related fitness in
396 youth: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2009; 43(12):909-923.
- 397 4. Smith JJ, Eather N, Morgan PJ et al. The health benefits of muscular fitness for children
398 and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med (Auckland, N.Z.)*
399 2014; 44(9):1209-1223.
- 400 5. Institute of Medicine (IOM). *Fitness measures and health outcomes in youth*,
401 Washington, DC, The national academies press, 2012.
- 402 6. Moreno LA, De Henauw S, Gonzalez-Gross M et al. Design and implementation of the
403 Healthy Lifestyle in Europe by Nutrition in Adolescence Cross-Sectional Study. *Int J*
404 *Obes (Lond)* 2008; 32 Suppl 5:S4-11.
- 405 7. Ruiz JR, Castro-Pinero J, Espana-Romero V et al. Field-based fitness assessment in
406 young people: the ALPHA health-related fitness test battery for children and adolescents.
407 *Br J Sports Med* 2011; 45(6):518-524.
- 408 8. Ortega FB, Artero EG, Ruiz JR et al. Physical fitness levels among European
409 adolescents: the HELENA study. *Br J Sports Med* 2011; 45(1):20-29.

- 410 9. Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM et al. Establishing a standard definition for child
411 overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. *BMJ* 2000; 320(7244):1240-
412 1243.
- 413 10. Castro-Pinero J, Artero EG, Espana-Romero V et al. Criterion-related validity of field-
414 based fitness tests in youth: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* 2009; 44(13):934-943.
- 415 11. Artero EG, Espana-Romero V, Castro-Pinero J et al. Reliability of field-based fitness
416 tests in youth. *Int J Sports Med* 2011; 32(3):159-169.
- 417 12. Espana-Romero V, Artero EG, Jimenez-Pavon D et al. Assessing health-related fitness
418 tests in the school setting: reliability, feasibility and safety; the ALPHA Study. *Int J*
419 *Sports Med* 2010; 31(7):490-497.
- 420 13. Ruiz JR, Espana-Romero V, Ortega FB et al. Hand span influences optimal grip span in
421 male and female teenagers. *J Hand Surg* 2006; 31(8):1367-1372.
- 422 14. Leger LA, Mercier D, Gadoury C et al. The multistage 20 metre shuttle run test for
423 aerobic fitness. *J Sports Sci* 1988; 6(2):93-101.
- 424 15. Cureton KJ, Plowman SA, Mahar MT. Aerobic capacity assessments, in
425 *Fitnessgram/Activitygram Reference Guide*. Plowman SA, Meredith MD, eds. 4th ed.
426 Dallas, TX, The Cooper Institute, 2013.
- 427 16. Nagy E, Vicente-Rodriguez G, Manios Y et al. Harmonization process and reliability
428 assessment of anthropometric measurements in a multicenter study in adolescents. *Int J*
429 *Obes (Lond)* 2008; 32 Suppl 5:S58-65.
- 430 17. Gonzalez-Gross M, Breidenassel C, Gomez-Martinez S et al. Sampling and processing of
431 fresh blood samples within a European multicenter nutritional study: evaluation of

- 432 biomarker stability during transport and storage. *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2008; 32 Suppl 5:S66-
433 75.
- 434 18. Jolliffe CJ, Janssen I. Development of age-specific adolescent metabolic syndrome
435 criteria that are linked to the Adult Treatment Panel III and International Diabetes
436 Federation criteria. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2007; 49(8):891-898.
- 437 19. Martinez-Vizcaino V, Ortega FB, Solera-Martinez M et al. Stability of the factorial
438 structure of metabolic syndrome from childhood to adolescence: a 6-year follow-up
439 study. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2011; 10:81.
- 440 20. Cole TJ, Green PJ. Smoothing reference centile curves: the LMS method and penalized
441 likelihood. *Stat Med* 1992; 11(10):1305-1319.
- 442 21. Kelly MJ, Dunstan FD, Lloyd K et al. Evaluating cutpoints for the MHI-5 and MCS
443 using the GHQ-12: a comparison of five different methods. *BMC Psychiatry* 2008; 8:10.
- 444 22. Hanley JA, McNeil BJ. A method of comparing the areas under receiver operating
445 characteristic curves derived from the same cases. *Radiology* 1983; 148(3):839-843.
- 446 23. Huang TT, Ball GD, Franks PW. Metabolic syndrome in youth: current issues and
447 challenges. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2007; 32(1):13-22.
- 448 24. Andersen LB, Lauersen JB, Brond JC et al. A new approach to define and diagnose
449 cardiometabolic disorder in children. *J Diabetes Res* 2015; 2015:539835.
- 450 25. Grundy SM, Brewer HB, Jr., Cleeman JI et al. Definition of metabolic syndrome: Report
451 of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute/American Heart Association conference
452 on scientific issues related to definition. *Circulation* 2004; 109(3):433-438.

- 453 26. Calcaterra V, Klersy C, Muratori T et al. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome (MS) in
454 children and adolescents with varying degrees of obesity. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)* 2008;
455 68(6):868-872.
- 456 27. Fernandez Santos JR, Ruiz JR, Gonzalez-Montesinos JL et al. Reliability and Validity of
457 Field-Based Tests to Assess Upper-Body Muscular Strength in Children Aged 6-12
458 Years. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2016; 28(2):331-340.
- 459 28. Ramirez-Velez R, Pena-Ibagon JC, Martinez-Torres J et al. Handgrip strength cutoff for
460 cardiometabolic risk index among Colombian children and adolescents: The FUPRECOL
461 Study. *Sci Rep* 2017; 7:42622.
- 462 29. Peterson MD, Zhang P, Saltarelli WA et al. Low Muscle Strength Thresholds for the
463 Detection of Cardiometabolic Risk in Adolescents. *Am J Prev Med* 2016; 50(5):593-599.
- 464 30. Artero EG, Ruiz JR, Ortega FB et al. Muscular and cardiorespiratory fitness are
465 independently associated with metabolic risk in adolescents: the HELENA study. *Pediatr*
466 *Diabetes* 2011; 12(8):704-712.

Acknowledgements

We thank the adolescents who participated in the study and their parents and teachers for their collaboration. We also acknowledge the members involved in fieldwork for their efforts and the HELENA study group. The HELENA project was supported by the European Community Sixth RTD Framework Programme (contract FOOD-CT-2005-007034). The data for this study was gathered under the aegis of the HELENA project, and further analysis was additionally supported by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (grants RYC-201416390), the Spanish Ministry of Health: Maternal, Child Health and Development Network (grant RD16/0022), the Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (MICINN-FEDER) and by the University of Granada, Plan Propio de Investigación 2016, Excellence actions: Units of Excellence; Unit of Excellence on Exercise and Health (UCEES). *The funders* of the HELENA project had no role in study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation, writing of the report, or in the decision to submit the paper for publication. The content of this paper reflects the authors' views alone, and the European Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

Table 1. ROC-derived cut points and diagnostic statistics for tests of muscle strength to determine elevated cardiometabolic risk index in boys and girls.

| Test | Cut point Z-score | Cut point Percentile | Sensitivity (%) | Specificity (%) | Youden Index | PPV | NPV | DOR |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------|------|------|
| <i>Boys (n = 444)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Handgrip (kg) | > 0.143 | > 55.7 | 66.7 | 59.9 | 0.27 | 10.8 | 96.1 | 3.0 |
| Rel. Handgrip (kg/mass kg) | ≤ -0.728 | ≤ 23.3 | 80.0 | 79.7 | 0.60 | 22.2 | 98.2 | 15.8 |
| Standing Long Jump (cm) | ≤ -0.790 | ≤ 21.5 | 73.3 | 80.7 | 0.54 | 21.6 | 97.7 | 11.5 |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | > 0.156 | > 56.2 | 70.0 | 62.1 | 0.32 | 11.8 | 96.6 | 3.9 |
| <i>Girls (n = 506)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Handgrip (kg) | > -0.287 | > 38.7 | 84.2 | 40.8 | 0.25 | 10.4 | 97.0 | 3.6 |
| Rel. Handgrip (kg/mass kg) | ≤ -0.672 | ≤ 25.1 | 65.8 | 78.0 | 0.44 | 19.5 | 96.6 | 6.8 |
| Standing Long Jump (cm) | ≤ -0.846 | ≤ 19.9 | 44.7 | 83.1 | 0.28 | 17.7 | 94.9 | 4.0 |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | > 0.623 | > 73.5 | 57.9 | 79.5 | 0.37 | 18.6 | 95.9 | 5.3 |
| <i>Boys and Girls (n = 950)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Handgrip (kg) | > -0.227 | > 41.0 | 79.4 | 44.1 | 0.24 | 9.9 | 96.5 | 3.0 |
| Rel. Handgrip (kg/mass kg) | ≤ -0.672 | ≤ 25.1 | 72.1 | 78.1 | 0.50 | 20.2 | 97.3 | 9.1 |
| Standing Long Jump (cm) | ≤ -0.790 | ≤ 21.5 | 58.8 | 80.5 | 0.39 | 18.9 | 96.2 | 5.9 |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | > 0.623 | > 73.5 | 54.4 | 79.0 | 0.33 | 16.7 | 95.7 | 4.7 |

Rel., relative (test expressed by body mass); PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value; DOR, diagnostic odds ratio.

Cardiometabolic Risk Index Status defined by mean of age- and sex-specific z-scores for waist, TG/HDL ratio (triglycerides /high-density lipoprotein cholesterol), fasting insulin, mean arterial pressure (≥ 1.0) proposed by Martinez-Vizcaino et al.¹⁹

Table 2. ROC-derived cut points and diagnostic statistics for tests of muscle strength to determine metabolic syndrome in boys and girls.

| Test | Cut point Z-score | Cut point Percentile | Sensitivity (%) | Specificity (%) | Youden Index | PPV | NPV | DOR |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------|------|------|
| <i>Boys (n = 449)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Handgrip (kg) | > -0.129 | > 44.9 | 72.7 | 49.1 | 0.22 | 3.5 | 98.6 | 2.6 |
| Rel. Handgrip (kg/mass kg) | ≤ -1.127 | ≤ 13.0 | 72.7 | 87.7 | 0.60 | 12.9 | 99.2 | 19.0 |
| Standing Long Jump | ≤ -0.890 | ≤ 18.7 | 63.6 | 80.8 | 0.44 | 7.7 | 98.9 | 7.4 |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | > 0.156 | > 56.2 | 72.7 | 61.2 | 0.34 | 4.5 | 98.9 | 4.2 |
| <i>Girls (n = 520)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Handgrip (kg) | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Rel. Handgrip (kg/mass kg) | ≤ -0.713 | ≤ 23.8 | 63.2 | 76.9 | 0.40 | 9.4 | 98.2 | 5.7 |
| Standing Long Jump (cm) | ≤ -0.797 | ≤ 21.3 | 57.9 | 78.7 | 0.37 | 9.3 | 98.0 | 5.0 |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | > 0.627 | > 73.5 | 68.4 | 78.4 | 0.47 | 10.7 | 98.5 | 7.9 |
| <i>Boys and Girls (n = 969)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Handgrip (kg) | > -0.834 | > 20.2 | 96.7 | 23.2 | 0.20 | 3.9 | 99.5 | 9.0 |
| Rel. Handgrip (kg/mass kg) | ≤ -0.622 | ≤ 26.7 | 70.0 | 73.7 | 0.44 | 7.8 | 98.7 | 6.5 |
| Standing Long Jump (cm) | ≤ -0.797 | ≤ 21.3 | 60.0 | 78.6 | 0.39 | 8.2 | 98.4 | 5.5 |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | > 0.627 | > 73.5 | 56.7 | 77.9 | 0.35 | 7.6 | 98.3 | 4.6 |

Rel., relative (test expressed by body mass); PPV, positive predictive value; NPV, negative predictive value; DOR, diagnostic odds ratio.

Metabolic Syndrome Status defined by Jolliffe and Janssen.²⁴

Table 3. Recommended age- and sex-specific cut points to detect elevated cardiometabolic risk index and metabolic syndrome using upper and lower body muscle strength tests.

| Test Age/Sex | Relative Grip Strength (kg/kg mass) | | Standing Long Jump (cm) | |
|-----------------|--|-------|----------------------------|-------|
| | Boys | Girls | Boys | Girls |
| 13 years old | 0.44 | 0.41 | 135.4 | 118.1 |
| 14 years old | 0.48 | 0.41 | 151.5 | 121.8 |
| 15 years old | 0.52 | 0.41 | 165.4 | 123.0 |
| 16 years old | 0.56 | 0.42 | 175.9 | 126.0 |
| 17 years old | 0.59 | 0.42 | 184.2 | 129.5 |
| Z-score | ≤ -0.675 | | ≤ -0.842 | |
| Percentile | ≤ 25.0 | | ≤ 20.0 | |

Youth at or below the values would be considered as having ‘poor’ muscle strength based on the relevant test. 13 years old = 12.5 to 13.49 years old, 14 years old = 13.5 to 14.49 years old, etc.

Table S1. Descriptive characteristics of the adolescents participating in the study

| Variable | Boys (n = 444) | Girls (n = 506) | Total (n = 950) |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Age (years) | 14.7 (1.2) | 14.7 (1.2) | 14.7 (1.2) |
| Stature (cm) | 169.3 (9.8)* | 161.7 (7.1) | 165.3 (9.3) |
| Body Mass (kg) | 61.3 (13.7)* | 55.6 (10.2) | 58.3 (12.3) |
| Overweight/Obese (%) | 23.9%* | 18.4% | 20.9% |
| Healthy Cardiorespiratory Fitness (%) | 51.5%* | 38.9% | 44.6% |
| Handgrip Strength (kg) ^A | 35.6 (9.5)* | 25.8 (4.9) | 30.4 (8.9) |
| Rel. Handgrip Strength (kg/mass kg) | 0.59 (0.12)* | 0.47 (0.09) | 0.53 (0.12) |
| Standing Long Jump (cm) | 182.8 (32.6)* | 144.2 (25.4) | 162.3 (34.8) |
| Rel. Standing Long Jump (cm x mass kg) | 11,226 (3,227)* | 7,968 (1,783) | 9,491 (3,033) |
| Waist Circumference (cm) | 74.2 (9.1)* | 70.4 (7.9) | 72.2 (8.7) |
| Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg) | 123.9 (14.0)* | 115.9 (11.4) | 119.7 (13.3) |
| Diastolic Blood Pressure (mmHg) | 67.3 (8.8)* | 68.4 (8.7) | 67.9 (8.8) |
| Mean Arterial Pressure (mmHg) | 86.1 (9.3)* | 84.2 (8.7) | 85.1 (9.0) |
| Triglycerides (mg/dL) | 63.1 (30.8)* | 72.9 (37.6) | 68.3 (34.9) |
| HDL-Cholesterol (mg/dL) | 53.1 (10.0)* | 57.3 (10.9) | 55.3 (10.7) |
| TG/HDL Ratio (mg/dL) | 1.28 (0.82) | 1.36 (0.93) | 1.32 (0.88) |
| Fasting Glucose (mg/dL) | 92.9 (7.3)* | 89.6 (6.7) | 91.2 (7.2) |
| Fasting Insulin (μ IU/mL) | 10.2 (9.2) | 10.4 (6.8) | 10.3 (8.0) |
| Cardiometabolic Risk Index ^B | -0.03 (0.67) | -0.01 (0.63) | -0.01 (0.65) |
| Elevated Cardiometabolic Risk Index ^C | 6.8% | 7.5% | 7.2% |
| Metabolic Syndrome prevalence ^D | 2.4% | 3.7% | 3.1% |

Values are Mean (SD), except percentages in the case of Overweight/Obese, Healthy CRF, **cardiorespiratory fitness**; and Metabolic Syndrome. Rel., relative; TG/HDL, triglyceride-to-high density

lipoprotein-cholesterol ratio.

*Statistically different from girls ($p < 0.05$).

^AAverage of right and left hands. ^BMean of age- and sex-specific z-scores for waist, TG/HDL ratio, fasting insulin, mean arterial pressure. ^CCardiometabolic Risk Index ≥ 1.0 , based on Martinez-Vizcaino.¹⁹ ^DMetabolic Syndrome based on Jolliffe and Janssen.²⁴

Table S2. Pairwise comparisons of ROC area under the curve using muscle strength tests to detect elevated cardiometabolic risk index and metabolic syndrome in boys and girls.

| Muscle Strength Parameter | Elevated Cardiometabolic Risk Index | | Metabolic Syndrome | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| | AUC (95% CI) | Significantly different AUC* | AUC (95% CI) | Significantly different AUC* |
| <i>Boys</i> | <i>n = 444</i> | | <i>n = 449</i> | |
| A) Handgrip | 0.655 (0.609, 0.700) | B, C | 0.564 (0.517, 0.610) | B, C, D |
| B) Relative Handgrip | 0.832 (0.793, 0.865) | A, D | 0.873 (0.838, 0.902) | A, D |
| C) Standing Long Jump | 0.775 (0.733, 0.813) | A | 0.749 (0.706, 0.788) | A |
| D) Relative Standing Long Jump | 0.702 (0.657, 0.744) | B | 0.720 (0.675, 0.761) | A, B |
| <i>Girls</i> | <i>n = 506</i> | | <i>n = 520</i> | |
| A) Handgrip | 0.640 (0.592, 0.681) | B | 0.539 (0.495, 0.582) | B, D |
| B) Relative Handgrip | 0.748 (0.708, 0.785) | A | 0.755 (0.716, 0.792) | A |
| C) Standing Long Jump | 0.688 (0.645, 0.728) | -- | 0.622 (0.620, 0.703) | -- |
| D) Relative Standing Long Jump | 0.697 (0.655, 0.737) | -- | 0.676 (0.634, 0.716) | A |
| <i>Boys and Girls</i> | <i>n = 950</i> | | <i>n = 969</i> | |
| A) Handgrip | 0.647 (0.615, 0.677) | B, C | 0.549 (0.517, 0.581) | B, C, D |
| B) Relative Handgrip | 0.786 (0.758, 0.812) | A | 0.799 (0.773, 0.824) | A, C |
| C) Standing Long Jump | 0.728 (0.698, 0.756) | A | 0.695 (0.665, 0.724) | A, B |
| D) Relative Standing Long Jump | 0.699 (0.668, 0.728) | -- | 0.693 (0.662, 0.721) | A |

AUC = Area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve where muscle strength parameter was used to detect presence/absence of metabolic risk/syndrome.

*AUC significantly different from correspondingly labeled test within column based on Hanley and McNeil ³⁰, $p < 0.05$.

Cardiometabolic Risk Index defined by mean of age- and sex-specific z-scores for waist, TG/HDL ratio, insulin, mean arterial pressure (≥ 1.0) proposed by Martinez-Vizcaino et al. ¹⁹

Metabolic Syndrome defined by Jolliffe and Janssen. ²⁴

Table S3. Logistic regression of elevated cardiometabolic risk index and metabolic syndrome by muscle strength tests.

| Model | Relative Grip Strength | | Standing Long Jump | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Cardiometabolic Risk Index <i>n = 961</i> | Metabolic Syndrome <i>n = 980</i> | Cardiometabolic Risk Index <i>n = 954</i> | Metabolic Syndrome <i>n = 973</i> |
| Model 1 | | | | |
| <i>Unadjusted</i> | 8.5 (5.0, 14.7) | 6.2 (2.9, 13.4) | 5.8 (3.5, 9.6) | 4.5 (2.3, 9.4) |
| Model 2 | | | | |
| <i>Adjusted for aerobic fitness status</i> | 7.3 (4.2, 12.7) | 5.2 (2.4, 11.5) | 4.7 (2.8, 7.9) | 3.6 (1.7, 7.7) |

Values are odds ratio and 95% confidence interval (OR, 95% CI), the meeting recommended muscle strength group was referent (OR = 1.0).