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1. Introduction

The bioimpedance phase angle has been considered as an important predictor of health status in different clinical situations. It is obtained through the relationship between direct measures of resistance (R) and reactance (Xc) from bioelectrical impedance analysis. Low phase-angle values have been associated with cell death or with a change in selective permeability of the membranes, which in turn compromise their integrity. It is known that inflammation, disease, malnutrition, functional disabilities and healthy life stale can result in disturbed electric tissue properties, consequently affecting the phase angle [1–3].

Recently, evidences show that subjects with acute and chronic disease have lower phase-angle values than healthy individuals, which may predict worse health outcomes [4–6], including mortality [7,17]. Therefore, lower phase angle seems to be a prognostic factor predicting mortality in patients with liver cirrhosis [8], with
chronic obstructive pulmonary disease [9], undergoing hemodialysis [10] and with cancer [7].

The phase angle is dependent on the capacitive behavior of tissues associated with cellularity, cell size and integrity of the cell membrane. Therefore, phase-angle reference values are mandatory for the assessment of individual deviations from the population average [11–13]. However, reference values from a large healthy population, with data from the first year of life to the most advanced ages, are lacking. Hence, the aim of this meta-analysis is to estimate phase-angle values for healthy individuals from both sexes and for different ages.

2. Subjects and methods

This systematic review and meta-analysis were performed following the PRISMA guidelines [14], and its protocol was registered in the PROSPERO database as CRD42018063875.

2.1. Eligibility criteria

The inclusion criteria for studies included the following: (i) healthy individuals of any age and sex; (ii) all types of study designs; (iii) any language; and (iv) the study reported mean bioimpedance phase angle separated by sex and age. Case and review studies, case series, experimental models, responses letters, editorials and duplicated publications were excluded. A study was considered as duplicate if it was from the same study group with the same inclusion date and individual characteristics. In case of duplicated studies, the study with the larger sample size was considered.

2.2. Information sources

The following databases, from inception to October 2018, were used to search the literature: MEDLINE (via PUBMED), EMBASE, Cochrane The Cochrane Controlled Trials Register (CCTR) Scientific Electronic Library Online SCIELO, Latin American Caribbean Health Sciences Literature (LILACS via BIREME), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) and Web of Science (Thomson Reuters). The MEDLINE search strategy was created and adapted for the other databases. Additional references were searched by crosschecking bibliographies of retrieved full-text papers. Gray literature was also searched by writing to leading experts in the field and checking reference lists of other systematic reviews. Studies published in any language were included. Detailed information on the search strategy is reported in supplementary material (Table S1).

2.3. Study selection

Two review authors (RM and EM) independently scanned the abstract and title of each study from the search results. All potentially relevant articles were investigated as full texts. In both phases, wherever differences in opinion existed, a third author (MA), who initially did not evaluate the articles, reviewed it to reach a final decision between the three authors. For studies that fulfilled the inclusion criteria, three authors worked on extracting the data. RM did the extraction of all articles and, independently, MA and EM split the whole as a second extractor.

2.4. Data extraction and quality appraisal

The following information for each study was collected: author, year of publication, country and language. The following information from the study population was obtained: age, sex, ethnicity and BMI. Study methods and characteristics included the study design, bioelectrical impedance equipment characteristics, sample size and inclusion exclusion criteria. Primary data were the phase angle and factors that were used to adjust the analyses. Authors were contacted to obtain missing data regarding phase-angle means, standard deviation (or error) and sample size by sex, when necessary. Quality of individual studies was assessed independently by two review authors (RM and EM) according to the National Institute of Health for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies [15]. Publication bias was assessed graphically (Figure S1).

2.5. Statistical analysis

Phase-angle means were pooled using meta-analysis for single-arm studies with random-effects models. Metanalyses were fitted separately for males and females and for each age group (up to 2; 3–5; 6–12; 13–15; 16–18; 19–28; 29–38; 39–48; 49–58; 59–69; 70–80, and >80 years of age). Age groups were defined according to previously described literature [16–18]. The results were presented as pooled means with a 95% confidence interval (CI). The heterogeneity among studies was assessed using the Q-Cochran test and I² statistics. We planned to explore heterogeneity using race as a factor, but this was not performed since the studies did not provide sufficient data. For longitudinal and clinical trials studies that assessed phase angle in more than one moment, the values from the baseline evaluation were the ones considered. The review authors were aware that some issues suitable for sensitivity analysis were only identified during the review process when the individual peculiarities of the studies under investigation were identified. At this phase of our review, we performed a sensitivity analysis to assess the robustness of our analyses by including only the studies with good quality. The meta-analysis was performed using the Meta R package (https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=meta).

3. Results

The search strategy identified 549 articles. From this total, the 122 duplicates and 254 that did not address the research topic were excluded, leaving 427 for assessment of titles and abstracts. At this phase, 254 articles that did not address our research question, 4 that were duplicates and 36 other studies were excluded leaving 133 for full-text reading. Fifty studies were eventually included in this review since 84 studies were excluded because they did not describe essential information (e.g., absolute values for phase angle by sex) (Fig. 1). The percentage of disagreement between the evaluators during the full-text phase was 24%.

3.1. Characteristics of included studies

Twenty studies were conducted in European countries [10,11,18–35]. Participants’ ages ranged from 13 days [36] to >80 years [21], and 17 studies included only one sex: females [20,22,26,37–42] or males [23,28,32,33,43–45]. Ethnicity was not described in most of studies; of the 6 studies that described it, White/Caucasian participants were more frequently mentioned [11,16,34,46–48]. The mean BMI ranged from 13.8 [36] in young children to 49.1 in adult subjects [38] (Tables 1 and S2).

The participants’ inclusion criteria vary according to the target population addressed by the studies. Most participants were recruited for convenience in communities, schools, universities, sports centers, hospitals, outpatient clinics and clubs. Exclusion criteria were essentially the ones that contraindicated the bioimpedance (Table 1 and S2).
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Five studies were clinical trials [22,26,37,41,49], and the remaining were observational, 3 of which had a follow-up [31,33,38]. The mean phase angle was described, adjusted by or associated with sex in a majority of studies (64%) [6,10–12,17–19,21–24,25,27,29,30,34–36,46–60]. However, less than half of the studies considered participant age [9,11,12,17,18,20,24,25,27,29,30,34,35,44,46–48,50,53,54,56,57,60].

In general, the included studies considered different variables for adjustments or associations with phase angle according to the objective of the study.

The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics), frequencies and currents varied between studies, and this information was not done in a standardized way (Table S1). The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics) for adjustments or associations with phase angle according to the objective of the study.

The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics), frequencies and currents varied between studies, and this information was not done in a standardized way (Table S1). The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics) for adjustments or associations with phase angle according to the objective of the study.

The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics), frequencies and currents varied between studies, and this information was not done in a standardized way (Table S1). The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics) for adjustments or associations with phase angle according to the objective of the study.

The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics), frequencies and currents varied between studies, and this information was not done in a standardized way (Table S1). The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics) for adjustments or associations with phase angle according to the objective of the study.

The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics), frequencies and currents varied between studies, and this information was not done in a standardized way (Table S1). The description of the equipment (e.g., electrode characteristics) for adjustments or associations with phase angle according to the objective of the study.
97% to 100% for females. The only group that had low (I² = 0%) heterogeneity in both sexes was the group aged 80 years and above. By including only studies with good quality, the sensitivity analysis did not change the heterogeneity results. The lowest I² value identified by the sensitivity analysis was I² = 99%.

There no evidence of publication bias (Figure S1).

4. Discussion

In our systematic review and meta-analysis, mean phase angles were estimated for healthy individuals of both sexes and with different ages. For the first time, it was demonstrated that, for both sexes, there is a progressive increase in the mean phase angle, starting at the first years of life until approximately the age of 18. It then stabilizes until adulthood at 7.3 for men and 6.4 for women. Finally, values progressively decrease after 48 years of age.

Different mechanisms are involved in the process that leads to higher phase-angle values, reflecting better integrity and functionality of the cell membrane, intracellular composition and enhanced tissue capacity. The process of growing up involves quantitative and qualitative bodily changes, which are reflected in the phase-angle values [16,20]. Thus, when interpreting bioelectrical measures in children and adolescents, particularly during puberty, which is characterized by dramatic changes that occur at different times among individuals, we must acknowledge that observed values may be temporary [13,17]. The opposite takes place in the aging adult, where cellular integrity becomes progressively compromised and tissue mass is lost, leading to a decrease in phase angle with increasing age. This situation may suggest that the phase angle
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angle is also an indicator of cell function and health [16,21,25,46,63]. Males have higher mean phase angles compared to females. This can be explained due to the higher amount of body cell mass in males [11,25,63].

A low phase angle is an established parameter suggesting poor health prognosis [10,18,63]. The prognostic value may also differ between groups of patients with different clinical conditions since conditions such as infection, inflammation or disease-specific parameters may modify the phase angle [11,25,29,63]. A considerable number of studies have shown that the phase angle is a prognostic indicator for disease severity and mortality. However, the majority an important number of these studies did not consider the possible differences between sexes and age groups. Since phase-angle data is not usually available in a unique form, some authors use standardized phase-angle values (with cut-offs) derived from reference values from a specific population [16]. A major drawback of this method is that these cut-offs are not necessarily transferable to other populations and might not be applicable in the general clinical setting [16,63]. An alternative for the clinical interpretation of phase-angle results, particularly in the evaluation of interventions, could be the identification of the minimal important difference. Considering the mean difference between ages, health status, sex and age categories from the literature, we would suggest a clinically important phase-angle difference of 0.90° for females and 1.0° for males. Similar values have already been described in other studies with patients when comparing mean differences or suggested cut-offs between healthy and non-healthy groups [2,62].

There seems to be a difference in phase-angle values among different population characteristics, such as ethnic group, body mass and active vs. sedentary subjects [3,25,63]. We did not analyze those differences since very few of the included studies had all of this information, and factors considered in each study were different.

This study has some limitations. First, there exists population variability, since studies included different populations; however, this apparent limitation could be considered a strength due to the relevant sample size. The inclusion of participants with different characteristics improves the external validity of our study when using the data for the general population. The sensitivity analysis did not decrease the heterogeneity; nevertheless, the high statistical heterogeneity can be justified by the number of participants included in the studies. Most of the studies did not provide a bioimpedance analysis with sufficient detail or in a standardized manner, and this could have an impact on our results [27,62]. However, a large number of studies used the same apparatus. Future studies should include the technical specifications of the equipment used and describe the techniques used in a standardized manner to identify potential clinical differences in studies with representative population samples.

As shown in the analysis of the quality of studies was reasonable, but some items were poorly reported. A possible justification for this result is that some items from the quality scale used are more applicable to cohort studies than to cross-sectional studies, and most of the studies included in our analysis were cross-sectional. A major strength of our systematic review is the inclusion of all available studies by including gray literature in our search strategy as well as all major databases. We also did not limit the search by publication period or by language.

5. Conclusion

Our study found that, in both sexes, phase-angle values have a pattern where values increase progressively from the first years of life until 18 years of age, stabilize from 19 until 48 years and then progressively decrease thereafter. These estimates of mean phase-angle values in healthy individuals are important for clinical practice and research, whereas the use of bioimpedance phase angle can also contribute to the diagnosis and prognosis of health status as long as the different ages and sexes are considered in the interpretation of the results.
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