



## Nutritional Status and Risk of Sarcopenia among Hospitalized Older Adults Residing in a Rural Region in Turkey

Hacer Alatas<sup>1</sup>, Yeliz Serin<sup>2</sup>, Nurgül Arslan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Health Sciences, Malatya Turgut Ozal University, Malatya, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Faculty of Health Sciences, Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey

<sup>3</sup>Department of Nutrition and Dietetics, Ataturk Faculty of Health Sciences, Dicle University, Diyarbakir, Turkey

Corresponding Author:

Hacer Alatas, PhD

Department of Nutrition and Dietetics,  
Faculty of Health Sciences, Malatya  
Turgut Ozal University, Boran Mahallesi  
Kırgöz Caddesi, Malatya, Turkey  
E-mail: [hacer\\_alatas@hotmail.com](mailto:hacer_alatas@hotmail.com)

ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6441-0362>

Received: May 13, 2023

Revised: July 17, 2023

Accepted: September 3, 2023

**Background:** This study aimed to determine the prevalence of sarcopenia and its associated factors in community-dwelling older adults at risk of malnutrition based on the Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA), Prognostic Nutritional Index (PNI), and Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index (GNRI).

**Methods:** The study participants were 345 adults aged >65 years who visited Geriatric Internal Medicine outpatient clinics. The study included people without acute illness for whom the risk of malnutrition could be assessed and appropriate measurements taken. At the baseline visit, participants' data and measurements were gathered. The primary data included sociodemographic details, anthropometric measurements, malnutrition screening tests, and functional assessments.

**Results:** The participants' mean age was  $76.21 \pm 5.59$  years, and 57.1% were men ( $n=97$ ). The prevalence rate of sarcopenia was 45.5%. Compared to individuals without sarcopenia, those with it were older; had lower MNA, PNI, and GNRI scores; and had lower muscle mass, muscle strength, and lower leg circumferences ( $p<0.001$ ). After adjusting for potential confounding factors, we found that sarcopenia, advanced age, male sex, high risk of malnutrition, calf circumference, and a low PNI score were all significantly associated with a low GNRI score ( $p<0.001$ ).

**Conclusion:** Sarcopenia was significantly associated with advanced age, male sex, and high risk of malnutrition. Patients' nutritional and functional status should always be assessed for therapeutic interventions and lifestyle changes.

**Key Words:** Elderly, Malnutrition, Nutrition assessment, Nutritional status, Sarcopenia

### INTRODUCTION

Aging is an inevitable process in which cells, organs, and entire systems change and show functional decline.<sup>1)</sup> In Turkey, people aged  $\geq 65$  years are expected to comprise 9.9% of the total population by 2022.<sup>2)</sup> As people age, they experience respiratory, cardiovascular, digestive, nervous, endocrine, immune, musculoskeletal, excretory, dermatological, ocular, otological, gustatory, and olfactory problems. Most individuals > 65 years of age also have multiple chronic systemic diseases and take multiple drugs.<sup>3)</sup> Sarcopenia and malnutrition are the most common health problems and show similar physiological mechanisms in this population.<sup>4)</sup> Sarcopenia

is a progressive and generalized skeletal muscle disorder involving accelerated loss of muscle mass and function and is associated with increased adverse outcomes, including falls, functional decline, frailty, and mortality.<sup>5)</sup> The European Society for Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism (ESPEN) defines malnutrition as a condition resulting from inadequate nutrient intake or an unhealthy diet, resulting in a change in body composition (lower lean mass and body cell mass), physical and mental function, and deterioration in clinical disease outcomes.<sup>6)</sup> Owing to inadequate nutrition, malnutrition develops first, triggering sarcopenia development.<sup>7,8)</sup> Thus, determining the nutritional risk, providing early treatment to slow disease progression, and ensuring the initiation of effective sarco-

penia treatment in older adults are critically important. For this purpose, some nutritional screening tools and risk indices have been defined for use in older adult populations. These tools and indices are easy to apply in clinical practice, fast, low-cost, acceptable, meet high specificity and sensitivity criteria, and are suitable for continuous application.<sup>9)</sup>

The Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA) and Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index (GNRI) are among the preferred nutritional screening tools in the older adult population. MNA consists of 18 questions and is the most popular test used to assess the nutritional status of older adults. It is used to gather data on anthropometric measurements, lifestyle, food consumption, and subjective health<sup>10-12)</sup> GNRI is universally adopted to evaluate patients' nutritional condition. It is an effective and simple risk index to present patients' nutritional risk and has been proven to be a predictive index for prognosis in aged patients, patients on dialysis, patients with cardiovascular conditions, and in healthcare contexts.<sup>11)</sup> The Prognostic Nutritional Index (PNI) is used to determine the risk of nutrition-related complications in patients undergoing surgery.<sup>13)</sup>

The European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People (EWGSOP) has made several updates over the last 10 years to standardize the definition of sarcopenia. These guidelines use low muscle strength, considered the most reliable measure of muscle function, as the primary parameter for sarcopenia.<sup>14)</sup> The most common methods for evaluating muscle mass are dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA), computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), bioimpedance analysis (BIA), total and partial body potassium/fat-free soft tissue ratios, and anthropometric measurements. The method used depends on cost and facilities.<sup>15)</sup> Gait speed, hand grip strength, and/or muscle mass are recommended to screen for sarcopenia starting at 65 years of age.<sup>16)</sup> The term malnutrition–sarcopenia syndrome was coined to describe the simultaneous occurrence of both malnutrition and sarcopenia, most notably in older adults, and has a higher mortality rate than that for either condition alone.<sup>17)</sup>

Older adults require adequate and nutritious food.<sup>18)</sup> Older adults in rural regions are more vulnerable to sarcopenia than those living in urban areas.<sup>19)</sup> Malatya, the province in which this study was conducted, is located in Eastern Anatolia, Turkey. People aged  $\geq 65$  years constitute 10%–12% of the total population in this province.<sup>2)</sup> This study aimed to determine the nutritional status and the risk of sarcopenia in hospitalized older adults in Malatya, a rural region in Turkey.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The inclusion criteria of the study were individuals aged  $\geq 65$  years

hospitalized at the Malatya Turgut Ozal University Medical Faculty Hospital and who volunteered to participate in the study. The exclusion criteria were people aged  $< 65$  years; those with dementia or Alzheimer disease, cognitive or mental impairment, end-stage kidney disease, or cancer, unable to communicate, or who did not agree to participate.

### Data Gathering Instruments

Information collection forms were completed by researchers during in-person interviews with the patients. The questionnaire consisted of four sections containing sociodemographic data, health information, nutrition screening tests, and anthropometric measurements, respectively.

### Anthropometric Measurements and Hand Grip Strength

#### Calf circumference

Calf circumference was measured from the widest part of the calf in the sitting position using a non-stretchable tape measure with the ankle and knee at 90°. The same measurement was performed on bedridden participants. Calf circumference reflects a change in the lean muscle mass with age.<sup>20)</sup>

#### Height

The presence of diseases (e.g., arthritis, osteoporosis, spinal deformity, and various neuromuscular diseases), dependence on a bed or wheelchair, and kyphotic posture that occur with aging make it difficult to accurately measure the height of older adults. Inaccurate measurement leads to misleading estimations of nutritional status. Therefore, knee length measurement is recommended to avoid this problem. The present study used the following formula to calculate height using the knee length, age, and sex.

Knee length was used to measure the correct height in elderly individuals who were bed- or chair-bound and cannot stand upright. Knee length was measured using a sliding caliper with the knee and ankle upright at 90°.

$$\text{Men: } 64.19 - (0.04 \times \text{age}) + (2.02 \times \text{knee length})$$

$$\text{Women: } 84.88 - (0.24 \times \text{age}) + (1.83 \times \text{knee length})$$

#### Body weight

The body weight of older adults who could move independently was measured with a weighing device sensitive to 0.1 kg. The participants stood on a flat, hard, and stable surface, and wore thin clothes and no shoes. During the measurements, care was taken that the participants did not lean on anything or apply any outside force.

### Body mass index

Body mass index (BMI) is a practical method for detecting obesity and protein–energy malnutrition. It is calculated by dividing the body weight (kg) by the square of the height (m<sup>2</sup>). Changes in BMI in older adults vary depending on the loss of lean tissue, in addition to adipose tissue. The absence of a consensus cutoff point for the assessment of BMI in older adults reduces its validity in determining nutritional status. We applied the World Health Organization (WHO) BMI values for adults.

### Hand Grip (muscle) strength

Hand grip strength was measured using a mechanical dynamometer (EASYCARE Hand Dynamometer; Fabrication Enterprises, Elmsford, NY, USA) with a scale of 0–100 kg and a precision of 1.0 kg.<sup>21)</sup> The participants were instructed to put all their strength into grasping the instrument while it was held vertically in front of them, with their free arm hanging freely from their side. The measurement was performed twice on each hand (right and left) and all three values, in addition to the mean value provided by the instrument, were recorded. These measured values were compared with reference values determined based on the participants' age and sex.<sup>22)</sup>

### GNRI

We calculated GNRI using the formula “ $1.489 \times \text{serum albumin (g/L)} + 41.7 \times (\text{body weight in kilograms/ideal body weight})$ .”

The formula “ $22 \times \text{square of height in meters}$ ” was used to determine the ideal body weight. In GNRI, scores  $> 112.3$ ,  $103.8$ – $112.3$ , and  $< 103.8$  indicate mild, moderate, and severe malnutrition, respectively.<sup>23)</sup>

### PNI

We calculated PNI using the formula “ $10 \times \text{serum albumin (g/dL)} + 0.005 \times \text{total lymphocyte count (mm}^3\text{)}$ .” In PNI, scores  $> 56.1$ ,  $50.0$ – $56.1$ , and  $< 50.0$  indicate normal, mild to moderate, and severe malnutrition, respectively.<sup>24)</sup>

### MNA

MNA offers an easy and rapid method to evaluate the nutritional status of older adult patients in outpatient clinics, hospitals, and nursing homes. In the MNA screening test, the best option is marked. At the end of the test, the scores are summed. The screening test consists of two stages; the screening phase, followed by the evaluation phase. In the screening stage, a score of 12–14 points denotes a normal nutritional status, 8–11 points denotes a risk of malnutrition, and 0–7 points denotes malnourishment in older adults. Scores of 24–30, 17–23.5, and  $< 17$  points in the screening and evaluation sections denote normal nutritional status, risk of

malnutrition, and malnutrition, respectively.<sup>25)</sup>

### Evaluation of Sarcopenia Status

The evaluation of an individual's muscle mass, muscle strength, and physical performance are all necessary steps in the diagnosis of sarcopenia. Various approaches are used to assess these three aspects. We measured the total muscle mass of each participant using Lee's equation, with muscle masses  $< 7.0$  kg in men and  $< 5.4$  kg in women defined as “low.”<sup>26)</sup> We measured muscle strength using the hand strength tightening method, with grip strengths of  $< 20.0$  kg in women and  $< 30.0$  kg in men categorized as “weak” based on the older adult diagnostic algorithm from the EWGSOP. We assessed each participant's level of physical performance using the get-up-and-go test, with  $< 0.8$  m/s as the threshold. Low walking speed was defined with  $< 0.8$  m/s as the threshold.<sup>27)</sup>

$$\text{Muscle mass (kg)} = (0.244 \times \text{BMI}) + (7.8 \times \text{height [m]}) + (6.6 \times \text{sex [M:1; F:0]}) - (0.098 \times \text{age}) + (\text{ethnicity} - 3.3)$$

where calculation of ethnicity was made by assigning values of 0, 1.4, and 1.2 for White and Hispanic, African, and Asian, respectively.

### Statistical Analysis

We performed the statistical analyses using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (version 22.0; IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Normality was assessed visually (histograms and probability plots) and analytically (Kolmogorov–Smirnov/Shapiro–Wilk tests). The chi-square test was used to compare proportions between groups. We applied Student t-test to compare the results between groups for normally distributed continuous variables. Continuous variables are presented as means and standard deviation, whereas categorical variables are shown as percentages and numbers. We applied the Mann–Whitney U test to compare nonnormally distributed continuous parameters between the groups.

We examined the relationship between muscle mass and strength using univariate regression analysis. Odds ratios were modified for other variables including BMI, age at baseline, polypharmacy, nutritional status indicators, and malnutrition status. The univariate regression model had statistically significant variables added as potential confounders. Statistical significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

### Ethics Statement

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Mardin Artuklu University (Approval No. 2023/15-15). Before beginning the survey, all the respondents read a written consent form and voluntarily consented to participate.

Also, this study complied the ethical guidelines for authorship and publishing in the *Annals of Geriatric Medicine and Research*.<sup>28)</sup>

## RESULTS

The mean age of the study participant was  $76.21 \pm 5.59$  years, with 55.65% of the participants 65–74 years of age and 42.90% women. Three or more chronic diseases were present in 36.23% of the participants, and 23.48% used three or more drugs per day (Table 1). According to the sarcopenia criteria, 45.50% of the participants had sarcopenia.

The results of the comparisons of age and anthropometric characteristics of the participants according to their sarcopenia status are shown in Table 2. The muscle mass, muscle strength, and calf circumference differed significantly according to sarcopenia status, with lower values in participants of both sexes with sarcopenia ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 3 shows the relationships between sarcopenia and malnutrition indices of individuals according to sex. The MNA-SF and GNRI scores of participants with sarcopenia were lower than those in individuals without it for both sexes ( $p < 0.05$ ). The PNI scores were lower in those with sarcopenia individuals than in those without sarcopenia group in women ( $p < 0.05$ ) but not in men ( $p > 0.05$ ).

The factors affecting muscle mass and strength are listed in Table 4. The most important factor was MNA score ( $p < 0.05$ ), followed by age, BMI, and GNRI (all  $p < 0.05$ ). Muscle mass was also affected by PNI score and calf circumference ( $p < 0.05$ ). Muscle mass and strength in men were influenced by BMI, PNI, and GNRI scores ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, the number of prescribed drugs was an important factor affecting muscle mass in men ( $p < 0.05$ ) but not in women ( $p > 0.05$ ).

## DISCUSSION

Care for older adults is a new and developing service model in Turkey. This study is one of the few that examine the nutritional status

**Table 1.** General characteristics of individuals (n=345)

|                            | Value        |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Age (y)                    | 76.21 ± 5.59 |
| 65–74 (young seniors)      | 192 (55.65)  |
| 75–84 (middle-aged)        | 81 (23.48)   |
| ≥ 85 (advanced old people) | 72 (20.87)   |
| Sex                        |              |
| Female                     | 148 (42.90)  |
| Male                       | 197 (57.10)  |
| Living place               |              |
| With her family            | 238 (68.99)  |
| Lives alone                | 107 (31.01)  |
| Marital status             |              |
| Married                    | 221 (64.06)  |
| Single                     | 124 (35.94)  |
| Educational status         |              |
| No read and write          | 108 (31.30)  |
| Read-write only            | 119 (34.49)  |
| Primary school             | 45 (13.04)   |
| Middle school and above    | 73 (21.16)   |
| Number of chronic diseases |              |
| None                       | 12 (3.48)    |
| 1                          | 96 (27.83)   |
| 2                          | 112 (32.46)  |
| ≥ 3                        | 125 (36.23)  |
| Number of drugs used daily |              |
| 0                          | 41 (11.88)   |
| 1                          | 77 (22.32)   |
| 2                          | 156 (45.22)  |
| ≥ 3                        | 81 (23.48)   |

Values are presented as mean±standard deviation or number (%).

**Table 2.** Age and anthropometric characteristics of individuals according to their sarcopenia status

|  | All individuals    |                        |                       | Female            |                       |                       | Male              |                        |                       |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | Sarcopenic (n=157) | Non-sarcopenic (n=188) | p-value <sup>a)</sup> | Sarcopenic (n=89) | Non-sarcopenic (n=79) | p-value <sup>a)</sup> | Sarcopenic (n=68) | Non-sarcopenic (n=109) | p-value <sup>a)</sup> |
| Age (y)                                | 74.30 ± 8.11       | 73.94 ± 6.21           | 0.201                 | 78.25 ± 7.07      | 75.19 ± 5.12          | 0.108                 | 79.30 ± 9.76      | 70.09 ± 4.65           | 0.032*                |
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )               | 22.05 ± 1.63       | 21.33 ± 2.39           | 0.501                 | 22.19 ± 2.21      | 23.01 ± 3.14          | 0.231                 | 23.56 ± 1.17      | 23.99 ± 2.39           | 0.399                 |
| Muscle mass (kg)                       | 24.22 ± 3.25       | 27.88 ± 3.44           | 0.001*                | 18.24 ± 2.25      | 20.22 ± 2.75          | 0.001*                | 24.75 ± 2.35      | 25.24 ± 3.21           | 0.297                 |
| Muscle strength, hand grip (kg)        | 28.32 ± 3.52       | 32.5 ± 7.52            | 0.039*                | 22.21 ± 4.55      | 25.21 ± 5.45          | 0.006*                | 29.52 ± 6.52      | 32.88 ± 4.59           | 0.046*                |
| Muscle mass index (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) | 9.21 ± 1.25        | 9.33 ± 1.88            | 0.293                 | 8.33 ± 1.54       | 8.75 ± 1.45           | 0.391                 | 10.22 ± 1.68      | 11.25 ± 2.01           | 0.102                 |
| Calf circumferences (cm)               | 30.34 ± 3.60       | 32.38 ± 2.56           | 0.225                 | 26.18 ± 2.26      | 29.45 ± 2.18          | 0.001*                | 30.15 ± 3.15      | 34.35 ± 3.75           | 0.001*                |

Values are presented as mean±standard deviation.

BMI, body mass index.

<sup>a)</sup>Mann-Whitney U test (\* $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 3.** Malnutrition indices and distributions of individuals according to sarcopenia and sex

| Malnutrition index      | All individuals | Female             |                        |                      | Male               |                         |                       |
|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                         |                 | Sarcopenic (n= 89) | Non-sarcopenic (n= 79) | p-value              | Sarcopenic (n= 68) | Non-sarcopenic (n= 109) | p-value               |
| MNA SF                  | 11.21 ± 1.12    | 7.23 ± 1.45        | 12.13 ± 2.13           | 0.024a)*             | 8.14 ± 1.67        | 14.21 ± 2.91            | 0.014 <sup>a</sup> *) |
| Malnutrition            | 54.49           | 46.07              | 21.52                  |                      | 32.11              | 26.61                   |                       |
| At risk of malnutrition | 28.12           | 24.72              | 37.97                  |                      | 15.60              | 33.94                   |                       |
| Normal nutrition status | 17.39           | 29.21              | 40.51                  | 0.006**              | 14.68              | 39.45                   | 0.001 <sup>b</sup> *) |
| GNRI                    | 109.14 ± 7.21   | 94.21 ± 11.13      | 98.12 ± 8.21           | 0.051 <sup>a</sup> ) | 106.21 ± 7.19      | 114.28 ± 7.94           | 0.022 <sup>a</sup> *) |
| Normal                  | 28.70           | 12.36              | 35.44                  |                      | 11.01              | 42.20                   |                       |
| Moderate malnutrition   | 57.10           | 33.71              | 30.38                  |                      | 33.03              | 30.28                   |                       |
| Malnutrition            | 14.20           | 53.93              | 34.18                  | 0.028*               | 18.35              | 27.52                   | 0.041 <sup>b</sup> *) |
| PNI                     | 54.13 ± 3.27    | 48.19 ± 4.46       | 51.21 ± 3.28           | 0.001*               | 44.13 ± 2.55       | 49.24 ± 2.25            | 0.081 <sup>a</sup> )  |
| Normal                  | 25.22           | 10.11              | 26.58                  |                      | 12.84              | 44.04                   |                       |
| Moderate malnutrition   | 55.65           | 39.33              | 49.37                  |                      | 20.18              | 33.03                   |                       |
| Malnutrition            | 19.13           | 50.56              | 24.05                  | 0.104                | 29.36              | 11.01                   | 0.007 <sup>b</sup> *) |

Values are presented as mean ± standard deviation.

MNA-SF, Mini Nutritional Assessment-Short form; GNRI, Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index; PNI, Prognostic Nutrition Index.

<sup>a</sup>)Mann-Whitney U test, <sup>b</sup>)chi-squared test.

\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01.

**Table 4.** Multiple linear regression analysis of factors affecting muscle strength and muscle mass in individuals by sex

|   | Female              |         |                     |         | Male                |         |                     |         |
|---|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
|   | Muscle mass         |         | Muscle strength     |         | Muscle mass         |         | Muscle strength     |         |
|   | OR (95% CI)         | p-value | OR (95% CI)         | p-value | OR (95% CI)         | p-value | OR (95% CI)         | p-value |
| Age (y)                                     | 1.011 (0.804–1.689) | < 0.05  | 0.944 (0.806–1.291) | < 0.05  | 0.809 (0.741–1.291) | < 0.05  | 0.704 (0.604–1.008) | < 0.05  |
| MNA score                                   | 1.401 (0.991–2.285) | < 0.05  | 1.201 (1.341–2.344) | < 0.05  | 1.390 (1.103–3.467) | < 0.05  | 1.109 (0.956–1.690) | < 0.05  |
| Number of prescribed drugs currently taking | 0.287 (0.101–0.581) | > 0.05  | 0.351 (0.104–0.456) | > 0.05  | 0.290 (0.089–0.401) | < 0.05  | 0.451 (0.045–0.521) | > 0.05  |
| Calf circumferences                         | 0.678 (0.521–1.701) | < 0.05  | 0.809 (0.771–1.506) | < 0.05  | 0.901 (0.856–1.772) | < 0.05  | 1.102 (1.055–2.809) | < 0.05  |
| BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )                    | 1.002 (0.569–1.991) | < 0.05  | 1.190 (0.951–2.175) | < 0.05  | 1.412 (0.890–4.104) | < 0.05  | 1.249 (1.031–1.706) | < 0.05  |
| PNI score                                   | 0.798 (0.490–1.809) | < 0.05  | 1.301 (1.101–2.781) | < 0.05  | 1.291 (0.801–1.706) | < 0.05  | 0.991 (0.761–1.045) | < 0.05  |
| GNRI score                                  | 0.959 (0.641–3.701) | < 0.05  | 1.003 (0.871–2.145) | < 0.05  | 1.079 (1.009–1.760) | < 0.05  | 1.181 (0.831–1.291) | < 0.05  |

MNA, Mini Nutritional Assessment; BMI, body mass index; PNI, Prognostic Nutrition index; GNRI, Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

of older care patients with sarcopenia in Turkey. Our results showed that the prevalence of malnutrition is quite high in general and reflects sarcopenia in patients receiving hospital care.

In this study, 55.7% of the older adults were aged 65–74 years. According to the Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI) in 2022, 64.5% of the elderly population in Turkey is 65–74 years of age, and this age range is consistent with the proportions of hospitalized older adults.<sup>2)</sup> In the present study, 42.9% of the participants were women and 57.1% were men. According to the TSI-2022 data, the prevalence of older adult women is higher than that of men in Turkey (F, 55.7%; M, 44.3%).<sup>2)</sup> Moreover, 61.1% of women and 49% of men had visited a health institution in the last 3 months.<sup>29)</sup> One explanation for the predominance of men in this study was a higher number of hospital admissions due to the number of chronic diseases and multiple drug use rates compared to women. Sarcopenia and malnutrition are associated with negative health outcomes including falls, fractures, physical disability, frailty, poor quality of

life, and mortality. Therefore, early diagnosis is important, especially in older adults, to prevent sarcopenia and malnutrition in a timely manner and allow early treatment interventions.<sup>30)</sup> BMI values of 23–29.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup> have been associated with optimal life expectancy in older adults. The risk of death increases in older adults with BMI < 23 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.<sup>31)</sup> The mean BMI values were 22.1 kg/m<sup>2</sup> and 21.3 kg/m<sup>2</sup> among the participants in this study with and without sarcopenia, respectively. BMI was a risk factor in both groups. Yanishi et al.<sup>32)</sup> Chien et al.<sup>33)</sup> and Siegert et al.<sup>34)</sup> reported higher BMI in individuals without sarcopenia compared to those with it. However, Prior et al.<sup>35)</sup> observed no significant differences between the BMIs of 76 middle-aged and older adults with and without sarcopenia. We observed similar results regarding BMI values as those in the study by Prior et al.<sup>35)</sup>

Regardless of BMI, malnutrition in older adults exacerbates the age-related loss of muscle mass and plays a role in sarcopenia.<sup>7)</sup> A previous study found that participants with both sarcopenia and a

high risk of malnutrition have a four-fold higher mortality risk compared to participants with normal nutrition and without sarcopenia<sup>17)</sup>; therefore, sarcopenia screening in conjunction with nutritional assessment is crucial.<sup>36)</sup> The components of sarcopenia are based on the loss of muscle mass and strength with poor nutritional parameters. A recent systematic review reported a sarcopenic ratio of 10% in older adults; however, the measurement instruments vary among studies.<sup>37)</sup> In this study, three different instruments used to measure sarcopenia. A hand-grip dynamometer was used to measure hand-grip strength, usual gait speed was used to gauge physical performance, and calf circumference was used as a proxy for muscle mass. The hand-grip strength thresholds recommended by the EWGSOP are < 16 kg for women and < 27 kg for men. EWGSOP-2 suggests that each community should set its own threshold values.<sup>14)</sup> Accordingly, the threshold values for hand grip strength in Turkey are < 22 kg for women and < 32 kg for men.<sup>38)</sup> In the present study, the average hand-grip strength of the sarcopenic individuals was 28.3 kg. In their study of participants with sarcopenia, presarcopenia, and no sarcopenia, Chien et al.<sup>33)</sup> reported that hand-grip strength did not differ significantly between individuals. However, the grip strength of individuals without sarcopenia was higher than that of individuals with it in the studies by Moreira et al.<sup>39)</sup> in middle-aged women in Northeast Brazil, Siegert et al.,<sup>34)</sup> Yanishi et al.,<sup>32)</sup> and Di Monaco et al.<sup>40)</sup> in 138 women, and Woo et al.<sup>41)</sup> in Chinese women and men. Similarly, in our study, the grip strength of participants with sarcopenia was lower because of decreased muscle strength. Therefore, regular follow-up of individuals with sarcopenia is important.

WHO regards calf circumference as the most accurate anthropometric standard for determining muscle mass in older adults.<sup>42)</sup> In 2019, the EWGSOP revised its criteria to include calf circumference as a diagnostic proxy for older adults in areas lacking access to other methods of diagnosing muscle mass.<sup>43)</sup> In the present study, the mean calf circumference in individuals with sarcopenia was 30.3 cm. Low calf circumference is an important predictor of mortality and frailty in older adults.<sup>44)</sup> Kuhama et al.<sup>45)</sup> reported greater right and left calf circumferences in individuals without sarcopenia compared to those with it. Similarly, we observed greater calf circumference measurements in both men and women without sarcopenia. In addition, calf circumference measurement was significantly associated with muscle mass and muscle strength in the present study.

Decreased muscle mass is a common characteristic of malnutrition and sarcopenia. Malnutrition directly contributes to the sarcopenia development. A previous study showed that the risk of developing sarcopenia was 13 times higher in malnourished or older adults at risk of malnutrition than in individuals with a normal nu-

tritional status.<sup>46)</sup> In another study, > 80% of participants with sarcopenia were malnourished or at risk of malnutrition according to the MNA.<sup>47)</sup> In the present study, the malnutrition index scores were lower in individuals with sarcopenia compared with those without sarcopenia. The most important factor affecting muscle mass and strength in both sexes was the MNA score, followed by age, BMI, and GNRI. In addition, the number of prescribed drugs was an important factor affecting muscle mass in men. Nutritional screening tools have revealed that factors affecting food intake and malnutrition are associated with sarcopenia in older adults living in rural areas. Our findings are supported by those of other studies reporting the association of sarcopenia with advancing age, low BMI, and malnutrition indices.<sup>48-50)</sup>

The most important limitation of this study was its cross-sectional design, which prevented the generalization of these findings to other older adult populations. Moreover, we were unable to use techniques regarded as gold standards to assess muscle mass, such as DEXA, computed tomography, and MRI. Instead, we substituted the calf circumference measurements for actual muscle mass. While the lack of use of these gold-standard techniques can be seen as a limitation, a strength of this study was that we optimized our measurements according to our study objectives.

In conclusion, malnutrition and sarcopenia, which are common conditions in older adults, have negative effects such as higher morbidity and mortality, as well as higher healthcare costs and re-hospitalizations. A healthy diet and regular exercise can prevent these two conditions. Each condition is typically screened separately, and they are rarely assessed simultaneously. A patient's nutritional and functional status should always be assessed to discuss therapeutic interventions and lifestyle changes, as many patients exhibit both malnutrition and sarcopenia (i.e., an increase in protein intake and physical activity). The results of our study will inform future studies, since the study region is rural and has a high ratio of older adult population to the total population.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank all the participants. We also express our sincere thanks to Dr. Bülent Yaprak and Professor Murat Aladağ, who helped us reach the patients and reviewed the draft.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The researchers claim no conflicts of interest.

## FUNDING

None.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization, NA, HA, YS; Data curation, NA, HA, YS; Supervision, NA, HA, YS. Investigation, NA, HA, YS; Writing-original draft, NA, HA, YS; Writing-review & editing, NA, HA, YS.

## REFERENCES

- Orimo H, Ito H, Suzuki T, Araki A, Hosoi T, Sawabe M. Reviewing the definition of "elderly". *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2006;6:149-58.
- Turkish Statistical Institute. Elderly Statistics 2022 [Internet]. Ankara, Turkey: Turkish Statistical Institute; 2023 [cited 2023 Sep 15]. Available from: <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=%C4%B0statistiklerle-Ya%C5%9Fl%C4%B1lar-2022-49667&dil=1#:~:text=T%C3%9C%C4%B0K%20Kurumsal&text=Ya%C5%9Fl%C4%B1%20n%C3%BCfus%20olarak%20kabul%20edilen,45%20bin%20669%20ki%C5%9Fi%20oldu>.
- Colloca G, Santoro M, Gambassi G. Age-related physiologic changes and perioperative management of elderly patients. *Surg Oncol* 2010;19:124-30.
- Abbasi J. Interest in the ketogenic diet grows for weight loss and type 2 diabetes. *JAMA* 2018;319:215-7.
- Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Woo J. Nutritional interventions to prevent and treat frailty. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 2019;22:191-5.
- Cederholm T, Barazzoni R, Austin P, Ballmer P, Biolo G, Bischoff SC, et al. ESPEN guidelines on definitions and terminology of clinical nutrition. *Clin Nutr* 2017;36:49-64.
- Shiota A, Nakayama N, Saito Y, Maeda T, Maeda Y, Nakayama K. Prevalence and associated factors of malnutrition and sarcopenia in a daycare facility: a cross-sectional study. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2020;8:576.
- Demirel Y, Bilici S, Koksall E. Evaluation of private and public nursing homes' menus quality and adequacy. *Bes Diy Derg* 2018;46:24-9.
- Akmansu M, Kanyilmaz G. [Methods in Malnutrition screening: which method should we use?]. *Turk J Oncol* 2020;35(Supp 5):5-11.
- Liguori I, Curcio F, Russo G, Cellurale M, Aran L, Bulli G, et al. Risk of malnutrition evaluated by mini nutritional assessment and sarcopenia in noninstitutionalized elderly people. *Nutr Clin Pract* 2018;33:879-86.
- Luo H, Yang H, Huang B, Yuan D, Zhu J, Zhao J. Geriatric Nutritional Risk Index (GNRI) Independently Predicts Amputation Inchronic Criticallimb Ischemia (CLI). *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0152111.
- Cereda E, Pedrolli C, Zagami A, Vanotti A, Piffer S, Opizzi A, et al. Nutritional screening and mortality in newly institutionalized elderly: a comparison between the geriatric nutritional risk index and the mini nutritional assessment. *Clin Nutr* 2011;30:793-8.
- Sun K, Chen S, Xu J, Li G, He Y. The prognostic significance of the prognostic nutritional index in cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2014;140:1537-49.
- Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, Boirie Y, Cederholm T, Landi F, et al. Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis: report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. *Age Ageing* 2010;39:412-23.
- Bosaeus I, Wilcox G, Rothenberg E, Strauss BJ. Skeletal muscle mass in hospitalized elderly patients: comparison of measurements by single-frequency BIA and DXA. *Clin Nutr* 2014;33:426-31.
- Lauretani F, Russo CR, Bandinelli S, Bartali B, Cavazzini C, Di Iorio A, et al. Age-associated changes in skeletal muscles and their effect on mobility: an operational diagnosis of sarcopenia. *J Appl Physiol* (1985) 2003;95:1851-60.
- Hu X, Zhang L, Wang H, Hao Q, Dong B, Yang M. Malnutrition-sarcopenia syndrome predicts mortality in hospitalized older patients. *Sci Rep* 2017;7:3171.
- Bardenhagen CJ, Pinard CA, Pirog R, Yaroch AL. Characterizing rural food access in remote areas. *J Community Health* 2017;42:1008-19.
- Gao L, Jiang J, Yang M, Hao Q, Luo L, Dong B. Prevalence of sarcopenia and associated factors in Chinese community-dwelling elderly: comparison between rural and urban areas. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2015;16:1003.
- Pagotto V, Santos KF, Malaquias SG, Bachion MM, Silveira EA. Calf circumference: clinical validation for evaluation of muscle mass in the elderly. *Rev Bras Enferm* 2018;71:322-8.
- Roberts HC, Denison HJ, Martin HJ, Patel HP, Syddall H, Cooper C, et al. A review of the measurement of grip strength in clinical and epidemiological studies: towards a standardised approach. *Age Ageing* 2011;40:423-9.
- Sousa-Santos AR, Amaral TF. Differences in handgrip strength protocols to identify sarcopenia and frailty: a systematic review. *BMC Geriatr* 2017;17:238.
- Honda Y, Nagai T, Iwakami N, Sugano Y, Honda S, Okada A, et al. Usefulness of geriatric nutritional risk index for assessing nutritional status and its prognostic impact in patients aged  $\geq 65$  years with acute heart failure. *Am J Cardiol* 2016;118:550-5.
- Zhang H, Tao Y, Wang Z, Lu J. Evaluation of nutritional status and prognostic impact assessed by the prognostic nutritional index in children with chronic kidney disease. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2019;98:e16713.
- Juby AG, Mager DR. A review of nutrition screening tools used to assess the malnutrition-sarcopenia syndrome (MSS) in the

- older adult. *Clin Nutr ESPEN* 2019;32:8-15.
26. Chen LK, Liu LK, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung TW, Bahyah KS, et al. Sarcopenia in Asia: consensus report of the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2014;15:95-101.
  27. Escriche-Escuder A, Fuentes-Abolafio IJ, Roldan-Jimenez C, Cuesta-Vargas AI. Effects of exercise on muscle mass, strength, and physical performance in older adults with sarcopenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis according to the EWGSOP criteria. *Exp Gerontol* 2021;151:111420.
  28. Noh JH, Jung HW, Ga H, Lim JY. Ethical guidelines for publishing in the *Annals of Geriatric Medicine and Research*. *Ann Geriatr Med Res* 2022;26:1-3.
  29. Bakanligi TS, Mudurlugu HS. Turkey Nutrition and Health Survey (Ministry of Health Publication No. 1132) [Internet]. Ankara, Turkey: Türkiye beslenme ve sağlık araştırması (TBSA); 2019 [cited 2023 Sep 15]. Available from: [https://krtknadm.karatekin.edu.tr/files/sbf/TBSA\\_RAPOR\\_KITAP\\_20.08.pdf](https://krtknadm.karatekin.edu.tr/files/sbf/TBSA_RAPOR_KITAP_20.08.pdf).
  30. Taani MH, Apchemengich I, Sima CD. Malnutrition-sarcopenia syndrome and self-management behaviors in continuing-care retirement community residents. *Geriatrics (Basel)* 2021;7:9.
  31. Winter JE, MacInnis RJ, Wattanapenpaiboon N, Nowson CA. BMI and all-cause mortality in older adults: a meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;99:875-90.
  32. Yanishi M, Tsukaguchi H, Kimura Y, Koito Y, Yoshida K, Seo M, et al. Evaluation of physical activity in sarcopenic conditions of kidney transplantation recipients. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2017;49:1779-84.
  33. Chien MY, Kuo HK, Wu YT. Sarcopenia, cardiopulmonary fitness, and physical disability in community-dwelling elderly people. *Phys Ther* 2010;90:1277-87.
  34. Siegert E, March C, Otten L, Makowka A, Preis E, Buttgerit F, et al. Prevalence of sarcopenia in systemic sclerosis: assessing body composition and functional disability in patients with systemic sclerosis. *Nutrition* 2018;55-56:51-5.
  35. Prior SJ, Ryan AS, Blumenthal JB, Watson JM, Katzell LI, Goldberg AP. Sarcopenia is associated with lower skeletal muscle capillarization and exercise capacity in older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2016;71:1096-101.
  36. Vandewoude MF, Alish CJ, Sauer AC, Hegazi RA. Malnutrition-sarcopenia syndrome: is this the future of nutrition screening and assessment for older adults? *J Aging Res* 2012;2012:651570.
  37. Shafiee G, Keshtkar A, Soltani A, Ahadi Z, Larijani B, Heshmat R. Prevalence of sarcopenia in the world: a systematic review and meta-analysis of general population studies. *J Diabetes Metab Disord* 2017;16:21.
  38. Bahat G, Tufan A, Tufan F, Kilic C, Akpınar TS, Kose M, et al. Cut-off points to identify sarcopenia according to European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People (EWGSOP) definition. *Clin Nutr* 2016;35:1557-63.
  39. Moreira MA, Zunzunegui MV, Vafaei A, da Camara SM, Oliveira TS, Maciel AC. Sarcopenic obesity and physical performance in middle aged women: a cross-sectional study in Northeast Brazil. *BMC Public Health* 2016;16:43.
  40. Di Monaco M, Castiglioni C, De Toma E, Gardin L, Giordano S, Di Monaco R, et al. Presarcopenia and sarcopenia in hip-fracture women: prevalence and association with ability to function in activities of daily living. *Aging Clin Exp Res* 2015;27:465-72.
  41. Woo J, Leung J, Sham A, Kwok T. Defining sarcopenia in terms of risk of physical limitations: a 5-year follow-up study of 3,153 Chinese men and women. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009;57:2224-31.
  42. World Health Organization. Physical status: the use and interpretation of anthropometry: report of a WHO Expert Committee. *World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser* 1995;854:1-452.
  43. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyere O, Cederholm T, et al. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age Ageing* 2019;48:16-31.
  44. Easton JF, Stephens CR, Roman-Sicilia H, Cesari M, Perez-Zepeda MU. Anthropometric measurements and mortality in frail older adults. *Exp Gerontol* 2018;110:61-6.
  45. Kusaka S, Takahashi T, Hiyama Y, Kusumoto Y, Tsuchiya J, Umeda M. Large calf circumference indicates non-sarcopenia despite body mass. *J Phys Ther Sci* 2017;29:1925-28.
  46. Sato PH, Ferreira AA, Rosado EL. The prevalence and risk factors for sarcopenia in older adults and long-living older adults. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2020;89:104089.
  47. Murawiak M, Krzyminska-Siemaszko R, Kaluzniak-Szymanowska A, Lewandowicz M, Tobis S, Wieczorowska-Tobis K, et al. Sarcopenia, obesity, sarcopenic obesity and risk of poor nutritional status in polish community-dwelling older people aged 60 years and over. *Nutrients* 2022;14:2889.
  48. Yoshida D, Suzuki T, Shimada H, Park H, Makizako H, Doi T, et al. Using two different algorithms to determine the prevalence of sarcopenia. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2014;14 Suppl 1:46-51.
  49. Alexandre TD, Duarte YA, Santos JL, Lebrao ML. Prevalence and associated factors of sarcopenia, dynapenia, and sarcodynepenia in community-dwelling elderly in Sao Paulo: SABE Study. *Rev Bras Epidemiol* 2019;21(Suppl02):e180009.
  50. Kim H, Suzuki T, Kim M, Kojima N, Yoshida Y, Hirano H, et al. Incidence and predictors of sarcopenia onset in community-dwelling elderly Japanese women: 4-year follow-up study. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2015;16:85.