Reliability of resting metabolic rate measurements in young adults: Impact of methods for data analysis

Sanchez-Delgado, G.; Alcantara, J.M.A.; Ortiz-Alvarez, L.; Xu, H.W.; Martinez-Tellez, B.; Labayen, I.; Ruiz, J.R.

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

1   **Reliability of resting metabolic rate measurements in young adults: Impact of**

2   **methods for data analysis**

3   Guillermo Sanchez-Delgado [a], Juan M.A. Alcantara [a], Lourdes Ortiz-Alvarez [a], Huiwen

4   Xu[a], Borja Martinez-Tellez [a,b], Idoia Labayen [c], Jonatan R. Ruiz [a]

5

6   [a] PROFITH "PROmoting FITness and Health through physical activity" research group.

7   Department of Physical Education and Sport, Faculty of Sport Sciences, University of

8   Granada, Spain. Ctra de Alfacar s/n C.P. 18071

9   [b] Department of Medicine, Division of Endocrinology, and Einthoven Laboratory for

10   Experimental Vascular Medicine, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The

11   Netherlands. Albinusdreef 2, 2333

12   [c] Department of Health Sciences, Public University of Navarra, Pamplona, Avda.

13   Barañáisn s/n. 31008.

14

15   **Corresponding author:**

16   Guillermo Sanchez-Delgado. Department of Physical Education and Sport, Faculty of

17   Sport Sciences. University of Granada, Granada, Spain. Ctra de Alfacar s/n C.P. 18071.

18   E-mail: gsanchezdelgado@ugr.es; tel.: 0034 958242754; Fax: 0034 958244369

19   **ABSTRACT**

20   **Background & Aims:** A high inter-day reliability is a key factor to analyze the

21   magnitude of change in resting metabolic rate (RMR) after an intervention, and the

22   impact of using different methods for data analysis is not known. The aims of this study

23   were: i) to analyze the impact of methods for data analysis on RMR and respiratory

24   exchange ratio (RER) estimation; ii) to analyze the impact of methods for data analysis

25   on inter-day RMR and RER reliability; iii) to compare inter-day RMR and RER

26   reliability across methods for data analysis in participants who achieved steady state

27   (SS) vs. participants who did not achieve SS.

28   **Methods:** Seventeen young healthy adults completed two 30-minute indirect

29   calorimetry (IC) measures on two consecutive mornings, using two metabolic carts each

30   day. Two methods for data analysis were used: i) Selection of a predefined time interval

31   (TI) every 5 minutes (*1-5 min; 6-10 min, 11-15 min, 16-20 min, 21-25 min, 26-30 min*);

32   and TI representing the whole measurement period (*0-30 min, 5-30 min, 5-25 min*); and

33   ii) Methods based on the selection of the most stable period (SSt methods) (*3 min SSt, 4*

34   *min SSt, 5 min SSt, 10 min SSt*). Additionally, participants were classified as those

35   achieving SS (CV<10% for VO_2, VCO_2 and VE, and CV<5% for RER) and those who

36   did not.

37   **Results:** RMR and RER measurements were lower when following SSt methods than

38   when following TI methods (all $P<0.01$). Although no significant differences were

39   found between different lengths of SSt, *5 min SSt* presented the lowest RMR. There

40   were no differences on the inter-day reliability across methods for data analysis (TI and

41   SSt) (all $P>0.2$), and there was no systematic bias when comparing RMR and RER day

42   1 and day 2 measurements (all $P>0.1$). Inter-day reliability was similar in individuals

43   who achieved the SS and individuals who did not achieve it. The results were consistent

44   independently of the metabolic cart used.

45   **Conclusions:** The *5 min SSt* approach should be the method of choice for analyzing IC

46   measures with metabolic carts. However, achieving SS should not be an inclusion

47   criterion in an IC study with young healthy adults.

50 **ABBREVIATIONS**

51 RMR: Resting metabolic Rate.

52 IC: Indirect calorimetry.

53 VO_2: Oxygen consumption.

54 VCO_2: Carbon dioxide production.

55 RER: Respiratory exchange ratio.

56 VE: Minute ventilation.

57 CV: Coefficient of variance.

58 SS: Steady state.

59 SSt: Steady state time.

60 TI: Time interval.

61 CCM: CCM Express (Medgraphics Corp, Minnesota, USA).

62 MGU: Ultima CardiO2 (Medgraphics Corp, Minnesota, USA).

63 ANOVA: Analyses of variance.

INTRODUCTION

Measuring human resting metabolic rate (RMR) is of key relevance in research and in the clinical setting [1-3]. Among the available methods to measure RMR, indirect calorimetry (IC) through a metabolic cart is the most commonly used in healthy, non-critically ill and ventilated individuals. In IC, energy expenditure is calculated from measured oxygen consumption (VO_2) and carbon dioxide production (VCO_2) by using estimating equations [4, 5]. Additionally, nutrient oxidation rates (i.e. carbohydrate and fat oxidation) can be estimated from IC measurements [6]. Guidelines on how to perform IC evaluations were published more than a decade ago [7] and were recently updated [8]; yet, there are still some issues that need to be clarified [8].

When performing IC with metabolic carts, gas exchange is commonly recorded during a relatively short period of time (e.g. 30 minutes), from which a shorter period of recorded data is selected and analyzed (e.g. 5 minutes). It is assumed that the selection of a steady state (SS) period, defined as a period in which gas exchange variables present low variation, increases the validity of the measure [9]. SS is commonly established as a period during which average minute VO_2, VCO_2, respiratory exchange ratio (RER), and/or minute ventilation (VE) coefficient of variance (CV) is lower than a pre-determined percentage (usually 10% for VO_2, VCO_2, and VE, and 5% for RER) [9]. However, as SS is not always feasible to achieve, other methods for data analysis have been proposed [10].

Methods for data analysis can be grouped in those based on a pre-defined time interval (TI) selection and those based on steady state time (SSt) approach [10]. Of note is that there is no consensus about time length of data selection in both TI or SSt methods [8, 10, 11], neither about the selection of which gas exchange variables and which pre-defined CV is better for determining SS [8]. High inter-day reliability is a key factor to

89   analyze the magnitude of change in RMR after an intervention [12, 13]. Moreover,

90   although RMR estimation is mainly dependent on VO_2 [4], the ratio between VO_2 and

91   VCO_2 (i.e. RER) is crucial for estimating nutrient oxidation rates [5, 14]. Consequently,

92   achieving a high RER reliability is also key for a method to be able to accurately estimate

93   fuel oxidation. However, to our knowledge there are no studies examining the impact of

94   different methods for data analysis (i.e. TI and SSt) on inter-day RMR and RER

95   reliability.

96   The assumption that SS provides more valid RMR and RER measurements comes mainly

97   from studies performed with ventilated patients [9, 15]. However, it is unknown whether

98   this also applies to healthy non-ventilated people [15, 16]. On the other hand, it has been

99   shown that RMR is consistently lower when following SSt than when following TI

100   methods in healthy individuals achieving SS [10]. This suggests that achieving SS could

101   provide a more valid RMR measure, given that RMR is considered the lowest energy

102   expenditure in an awake person [10]. However, whether the inter-day RMR or RER

103   reliability is higher in individuals achieving the SS compared to those that do not achieve

104   the SS needs to be studied.

105   The aims of this study were: i) to analyze the impact of methods for data analysis (TI and

106   SSt) on RMR and RER measurements in young adults; ii) to analyze the impact of

107   methods for data analysis (TI and SSt) on inter-day RMR and RER reliability; iii) to

108   compare inter-day RMR and RER reliability across methods for data analysis (TI and

109   SSt) in participants who achieved SS vs. participants who did not achieve SS.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participants

A total of 20 (n=13 women) Caucasian young healthy adults aged 18-26 years participated in the study. A total of 3 out of 20 participants did not meet the previous conditions for IC measurements on one of the testing days (2 participants performed physical activity in the 24 hours prior to the measurement, and the other one did not met the minimum fasting time requirement). Consequently, they were retrospectively excluded from further statistical analyses. They were non-physically active (<20 minutes <3 days/week), had a stable body weight (body weight changes <3 kg) over the last 3 months, were not enrolled in a weight loss program, were non-smokers, did not take any medication, had no acute or chronic illness, and were not pregnant. The study protocol and informed consent were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (revision of 2013), and was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of both University of Granada (nº924) and Servicio Andaluz de Salud (Centro de Granada, CEI-Granada). Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants before their enrollment.

Procedures

The study was conducted between February and April 2016. IC was measured via a repeated-measures design over 2 consecutive days. Measurements were conducted between 7.30 AM and 11 AM, and each participant was given an appointment at the same time on both days. Participants arrived to the laboratory by car or by bus (avoiding any physical activity after waking up) in a fasted state (at least 8 hours). They were instructed to refrain from moderate or vigorous physical activity 24 and 48 hours before the testing day, respectively. On each testing day, before performing the measurements, participants had to confirm that they met the aforementioned study conditions.

On both testing days, IC measurements were performed during two consecutive 30-minute periods with two different metabolic carts: CCM Express (CCM) and Ultima CardiO2 (MGU) (Medgraphics Corp, Minnesota, USA), using neoprene face-mask without external ventilation. The device order was replicated on both testing days, and it was counterbalanced between participants. Both devices measure VO_2 and VCO_2 using a breath-by-breath technique for determining the gas exchange. VCO_2 measurement is performed using a non-dispersive infrared analyzer, and VO_2 is measured using a galvanic fuel cell [17, 18].

IC measurements followed current guidelines [8]. In brief, all measurements were conducted in the same quiet room with dim lighting, with controlled ambient temperature (22-24ºC) and humidity (35-45%), and by the same trained staff. Before being evaluated, all participants confirmed that they met previous study conditions and lied on a reclined bed in a supine position and covered by a sheet for the 20 minutes prior to the IC measurement. They were instructed to breathe normally, and not to talk, fidget, or sleep. The same position and instructions were maintained during the two 30-minute measurement periods. Flow calibration was performed by using a 3-L calibration syringe at the beginning of every testing day, and gas analyzers were calibrated using 2 standard gas concentrations following the manufacturer's instruction before every IC measurement.

On day 1, we measured participants' weight and height using a Seca scale and stadiometer (model 799, Electronic Column Scale, Hamburg, Germany). Participants wore light clothing and no shoes during the measurements.

Methods for data analysis and steady state criteria

We used two types of methods for data analysis based on TI and SSt periods. (Figure 1):

(i) TI every 5 minutes, and TI representing the whole measurement period; and (ii) SSt

160   methods. TI every 5 minutes: mean values of every consecutive 5-minute period (i.e. from

161   the 1st to the 5th minute, from the 6th to the 10th, etc.), hereinafter referred as *1-5 min*, *6-*

162   *10 min*, *11-15 min*, *16-20 min*, *21-25 min*, and *26-30 min* (Figure 1A). TI representing the

163   whole measurement period: mean values for the whole measurement period (i.e. *1-30*

164   *min*), and mean values for the whole measurement period except for the first 5 minutes

165   (i.e. *6-30 min*) [8] or the first and the last 5 minutes (i.e. *6-25 min*) [19] (Figure 1B). For

166   the SSt methods, we calculated the CV of VO_2, VCO_2, VE, and RER for every period of

167   3, 4, 5, and 10 minutes [7, 11], excluding the first 5 minutes of data collection (i.e. for *3*

168   *min SSt*, CVs were calculated from 6th to 8th minute, from 7th to 9th, etc.) (Figure 1C).

169   Thereafter, we selected the periods of 3, 4, 5, or 10 minutes that met most of the following

170   criteria: i) CV<10% for VO_2, ii) CV<10% for VCO_2, iii) CV<10% for VE, and iv) CV<5%

171   for RER. Finally, among the periods that met most of those criteria we selected the 3, 4,

172   5, and 10-minute periods with the lowest average between CVs of VO_2, VCO_2, VE, and

173   RER, for being used as *3 min SSt*, *4 min SSt*, *5 min SSt* and *10 min SSt*, respectively

174   (Figure 1C). Finally, mean VO_2 and VCO_2 obtained by each method for data analysis

175   were entered into Weir´s abbreviated equation [4] (see below) to estimate energy

176   expenditure, and RER was calculated as VCO_2/VO_2:

177    $$RMR \text{ (Kcal/min)} = 3.941 \times VO_2 \text{(l/min)} + 1.106 \times VCO_2 \text{(l/min)}$$

178

Figure 1. Methods for data analysis. A=Time interval (TI) methods every 5 minutes; B= TI for the whole measurement. Pointed blocks represent selected data for each method for data analysis in A and B panels; C= Steady state time (SSt) methods. Y axe represents resting metabolic rate (simulated data). Blocks represent the 3, 4, 5, or 10-minute periods that met the most of the following criteria: CV<10% for VO_2, VCO_2, and VE, and CV<5% for RER, among the 30-minute record, after having discarded the first 5 minutes recorded. The solid lined blocks represent the period with the lowest average between CVs of VO_2, VCO_2, VE, and RER, and thus, the period of time selected in each method for data analysis. Dashed lined blocks represent periods with the same number of CVs criteria achieved as the selected period but with a higher average between CVs of VO_2, VCO_2, VE, and RER.

186   To compare inter-day RMR and RER reliability across methods for data analysis in

187   participants who achieved SS vs. participants who did not achieve SS, we classified

188   participants as those achieving CV<10% for VO_2, VCO_2 and VE and CV<5% for RER

189   (SS criteria) and those who failed to comply the SS criteria on any of the two testing days.

190   This classification was performed for every method for data analysis. Therefore, a total

191   of 13 methods for data analysis were tested, and were further grouped in those achieving

192   SS vs. not achieving SS.

193   The selected CV cut-off points are probably the most used ones in literature [8]. In

194   addition, a CV cut-off point of 10% for VO_2 and VCO_2 has been proved to accurately

195   predict total energy expenditure in ventilated patients [9]. However, there is no consensus

196   on how to define SS, neither on CV cut-off points, nor in the combination of gas exchange

197   variables. Therefore, we selected the most used CV cut-off points [8], and we decided to

198   classify participants taking into account the four gas exchange variables. This is the most

199   strict combination criteria, which would allow to test whether achieving SS would result

200   in better inter-day reliability. Nevertheless, we performed additional analyses classifying

201   participants just based on VO_2 and VCO_2 CV criteria.

202   **Statistical analysis**

203   Gas exchange parameters including VO_2, VCO_2, VE, RMR, and RER were averaged each

204   minute with the Breeze Suite (8.1.0.54 SP7, MGCDiagnostic®) software and downloaded

205   to an Excel spreadsheet where the CVs and outputs of the different methods for data

206   analysis were calculated. Results are presented as means ± standard deviation, unless

207   otherwise stated. The analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social

208   Sciences (SPSS, v. 21.0, IBM SPSS Statistics, IBM Corporation), and the level of

209   significance was set to <0.05.

210   *Impact of methods for data analysis on RMR and RER measurements*

211 A repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test differences in RMR

212 and RER measurements across methods for data analysis for both CCM and MGU

213 metabolic carts on both testing days. LSD Tuckey and Bonferroni corrections were used

214 to perform post hoc comparisons.

215 *Impact of methods for data analysis on inter-day reliability*

216 We compared the absolute value of inter-day differences in RMR and RER values (e.g.

217 |RMR Day1 – RMR Day2|) with every method for data analysis using repeated-measures

218 ANOVA for both CCM and MGU metabolic carts. Inter-day RMR and RER reliability

219 for every method of data analysis was also assessed using the Bland-Altman method [20].

220 Day 1 measurements were subtracted from day 2 measurements, so a positive difference

221 indicates that day 2 measurements were higher than day 1. Bias was measured by using a

222 2-sided *t*-test to determine if there was a significant difference between RMR and RER

223 measures on day 2 vs. day 1.

224 *Inter-day reliability across methods for data analysis in participants achieving SS vs. not*

225 *achieving SS*

226 The absolute value of inter-day differences in RMR and RER (e.g. |RMR Day1 – RMR

227 Day2|) in each method for data analysis and for both CCM and MGU metabolic carts

228 were compared between those participants who achieved the SS criteria and those who

229 did not, using independent sample *t*-tests.

230

RESULTS

The included participants (n=17, 11 women) were 23.2±1.9 years old. Mean weight and height were 63.3±11.5 Kg and 168±9 cm respectively (body mass index: 18.6 to 26.2 kg/m^2). All participants had valid data for the MGU, and all except one had valid data for the CCM (n=16).

Impact of methods for data analysis on RMR and RER measurements

Figure 2 shows mean values of day 1 measurements for RMR and RER across different methods for data analysis. Repeated-measures ANOVA indicated significant differences in mean RMR and RER for both CCM and MGU metabolic carts (all P<0.01). The lowest RMR value was obtained when following the *5 min SSt* method for both CCM and MGU. The lowest RER value was also obtained following the *5 min SSt* for the CCM, but not for the MGU, where *1-5 min* method resulted in lower RER value. LSD Tuckey post hoc comparisons revealed significant differences between SSt and TI methods. SSt obtained lower values, but we found no significant differences when comparing between different lengths of SSt methods. Nevertheless, significant differences disappeared after Bonferroni corrections. Results were similar in the measurements preformed on day 2 (data not shown).

CCM (n=16)   **MGU** (n=17)

248

Figure 2. Day 1 resting metabolic rate (RMR) and respiratory exchange ratio (RER) measurements across methods for data analysis (steady state
time and time interval) in the CCM and MGU metabolic carts. Black columns represent time intervals of 5 minutes; Grey columns represent time
intervals for longer time periods; and White columns represent steady state time (SSt) periods. SSt is defined as the period (3, 4, 5, or 10 minutes)
with the lowest coefficient of variance for VO2, VCO2, RER, and VE (i.e. the most stable period of *n* minutes). P from analysis of variance.

253   *Impact of methods for data analysis on inter-day reliability*

254   Repeated-measures ANOVA indicated no significant effect of method for data analysis

255   in absolute value of inter-day RMR and RER differences on both CCM and MGU

256   metabolic carts (Figure 3, all P>0.2). Results remained unaltered when using inter-day

257   percentages instead of absolute values (all P>0.2, data not shown).

258   Table 1 shows inter-day mean bias (Day2 - Day1) and the 95% limit of agreement (mean

259   difference±1.96 standard deviation of the difference) for every method for data analysis

260   with the CCM and MGU metabolic carts. Paired *t*-test showed no significant RMR or

261   RER inter-day mean differences in any of the methods for data analysis (all P>0.1). The

262   limits of agreement were quite similar across methods, and no method presented the

263   narrowest limits of agreement for all analysis. We observed that *10 min SSt*, *5 min SSt*, *6-*

264   *25 min*, and *10 min SSt* presented the narrowest limits of agreement for RMR-CCM,

265   RMR-MGU, RER -CCM, and RER -MGU, respectively.

Figure 3. Inter-day reliability of resting metabolic rate (RMR) and respiratory exchange ratio (RER) across methods for data analysis (steady state and time interval) in the CCM and MGU metabolic carts. Y axis represents absolute values of the inter-day differences (e.g. |RMR Day1 – RMR Day2|). Black columns represent time intervals of 5 minutes; Grey columns represent time intervals for longer time periods; and White columns represent steady state time (SSt) periods. SSt is defined as the period (3, 4, 5, or 10 minutes) with the lowest coefficient of variance for VO2, VCO2, RER, and VE (i.e. the most stable period of *n* minutes). P from analysis of variance.

272 **Table 1.** Resting metabolic rate (RMR) and respiratory exchange ratio (RER) inter-day reliability across methods for data analysis by metabolic cart (CCM
273 and MGU).

	CMM (n=16)			MGU (n=17)		
	Bias	(Lower limit ; Higher limit)	P	Bias	(Lower limit ; Higher limit)	P
RMR (Kcal/day)						
1-5 min	51	(-385 ; 488)	0.364	87	(-490 ; 665)	0.231
6-10 min	48	(-396 ; 493)	0.396	45	(-539 ; 629)	0.533
11-15 min	53	(-398 ; 505)	0.361	69	(-502 ; 640)	0.334
16-20 min	58	(-373 ; 488)	0.3	59	(-513 ; 631)	0.408
21-25 min	61	(-361 ; 483)	0.267	77	(-508 ; 662)	0.295
26-30 min	46	(-424 ; 517)	0.443	67	(-507 ; 641)	0.352
1-30 min	53	(-376 ; 482)	0.339	67	(-499 ; 634)	0.342
6-30 min	53	(-380 ; 486)	0.34	63	(-508 ; 635)	0.374
6-25 min	55	(-371 ; 481)	0.318	62	(-512 ; 637)	0.383
3 min SSt*	50	(-375 ; 475)	0.359	77	(-489 ; 644)	0.277
4 min SSt*	48	(-388 ; 484)	0.39	83	(-485 ; 651)	0.244
5 min SSt*	53	(-382 ; 487)	0.347	75	(-468 ; 619)	0.27
10 min SSt*	55	(-358 ; 468)	0.301	69	(-534 ; 672)	0.361
RER						
1-5 min	0.01	(-0.09 ; 0.10)	0.549	0	(-0.11 ; 0.12)	0.786
6-10 min	0	(-0.07 ; 0.07)	0.934	0.01	(-0.08 ; 0.09)	0.578
11-15 min	0	(-0.07 ; 0.08)	0.821	0.01	(-0.08 ; 0.10)	0.362
16-20 min	0	(-0.07 ; 0.07)	0.989	0	(-0.10 ; 0.10)	0.88
21-25 min	0.01	(-0.06 ; 0.09)	0.226	0	(-0.10 ; 0.10)	0.946
26-30 min	0.02	(-0.21 ; 0.25)	0.478	0	(-0.09 ; 0.09)	0.828
1-30 min	0.01	(-0.06 ; 0.07)	0.417	0	(-0.08 ; 0.08)	0.746
6-30 min	0.01	(-0.07 ; 0.08)	0.469	0	(-0.08 ; 0.09)	0.761
6-25 min	0	(-0.05 ; 0.06)	0.627	0	(-0.08 ; 0.09)	0.748
3 min SSt*	0.01	(-0.11 ; 0.12)	0.658	0.01	(-0.09 ; 0.10)	0.641
4 min SSt*	0.02	(-0.07 ; 0.1)	0.134	0	(-0.10 ; 0.10)	0.945
5 min SSt*	0.01	(-0.07 ; 0.1)	0.206	0	(-0.10 ; 0.09)	0.693
10 min SSt*	0.01	(-0.05 ; 0.06)	0.451	0.01	(-0.07 ; 0.09)	0.459

274 Data are mean bias (Day2 - Day1) and the 95% limits of agreement (mean difference ±1.96 standard deviation of the difference). P from paired T-test for
275 Day1 vs. Day2. *Steady state time (SSt) period is defined as the period (3, 4, 5, or 10 minutes) with the lowest coefficient of variance for VO2, VCO2, RER,
276 and VE (i.e. the most stable period of *n* minutes).

277   *Inter-day reliability across methods for data analysis in participants achieving SS vs.*

278   *participants not achieving SS*

279   Table 2 shows the comparisons between participants who achieved SS and those who did

280   not on inter-day differences in RMR and RER in each method for data analysis and for

281   both CCM and MGU metabolic carts. All participants, except one, achieved the SS

282   criteria when following the *3, 4*, and *5 min SSt* method for data analysis. There were no

283   significant mean differences between participants who achieved the SS criteria and those

284   who did not, except in RMR-MGU following the *6-10 min* method (98±108 vs. 296±180

285   Kcal/day, respectively, P=0.027). Results were similar when the SS criteria were based

286   on just VO_2 and VCO_2 CV (data not shown).

Table 2. Resting metabolic rate (RMR) and respiratory exchange ratio (RER) inter-day reliability across methods for data analysis between participants who achieved steady state (Steady State) and participants who did not (non-Steady state), and by metabolic cart (CCM and MGU).

		CMM (n=16)						MGU (n=17)			
	n	*Steady state	n	non-Steady state	P		n	*Steady state	n	non-Steady state	P
RMR (Kca/day)											
1-5 min	3	270 (258)	13	138 (114)	0.473		3	147 (153)	14	245 (198)	0.44
6-10 min	2	374 (347)	14	121 (115)	0.488		6	98 (108)	11	296 (180)	**0.027**
11-15 min	5	80 (54)	11	191 (190)	0.226		10	186 (191)	7	273 (178)	0.361
16-20 min	4	203 (297)	12	135 (95)	0.68		7	214 (210)	10	230 (168)	0.863
21-25 min	5	208 (244)	11	136 (84)	0.552		6	247 (266)	11	210 (159)	0.824
26-30 min	8	219 (213)	8	131 (61)	0.293		6	196 (263)	11	215 (176)	0.858
1-30 min	5	207 (241)	11	128 (105)	0.366		8	170 (215)	9	264 (151)	0.306
6-30 min	6	190 (226)	10	131 (108)	0.483		9	196 (224)	8	245 (144)	0.607
6-25 min	6	182 (229)	10	126 (110)	0.514		9	203 (221)	8	247 (138)	0.633
3 min SSt*	16	140 (164)	0		NC		16	226 (193)	1	80	NC
4 min SSt*	16	150 (161)	0		NC		16	233 (187)	1	144	NC
5 min SSt*	15	163 (158)	1	83	NC		16	213 (190)	1	120	NC
10 min SSt*	11	157 (179)	5	115 (91)	0.634		14	254 (206)	3	159 (29)	0.129
RER											
1-5 min	3	0 (0)	13	0.04 (0.03)	0.077		3	0.02 (0.02)	14	0.04 (0.04)	0.458
6-10 min	2	0.02 (0.02)	14	0.03 (0.02)	0.396		6	0.04 (0.02)	11	0.04 (0.03)	0.958
11-15 min	5	0.02 (0.02)	11	0.03 (0.02)	0.334		10	0.03 (0.03)	7	0.04 (0.02)	0.441
16-20 min	4	0.02 (0.02)	12	0.03 (0.02)	0.283		7	0.03 (0.03)	10	0.04 (0.04)	0.284
21-25 min	5	0.03 (0.02)	11	0.04 (0.02)	0.821		6	0.03 (0.02)	11	0.04 (0.03)	0.068
26-30 min	8	0.05 (0.02)	8	0.07 (0.14)	0.61		6	0.03 (0.02)	11	0.04 (0.03)	0.544
1-30 min	5	0.01 (0.02)	11	0.03 (0.02)	0.197		8	0.03 (0.02)	9	0.04 (0.02)	0.348
6-30 min	6	0.02 (0.02)	10	0.03 (0.03)	0.414		9	0.03 (0.02)	8	0.04 (0.03)	0.39
6-25 min	6	0.02 (0.02)	10	0.02 (0.01)	0.734		9	0.03 (0.02)	8	0.04 (0.03)	0.417
3 min SSt*	16	0.04 (0.04)	0		NC		16	0.03 (0.03)	1	0.03	NC
4 min SSt*	16	0.03 (0.03)	0		NC		16	0.04 (0.03)	1	0.07	NC
5 min SSt*	15	0.03 (0.03)	1	0.07	NC		16	0.03 (0.03)	1	0.02	NC
10 min SSt*	11	0.03 (0.01)	5	0.02 (0.02)	0.522		14	0.04 (0.03)	3	0.05 (0.02)	0.799

Data are presented as absolute mean differences between day 1 and day 2 (e.g. |RMR Day1 – RMR Day2|) and (standard deviation). P from paired T-Test comparing participants who achieved steady state (SS) and participants who did not. "NC": Not computable. *Steady state (SS) is defined as the time period where VO2, VCO2, VE vary by <10% and RER varies by <5%. When these criteria are not met, measurement is defined as non-SS. **Steady state time (SSt) period is defined as the period (3, 4, 5, or 10 minutes) with the lowest coefficient of variance for VO2, VCO2, RER and VE (i.e. the most stable period of *n* minutes).

DISCUSSION

The main findings of this study suggest that: i) RMR and RER measurements are lower when following SSt methods than when following TI methods in young healthy adults using the CCM or MGU metabolic carts. Although no significant differences were found between different lengths of SSt, *5 min SSt* seems to present the lowest RMR and RER values; ii) there are no differences on the inter-day reliability across methods for data analysis (TI and SSt), and there is no systematic bias when comparing RMR and RER day 1 and day 2 measurements; iii) inter-day reliability seems to be comparable between participants who achieved the SS and participants who did not. Of note is that the results were consistent independently of the metabolic cart used. Taken together, these findings suggest that *5 min SSt* should be the method of choice, and that not achieving SS should not be an inclusion criterion in an IC study with young adults using either the CCM or MGU metabolic cart.

We observed that *5 min SSt* was the method which obtained the lowest RMR value in both metabolic carts, and the lowest RER in one of the metabolic carts (CCM). These results concur with those reported by Irving et al. [10]. They reported that RMR values obtained by *5 min SSt* method was lower than values obtained with TI methods of several lengths. However, there are some differences between our study and the one by Irving et al. [10]: (i) they excluded participants who did not achieve the SS, (ii) they did not include other SSt periods in their analysis, and (iii) they did not compare RER values between methods for data analysis. Nevertheless, as RMR is considered to be the lowest energy expenditure on an awake person, our results also suggest that *5 min SSt* may provide the most valid RMR measurement. Nonetheless, it should be noted that when comparing mean RMR measurements between different SSt methods, maximum differences were of 20 Kcal/day, which may not be of clinical relevance, and no statistical differences were

319   found. Reeves et al. [11] also showed similar RMR differences when comparing *3 min*

320   *SSt*, *4 min SSt*, and *5 min SSt*, which also concur with our results.

321   Interestingly, Reeves et al. [11] showed that only 54% of the participants were able to

322   achieve SS on *5 min SSt*, while Irving et al. [10] reported that 84% of participants achieved

323   SS on *5 min SSt*. Horner et al. [16] observed that 93% of participants achieved SS on *5*

324   *min SSt* (considering a CV<10% for VO_2, RER, and VE) and that 47% of participants

325   achieved the SS on *10 SSt* in 30 min of measuring. These results are in agreement with

326   our study. We observed that 93.7% and 94.1% (CCM and MGU, respectively) of

327   participants achieved the SS on *5 min SSt* on both testing days, and only 68.7% and 82.3%

328   (CCM and MGU, respectively) achieved the SS on *10 min SSt* on both testing days.

329   Surprisingly, we found a higher percentage of participants that achieved SS than most of

330   previous studies, except for Horner et al. [16]. It is to note that Reeves et al. [11] included

331   patients with cancer, and that the participants in Irving et al. [10] study were considerably

332   older than those taking part in our study. Thus, it is plausible that both health status [9],

333   sex [11], and age influence the ability to achieve SS. Further studies are needed to confirm

334   this hypothesis.

335   A high RMR reliability is important in order to be able to detect changes resulting from

336   an intervention or for between-individual comparisons on a cross-sectional study [12, 13].

337   Haugen et al. [21] reported 79±11 Kcal/day absolute inter-day RMR differences when

338   measuring healthy individuals with a canopy system (model 2900 Metabolic Cart;

339   SensorMedics). Cooper et al. [19] showed a 10.9% mean inter-day variance of RMR

340   measured with an older MGU model. In our study, the inter-day variability following the

341   *5 min SSt* method was 158±154 Kcal/day (13.5±15.3%) for the CCM, and 219±185

342   Kcal/day (18.3±17.2%) for the MGU (Figure 3). Of note is that the reliability was similar

343   when using different methods for data analysis (TI and SSt). Future studies are needed to

344   confirm if these results also apply to other metabolic carts such as those used by Haugen

345   et al. [21] or Cooper et al. [19].

346   Although factors influencing RMR inter-day reliability have been explored in several

347   studies [19, 21], not all of them have also studied RER inter-day reliability [21]. RER

348   equally depends on VCO_2 and VO_2, whereas RMR depends mainly on VO_2.

349   Consequently, using different methods for data analysis could have a different impact on

350   RMR and RER inter-day reliability. In a study comparing six metabolic carts, Cooper et

351   al. [19] showed that RER inter-day reliability was considerably better than RMR inter-

352   day reliability. Indeed, there were no differences between the RER inter-day reliability

353   obtained with the gold-standard metabolic cart (Deltatrac metabolic monitor), whereas

354   important differences between metabolic carts were found for RMR inter-day reliability

355   [19]. Taken together, these findings [19] suggest than RER has a better inter-day

356   reliability than RMR. In line with this, we found that RER inter-day reliability was not

357   influenced by the selected method for data analysis. Nonetheless, it should be noted that

358   limits of agreement of inter-day RER differences (Table 1) might not be considered

359   clinically acceptable. It is to note that we did not control the composition of previous

360   meals, which could affect RER inter-day reliability. In addition, RER inter-day reliability

361   has been shown to be slightly worse in IC performed with a MGU metabolic cart (an older

362   model than the one used in our study) than with several other metabolic carts [19], which

363   could also explain why we found these high inter-day RER differences.

364   Achieving SS is generally considered necessary to obtain a valid measure of RMR and

365   RER [9-11, 15]. However, we found that participants who achieved SS did not

366   consistently present higher inter-day RMR or RER reliability than participants who did

367   not achieve SS in any of the methods used for data analysis. Although an unequal

368   distribution of participants in both groups (SS vs. non-SS) hampers deeper analysis, our

369 results suggest that achieving SS does not improve inter-day reliability. These findings

370 concur with those by Horner et al. [16]. They showed no higher repeatability on

371 participants achieving SS than in those not achieving SS when analyzing data following

372 the TI methods. If confirmed, these results should be considered in future IC studies, as

373 it might be that excluding participants who do not achieve SS, and consequently loosing

374 statistical power, has no advantage in terms of inter-day reliability.

375 The results of this study should be considered with caution as there are some limitations.

376 Participants were healthy young adults, and we do not know if these findings can be

377 extended to older or unhealthy people. We strictly controlled the fasting time (8 hours)

378 prior to IC measurements, which is considered a mandatory condition to measure RER

379 [22]. However, the composition of previous meals was not standardized, which affect the

380 RER measurements [23]. Whereas our results are similar when using the CCM and MGU

381 metabolic carts, we do not know if our findings apply to other metabolic carts, or even to

382 other gases collection systems such as canopy which may affect the RMR estimation (e.g.

383 canopy) [24, 25]. Due to the relatively low sample size, we were not able to analyze the

384 data in men and women separately. Further studies with larger sample sizes are needed to

385 confirm the impact of achieving SS on inter-day RMR and RER reliability.

386 In summary, our findings suggest that inter-day RMR and RER reliability is not

387 influenced by the use of different methods for data analysis (TI and SSt) and that it is not

388 better in participants who achieved SS. This finding implies that participants who do not

389 achieve SS should not be excluded from data analysis. Moreover, our data confirm the

390 use of the *5 min SSt* as the optimal method for analyzing RMR and RER from IC. The *5*

391 *min SSt* presented the lowest RMR value, and the proportion of participants able to

392 achieve SS following this method was higher than with other methods for data analysis.

393   These findings are further reinforced by the fact that the results are similar when using

394   two different metabolic carts.

AUTHOR´S CONTRIBUTION

GSD, JMA, IL, and JRR conceived the study; GSD, JMA, BMT, and JRR designed the study; JMA, LOA, and HX did the data collection; GSD performed the statistical analyses and drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST SOURCES

The authors confirm that there are no conflicts of interest.

412 **REFERENCES**

413 [1] Lam YY, Ravussin E. Indirect calorimetry: an indispensable tool to understand and

414 predict obesity. European journal of clinical nutrition. 2017;71:318-22.

415 [2] Pontzer H, Brown MH, Raichlen DA, Dunsworth H, Hare B, Walker K, et al.

416 Metabolic acceleration and the evolution of human brain size and life history. Nature.

417 2016;533:390-2.

418 [3] Ainslie P, Reilly T, Westerterp K. Estimating human energy expenditure: a review

419 of techniques with particular reference to doubly labelled water. Sports medicine

420 (Auckland, NZ). 2003;33:683-98.

421 [4] Weir JB. New methods for calculating metabolic rate with special reference to

422 protein metabolism. The Journal of physiology. 1949;109:1-9.

423 [5] Jequier E, Acheson K, Schutz Y. Assessment of energy expenditure and fuel

424 utilization in man. Annual review of nutrition. 1987;7:187-208.

425 [6] Frayn KN. Calculation of substrate oxidation rates in vivo from gaseous exchange.

426 Journal of applied physiology: respiratory, environmental and exercise physiology.

427 1983;55:628-34.

428 [7] Compher C, Frankenfield D, Keim N, Roth-Yousey L. Best practice methods to

429 apply to measurement of resting metabolic rate in adults: a systematic review. Journal of

430 the American Dietetic Association. 2006;106:881-903.

431 [8] Fullmer S, Benson-Davies S, Earthman CP, Frankenfield DC, Gradwell E, Lee PS,

432 et al. Evidence analysis library review of best practices for performing indirect

433 calorimetry in healthy and non-critically ill individuals. Journal of the Academy of

434 Nutrition and Dietetics. 2015;115:1417-46.e2.

435   [9] McClave SA, Spain DA, Skolnick JL, Lowen CC, Kieber MJ, Wickerham PS, et al.

436   Achievement of steady state optimizes results when performing indirect calorimetry.

437   JPEN Journal of parenteral and enteral nutrition. 2003;27:16-20.

438   [10] Irving CJ, Eggett DL, Fullmer S. Comparing Steady State to Time Interval and

439   Non-Steady State Measurements of Resting Metabolic Rate. Nutrition in clinical

440   practice : official publication of the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral

441   Nutrition. 2017;32:77-83.

442   [11] Reeves MM, Davies PS, Bauer J, Battistutta D. Reducing the time period of steady

443   state does not affect the accuracy of energy expenditure measurements by indirect

444   calorimetry. Journal of applied physiology (Bethesda, Md : 1985). 2004;97:130-4.

445   [12] Roffey DM, Byrne NM, Hills AP. Day-to-day variance in measurement of resting

446   metabolic rate using ventilated-hood and mouthpiece & nose-clip indirect calorimetry

447   systems. JPEN Journal of parenteral and enteral nutrition. 2006;30:426-32.

448   [13] Kennedy S, Ryan L, Fraser A, Clegg ME. Comparison of the GEM and the ECAL

449   indirect calorimeters against the Deltatrac for measures of RMR and diet-induced

450   thermogenesis. Journal of nutritional science. 2014;3:e52.

451   [14] Jeukendrup AE, Wallis GA. Measurement of substrate oxidation during exercise by

452   means of gas exchange measurements. International journal of sports medicine. 2005;26

453   Suppl 1:S28-37.

454   [15] Borges JH, Langer RD, Cirolini VX, Pascoa MA, Guerra-Junior G, Goncalves EM.

455   Minimum Time to Achieve the Steady State and Optimum Abbreviated Period to

456   Estimate the Resting Energy Expenditure by Indirect Calorimetry in Healthy Young

457   Adults. Nutrition in clinical practice : official publication of the American Society for

458   Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. 2016;31:349-54.

459   [16] Horner NK, Lampe JW, Patterson RE, Neuhouser ML, Beresford SA, Prentice RL.

460   Indirect calorimetry protocol development for measuring resting metabolic rate as a

461   component of total energy expenditure in free-living postmenopausal women. The

462   Journal of nutrition. 2001;131:2215-8.

463   [17] Black C, Grocott MP, Singer M. Metabolic monitoring in the intensive care unit: a

464   comparison of the Medgraphics Ultima, Deltatrac II, and Douglas bag collection

465   methods. British journal of anaesthesia. 2015;114:261-8.

466   [18] Sundstrom M, Tjader I, Rooyackers O, Wernerman J. Indirect calorimetry in

467   mechanically ventilated patients. A systematic comparison of three instruments. Clinical

468   nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland). 2013;32:118-21.

469   [19] Cooper JA, Watras AC, O'Brien MJ, Luke A, Dobratz JR, Earthman CP, et al.

470   Assessing validity and reliability of resting metabolic rate in six gas analysis systems.

471   Journal of the American Dietetic Association. 2009;109:128-32.

472   [20] Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two

473   methods of clinical measurement. Lancet (London, England). 1986;1:307-10.

474   [21] Haugen HA, Melanson EL, Tran ZV, Kearney JT, Hill JO. Variability of measured

475   resting metabolic rate. The American journal of clinical nutrition. 2003;78:1141-5.

476   [22] Shook RP, Hand GA, Paluch AE, Wang X. High respiratory quotient is associated

477   with increases in body weight and fat mass in young adults. 2016;70:1197-202.

478   [23] Labayen I, Forga L, Martinez JA. Nutrient oxidation and metabolic rate as affected

479   by meals containing different proportions of carbohydrate and fat, in healthy young

480   women. European journal of nutrition. 1999;38:158-66.

481   [24] Graf S, Karsegard VL, Viatte V, Maisonneuve N, Pichard C, Genton L.

482   Comparison of three indirect calorimetry devices and three methods of gas collection: a

483   prospective observational study. Clinical nutrition (Edinburgh, Scotland).

484   2013;32:1067-72.

485   [25] Forse RA. Comparison of gas exchange measurements with a mouthpiece, face

486   mask, and ventilated canopy. JPEN Journal of parenteral and enteral nutrition.

487   1993;17:388-91.

488