1   **Handgrip strength, inflammatory markers and mortality**

2   Lee Smith,[1] PhD; Lin Yang,[2] PhD; Mark Hamer,[3*] PhD

3

4   [1]The Cambridge Centre for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Anglia Ruskin University,

5   Cambridge; [2]Department of Epidemiology, Medical University of Vienna, Austria; [3]School

6   Sport, Exercise Health Sciences, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK

7

8   *Correspondence: Dr Lee Smith; [1]The Cambridge Centre for Sport and Exercise Sciences,

9   Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, UK; lee.smith@anglia.ac.uk

10   Word count = 1,899

11   Running Head: handgrip strength and mortality

12   Disclosures: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20   **Abstract**

21   **Purpose:** To investigate the extent to which inflammatory markers explain the association

22   between handgrip strength and mortality.

23   **Methods:** Analyses of data from The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. Handgrip

24   strength and inflammatory marker data (C-reactive protein and Fibrinogen) were collected at

25   baseline (2004/5) and inflammatory marker data at follow up (2012/13). Participant data were

26   linked with death records. General linear models were used to explore associations between

27   handgrip strength and inflammatory markers at follow up. Cox proportional hazards

28   regression models were used to examine associations between grip strength and risk of death.

29   Models were estimated with the covariates age, sex, wealth, physical activity, smoking,

30   depressive symptoms, long standing illness, adiposity.

31   **Results:** The sample comprised 5,240 participants (mean age 65.9 (SD 9.4) yrs; 53.8%

32   female). Over an average 9.7 ±1.4yrs follow up there were 650 deaths. Inverse associations

33   were evident between handgrip strength and change in inflammatory markers in women only.

34   There was an association between grip strength and lower risk of mortality in women (hazard

35   ratio = 0.85; 95% CI, 0.74, 0.98) after adjusting for age and wealth. The association was

36   attenuated after adjustment for clinical and behavioural risk factors (0.92; 0.79, 1.07), and

37   further attenuated after adjusting for inflammatory markers (0.95; 0.82, 1.11).

38   **Conclusion:** Higher grip strength is associated with lower levels of inflammation at 8-year

39   follow-up, and inflammatory markers partly explained the association between handgrip

40   strength and mortality.

41   **Keywords:** Handgrip strength, mortality, inflammatory markers, ELSA

42

2

INTRODUCTION

Physical activity promotes cardiorespiratory fitness and the maintenance of lean muscle mass with ageing.[1] The health benefits of cardiorespiratory fitness are well established[2] although less is known about muscle strength.[3,4]

Handgrip strength is a valid measure of physical function/ performance that has been widely used in observational cohort studies and clinical settings.[5-8] Several studies have shown that handgrip strength is inversely associated with risk of mortality[9-11] although the mechanisms linking muscle strength and disease outcomes is poorly understood. One possible explanation is systemic inflammation. Systemic inflammation has been shown to be associated with a plethora of noncommunicable diseases (e.g. see, Ridker et al[12] and Sin et al[13]).

Three well studied inflammatory biomarkers include Interleukin 6 (IL-6), C-reactive protein (CRP), and Fibrinogen. Briefly, IL-6 is a pleiotropic cytokine that is secreted by T cells and macrophages to activate immune responses during infection or after trauma (tissue injury).[14] CRP is produced in the liver and it is an acute phase reactant thus levels will rise when inflammation is present.[15] Finally, Fibrinogen is a blood plasma protein that is made in the liver. It is also an acute phase reactant and levels rise when inflammation is present.[16] Unfavourable levels of these three inflammatory biomarkers have been found to be associated with several physical and mental health conditions.[17-19]

Inflammatory processes have also been linked with muscle atrophy (and thus weaker grip strength),[20] and muscle tissue expresses various transcriptional co-activators that may promote systemic anti-inflammatory effects.[21] We have previously shown cross-sectional associations between systematic inflammation and muscle strength,[22] consistent with others.[23] In another study, higher levels of IL-6 and CRP were associated with a two- to three-fold greater risk of losing more than 40% of grip strength over 3 years follow-up.[24] The current

67 literature therefore suggests that inflammation is associated with muscle strength although the

68 direction of the association is not clear.

69 We hypothesized that inflammatory processes might in part explain the association between

70 handgrip strength and mortality. The primary aim of the present study was to investigate the

71 longitudinal association between handgrip strength and inflammatory markers, and examine

72 the extent to which inflammatory markers explain the association between handgrip strength

73 and mortality.

74 **METHODS**

75 *Study sample and procedures*

76 The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) is a cohort study of older adults

77 previously described.[25] The sample was drawn from participants in the Health Survey for

78 England (HSE), an annual cross-sectional survey that is designed to monitor the health of the

79 general population. For wave 1, participants were recruited from the HSE in 1998, 1999 and

80 2001. Eligibility criteria included, membership of a participating household from HSE in

81 which at least one person had agreed to follow-up, born before 1 March 1952 and living in a

82 private household in England at the time of the first wave of fieldwork. Data on grip strength

83 and inflammatory markers was first collected at wave 2 (2004/5), and was thus used as the

84 baseline for the present analyses. Inflammatory marker data collection were repeated at wave

85 6 (2012/13) in survivors. Participants gave full informed consent to participate in the study.

86 Ethical approval was obtained from the London Multi-center Research Ethics Committee,

87 compliant with the Declaration of Helsinki.

88

89 *Clinical assessments*

4

Anthropometric data (weight, waist, hip), grip strength and blood samples were collected by trained nurses. Participants were excluded from providing blood if they reported clotting and bleeding disorders, or taking anti-coagulant medication, and excluded from hand grip tests if they had swelling or inflammation, severe pain, or a recent injury or surgery to the hand in the preceding 6 months. Handgrip strength (kg) of the dominant hand was assessed using the Smedley hand-held dynamometer (Stoelting Co, IL, USA), using the average of three measurements. Participants were required to hold the device at a right angle to their body and exert maximum force for a couple of seconds when instructed. Successive trials were alternated between dominant and non-dominant hands. Body weight was measured without shoes and in light clothing using Tanita electronic scales. Waist circumference was recorded twice midway between the iliac crest and lower rib and hip circumference around the widest portion of the buttocks using measuring tape. Central obesity was defined using waist to hip ratio (WHR) World Health Organization criteria (WHR≥0.85 in women and WHR≥0.90 in men). Blood samples were analyzed for high sensitivity C-reactive protein (CRP) and fibrinogen, described elsewhere.[26]

Mortality

The individual participant data were linked with death records from National Health Service registries for all consenting respondents (96.5% of the sample) up to February 2012.

Covariates

Trained interviewers asked questions on cigarette smoking (current, ex-smoker or non-smoker), frequency of vigorous, moderate- and low-intensity physical activity (> once a week, once a week, 1 – 3 times a month, and hardly ever/never), chronic illnesses (at least one vs. none), and depressive symptoms (using a score >3 on the 8-item Centre of

115 Epidemiological Studies Depression scale).[27] Wealth was self-reported, comprising of the

116 total value of the participant's home (excluding mortgage), financial assets such as savings,

117 business assets, and physical wealth such as artwork or jewelry, which has been shown to

118 best capture the material resources available to older adults.[28] Wealth was grouped into

119 quintiles relative to the ELSA sample.

120

121 *Statistical analysis*

122 Handgrip was standardised for body mass (as the two variables were moderately correlated,

123 r>0.40) and treated as a continuous variable using the standardised score. Inflammatory

124 markers were examined for normality and log transformed where appropriate. In all analysis

125 we ran models separately for men and women as handgrip strength was greater in men. We

126 used general linear models to explore longitudinal associations between handgrip strength

127 and change in inflammatory markers. Models were adjusted for age, sex, levels of

128 inflammatory marker at baseline, wealth, physical activity, smoking, depressive symptoms,

129 long standing illness, WHR.

130 Cox proportional hazards regression models were employed to examine associations between

131 grip strength and death. Years were the time scale for the follow-up calculated from age at

132 death, and for participants with no record of an event, the data were censored at February

133 2012. Plots of the Nelson-Aalen cumulative hazard estimates were examined to assess the

134 proportional hazards assumption. We estimated models that initially contained the covariates

135 age, sex, wealth (model 1), with further adjustment for physical activity, smoking, depressive

136 symptoms, long standing illness, WHR (model 2). These covariates were considered as

137 confounders and selected a priori based on previous literature.[29-31] We then added

138 inflammatory markers (log CRP, fibrinogen) as continuous variables to theoretically test for

139 mediation. In these mediation analyses we primarily focused on the change in effect estimate

6

140 and confidence intervals as "statistical significance" is less relevant.[33] In sensitivity analyses

141 we removed participants with activity limiting illnesses to examine if reverse causation was

142 driving the results. All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 22 (SPSS, Chicago, IL).

RESULTS

144 At baseline 5,812 participants provided a blood sample and data on hand grip strength. After

145 removing participants not consenting to mortality linkage (n=138) and those with missing

146 covariates (n=434) the analytic sample for survival analyses comprised 5,240 participants

147 (mean age 65.9 (SD 9.4) yrs; 53.8% female). In the longitudinal analyses that modelled

148 change in inflammatory markers we further excluded participants that died through follow up

149 (n=650) and those that did not provide blood samples at 8 years follow up (n=1,885), leaving

150 an analytic sample of 2,705 participants (age 63.3±7.8 yrs; 55.2% female).

151 At baseline the mean handgrip strength of dominant hand was 38.4±9.7 kg (men) and

152 22.5±6.6 kg (women); normalised for body mass 0.47±0.12 (men) and 0.33±.10 (women).

153 Participants in the highest hand grip strength tertiles were younger, more vigorously active,

154 more affluent, reported less illness and depressive symptoms, and recorded lower prevalence

155 of central obesity (Table 1).

156 In longitudinal analyses that examined baseline grip strength and change in inflammatory

157 markers over 8 years follow up inverse associations were evident with both fibrinogen and

158 CRP in women only (Table 2). This was the case in fully adjusted analyses and also among

159 the pooled sample of men and women. In men, the inverse associations between grip strength

160 and change in inflammatory markers were evident in age adjusted models but did not persist

161 in models adjusted for all covariates.

7

162 Over an average 9.7 ±1.4yrs follow up there were 650 deaths. There was an association

163 between baseline grip strength and lower risk of mortality in women (hazard ratio [per SD

164 increase in grip strength] = 0.85; 95% CI, 0.74, 0.98) after adjusting for age and wealth; no

165 associations were seen in men (0.94; 0.83, 1.06) (Table 3). The association was somewhat

166 attenuated after adjustment for clinical and behavioural risk factors, and further attenuated

167 after adjusting for inflammatory markers. In mutually adjusted models the covariates

168 associated with mortality included longstanding illness, physical inactivity, smoking, and

169 CRP (Table S1, SDC, association between clinical and behavioural covariates with

170 mortality).

171 In sensitivity analyses we repeated the survival models after removal of participants who

172 reported that their illness/disability limited their activity (n=1,409). The effect estimates

173 remained largely unchanged albeit confidence intervals became wider as a result of reduced

174 numbers (Table S2, SDC, the extent to which baseline clinical and biological factors explain

175 associations between handgrip and mortality (excluding participants with activity limiting

176 illnesses at baseline)).

177 **DISCUSSION**

178 In this population-based sample of older English adults, those with higher levels of grip

179 strength were significantly more likely to have lower levels of systemic inflammatory

180 markers, CRP and Fibrinogen, at follow-up. This association was seen in females, only. Grip

181 strength was inversely associated with risk of mortality in females only. However, this

182 association was attenuated to the null after adjustment for clinical and behavioural risk

183 factors, and further attenuated after adjusting for inflammatory markers.

184 Our findings support previous research on the association between grip strength and

185 inflammatory markers[34,35] and add to this body of work by showing that longitudinal

186 associations persist when controlling for a range of clinical and behavioural risk factors

187 including measures of central adiposity.

188 One plausible explanation for the association between grip strength and inflammation is that

189 muscle mass is a predictor of greater grip strength and those who partake in regular exercise

190 tend to have greater muscle mass. Exercise using large muscle groups produces a short-term,

191 inflammatory response, and both cross-sectional comparisons and longitudinal exercise

192 training studies demonstrate a long-term "anti-inflammatory" effect.[36] Models in the present

193 study controlled for levels of physical activity, though the types of activities (aerobics vs.

194 resistance training) were not clearly separated. One other possible explanation is that high

195 levels of circulating inflammatory markers and/or cytokines are associated with low muscle

196 mass per se in older and obese people thus suggesting that muscle itself my play a role in

197 regulating inflammatory markers.[37-39]

198 It is feasible that inflammatory markers could be exercising their effect through a

199 combination of lifestyle and behavioural factors; indeed adding inflammatory markers

200 directly to Model 1, (Table 3) in women closely mimicked (HR=0.91; 95% CI, 0.79 - 1.05)

201 the effect of adding lifestyle / behavioural covariates. The association of grip strength with

202 inflammation and mortality was more robust in females, which is consistent with other

203 findings.[22,40]). Recent meta-analytic data showed grip strength was associated with reduced

204 mortality in both genders, although the association was stronger in women.[41] Our sex specific

205 findings are unremarkable as the aging process particularly affects women, such that women

206 are more susceptible to sarcopenia than men.[42,43] In our own sample, the proportion of men

207 having grip strength above the gender specific sarcopenia diagnosis cut-off is higher

208 (90.5%>= 26kg) than that of women (84.8%>= 16kg).[44] Furthermore, male and female

209 hormones modulate the immune system differently, thus resulting in differential age-related

210   pathologies.[45] Therefore, muscle strength might be particularly important for women in

211   regulating chronic inflammation.[46]

212   Clear strengths of the present study include the large population-based sample of older

213   English adults, the longitudinal design, the objective measure of both the exposure and the

214   outcome, and repeated measure of inflammatory biomarkers. However, the data must be

215   interpreted considering the following limitations. Data on skeletal muscle mass were not

216   available in the present cohort and we relied on measurements of muscle strength alone.

217   While lean mass and strength (muscle quality) may not decline at the same rate, loss of lean

218   mass is strongly associated with strength decline in both men and women.[47] In our study, grip

219   strength was standardized for body weight in the analyses. This approach allows us to

220   account for muscle strength driven by body composition. There are ongoing discussions on

221   how to standardize the procedure and utilization of grip strength measures in clinical and

222   epidemiological studies, particularly in the ageing population.[48] Although a unified method is

223   yet to be developed, our approach of body weight standardized grip strength has shown to be

224   a superior technique in the aging population.[49,50] We were unable to account for underlying

225   disease that were not detected through our measures; however, the results were largely

226   unchanged after excluding participants with activity limiting illnesses suggesting reverse

227   causation is an unlikely interpretation of our data. Participants retained in our analyses were

228   generally healthier than the overall sample (driven by our exclusion criteria for blood and

229   handgrip tests), thus our results are likely to reflect a conservative estimate of the true

230   associations. Since the data are observational we cannot exclude the possibility of residual

231   confounding. Nevertheless, recent evidence using Mendelian randomisation approaches

232   suggested genetic correlations of grip strength with cardiometabolic traits and markers of

233   frailty.[51] Our study provides evidence on plausible biological pathways linking strength and

234   mortality thus further strengthening causal inferences.

Perspective

The present longitudinal analyses suggest that higher grip strength is associated with lower levels of inflammation at 8-year follow-up, and inflammatory markers partly explain the association between handgrip and mortality. Interventions designed to prevent a decline in physical functioning in females, especially, may improve inflammatory profiles and health. Such interventions may want to focus on functional task exercises as opposed to resistance exercises as functional task exercises have been shown to be more effective at improving functional task performance. Moreover, other literature suggests that functional task exercises may have an important role in helping maintain an independent lifestyle.[52]

Authors contribution Statement

Hamer is the guarantor; he conceptualized and designed the study, performed statistical analyses, and approved the final manuscript as submitted. Smith conceptualized and designed the study, drafted the initial manuscript, and approved the final manuscript as submitted; Yang conceptualized and designed the study, provided critical revision of the manuscript and approved the final manuscript as submitted.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest. The results of the present study do not constitute endorsement by ACSM and are presented clearly, honestly, and without fabrication, falsification, or inappropriate data manipulation

259   **References**

260   1.   McPhee JS, French DP, Jackson D, Nazroo J, Pendleton N, Degens H. Physical

261   activity in older age: perspectives for healthy ageing and frailty. Biogerontology

262   2016;17:567-80.

263   2.   Kodama S, Saito K, Tanaka S, et al. Cardiorespiratory fitness as a quantitative

264   predictor of all-cause mortality and cardiovascular events in healthy men and women: a meta-

265   analysis. Jama 2009;301:2024-35.

266   3.   Stamatakis E, Lee IM, Bennie J, et al. Does Strength-Promoting Exercise Confer

267   Unique Health Benefits? A Pooled Analysis of Data on 11 Population Cohorts With All-

268   Cause, Cancer, and Cardiovascular Mortality Endpoints. American journal of epidemiology

269   2018;187:1102-12.

270   4.   Bakker EA, Lee DC, Sui X, et al. Association of Resistance Exercise With the

271   Incidence of Hypercholesterolemia in Men. Mayo Clinic proceedings 2018;93:419-28.

272   5.   Giampaoli S, Ferrucci L, Cecchi F, et al. Hand-grip strength predicts incident

273   disability in non-disabled older men. Age and ageing 1999;28:283-8.

274   6.   Rantanen T, Guralnik JM, Foley D, et al. Midlife hand grip strength as a predictor of

275   old age disability. Jama 1999;281:558-60.

276   7.   Onder G, Penninx BW, Ferrucci L, Fried LP, Guralnik JM, Pahor M. Measures of

277   physical performance and risk for progressive and catastrophic disability: results from the

278   Women's Health and Aging Study. The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences

279   and medical sciences 2005;60:74-9.

280   8.   Rantanen T, Avlund K, Suominen H, Schroll M, Frandin K, Pertti E. Muscle strength

281   as a predictor of onset of ADL dependence in people aged 75 years. Aging clinical and

282   experimental research 2002;14:10-5.

283   9.   Wu Y, Wang W, Liu T, Zhang D. Association of Grip Strength With Risk of All-

284   Cause Mortality, Cardiovascular Diseases, and Cancer in Community-Dwelling Populations:

285   A Meta-analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. Journal of the American Medical Directors

286   Association 2017;18:551.e17-.e35.

287   10.   Oksuzyan A, Demakakos P, Shkolnikova M, et al. Handgrip strength and its

288   prognostic value for mortality in Moscow, Denmark, and England. PloS one

289   2017;12:e0182684.

290   11.   Celis-Morales CA, Welsh P, Lyall DM, et al. Associations of grip strength with

291   cardiovascular, respiratory, and cancer outcomes and all cause mortality: prospective cohort

292   study of half a million UK Biobank participants. BMJ (Clinical research ed) 2018;361:k1651.

293   12.   Ridker PM, Rifai N, Cook NR, Bradwin G, Buring JE. Non-HDL cholesterol,

294   apolipoproteins A-I and B100, standard lipid measures, lipid ratios, and CRP as risk factors

295   for cardiovascular disease in women. Jama 2005;294:326-33.

296   13.   Sin DD, Man SF. Why are patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease at

297   increased risk of cardiovascular diseases? The potential role of systemic inflammation in

298   chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Circulation 2003;107:1514-9.

299   14.   Tanaka T, Narazaki M, Kishimoto T. IL-6 in inflammation, immunity, and disease.

300   Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology 2014;6:a016295.

301   15.   Du Clos TW. Function of C-reactive protein. Annals of medicine 2000;32:274-8.

302   16.   Lowe GD. Fibrinogen assays for cardiovascular risk assessment. Clinical chemistry

303   2010;56:693-5.

304   17.   Ernst E, Resch KL. Fibrinogen as a cardiovascular risk factor: a meta-analysis and

305   review of the literature. Annals of internal medicine 1993;118:956-63.

306   18.   Kaptoge S, White IR, Thompson SG, et al. Associations of plasma fibrinogen levels

307   with established cardiovascular disease risk factors, inflammatory markers, and other

308   characteristics: individual participant meta-analysis of 154,211 adults in 31 prospective

309   studies: the fibrinogen studies collaboration. American journal of epidemiology

310   2007;166:867-79.

311   19.   Howren MB, Lamkin DM, Suls J. Associations of depression with C-reactive protein,

312   IL-1, and IL-6: a meta-analysis. Psychosomatic medicine 2009;71:171-86.

313   20.   Londhe P, Guttridge DC. Inflammation induced loss of skeletal muscle. Bone

314   2015;80:131-42.

315   21.   Pedersen BK. Exercise-induced myokines and their role in chronic diseases. Brain,

316   behavior, and immunity 2011;25:811-6.

317   22.   Hamer M, Molloy GJ. Association of C-reactive protein and muscle strength in the

318   English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. Age (Dordrecht, Netherlands) 2009;31:171-7.

319   23.   Taaffe DR, Harris TB, Ferrucci L, Rowe J, Seeman TE. Cross-sectional and

320   prospective relationships of interleukin-6 and C-reactive protein with physical performance in

321   elderly persons: MacArthur studies of successful aging. The journals of gerontology Series A,

322   Biological sciences and medical sciences 2000;55:M709-15.

323   24.   Schaap LA, Pluijm SM, Deeg DJ, Visser M. Inflammatory markers and loss of

324   muscle mass (sarcopenia) and strength. The American journal of medicine 2006;119:526.e9-

325   17.

326   25.   Steptoe A, Breeze E, Banks J, Nazroo J. Cohort profile: the English longitudinal study

327   of ageing. International journal of epidemiology 2013;42:1640-8.

328   26.   Craig R, Deverill C, Pickering K. Quality control of blood, saliva and urine analytes.

329   Health survey for England 2004, Methodology and documentation Vol 2. London: The

330   Information Centre; 2006:34-41.

331   27.   Irwin M, Artin KH, Oxman MN. Screening for depression in the older adult: criterion

332   validity of the 10-item Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D).

333   Archives of internal medicine 1999;159:1701-4.

334   28.   Banks JA, Karlsen S, Oldfield Z. Socio-economic position. In: Marmot M, Banks JA,

335   Blundell R, Lessof C, Nazroo J,. In: Marmot M, Banks JA, Blundell R, Lessof C, Nazroo J,

336   eds. Health, wealth and lifestyles of the older population in England: The 2002 English

337   Longitudinal Study of Ageing. London: Institute of Fiscal Studies; 2003.

338   29.   Syddall HE, Westbury LD, Shaw SC, Dennison EM, Cooper C, Gale CR. Correlates

339   of Level and Loss of Grip Strength in Later Life: Findings from the English Longitudinal

340   Study of Ageing and the Hertfordshire Cohort Study. Calcified tissue international

341   2018;102:53-63.

342   30.   Quan S, Jeong JY, Kim DH. The Relationship between Smoking, Socioeconomic

343   Status and Grip Strength among Community-dwelling Elderly Men in Korea: Hallym Aging

344   Study. Epidemiology and health 2013;35:e2013001.

345   31.   Smith L, White S, Stubbs B, et al. Depressive symptoms, handgrip strength, and

346   weight status in US older adults. Journal of affective disorders 2018;238:305-10.

347   32.   Mora S, Cook N, Buring JE, Ridker PM, Lee IM. Physical activity and reduced risk of

348   cardiovascular events: potential mediating mechanisms. Circulation 2007;116:2110-8.

349   33.   Sterne JA, Davey Smith G. Sifting the evidence-what's wrong with significance tests?

350   BMJ (Clinical research ed) 2001;322:226-31.

351   34.   Granic A, Davies K, Martin-Ruiz C, et al. Grip strength and inflammatory biomarker

352   profiles in very old adults. Age and ageing 2017;46:976-82.

353   35.   Sousa AC, Zunzunegui MV, Li A, Phillips SP, Guralnik JM, Guerra RO. Association

354   between C-reactive protein and physical performance in older populations: results from the

355   International Mobility in Aging Study (IMIAS). Age and ageing 2016;45:274-80.

356   36.   Kasapis C, Thompson PD. The effects of physical activity on serum C-reactive

357   protein and inflammatory markers: a systematic review. Journal of the American College of

358   Cardiology 2005;45:1563-9.

359   37.   Visser M, Pluijm SM, Stel VS, Bosscher RJ, Deeg DJ. Physical activity as a

360   determinant of change in mobility performance: the Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam.

361   Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 2002;50:1774-81.

362   38.   Schrager MA, Metter EJ, Simonsick E, et al. Sarcopenic obesity and inflammation in

363   the InCHIANTI study. Journal of applied physiology (Bethesda, Md : 1985) 2007;102:919-

364   25.

365   39.   Pedersen BK, Febbraio MA. Muscles, exercise and obesity: skeletal muscle as a

366   secretory organ. Nature reviews Endocrinology 2012;8:457-65.

367   40.   Visser M, Pahor M, Taaffe DR, et al. Relationship of interleukin-6 and tumor necrosis

368   factor-alpha with muscle mass and muscle strength in elderly men and women: the Health

369   ABC Study. The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences

370   2002;57:M326-32.

371   41.   Garcia-Hermoso A, Cavero-Redondo I, Ramirez-Velez R, et al. Muscular Strength as

372   a Predictor of All-Cause Mortality in an Apparently Healthy Population: A Systematic

373   Review and Meta-Analysis of Data From Approximately 2 Million Men and Women.

374   Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation 2018.

375   42.   Perrig-Chiello P, Hutchison S. Health and well-being in old age: the pertinence of a

376   gender mainstreaming approach in research. Gerontology 2010;56:208-13.

377   43.   Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, et al. Sarcopenia: European consensus on

378   definition and diagnosis: Report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older

379   People. Age and ageing 2010;39:412-23.

380   44.   Studenski SA, Peters KW, Alley DE, et al. The FNIH sarcopenia project: rationale,

381   study description, conference recommendations, and final estimates. The journals of

382   gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences 2014;69:547-58.

383   45.   Berghella AM, Contasta I, Marulli G, et al. Ageing gender-specific "Biomarkers of

384   Homeostasis", to protect ourselves against the diseases of the old age. Immunity & ageing : I

385   & A 2014;11:3.

386   46.   Chupel MU, Direito F, Furtado GE, et al. Strength Training Decreases Inflammation

387   and Increases Cognition and Physical Fitness in Older Women with Cognitive Impairment.

388   Frontiers in physiology 2017;8:377.

389   47.   Goodpaster BH, Park SW, Harris TB, et al. The loss of skeletal muscle strength, mass,

390   and quality in older adults: the health, aging and body composition study. The journals of

391   gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences 2006;61:1059-64.

392   48.   Roberts HC, Denison HJ, Martin HJ, et al. A review of the measurement of grip

393   strength in clinical and epidemiological studies: towards a standardised approach. Age and

394   ageing 2011;40:423-9.

395   49.   Lawman HG, Troiano RP, Perna FM, Wang CY, Fryar CD, Ogden CL. Associations

396   of Relative Handgrip Strength and Cardiovascular Disease Biomarkers in U.S. Adults, 2011-

397   2012. American journal of preventive medicine 2016;50:677-83.

398   50.   Whitney DG, Peterson MD. The Association Between Differing Grip Strength

399   Measures and Mortality and Cerebrovascular Event in Older Adults: National Health and

400   Aging Trends Study. Frontiers in physiology 2018;9:1871.

401   51.   Tikkanen E, Gustafsson S, Amar D, et al. Biological Insights Into Muscular Strength:

402   Genetic Findings in the UK Biobank. Scientific reports 2018;8:6451.

403   52.   de Vreede PL, Samson MM, van Meeteren NL, Duursma SA, Verhaar HJ.

404   Functional-task exercise versus resistance strength exercise to improve daily function in older

405   women: a randomized, controlled trial. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society 2005;53:2-

406   10.

407

408

409   **Table 1.** Baseline descriptive characteristics by sex specific handgrip tertiles.

Baseline variable	Sex specific handgrip tertile‡		
	Low	Middle	High
Age (yrs; mean, SD)	70.6 ± 10.3	65.8 ± 9.0	62.3 ± 7.8
Smoking (%)	14.2	14.4	18.6
Vigorous physical activity (%)	18.8	29.3	41.2
Highest wealth quintile (%)	17.4	24.2	28.5
Longstanding illness (%)	66.0	49.9	41.7
Depressive symptoms (%)	18.8	11.9	10.2
Central obesity (%)	68.0	56.9	23.7
C-reactive protein (mg/L)†	2.8 (4.3)	2.0 (3.0)	1.3 (2.2)
Fibrinogen (g/L)†	3.3 (0.9)	3.2 (0.9)	3.0 (0.8)

410   ‡ grip strength standardised for body weight values; lowest tertile (<0.42 men, <0.28 women),

411   middle (0.42 – 0.52 men, 0.28 – 0.37 women), highest (>0.52 men, >0.37 women).

412   † data are median (interquartile range)

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423   **Table 2.** Longitudinal association between grip strength and inflammatory markers over 8 years

424   follow up: English Longitudinal Study Ageing

	Log C-reactive protein	
	Model 1	Model 2
Whole sample (n=2705)	-0.060 (-0.092, -0.028)	-0.049 (-0.083, -0.015)
Men (n=1211)	-0.046 (-0.087, -0.006)	-0.038 (-0.082, 0.006)
Women (n=1494)	-0.068 (-0.11, -0.030)	-0.055 (-0.095, -0.015)
	Fibrinogen	
	Model 1	Model 2
Whole sample (n=2624)	-0.053 (-0.077, -0.029)	-0.044 (-0.070, -0.019)
Men (n=1168)	-0.041 (-0.073, -0.009)	-0.026 (-0.060, 0.008)
Women (n=1456)	-0.053 (-0.081, -0.025)	-0.046 (-0.075, -0.016)

425   B (95% CI) coefficients per SD increase in grip strength standardised for body weight

426   Model 1 adjusted for age, sex and CRP or fibrinogen at baseline (sex adjustment excluded for sex

427   specific models).

428   Model 2 adjusted for age, sex, CRP or fibrinogen at baseline, waist-hip-ratio, smoking, physical

429   activity, depressive symptoms, chronic illness, wealth.

430

431

432

433

434   **Table 3.** The extent to which baseline clinical and biological factors explain associations between

435   handgrip and mortality

	Model 1 HR (95% CI)	Model 2 HR (95% CI)	Model 3 HR (95% CI)
Whole sample (n=5240; 650 events)	0.87 (0.78, 0.97)	0.90 (0.80, 1.00)	0.93 (0.82, 1.04)
Men (n=2422; 355 events)	0.94 (0.83, 1.06)	0.93 (0.82, 1.06)	0.95 (0.84, 1.08)
Women (n=2818; 295 events)	0.85 (0.74, 0.98)	0.92 (0.79, 1.07)	0.95 (0.82, 1.11)

436   Hazard ratio, HR, (95% CI) for risk of mortality per SD increase in grip strength standardised for body

437   weight.

438   Model 1: adjusted for age, sex, wealth (sex adjustment excluded for sex specific models);

439   Model 2: further adjusted for clinical and behavioural covariates; smoking, physical activity, chronic

440   illness, central obesity, depressive symptoms

441   Model 3: further adjusted for C-reactive protein, fibrinogen

442

443