THE ACCURACY OF BASAL ENERGY EXPENDITURE ESTIMATION BASED ON HEAT FLUX AND MACHINE LEARNING AS BODY COMPOSITION CHANGES

Heikki Peltonen¹, Mari Sulonen², Ville Isola², Juha Hulmi², Juha Ahtiainen² and Heikki Kyröläinen² ¹Jamk University of Applied Sciences, School of Business, Jyväskylä, Finland ²University of Jyväskylä, Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, Jyväskylä, Finland



Heat flux

from the radial zone of

the wrist

INTRODUCTION

The basal energy expenditure (BEE) provides more than half our total daily energy consumption. However, most sports enthusiasts monitor BEE estimates using portable trackers and monitors based on background information (age, gender, height, weight) and the user's heart rate.

A novel heat flux sensor solution measures amount of heat released from the skin surface [1] combined with a machine learning algorithm.

PURPOSE

This study compared the accuracies of these two different BEE estimations -methods with indirect calorimetry of respiratory gases before and after preparing (23 weeks) and recovering (23 weeks) phases of physique athletes for fitness and body building competitions.

METHODS

A total of 58 physique athletes participated to this study

- 27 athletes competed during the study.
- 31 athletes were controls and engaged in fitness-related strength training with no competition goal and no body fat reduction during the study period (Fig 1).

BEE measurements were taken simultaneously to measure respiratory gases, heart rate and heat flux, and body composition was analysed at the same visit.

BEE was calculated using Weir's equation [2] as the gold standard and a trained algorithm with heat flux.

| RESULTS | Fat% after 23 weeks | | <i>p</i> -value |
|----------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Women | (competitors) | 14.1 ± 7.4% | <0.05 |
| | (controls) | 25.3 ± 6.8% | <0.05 |
| Men | (competitors) | 5.6 ± 2.1% | <0.001 |
| | (controls) | 18.1 ± 7.2% | |

BEE estimates by the heat flux method ($1656 \pm 410 \text{ kcal/d}$) were not statistically different from indirect calorimetry ($1657 \pm 305 \text{ kcal/d}$), in contrast to background information estimations ($1718 \pm 270 \text{ kcal/d}$, p<0.001).

EE values from the heat flux method and indirect calorimetry were positively correlated (r=0.346, p<0.001), whereas resting heart rate and indirect calorimetry values were not correlated.

The configuration combining background information and heat flux gave the lowest mean error (6.73%) for BEE. The accuracy of heat flux estimates did not differ between the competition and control groups. However, there was a statistical difference between genders (p < 0.05), with higher errors in estimates for females (Fig 2).





Fig 1. Basal energy expenditure and body composition (DXA) measurements

CONCLUSIONS

The heat flux method using machine learning appears to be promising tool for more accurate estimation of resting energy expenditure. Overall, the average error, ~7%, is much lower than errors of consumer devices documented in previous studies [3]. Further studies should also focus on testing heat flux and machine learning in different populations as their body composition changes.

1. Levikari et al. (2021) 2. Weir (1949) 3. Shcherbina et al. (2017)