

Draft Manuscript for Review

**Normative Calcaneal Quantitative Ultrasound Data for the Indigenous Shuar and Non-Shuar Colonos of the Ecuadorian Amazon**

Journal:	<i>Osteoporosis International</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Madimenos, Felicia; University of Oregon, Anthropology; Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences Snodgrass, James; University of Oregon, Anthropology; Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences Blackwell, Aaron; Integrative Anthropological Sciences, Anthropology; University of Oregon, Anthropology; Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences Liebert, Melissa; University of Oregon, Anthropology; Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences Cepon, Tara; University of Oregon, Anthropology; Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences Sugiyama, Lawrence; University of Oregon, Anthropology; Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences
Keyword:	bone mineral density, Shuar, Colonos, calcaneal ultrasound, developing country

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts



1  
2  
3 **Normative Calcaneal Quantitative Ultrasound Data for the Indigenous Shuar and Non-**  
4 **Shuar *Colonos* of the Ecuadorian Amazon**  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 FELICIA C. MADIMENOS<sup>1,2</sup>, J. JOSH SNODGRASS<sup>1,2</sup>, AARON D. BLACKWELL<sup>1,2,3</sup>,  
10 MELISSA A. LIEBERT<sup>1,2</sup>, TARA J. CEPON<sup>1,2</sup>, and LAWRENCE S. SUGIYAMA<sup>1,2,4</sup>  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 <sup>1</sup>Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

17 <sup>2</sup>Institute of Cognitive and Decision Sciences, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

18 <sup>3</sup>Department of Anthropology, Integrative Anthropological Sciences, University of California,  
19 Santa Barbara, CA 93106  
20  
21  
22

23 <sup>4</sup>Center for Evolutionary Psychology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Corresponding Author:

46 Felicia C. Madimenos  
47 Department of Anthropology  
48 University of Oregon  
49 Eugene, OR 97403  
50

51 Phone: (541) 346-5102  
52 Fax: (541) 346-0668  
53 E-mail: fmadimen@uoregon.edu  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

NO DISCLOSURES

### MINI-ABSTRACT

Minimal data on bone mineral density changes are available from populations in developing countries. Using calcaneal QUS techniques, the current study contributes to remedying this gap in the literature by establishing a normative data set on the indigenous Shuar and non-Shuar *Colonos* of the Ecuadorian Amazon.

### ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** The paucity of bone mineral density (BMD) data from populations in developing countries partially reflects the lack of diagnostic resources in these areas. Portable quantitative ultrasound (QUS) techniques now enable researchers to collect bone health data in remote field-based settings and to contribute normative data from developing regions. The main objective of this study is to establish normative QUS data for two Ecuadorian Amazonian populations--the indigenous Shuar and non-Shuar *Colonos*. The effects of ethnic group, sex, age, and body size on QUS parameters are also considered.

**Methods:** A study cohort consisting of 227 Shuar and 261 *Colonos* (15-91 years old) were recruited from several small rural Ecuadorian communities in the Upano River Valley. Calcaneal QUS parameters were collected on the right heel of each participant using a Sahara bone sonometer. Three ultrasound generated parameters were employed: broadband ultrasound attenuation (BUA), speed of sound (SOS), and calculated heel BMD (hBMD).

1  
2  
3 **Results:** In both populations and sexes, all QUS values were progressively lower with advancing  
4 age. Shuar have significantly higher QUS values than *Colonos*, with most pronounced  
5 differences found between pre-menopausal Shuar and *Colono* females. Multiple regression  
6 analyses show that age is a key predictor of QUS while weight alone is a less consistent  
7 determinant. Both Shuar males and females display comparatively greater QUS parameters than  
8 other reference populations.  
9

10  
11 **Conclusions:** These normative data for three calcaneal QUS parameters will be useful for  
12 predicting fracture risk and determining diagnostic QUS criteria of osteoporosis in non-  
13 industrialized populations in South America and elsewhere.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 **Keywords:** bone mineral density, Shuar, *Colonos*, calcaneal ultrasound, developing country  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Bone mineral density (BMD) data are limited for non-industrialized, natural fertility populations, a gap that obscures our current understanding of the prevalence of osteoporosis in developing countries. In part, the lack of epidemiological data on osteoporosis in developing countries reflects the limited availability of diagnostic resources in these regions. However, relatively non-invasive and portable techniques have recently facilitated the collection of BMD data in remote field settings. Calcaneal quantitative ultrasound (QUS) techniques in particular have proven to be clinically useful as a screening tool for early signs of low BMD, and are highly correlated with dual X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) measures [1-3]. Additional reasons for the lack of attention to bone health in developing countries are assumptions that osteoporosis is a disease of developed nations and an inevitable consequence of aging that cannot be effectively treated or prevented [4]. Indeed, key environmental risk factors for the development of osteoporosis are typically associated with a Westernized lifestyle, characterized by low levels of physical activity and poor diets that include processed foods, coffee, and carbonated soda beverages. Yet demographic transition and the aging of the population, as well as increasing global trends towards Westernization, appear to be contributing to a dramatic rise in the burden of osteoporosis prevalence in developing countries [5]. The paucity of data on bone density in these countries limits our ability to assess osteoporosis prevalence and risk, and complicates prevention and treatment efforts. In order to begin addressing these issues, it is critical to gather and present population-specific normative data on BMD from non-urbanized groups living in developing countries.

The current study was designed to assess bone quality, using calcaneal QUS techniques, among the indigenous Shuar and non-Shuar mestizo colonists (*Colonos*) of Ecuadorian

1  
2  
3 Amazonia. As with other indigenous populations, BMD information for the Shuar is not  
4  
5 presently available. Further, published data are virtually non-existent for any subsistence-based,  
6  
7 natural fertility population. These type of data are critical because diet, activity, and reproductive  
8  
9 patterns all contribute to BMD, but it is currently unclear whether the BMD trajectories observed  
10  
11 in low-fertility Western populations will be similar to those of subsistence-based groups.  
12  
13  
14 Further, an investigation of the key factors that structure BMD variation with age among  
15  
16 subsistence groups can provide valuable information on the myriad of factors that shape bone  
17  
18 health and disease risk in industrialized population. Inclusion of the *Colono* population was  
19  
20 intended to provide a comparative sample of individuals from the same geographical region who  
21  
22 also participate in agricultural-based activities but who are not closely related to the Shuar. The  
23  
24 cross-sectional data reported here are part of a larger, multi-year study on health and market  
25  
26 integration, the Shuar Health and Life History Project (<http://www.bonesandbehavior.org/shuar>).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 **METHODS**

### 35 **Study Populations**

#### 36 *Shuar*

37  
38  
39 The Shuar are a large indigenous Amazonian forager-horticulturalist group (~50,000  
40  
41 persons) concentrated in the Morona-Santiago and Zamora provinces of Ecuador. Many Shuar  
42  
43 live in scattered households across the Upano River Valley, between the eastern Andean foothills  
44  
45 and the Cordillera de Cutucu mountain range. Traditional Shuar economy is based on hunting,  
46  
47 fishing, and swidden-horticulture [6]. While these subsistence activities remain common, recent  
48  
49 infrastructural development has led to an increasingly rapid lifestyle change for many Shuar,  
50  
51 especially in the Upano River Valley. In this region, recently paved roads extending to many  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Shuar communities have resulted in increased access to commercial goods and a lifestyle  
4 associated with market integration (e.g., electricity). These lifestyle changes are most apparent in  
5 large town centers where some Shuar work wage-labor jobs. However, many Shuar living in  
6 rural communities continue to depend on and actively participate in mixed subsistence and  
7 agricultural production.  
8  
9

10  
11 From an epidemiological perspective, the Shuar in the current study are not a particularly  
12 high-risk group for the development of osteoporosis. In the participant communities, Shuar  
13 engage in consistent levels of moderate subsistence-based activities year-round [7] and consume  
14 a diet that is rich in yuca, plantains, and rice with minimal inclusion of foods that are typically  
15 associated with poor bone health (e.g., caffeine, alcohol, processed foods, excessive protein) [8-  
16 11]. Additionally, deficiencies in vitamin D, a key nutrient for promoting intestinal calcium  
17 absorption, are rarely found in equatorial populations because of year-round exposure to  
18 sunlight [e.g., 12-13]. While the Upano Valley Shuar are currently shifting towards an increased  
19 reliance on a market economy, including economic development and lifestyle changes similar to  
20 those observed in Western countries, the participant communities continue to be highly  
21 dependent on a subsistence-based lifestyle.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 *Colonos*

45  
46 The settlement of non-Shuar *Colonos* into Morona Santiago began during the mid-20<sup>th</sup>  
47 century at the height of the oil boom. While Upano River Valley *Colonos* and Shuar often reside  
48 in communities that are in close proximity, they are largely socially and politically divided, a  
49 schism that can be attributed to traditional Shuar antagonism toward outside colonization of their  
50 land and recurrent land feuds [6].  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Similar to the Shuar, *Colonos* in the Upano River Valley live in communities with  
4 varying degrees of market dependence. *Colonos* who live in town, particularly in the Sucua  
5 canton, typically engage in wage labor, attend school, and have minimal participation in the  
6 subsistence economy. Conversely, in rural areas, many *Colonos* are strongly dependent on  
7 household-level animal husbandry and agricultural production. The *Colonos* included in this  
8 study are primarily from small rural communities scattered across the Upano River Valley where  
9 varying degrees of dependence on an agriculture-based lifestyle exist across individuals.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Subjects**

24 Typically, there is a high degree of inter-relatedness within rural Shuar communities.  
25 Potential issues can arise in assessing bone health for a highly related group of individuals  
26 because this can increase frequencies of population-specific alleles responsible for maintaining  
27 bone integrity. To avoid these issues, Shuar participants were recruited from four Upano Valley  
28 communities. Rural *Colono* communities do not exhibit the same degree of relatedness as the  
29 Shuar. Nevertheless, *Colono* participants were recruited from across a large canton in the Upano  
30 Valley comprised of several smaller rural communities. In total, 227 Shuar (136 females and 91  
31 males; 15-86 years old) and 261 *Colonos* (157 females and 104 males; 15-91 years old)  
32 participated in this study.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Although conditions in this remote part of Ecuador prevented us from obtaining a random  
47 sample of participants, we made every effort possible to enroll a sample of participants that was  
48 representative of each community in terms of age and sociodemographics. This study used a  
49 cross-sectional design and while this approach is inherently limited for assessing individual bone  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 loss through time, it is useful for determining prevalence of low bone density across a  
4  
5  
6 population.

7  
8 All participants gave individual informed verbal consent, with both parental consent and  
9  
10 child assent for individuals under 18 years old. The study protocol was approved by community  
11  
12 leaders, the Instituto Ecuatoriano de Seguridad Social (IESS), the Federación Interprovincial de  
13  
14 Centro Shuar (FISCH) as appropriate for FICSH-associated communities, and the Office for  
15  
16 Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Oregon.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **Bone Mineral Density Measurements**

23  
24  
25 Calcaneal QUS parameters were collected on the right heel of each participant using the  
26  
27 gel-based Sahara® bone sonometer (Hologic, Inc., Waltham, MA). Two primary QUS values  
28  
29 were used for this analysis: broadband ultrasound attenuation (BUA; decibels per megahertz),  
30  
31 which is the slope of the ultrasonic attenuation versus frequency as it passes through bone; and  
32  
33 speed of sound (SOS; meters per second), a value determined by the width of the heel and time  
34  
35 delay between initial transmission and subsequent receipt of sound waves. BUA is more closely  
36  
37 related to the micro-architecture of bone such as trabecular connectivity, while SOS is greatly  
38  
39 influenced by the elasticity and mineral constituents of the bone matrix [14-15]. A third  
40  
41 parameter, heel bone mineral density (hBMD), a device-generated measure calculated from BUA  
42  
43 and SOS values, was also used. Instrumental quality control scans of the manufacturer-provided  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
phantoms were performed daily.

### 54 **Additional Measures of Body Size and Reproduction**

Participant stature (measured to the nearest millimeter [mm]) and weight (measured to the nearest 0.1 kilogram [kg]) were recorded using a field stadiometer (Seca, Hanover, MD) and digital scale (Tanita BF-558 electronic scale, Tokyo, Japan) respectively. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as weight (kg)/height (in meters<sup>2</sup>).

Female participants were asked additional questions regarding current reproductive status. Women were considered post-menopausal if they reported not having experienced a menstrual cycle within the last 12 months and were neither pregnant nor lactating.

### Statistical analyses

Participants were divided into six groups based on age (15-20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, > 60 years) with a 10-year age-span within each group (except in the 15-20 and over 60 age intervals). Two-tailed Student's t-tests were used to assess differences between ethnic groups and sexes for bone density measures and anthropometric variables. Stepwise multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to estimate the variation of QUS explained by ethnicity, age, body weight, height, and BMI. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 17.0 (Chicago, IL).

### Issues with Normative Data Sets in Developing Countries

Reproductive patterns among women, including parity, breast-feeding behaviors, and age at first pregnancy are known to contribute to bone density changes throughout the lifespan [e.g., 16-18]. For example, physiological changes characteristic of various reproductive states such as pregnancy-related weight gain, cumulative estrogen exposure, and fluctuations in bone turnover rates invariably influence bone integrity. As a result, pregnant and/or lactating women are

1  
2  
3 typically excluded from normative datasets on bone health. However, presenting normative data  
4  
5 on a natural fertility, subsistence-dependent population in a developing country without  
6  
7 including women who are pregnant and/or lactating is problematic for several reasons. First,  
8  
9 women in many developing countries are pregnant and/or lactating for much of their  
10  
11 reproductive life spans [19-21]. Exclusion of these women dramatically reduces the size of the  
12  
13 participant pool, specifically for critical age intervals when peak bone mass is realized. Further,  
14  
15 in developing countries, particularly in the type of rural settings described here, nulliparous  
16  
17 women of reproductive age do not represent the norm, as they may be suffering from health or  
18  
19 fertility problems. Therefore, presenting normative data on the indigenous Shuar and *Colono*  
20  
21 populations without inclusion of this female demographic is problematic. However, in order to  
22  
23 maximize our ability to compare across populations, data on the subset of females who were not  
24  
25 pregnant and/or lactating at the time of this study are also presented separately.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

## 34 RESULTS

### 35 *Characteristics of Study Participants*

36 Anthropometric and QUS measures by ethnic group and sex, and menopausal status are  
37  
38 presented in Table 1. Although height, weight, and BMI of *Colono* participants are higher than  
39  
40 for Shuar participants, QUS values are significantly higher among the Shuar ( $p < 0.001$ ). While  
41  
42 this trend is consistent across the Shuar group when compared to *Colonos*, the most pronounced  
43  
44 difference is found between pre-menopausal Shuar and *Colono* females (BUA:  $p < 0.05$ ; SOS  
45  
46 and hBMD:  $p < 0.001$ ); the only exception is shown among post-menopausal women where  
47  
48 there is no discernable difference in bone health measures between ethnic groups. In both  
49  
50 populations, all QUS values are progressively lower in advanced age groups irrespective of sex.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Shuar*

Overall, Shuar males exhibit significantly higher bone density parameters than their female counterparts for all bone health measures except SOS (BUA:  $p < 0.001$ ; hBMD:  $p < 0.05$ ). Table 2 illustrates Shuar anthropometric and calcaneal QUS results by age cohort and sex. For both sexes, all bone health measures are highest in the 21-30 age cohort and are progressively lower in each subsequent age group. One exception is found in males from the 51-60 year old cohort where all QUS parameters are greater than among males in the preceding 41-50 age interval. This difference may be attributed to small sample size in the older age interval, biased by one outlier with extremely high bone density (BUA: 164.2 dB/MHz; SOS: 1712.0 m/s hBMD: 1.177).

Figure 1 (a-c) presents clustered scatterplots of BUA, SOS, and hBMD by age for Shuar females and males. In both sexes, there is a significant inverse relationship between age and each of the QUS parameters ( $p < 0.001$ ). From ages 21 to 86, females show a cumulative decrease of 34% in BUA, 3.1% in SOS, and 32% in hBMD. Although males begin with higher peak bone mass values than females, Shuar males from ages 21 to 80 show greater total decrease in bone density: 37% in BUA, 3.8% in SOS, and 38% in hBMD. Among females, the most pronounced decrease in BUA, SOS, and hBMD by age group occurs after 50 years of age, whereas among males the greatest decline is seen among individuals over 60.

In the stepwise multiple linear regression analyses (Table 3), weight was a less important factor for calcaneal QUS than age in both Shuar men and women. In men, all QUS parameters were significantly related to age (BUA:  $\beta = -0.543$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; SOS:  $\beta = -1.288$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; hBMD:  $\beta = -0.005$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and BMI (BUA:  $\beta = 2.768$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; SOS:  $\beta = 2.682$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;

1  
2  
3 hBMD:  $\beta = 0.014, p < 0.01$ ). However, in women, SOS was dependent only on age ( $\beta = -0.889,$   
4  $p < 0.001$ ), while BUA was dependent on age ( $\beta = -0.284, p < 0.05$ ), height ( $\beta = 0.740, p <$   
5  $0.05$ ), and BMI ( $\beta = 1.288, p < 0.05$ ). Height was not a predictive variable for hBMD, although  
6  $0.05$ ), and BMI ( $\beta = 1.288, p < 0.05$ ). Height was not a predictive variable for hBMD, although  
7 age ( $\beta = -0.003, p < 0.001$ ) and BMI ( $\beta = 0.006, p < 0.05$ ) were significant. Weight alone was  
8 not a significant predictor for any QUS value among the Shuar.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 *Colonos*

19  
20 Among *Colonos*, sex differences for all QUS measures are more pronounced than among  
21 Shuar, and higher bone density measures are found among *Colono* males than females (BUA:  $p$   
22  $= 0.001$ ; SOS:  $p < 0.05$ ; hBMD:  $p < 0.01$ ). Analysis of QUS values by age cohort (Table 2)  
23  $= 0.001$ ; SOS:  $p < 0.05$ ; hBMD:  $p < 0.01$ ). Analysis of QUS values by age cohort (Table 2)  
24 shows that similar to Shuar, *Colono* females display the highest ultrasound measures in the 21-30  
25 year old cohort, with lower values in each successive age cohort. *Colono* males also have highest  
26 SOS in the 21-30 year old cohort, although 31-40 year olds exhibit the highest BUA and hBMD  
27 values. Among *Colono* females, as with their Shuar counterparts, the most pronounced reduction  
28 in BUA, SOS, and hBMD is apparent after 50 years of age. In contrast, for *Colono* males, all  
29 QUS parameters are sharply lower after 40 years of age.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Clustered scatterplots for BUA, SOS, and hBMD by age for *Colono* females and males  
42 (Figure 2 [a-c]) show a significant negative relationship between age and QUS parameters for  
43 both sexes ( $p < 0.05$ ). Among *Colono* females between 21 and 90 years old, total decline in QUS  
44 values with age are 38%, 3.0%, 36% for BUA, SOS, and BMD respectively; among *Colono*  
45 males 21 to 91 years old, there is a 31% decrease in BUA, 3.5% decrease in SOS, and 36%  
46 decrease in hBMD  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The stepwise multiple regression analysis in Table 3 shows that age is the sole predictive  
4 factor for SOS in *Colono* males ( $\beta = -0.832, p < 0.001$ ) and females ( $\beta = -1.001, p < 0.001$ ). In  
5  
6  
7  
8 *Colono* females, BUA and hBMD were a function of both age (*BUA*:  $\beta = -0.486, p < 0.001$ ;  
9  
10 *hBMD*:  $\beta = -0.004, p < 0.001$ ) and BMI (*BUA*:  $\beta = 0.773, p < 0.01$ ; *hBMD*:  $\beta = 0.004, p < 0.05$ ).  
11  
12 In *Colono* males, BUA was a function of age ( $\beta = -0.289, p < 0.01$ ) and weight ( $\beta = 0.363, p <$   
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Reproductive Status*

Table 4 shows descriptive statistics of QUS and anthropometric measures for Shuar and *Colono* females who were neither pregnant nor lactating at the time of the study. Among the Shuar, nine participants (4%) were pregnant, thirty (13.2%) were lactating, and one (0.4%) was both pregnant and lactating at the time of the study. Half of Shuar women aged 21-30 years reported being either pregnant and/or lactating at the time of the bone scan; all women who reported being in a lactating state were from this age cohort. Among *Colono* women, four (1.5%) were pregnant and eight (3.1%) were lactating at the time of the study. Student's t-tests were performed comparing QUS parameters between Shuar and *Colono* women based on reproductive status--that is, whether they were pregnant, lactating, both, or neither. Significant ethnic group differences in bone health measures were found only for non-pregnant/non-lactating participants, with Shuar women showing significantly higher bone density than *Colono* women for BUA, SOS, and hBMD ( $p < 0.001$ ).

### *Menopausal Status*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Analysis by menopausal status revealed that among pre-menopausal women there are significant ethnic differences for all QUS parameters ( $p < 0.001$ ). Menopausal status was not reported for four Shuar women (aged 52-55 years old) and thus could not be included in these analyses. Thirteen Shuar (9.6%) and seventy-six *Colono* women (48.4%) were post-menopausal at the time of the study (Table 1). Among *Colono* and Shuar post-menopausal women, there is no significant difference in BUA, SOS, and hBMD values, which suggests that the highest degree of variation in bone health between ethnic groups is present in the pre-menopausal lifespan.

## CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of this paper was to present population-specific normative data for bone density in a non-industrialized, natural fertility population from a developing country. Minimal bone health data are available from these contexts and this has inhibited efforts to quantify the burden of osteoporosis in developing nations, especially among rural groups [4-5]. Additionally, bone health information from diverse populations is necessary to determine the degree to which normative data from developed countries may reflect sub-optimal bone density levels. The skeletal system and mechanisms of bone turnover evolved under subsistence-based, natural fertility conditions with dietary, activity, and reproductive patterns that likely produce a vastly different representation of normative bone health than data garnered from industrialized, urban populations. The paucity of epidemiological data from non-urbanized populations in developing countries can be partly attributed to the lack of diagnostic resources in these regions. However, portable QUS technology now enables the collection of BMD data from remote field settings. Calcaneal sonometers, in particular, are increasingly being utilized to obtain data from populations worldwide and to compare this information with existing reference populations. The

1  
2  
3 current study focused on the calcaneus in order to maximize future inter-population comparisons,  
4  
5 and because the calcaneus is a weight-bearing site rich in trabecular bone that is therefore an  
6  
7 ideal single-site measure of bone density parameters.  
8  
9

10 The present study found that *Colonos* are taller, heavier, and have greater BMI values  
11  
12 than the Shuar. However, despite this result, and the finding that age-related bone loss occurs in  
13  
14 both groups, values for BUA, SOS, and hBMD are consistently higher in the Shuar population.  
15  
16 Higher peak bone mass among the Shuar may partially explain the higher QUS values exhibited  
17  
18 in all age groups when compared to *Colonos*. Although both ethnic groups participate to a  
19  
20 varying degree in an agriculture-based subsistence regime, population-specific variability in  
21  
22 dietary and lifestyle factors may account for the significant QUS differences reported here.  
23  
24 Individual and community-level variation in diet, activity levels, and smoking/drinking behaviors  
25  
26 have been reported elsewhere for these populations [7, 22] and future research will explore the  
27  
28 specific effects of these factors on Shuar and *Colono* bone health. Genetic differences between  
29  
30 ethnic groups have been established (e.g., African-American versus Caucasian-American  
31  
32 populations) and these factors may also explain the lower BMD documented across *Colono* age  
33  
34 cohorts [e.g., 23-26].  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 The most pronounced ethnic group difference in QUS values was documented between  
42  
43 Shuar and *Colono* pre-menopausal women who were not pregnant or lactating. In post-  
44  
45 menopausal women, no significant difference was found, suggesting that menopause onset has  
46  
47 similar negative effects on bone integrity across ethnic groups. For both Shuar and *Colono*  
48  
49 females, the lowest bone health values were found after 50 years old. This finding is consistent  
50  
51 with other studies [e.g., 27-28] that show that the most profound bone loss occurs for similar age  
52  
53 intervals, typically at the onset of menopause.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 We also observed the effect of age and body size (height, weight, and BMI) on QUS by  
4 ethnic group using a stepwise multiple regression analysis. Age is a consistent predictor of all  
5 QUS parameters, with declining values in older age groups. Among female cohorts, the second  
6 most reliable predictor of higher QUS values is greater BMI. In the current study, the highest  
7 QUS values among females are found among 21-30 year olds, which coincides with a period  
8 when peak bone mass is generally achieved. It is also important to recognize that half of the  
9 Shuar women in this age cohort reported being pregnant and/or lactating which may be variously  
10 contributing to calcaneal QUS values. However, when comparing females who are not pregnant  
11 and lactating, differences between the two ethnic groups are maintained.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Males in both populations show consistently higher QUS parameters than females and,  
25 similar to women, calcaneal QUS values are a primary function of age. BMI also predicts SOS,  
26 BUA, and hBMD among Shuar males. However, in *Colono* males QUS values, specifically BUA  
27 and hBMD, are not a function of BMI and are better predicted by the independent variables,  
28 weight and height, respectively. Furthermore, one of the earliest and more pronounced declines  
29 in QUS values occurs in *Colono* males after 40 years old. In contrast, Shuar male QUS data do  
30 not show this steep decline until after 60 years old, more typical of the pattern documented in  
31 other studies [e.g., 29-30]. While the *Colono* result does not follow the typical trend, a similar  
32 decrease in heel BMD is reported among Roma males from Croatia after 35 years old [31].  
33 Potential causes for this apparently early decrease in QUS parameters are not addressed in the  
34 Roma study, but the authors state that increased sedentism and diminutive body size are possible  
35 explanations for the low BMD characteristic of the entire group. The reason for an early decline  
36 among *Colono* males is unclear, but may be related to sampling biases. A larger sample size for  
37 each age interval is necessary to address this issue.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Shuar men and women both display comparatively greater QUS parameters than other  
4  
5  
6 populations whose reference values were determined using the same calcaneal QUS instrument.  
7  
8 In Korea, in a study by Rhee and colleagues [32], all QUS values are lower than the Shuar  
9  
10 population but higher than the *Colono* group. In a German study on an exclusively female cohort  
11  
12 [33], BUA and SOS parameters are again lower than Shuar women but higher than *Colono*  
13  
14 females in our study for similar age intervals. Normative data from the Croatian Roma  
15  
16 population discussed earlier show markedly lower hBMD values when compared to Ecuadorian  
17  
18 data; however this disparity is minimized after 40 years old for both female cohorts and for  
19  
20 *Colono* males. Shuar males maintain among the highest ultrasound values for any comparative  
21  
22 population presented here. From this cross-study comparison, the Shuar exhibit some of the  
23  
24 highest QUS values, while *Colonos* as a group show slightly lower bone density measures than  
25  
26 other global reference populations. The high values among the Shuar are likely related to a suite  
27  
28 of lifestyle and activity patterns that are reflective of greater dependency on a subsistence-based  
29  
30 economy than the *Colono* participants.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 *Study Limitations*

40  
41 The present study has several important limitations. While field-based research is a  
42  
43 necessary and critical approach to gathering information from populations in remote settings, this  
44  
45 type of research presents issues when aiming to establish a controlled setting for data collection.  
46  
47 One study limitation is that participant sample sizes for certain age intervals are small,  
48  
49 particularly among older cohorts, an issue that is more pronounced in the Shuar group. The small  
50  
51 sample sizes and non-random selection of participants within age categories may inhibit our  
52  
53 interpretations of the age effects on BMD that have been reported for other reference  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 populations. Also, participants in the current study were recruited from a sample pool of  
4  
5 individuals who may have been inclined to seek out health information provided by this study.  
6  
7 Although this may inherently bias the dataset towards individuals who demonstrate greater  
8  
9 health-related issues, this recruitment strategy is not atypical for field-based research in remote  
10  
11 settings. Also, as previously mentioned, normative data on bone health generally exclude  
12  
13 pregnant and lactating females, because the modifiable (e.g., diet, activity) and non-modifiable  
14  
15 (e.g., hormones) factors affecting bone integrity are constantly fluctuating. Yet in many  
16  
17 developing countries most females are pregnant and lactating for much of their reproductive life  
18  
19 spans, so inclusion of this demographic was an effort to present a normative representation of  
20  
21 bone health in these two groups. This inclusion, however, can present problems with cross-  
22  
23 population comparative studies. Further research on bone health in developing countries is  
24  
25 necessary in order to determine the most effective approach to remedying this issue. Finally,  
26  
27 cross-sectional data prevent us from making definitive statements on age-related changes in  
28  
29 skeletal health, but is a necessary first step in determining patterns of bone loss.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The current study established a preliminary dataset for three calcaneal QUS parameters in  
37  
38 the Shuar and non-Shuar *Colono* populations of Amazonian Ecuador. It investigated ethnic and  
39  
40 sex differences for the effect of age and body size variables on QUS parameters. The study also  
41  
42 addressed relevant issues in gathering bone health data in a remote field-based setting within a  
43  
44 developing country. The Shuar and *Colonos* represent two populations from the same  
45  
46 geographical region who have a range of dependency on mixed agricultural and subsistence-  
47  
48 based economy. Differences in QUS values between the two groups may be attributed to  
49  
50 genetics as well as to individual- and community-level variation in diet and lifestyle. Future  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 research will examine the specific ways in which dietary composition and lifestyle behaviors  
4  
5 contribute to Shuar and *Colono* bone health profiles.  
6  
7  
8  
9

#### 10 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

11  
12 We express gratitude to Ruby Fried, Michael Fernandez, Betsy Ruth, Paula Tallman,  
13 Cesar Kayap, Oswaldo Mankash, Luzmila Jempekat, Estela Jempekat, and Marilu Utitaj for  
14 their assistance with data collection. We also thank our funding sources: Wenner-Gren  
15 Foundation for Anthropological Research (Grant number: 7970); NSF (Grant number: BCS-  
16 0824602); Evonuk Foundation; L.S.B. Leakey Foundation; Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders  
17 Fellowship; NIH (5DP1OD000516-5 via UCSB Center for Evolutionary Psychology);  
18 University of Oregon. Finally, we wish to express our sincerest gratitude to the participants in  
19 this study.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

1. Barkmann R, Laugier P, Moser U, Dencks S, Padilla F, Haiat G, Heller M, Gluer CC (2007) A method for the estimation of femoral bone mineral density from variables of ultrasound transmission through the human femur. *Bone* 40:37-44.
2. Gerdhem P, Dencker M, Ringsberg K, Akesson K (2008) Accelerometer-measured daily physical activity among octogenarians: results and associations to other indices of physical performance and bone density. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 102:173-180.
3. Nayak S, Olkin I, Liu H, Grabe M, Gould MK, Allen IE, Owens DK, Bravata DM (2006) Meta-analysis: accuracy of quantitative ultrasound for identifying patients with osteoporosis. *Ann Intern Med* 144:832-841.
4. Handa R, Kalla AA, Maalouf Ghassan (2008) Osteoporosis in developing countries. *Best Pract Res Clin Rh* 22:693-708.
5. Woolf AD, Pflieger B (2005) Burden of osteoporosis and fractures in developing countries. *Current Osteoporosis Reports* 3:85-91.
6. Rubenstein S (2001) Colonialism, the Shuar Federation, and the Ecuadorian state. *Environ Plann D* 19:263-293.
7. Madimenos FC, Snodgrass JJ, Blackwell AD, Liebert MA, Sugiyama LS (2011) Physical activity in an indigenous Ecuadorian forager-horticulturalist population as measured using accelerometry *Am J Hum Biol* (in press).
8. Bunker VW (1994) The role of nutrition in osteoporosis. *Brit J Biomed Sci* 51:228-240.
9. Hernandez-Avila M, Stampfer MJ, Ravnkar VA, Willet WC, Schiff I, Francis M, Longscope C, Mckinlay SM, Longcope C (1993) Caffeine and other predictors of bone density among pre- and perimenopausal women. *Epidemiology* 4:128-134.
10. Lazenby R (1997) Bone loss, traditional diet, and cold adaptation in Arctic populations. *Am J Hum Bio* 9:329-341.
11. Sampson H (2002) Alcohol and other factors affecting osteoporosis risk in women. *Alcohol Res Health* 264:292-296.
12. Mazess RB (1978) Bone mineral in Vilcabamba, Ecuador. *Am J Roentgenol* 130:671-674.
13. da Rocha FA, Ribiero AR (2003) Low incidence of hip fractures in an equatorial area. *Osteoporos Int* 14:496-499.
14. Bartl R, Frisch B (2004) *Osteoporosis: Diagnosis, prevention, therapy*. Berlin, Germany.

- 1  
2  
3 15. Lee M, Nahhas RW, Choh AC, Demerath EW, Duren DL, Chumlea WC et al (2010)  
4 Longitudinal changes in calcaneal quantitative ultrasound measures during childhood.  
5 Osteoporos Int doi:10.1007/s00198-010-1458-0.  
6  
7  
8 16. Murphy S, Khaw KT, May H, Compston E (1994) Parity and bone mineral density in  
9 middle-aged women. *Osteoporos Int* 4:162-166.  
10  
11 17. Nguyen TV, Jones G, Sambrook PN, White CP, Kelly PJ, Eisman JA (1995) Effects of  
12 estrogen exposure and reproductive factors on bone mineral density and osteoporotic fractures. *J*  
13 *Clin Endocrinol Metab* 80:2709-2714.  
14  
15  
16 18. Streeten EA, Ryan KA, McBride DJ, Pollin TI, Shuldiner AR, Mitchell BD (2005) The  
17 relationship between parity and bone mineral density in women characterized by a homogenous  
18 lifestyle and high parity. *J Clin Endocr Metab* 90:4536-4541.  
19  
20  
21 19. Eaton SB, Pike MC, Short RV, Lee NC, Trussell J, Hatcher RA, Wood JW, Worthman CM  
22 et al (1994) Women's reproductive cancers in evolutionary context. *Q Rev Biol* 69:353-367.  
23  
24  
25 20. Sperling S, Beyene Y (1997) A pound of biology and a pinch of culture or a pinch of biology  
26 and a pound of culture? The necessity of integrating biology and culture in reproductive studies.  
27 In: Hager L (ed). *Women in human evolution*. Routledge, New York, pp 137-152.  
28  
29  
30 21. Weaver DS (1998) Osteoporosis in the bioarchaeology of women. In: Grauer A, Stuart-  
31 Macadam P (eds). *Sex and gender in paleopathological perspective*. Cambridge pp 27-46.  
32  
33 22. Liebert MA, Snodgrass JJ, Blackwell AD, Madimenos FC, Sugiyama LS (2010) The  
34 implications of varying degrees of market integration on blood pressure, glucose, cholesterol,  
35 and triglyceride levels in an indigenous lowland Ecuadorian population. *Am J Hum Biol* 22:260.  
36  
37  
38 23. Anderson JJ, Pollitzer WS (1994) Ethnic and genetic differences in susceptibility to  
39 osteoporotic fractures. *Adv Nutr Res* 9:129-149.  
40  
41  
42 24. Hinkley HJ, Drysdale IP, Walters NJ, Bird D (2004) Normative data for ultrasound  
43 measurement of the calcaneus within different female ethnic groups. *Brit J Radiol* 77:740-744.  
44  
45 25. Naganathan V, Macgregor A, Snieder H, Nguyen T, Spector T, Sambrook P (2002) Gender  
46 differences in the genetic factors responsible for variation in bone density and ultrasound. *J Bone*  
47 *Miner Res* 17:725-733.  
48  
49  
50 26. Thomas PA (2007) Racial and ethnic differences in osteoporosis. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg* 15  
51 *Suppl* 1:S26-30.  
52  
53 27. Pluskiewicz W (1998) Bone status assessed by quantitative ultrasound in healthy  
54 postmenopausal Polish women: normative data. *Clin Rheumatol* 17:40-43.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
28. Trovas G, Tsekoura M, Galanos A, Dionyssiotis Y, Dontas I, Lyritis G, Papioanou N (2009) Quantitative ultrasound of the calcaneus in Greek women: Normative data are different from the manufacturer's normal range. *J Clin Densito* 12:353-359.
29. Takeda N, Miyake M, Kita S, Tomomitsu T, Fukunaga M (1996) Sex and age patterns of quantitative ultrasound densitometry of the calcaneus in normal Japanese subjects. *Calcif Tissue Int* 59:84-88.
30. Liu W, Xu CL, Zhu ZQ et al (2006) Characteristics of calcaneus quantitative ultrasound normative data in Chinese mainland men and women. *Osteoporos Int* 17:1216-1224.
31. Skarić-Jurić T, Zajc M, Narancić NS, Barbalić M, Salihović MP, Lauc LB (2006) Calcaneous ultrasonographic assessment of bone mineral density in the Roma minority population of Croatia--preliminary report. *Coll Antropol.* 30:761-765.
32. Rhee Y, Lee J, Jung JY, Lee JE, Park SY, Kim YM, Lee S, Choi HS, Kim SH, Lim SK (2009) Modifications of T-scores by quantitative ultrasonography for the diagnosis of osteoporosis in Koreans. *J Korean Med Sci* 24:232-236.
33. Alenfeld FE, Engelke K, Schmidt D, Brezger M, Diessel E, Felsenberg D (2002) Diagnostic agreement of two calcaneal ultrasound devices: the Sahara bone sonometer and the Achilles. *Br J Radiol* 75: 895-902.

TABLES

Table 1. Anthropometric and QUS data by group, sex, and menopausal status (mean [SD]).

	Shuar	Colono	<i>p</i>
<i>Sexes Combined</i>			
N	227	261	
Age (years)	34.97 (14.72)	47.43 (19.53)	**
Height (cm)	152.09 (7.23)	153.83 (10.91)	*
Weight (kg)	58.49 (10.50)	64.72 (12.50)	**
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.19 (3.51)	27.28 (5.18)	**
BUA (dB/MHz)	82.0 (19.3)	69.4 (19.0)	**
SOS (m/s)	1571.4 (33.2)	1545.1 (32.9)	**
hBMD	0.600 (0.131)	0.499 (0.130)	**
<i>Males</i>			
N	91	104	
Age (years)	37.26 (14.76)	47.30 (20.15)	**
Height (cm)	157.99 (6.27)	161.13 (8.45)	*
Weight (kg)	63.19 (9.32)	69.49 (13.38)	**
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	25.20 (2.73)	26.90 (5.99)	*
BUA (dB/MHz)	87.5 (19.54)	74.1 (20.38)	**
SOS (m/s)	1574.4 (34.65)	1550.8 (33.96)	**
hBMD	0.622 (0.137)	0.527 (0.134)	**
<i>Females</i>			
N	136	157	
Age (years)	33.44 (14.54)	47.52 (19.18)	**
Height (cm)	148.32 (4.9)	149.00 (9.6)	**



<b>Weight (kg)</b>	55.51 (10.14)	61.57 (10.8)	**
<b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	25.19 (3.95)	27.53 (4.6)	**
<b>BUA (dB/MHz)</b>	78.4 (18.4)	66.2 (17.43)	**
<b>SOS (m/s)</b>	1569.4 (32.14)	1541.3 (31.7)	**
<b>hBMD</b>	0.586 (0.126)	0.481 (.124)	**
<i>Pre-menopausal women</i>			
<b>N</b>	118	81	
<b>Age (years)</b>	29.52 (10.55)	31.75 (10.44)	<i>Ns</i>
<b>Height (cm)</b>	148.86 (11.31)	152.34 (6.07)	**
<b>Weight (kg)</b>	56.17 (10.57)	61.76 (11.13)	**
<b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	25.33 (4.51)	26.58 (4.43)	*
<b>BUA (dB/MHz)</b>	80.6 (15.3)	74.3 (15.3)	*
<b>SOS (m/s)</b>	1574.2 (27.9)	1559.2 (23.6)	**
<b>hBMD</b>	0.605 (0.110)	0.548 (0.095)	**
<i>Post-menopausal women</i>			
<b>N</b>	13	76	
<b>Age (years)</b>	61.60 (11.35)	64.32 (9.68)	<i>Ns</i>
<b>Height (cm)</b>	144.66 (6.23)	145.40 (11.31)	<i>Ns</i>
<b>Weight (kg)</b>	49.63 (8.75)	61.37 (10.57)	**
<b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	23.57 (2.85)	28.56 (4.51)	**
<b>BUA (dB/MHz)</b>	58.7 (21.2)	57.5 (15.3)	<i>Ns</i>
<b>SOS (m/s)</b>	1532.7 (35.8)	1522.2 (27.9)	<i>Ns</i>
<b>hBMD</b>	0.439 (0.144)	0.409 (0.110)	<i>Ns</i>

*Ns* = not significant

\* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.001$  (significant difference between ethnic groups)

**Table 2.** Age-specific anthropometric and QUS parameters by ethnic group and sex (mean [SD]).

Ethnic Group	Age	Sex	n	Height (cm)	Weight (kg)	BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	BUA (dB/MHz)	SOS (m/s)	hBMD	
Shuar	15-20	Female	28	148.77 (4.94)	50.52 (5.03)	22.80 (1.77)	77.5 (17.0)	1577.6 (29.2)	0.604 (0.115)	
		Male	12	154.83 (11.6)	54.05 (12.32)	22.20 (2.56)	77.9 (15.6)	1580.4 (23.9)	0.612 (0.098)	
	21-30	Female	38	149.63 (4.51)	55.49 (11.52)	24.81 (4.64)	83.0 (17.2)	1578.4 (28.3)	0.620 (0.112)	
		Male	21	158.93 (5.16)	62.53 (6.22)	24.69 (1.21)	95.7 (12.8)	1590.3 (25.4)	0.684 (0.096)	
	31-40	Female	30	149.31 (3.63)	61.44 (9.44)	27.53 (3.81)	80.4 (17.9)	1571.8 (29.2)	0.599 (0.117)	
		Male	25	158.38 (3.99)	66.16 (5.97)	26.35 (1.85)	96.1 (15.7)	1582.6 (27.5)	0.665 (0.110)	
	41-50	Female	23	146.86 (4.69)	57.66 (10.44)	26.60 (3.61)	81.2 (14.7)	1567.5 (30.6)	0.591 (0.114)	
		Male	19	159.07 (4.02)	68.14 (9.84)	26.85 (3.13)	83.3 (11.5)	1563.6 (20.3)	0.583 (0.077)	
	51-60	Female	9	145.79 (5.57)	55.71 (7.54)	26.15 (2.57)	67.4 (19.8)	1538.6 (29.7)	0.476 (0.125)	
		Male	5	162.40 (4.58)	63.97 (3.56)	24.33 (2.25)	86.1 (44.4)	1573.4 (79.0)	0.615 (0.319)	
	> 60	Female	8	143.14 (7.06)	45.79 (6.32)	22.23 (1.20)	56.4 (23.1)	1529.4 (33.5)	0.424 (0.145)	
		Male	9	153.38 (4.58)	58.30 (10.45)	24.68 (3.58)	66.5 (20.9)	1529.8 (36.6)	0.452 (0.149)	
	Colono	15-20	Female	16	151.76 (5.66)	54.73 (13.0)	23.66 (5.04)	66.7 (9.2)	1557.9 (22.5)	0.525 (0.732)
			Male	13	164.41 (7.72)	61.18 (10.39)	22.68 (3.94)	69.6 (21.6)	1556.5 (30.4)	0.535 (0.135)
21-30		Female	22	153.96 (5.68)	62.23 (10.22)	26.20 (3.77)	79.5 (16.3)	1563.9 (24.6)	0.574 (0.101)	
		Male	13	165.67 (5.85)	68.95 (8.85)	25.17 (3.47)	86.1 (21.0)	1583.9 (36.7)	0.641 (0.141)	
31-40		Female	22	152.52 (6.52)	63.86 (9.32)	27.57 (4.55)	77.3 (15.1)	1562.8 (24.2)	0.565 (0.981)	
		Male	14	159.98 (14.24)	72.46 (11.99)	29.49 (10.98)	91.0 (16.8)	1580.9 (24.7)	0.647 (0.106)	
41-50		Female	23	149.96 (6.91)	63.89 (10.37)	28.30 (3.19)	70.7 (14.5)	1549.4 (21.5)	0.513 (0.089)	

	Male	21	163.19 (5.39)	80.16 (14.90)	30.04 (5.03)	73.8 (15.5)	1545.5 (19.5)	0.511 (0.086)
	Female	27	145.48 (17.75)	67.60 (10.39)	30.65 (4.44)	63.1 (14.0)	1530.9 (22.6)	0.448 (0.092)
<b>51-60</b>	Male	13	160.40 (6.42)	68.86 (13.31)	26.70 (4.48)	70.9 (12.1)	1538.8 (19.6)	0.488 (0.754)
	Female	47	145.58 (5.67)	58.04 (9.34)	27.41 (4.31)	54.3 (16.1)	1516.9 (30.3)	0.386 (0.118)
<b>&gt; 60</b>	Male	30	157.23 (8.45)	65.10 (13.38)	26.28 (4.0)	64.8 (21.0)	1528.8 (30.6)	0.448 (0.123)

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Table 3.** Stepwise multivariate linear regression model between QUS values and age (years), weight (kg), height (cm), and BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>).

Ethnicity	QUS	Stepwise multiple regression model*	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	p
<b>Shuar</b>	Male				
	BUA	38.04-0.543*age+2.768*BMI	.224	.204	.000
	SOS	1554.9-1.288*age+2.682*BMI	.269	.250	.040
	hBMD	0.443-0.005*age+0.014*BMI	.252	.233	.007
	Female				
	BUA	-53.7-0.284*age+0.74*height +1.288*BMI	.192	.172	.029
	SOS	1560.0-0.889*age	.159	.152	.000
	hBMD	0.56-0.003*age+0.006*BMI	.151	.138	.042
	Total				
	BUA	-63.1-0.35*age +0.8*height+1.431*BMI	.236	.224	.000
SOS	1497.5-0.94*age+0.705*height	.198	.190	.016	
hBMD	0.03-0.003*age+0.004*height+0.006*BMI	.202	.191	.017	
<b>Colono</b>	Male				
	BUA	62.7-0.289*age+0.363*weight	.143	.126	.012
	SOS	1590.2-0.832*age	.244	.236	.000
	hBMD	0.175-0.003*age+0.003*height	.226	.210	.049
	Female				
	BUA	68.1-0.486*age+0.773*BMI	.282	.272	.005
	SOS	1588.9-1.001*age	.370	.366	.000
	hBMD	0.567-0.004*age+0.004*BMI	.357	.348	.043
	Total				
	BUA	-29.0-0.321*age+0.609*height +0.726*BMI	.253	.244	.000

SOS	$1489.7-0.837*\text{age}+0.617*\text{height}$	.335	.330	.001
hBMD	$0.195-0.003*\text{age}+0.002*\text{height}+0.001*\text{weight}$	.322	.314	.039

\*QUS parameters that are not in the regression equation are not significant in the model.

For Peer Review

**Table 4.** Descriptive statistics for non-pregnant and non-lactating women by ethnic group (mean [SD]).

	<b>Shuar (n=96)</b>	<b>Colono (n=145)</b>	<b><i>p</i></b>
<b>Age (years)</b>	35.81 (15.37)	48.50 (19.17)	**
<b>Height (cm)</b>	148.17 (5.19)	148.84 (9.68)	<i>Ns</i>
<b>Weight (kg)</b>	55.30 (9.17)	61.51 (10.92)	**
<b>BMI (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	25.13 (3.55)	27.54 (4.61)	**
<b>BUA (dB/MHz)</b>	77.5 (19.4)	64.8 (16.7)	**
<b>SOS (m/s)</b>	1566.4 (32.6)	1539.1 (30.8)	**
<b>hBMD</b>	0.576 (0.130)	0.472 (0.119)	**

*Ns* = not significant


\*\* *P* < 0.001 (significant difference between ethnic groups)

For Peer Review


## FIGURES

**Figure 1 (a-c).** Sex differences in the Shuar for SOS (a), BUA (b), and hBMD (c) values based on age. Values represent means for the age category with confidence intervals.

a)




b)



Review




c)




Review

**Figure 2 (a-c).** Sex differences in the *colonos* for SOS (a), BUA (b), and hBMD (c) values based on age. Values represent means for the age category with confidence intervals.

a)




b)



Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

c)



Review