

TITLE PAGE

International norms for adult handgrip strength: A systematic review of data on 2.4 million adults aged 20 to 100+ years from 69 countries and territories

Authors' names

Grant R. TOMKINSON^{1*} (ORCID: 0000-0001-7601-9670)
Justin J. LANG^{1,2,3} (ORCID: 0000-0002-1768-319X)
Lukáš RUBÍN^{4,5} (ORCID: 0000-0003-4920-1113)
Ryan McGRATH^{1,6,7,8,9} (ORCID: 0000-0002-0644-5524)
Bethany GOWER¹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-6969-6913)
Terry BOYLE¹⁰ (ORCID: 0000-0001-6741-330X)
Marilyn G. KLUG¹¹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-8476-7097)
Alexandra J. MAYHEW^{12,13,14} (ORCID: 0000-0001-6700-9497)
Henry T. BLAKE¹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-9903-9287)
Francisco B. ORTEGA^{15,16,17} (ORCID: 0000-0003-2001-1121)
Cristina CADENAS-SANCHEZ^{15,16,18,19} (ORCID: 0000-0002-4513-9108)
Costan G. MAGNUSSEN^{1,20,21,22} (ORCID: 0000-0002-6238-5730)
Brooklyn J. FRASER^{1,23} (ORCID: 0000-0002-1752-5431)
Tetsuhiro KIDOKORO^{1,24} (ORCID: 0000-0002-1494-5123)
Yang LIU^{25,26} (ORCID: 0000-0003-1251-3025)
Kaare CHRISTENSEN²⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-5429-5292)
Darryl P. LEONG²⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-1968-169X)

and the iGRIPS (international handGRIP Strength) group

Mette AADAHL^{29,30} (ORCID: 0000-0001-5904-9747)
Edimansyah ABDIN³¹ (ORCID: 0000-0002-1016-3298)
Julian ALCAZAR^{32,33,34,35}
Aqeel ALENAZI³⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-2641-8339)
Bader ALQAHTANI³⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-8275-6906)
Cledir de A. AMARAL³⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-7221-5364)
Thatiana L. M. AMARAL³⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-9197-5633)
Alex ANDRADE FERNANDES³⁹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-7087-8263)
Peter AXELSSON⁴⁰ (ORCID: 0000-0003-2318-6824)
Jennifer BALDWIN⁴¹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-7830-7270)
Karin BAMMANN⁴² (ORCID: 0000-0002-5623-8160)
Aline R. BARBOSA⁴³ (ORCID: 0000-0003-0929-7659)
Amline BARDO^{44,45} (ORCID: 0000-0003-1840-6423)
Inosha BIMALI⁴⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-4021-333X)
Peter BJERREGAARD⁴⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0001-7153-8447)
Martin BOBAK⁴⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-2633-6851)
Colin A. BOREHAM⁴⁹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-8885-9677)

Klaus BÖS⁵⁰ (ORCID: 0009-0002-9195-7133)
João Carlos BOUZAS MARINS⁵¹ (ORCID: 0000-0003-0727-3450)
Joshua BURNS⁵² (ORCID: 0000-0001-7936-623X)
Nadezda CAPKOVA⁵³ (ORCID: 0000-0003-2218-0674)
Lilia CASTILLO-MARTÍNEZ⁵⁴ (ORCID: 0000-0001-9425-923X)
Liang-Kung CHEN^{55,56,57} (ORCID: 0000-0002-2387-8508)
Siu Ming CHOI⁵⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-0716-699X)
Rebecca K. J. CHOONG⁵⁹
Susana C. CONFORTIN^{60,61} (ORCID: 0000-0001-5159-4062)
Cyrus COOPER^{62,63,64} (ORCID: 0000-0003-3510-0709)
Jorge E. CORREA-BAUTISTA⁶⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-0646-2316)
Amandine COURNIL⁶⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-6172-4761)
Grace CRUZ⁶⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-8675-457X)
Eling D. de BRUIN^{68,69,70} (ORCID: 0000-0002-6542-7385)
José Antonio DE PAZ^{71,72} (ORCID: 0000-0002-4389-1777)
Bruno de Souza MOREIRA⁷³ (ORCID: 0000-0001-8840-4496)
Luiz Antonio DOS ANJOS⁷⁴ (ORCID: 0000-0002-5257-6912)
María Cristina ENRÍQUEZ REYNA⁷⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-7720-4269)
Eduardo FERRIOLLI⁷⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-5028-2451)
Gillian FORRESTER⁷⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0001-8321-719X)
Elena FROLOVA⁷⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-5569-5175)
Abadi K. GEBRE^{79,80} (ORCID: 0000-0002-1975-0085)
Atef M. GHALEB⁸¹ (ORCID: 0000-0003-4666-3283)
Tiffany K. GILL^{1,82} (ORCID: 0000-0002-2822-2436)
Yasuyuki GONDO⁸³ (ORCID: 0000-0002-9805-2807)
M. Cristina GONZALEZ^{84,85} (ORCID: 0000-0002-3901-8182)
Citlali GONZALEZ ALVAREZ⁸⁶
Mary K. HANNAH⁸⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0001-7777-0140)
Nicholas C. HARVEY^{62,63} (ORCID: 0000-0002-8194-2512)
Jean-Yves HOGREL⁸⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0003-0045-7505)
Marie-Theres HUEMER⁸⁹ (ORCID: 0000-0002-4329-8607)
Toshiko IIDAKA⁹⁰ (ORCID: 0009-0007-4662-4248)
Lewis A. INGRAM¹ (ORCID: 0000-0003-2741-1574)
Dmitri A. JDANOV^{91,92} (ORCID: 0000-0003-4633-2011)
Victoria L. KEEVIL⁹³ (ORCID: 0000-0001-6148-0640)
Wolfgang KEMMLER^{94,95} (ORCID: 0000-0003-3515-0669)
Rose Anne KENNY⁹⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-9336-8124)
Dae-Yeon KIM⁹⁷
Tracy L. KIVELL⁴⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0001-5087-0897)
Ingrid G. H. KJÆR⁹⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-7513-7453)
Alexander KLUTTIG⁹⁹ (ORCID: 0000-0003-4446-9938)
Rumi KOZAKAI^{100,101} (ORCID: 0009-0009-4961-3311)
Danit LANGER¹⁰² (ORCID: 0000-0001-5321-2232)
Lisbeth A. LARSEN²⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-0426-0569)

Wei-Ju LEE^{56,103} (ORCID: 0000-0003-4326-333X)
David A. LEON¹⁰⁴ (ORCID: 0000-0001-9747-1762)
Eric LICHTENSTEIN¹⁰⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-5860-9068)
Bertis B. LITTLE¹⁰⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-6485-4641)
Roberto Alves LOURENÇO^{107,108} (ORCID: 0000-0003-0838-1285)
Rahul MALHOTRA^{109,110} (ORCID: 0000-0002-9978-4276)
Robert M. MALINA^{106,111} (ORCID: 0000-0002-9402-0648)
Kiyooki MATSUMOTO⁸³
Tal MAZOR-KARSENTY¹⁰² (ORCID: 0000-0001-8018-5321)
Marnee J. McKAY⁴¹ (ORCID: 0000-0002-8126-3579)
Sinéad McLOUGHLIN⁹⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-9257-0400)
Abhishek L. MENEGERE¹¹² (ORCID: 0000-0002-3164-4648)
Mostafa MOHAMMADIAN¹¹³ (ORCID: 0000-0001-9688-2455)
Virgilio Garcia MOREIRA¹⁰⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-4932-1935)
Hiroshi MURAYAMA¹¹⁴
Anne MURRAY^{115,116} (ORCID: 0000-0002-2787-8433)
Anita Liberalesso NERI¹¹⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-6833-7668)
Claudia NIESSNER⁵⁰ (ORCID: 0000-0003-2094-0836)
Gabriel NÚÑEZ OTHÓN⁷² (ORCID: 0000-0001-6792-7570)
Gabriel OLVEIRA^{118,119,120} (ORCID: 0000-0002-7646-2899)
Suzanne ORCHARD¹²¹ (ORCID: 0000-0003-0211-3183)
Andrezj PAJAK¹²²
Chan Woong PARK¹²³ (ORCID: 0000-0003-3875-9832)
Julie A. PASCO^{124,125} (ORCID: 0000-0002-8968-4714)
Maria E. PEÑA REYES⁸⁶
Leani Souza Máximo PEREIRA¹²⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0001-7253-4392)
Annette PETERS^{89,127} (ORCID: 0000-0001-6645-0985)
Eric Tsz-Chun POON¹²⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-0842-1323)
Margareth C. PORTELA¹²⁹ (ORCID: 0000-0002-9858-9276)
Jedd PRATT^{49,130} (ORCID: 0000-0002-7410-078X)
Robinson RAMÍREZ-VÉLEZ^{131,132} (ORCID: 0000-0003-3075-6960)
Wendy RODRÍGUEZ-GARCÍA¹³³ (ORCID: 0000-0002-8529-9421)
Joanne RYAN¹³⁴ (ORCID: 0000-0002-7039-6325)
Mauricio A. SAN-MARTÍN¹³⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0003-0283-1716)
Francisco José SÁNCHEZ-TORRALVO¹¹⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0002-0739-2567)
Mahnaz SAREMI¹³⁶
Arno SCHMIDT-TRUCKSÄSS¹⁰⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-4662-3911)
Satoshi SEINO¹³⁷ (ORCID: 0000-0002-3620-8730)
Shamsul Azhar SHAH¹³⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0003-0635-1816)
Marc SIM^{79,139} (ORCID: 0000-0001-5166-0605)
Bjørn Heine STRAND¹⁴⁰ (ORCID: 0000-0003-4385-8886)
Mythily SUBRAMANIAM^{31,141} (ORCID: 0000-0003-4530-1096)
Charlotte SUETTA^{142,143} (ORCID: 0000-0001-8063-6508)
Sophia X. SUI¹²⁴ (ORCID: 0000-0001-6388-1261)

Jonas S. SUNDARAKUMAR¹¹² (ORCID: 0000-0002-0877-7936)
Koya SUZUKI¹⁴⁴ (ORCID: 0000-0002-2089-0886)
Abdonas TAMOSIUNAS¹⁴⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-0868-457X)
Maw Pin TAN¹⁴⁶ (ORCID: 0000-0002-3400-8540)
Yu TANIGUCHI¹⁴⁷
Barbara THORAND^{89,127} (ORCID: 0000-0002-8416-6440)
Anna TURUSHEVA⁷⁸ (ORCID: 0000-0003-3347-0984)
Anne Therese TVETER^{148,149} (ORCID: 0000-0003-1701-9835)
Jonathan WAGNER¹⁰⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-3436-588X)
Dao WANG¹⁵⁰ (ORCID: 0009-0007-5705-2978)
Stuart J. WARDEN¹⁵¹ (ORCID: 0000-0002-6415-4936)
Julia WEARING¹⁵² (ORCID: 0000-0002-1670-4673)
Shiou Liang WEE^{153,154} (ORCID: 0000-0002-7853-4112)
Leo D. WESTBURY⁶² (ORCID: 0009-0008-5853-8096)
Agnieszka WIŚNIEWSKA-SZURLEJ¹⁵⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0001-6651-0861)
Alexander WOLL⁵⁰ (ORCID: 0000-0002-5736-2980)
Noriko YOSHIMURA⁹⁰ (ORCID: 0000-0002-6555-5782)
Ruby YU^{156,157} (ORCID: 0000-0001-7051-4689)

Institutional affiliations

- ¹ Alliance for Research in Exercise, Nutrition and Activity (ARENA), Allied Health and Human Performance, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia.
- ² Centre for Surveillance and Applied Research, Public Health Agency of Canada, Ottawa, ON, K1A 0K9, Canada.
- ³ School of Epidemiology and Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, K1H 8M5, Canada.
- ⁴ Department of Physical Education and Sport, Faculty of Science, Humanities and Education, Technical University of Liberec, 461 17, Czech Republic.
- ⁵ Institute of Active Lifestyle, Faculty of Physical Culture, Palacký University Olomouc, Olomouc, 779 00, Czech Republic.
- ⁶ Healthy Aging North Dakota (HAND), North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, 58102, USA.
- ⁷ Department of Health, Nutrition, and Exercise Sciences, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND, 58108, USA.
- ⁸ Fargo VA Healthcare System, Fargo, ND, 58102, USA.
- ⁹ Department of Geriatrics, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, 58202, USA.
- ¹⁰ Australian Centre for Precision Health, Allied Health and Human Performance, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, 5000, Australia.
- ¹¹ Department of Population Health, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, 58202, USA.
- ¹² Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4L8, Canada.
- ¹³ Labarge Centre for Mobility in Aging, Hamilton, ON, L8P 0A1, Canada.
- ¹⁴ McMaster Institute for Research on Aging, Hamilton, ON, L8P 0A1, Canada.

- 15 Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Sport and Health University Research Institute (iMUDS), University of Granada, Granada, ES 18071, Spain.
- 16 Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red Fisiopatología de la Obesidad y Nutrición (CIBERObn), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Granada, ES 18071, Spain.
- 17 Faculty of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, FI 40014, Finland.
- 18 Department of Cardiology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 94305, USA.
- 19 Veterans Affairs Palo Alto Health Care System, Palo Alto, CA, 94304, USA.
- 20 Baker Heart and Diabetes Institute, Melbourne, VIC, 3004, Australia.
- 21 Research Centre of Applied and Preventive Cardiovascular Medicine, University of Turku, Turku, 20520, Finland.
- 22 Centre for Population Health Research, University of Turku and Turku University Hospital, Turku, 20520, Finland.
- 23 Menzies Institute for Medical Research, University of Tasmania, Hobart, TAS, 7000, Australia.
- 24 Faculty of Sport Science, Nippon Sport Science University, Setagaya, Tokyo, 158-8508, Japan.
- 25 School of Physical Education, Shanghai University of Sport, Shanghai, 200438, China.
- 26 Shanghai Research Center for Physical Fitness and Health of Children and Adolescents, Shanghai, 200438, China.
- 27 Department of Public Health, Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Biodemography, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, 5230, Denmark.
- 28 The Population Health Research Institute, McMaster University and Hamilton Health Sciences, Hamilton, ON, L8L 2X2, Canada.
- 29 Centre for Clinical Research and Prevention, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital, Frederiksberg, Denmark.
- 30 Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 31 Research Division, Institute of Mental Health, Singapore.
- 32 GENUD Toledo Research Group, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Toledo, Spain.
- 33 Geriatric Research Unit, Geriatric Department, Bispebjerg-Frederiksberg University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 34 CIBER on Frailty and Healthy Aging, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain.
- 35 Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Castilla-La Mancha (IDISCAM), Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha (JCCM), Spain.
- 36 Department of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, College of Applied Medical Sciences, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- 37 Federal Institute of Acre, Rio Branco, Acre, Brazil.
- 38 Federal University of Acre, Rio Branco, Acre, Brazil.
- 39 Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia de Minas Gerais—Campus Ipatinga, Ipatinga, Minas Gerais, Brazil.
- 40 Department of Hand Surgery, Clinical Sciences, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg at Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Gothenburg, Sweden.

- 41 Sydney School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney NSW, Australia.
- 42 Institute for Public Health and Nursing Sciences, University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany.
- 43 Centro de Desportos, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brazil.
- 44 UMR 7194-HNHP, CNRS-MNHN, Département Homme et Environnement, Musée de l'Homme, Paris, France.
- 45 Department of Human Origins, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany.
- 46 Department of Physiotherapy, Kathmandu University School of Medical Sciences, Dhulikhel, Nepal.
- 47 National Institute of Public Health, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark.
- 48 International Institute for Health and Society, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, UK.
- 49 Institute for Sport and Health, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland.
- 50 Institute of Sports and Sports Science, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany.
- 51 Physical Education Department, Federal University of Viçosa, Minas Gerais, Brazil.
- 52 Human Performance Lab, Department of Epidemiology and Cancer Control, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Memphis, TN, USA.
- 53 Environmental and Population Health Monitoring Centre, National Institute of Public Health, Prague, Czech Republic.
- 54 Clinical Nutrition Department, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, México City, México.
- 55 Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Taipei Veterans General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan.
- 56 Center for Healthy Longevity and Aging Sciences, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- 57 Taipei Municipal Gan-Dau Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan.
- 58 Faculty of Education, University of Macau, Macau, China.
- 59 Department of Medicine, Universiti Malaya Medical Centre, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- 60 Postgraduate Program in Public Health (PPGSCol), University of the Extreme South of Santa Catarina (UNESC), Criciúma, Santa Catarina, Brazil.
- 61 Department of Public Health, Federal University of Maranhão, São Luís, Maranhão, Brazil.
- 62 MRC Lifecourse Epidemiology Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK.
- 63 NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, University of Southampton and University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Southampton, UK.
- 64 NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.
- 65 Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte y la Educación Física, Universidad de Cundinamarca, Fusagasuga, Colombia.
- 66 Mission pour la Science Ouverte, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, Montpellier, France.
- 67 Population Institute, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, Philippines.

- 68 Institute of Human Movement Sciences and Sport (IBWS), Department of Health Sciences and Technology, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.
- 69 OST—Eastern Swiss University of Applied Sciences, Department of Health, St. Gallen, Switzerland.
- 70 Division of Physiotherapy, Department of Neurobiology, Care Sciences and Society, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.
- 71 Institute of Biomedicine, University of León, León, Spain.
- 72 Division of Biological Sciences and Health, University of Sonora, Hermosillo, Mexico.
- 73 Center for Studies in Public Health and Aging—Federal University of Minas Gerais and Oswaldo Cruz Foundation-Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.
- 74 Departamento de Nutrição Social, Faculdade de Nutrição Emilia de Jesus Ferreira, Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- 75 Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Facultad de Organización Deportiva Monterrey, Nuevo León, México.
- 76 Department of Internal Medicine, Ribeirao Preto Medical School, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil.
- 77 University of Sussex, School of Psychology, Sussex House, Falmer, Brighton, BN1 9RH, UK.
- 78 The North-Western State Medical University named after I.I. Mechnikov, Saint Petersburg, Russia.
- 79 Nutrition & Health Innovation Research Institute, School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, WA, Australia.
- 80 School of Pharmacy, College of Health Sciences, Mekelle University, Mekelle, Tigray, Ethiopia.
- 81 Department of Industrial Engineering, College of Engineering, Alfaisal University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
- 82 Adelaide Medical School, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia.
- 83 Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan.
- 84 Programa de Pós-graduação em Nutrição e Alimentos, Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, RS, Brazil.
- 85 Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Baton Rouge, LA, USA.
- 86 Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Mexico.
- 87 MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, School of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.
- 88 Neuromuscular Investigation Center, Institute of Myology, Paris, France.
- 89 Institute of Epidemiology, Helmholtz Zentrum München, German Research Center for Environmental Health (GmbH), Neuherberg, Germany.
- 90 Department of Preventive Medicine for Locomotive Organ Disorders, 22nd Century Medical and Research Center, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.
- 91 Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany.
- 92 National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia.
- 93 Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
- 94 Institute of Radiology, University-Hospital Erlangen, Erlangen, Germany.

- ⁹⁵ Institute of Medical Physics, University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany.
- ⁹⁶ The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing (TILDA), Trinity Central, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland.
- ⁹⁷ Measurement and Evaluation in Physical Education and Sport Science, Korea National Sport University, Seoul, Korea.
- ⁹⁸ Department of Sport Science and Physical Education, The University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway.
- ⁹⁹ Institute of Medical Epidemiology, Biometrics and Informatics, Interdisciplinary Center for Health Sciences, Medical Faculty of the Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany.
- ¹⁰⁰ Department of Health and Welfare Science, School of Lifelong Sport, Hokusho University, Hokkaido, Japan.
- ¹⁰¹ Department of Epidemiology of Aging, Research Institute, National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Aichi, Japan.
- ¹⁰² School of Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel.
- ¹⁰³ Department of Family Medicine, Taipei Veterans General Hospital Yuanshan Branch, Yi-Lan, Taiwan.
- ¹⁰⁴ Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK.
- ¹⁰⁵ Department of Sport, Exercise and Health, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland.
- ¹⁰⁶ School of Public Health and Information Sciences, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA.
- ¹⁰⁷ Research Laboratory on Human Aging—GeronLab, Internal Medicine Department, Faculty of Medical Sciences, State University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- ¹⁰⁸ Department of Medicine, Pontifical Catholic University, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- ¹⁰⁹ Centre for Ageing Research and Education, Duke-National University of Singapore Medical School, Singapore, Singapore.
- ¹¹⁰ Health Services and Systems Research, Duke-National University of Singapore Medical School, Singapore, Singapore.
- ¹¹¹ Department of Kinesiology and Health Education, University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA.
- ¹¹² Centre for Brain Research, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India.
- ¹¹³ Health Foresight and Innovation Research Center, Institute for Futures Studies in Health, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran.
- ¹¹⁴ Tokyo Metropolitan Institute for Geriatrics and Gerontology (TMIG), Tokyo, Japan.
- ¹¹⁵ Berman Centre for Outcomes and Clinical Research, Hennepin Healthcare Research Institute, Minneapolis, MN, USA.
- ¹¹⁶ University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, M FerreiraN, USA.
- ¹¹⁷ Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education, State University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil.
- ¹¹⁸ Servicio de Endocrinología y Nutrición, IBIMA/plataforma Bionand, Hospital Regional Universitario de Málaga, Málaga, Spain.
- ¹¹⁹ Departamento de Medicina y Dermatología, Universidad de Málaga, Málaga, Spain.

- 120 CIBER de Diabetes y Enfermedades Metabólicas Asociadas, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Málaga, Spain.
- 121 School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.
- 122 Department of Epidemiology and Population Studies, Jagellonian University Collegium Medicum, Krakow, Poland.
- 123 Department of Kinesiology, College of Health & Human Services, Sacramento State University, Sacramento, CA, USA.
- 124 Deakin University, Institute for Mental and Physical Health and Clinical Translation (IMPACT), Geelong, Victoria, Australia.
- 125 Department of Medicine—Western Health, The University of Melbourne, St. Albans, VIC, Australia.
- 126 Department of Physiotherapy, School of Physical Education, Physiotherapy and Therapy Occupational, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.
- 127 Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry and Epidemiology (IBE), Faculty of Medicine, LMU Munich, Pettenkofer School of Public Health, Munich, Germany.
- 128 Department of Sports Science and Physical Education, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong, China.
- 129 National School of Public Health Sergio Arouca, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- 130 Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Manchester Metropolitan University Institute of Sport, Manchester, UK.
- 131 Navarrabiomed, Hospital Universitario de Navarra (HUN)-Universidad Pública de Navarra (UPNA), IdiSNA, Pamplona, Spain
- 132 CIBER of Frailty and Healthy Aging (CIBERFES), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain.
- 133 Licenciatura en Nutriología, Facultad de Estudios Superiores Zaragoza, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México City, México.
- 134 School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
- 135 Locomotor Apparatus and Rehabilitation Institute, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile.
- 136 Workplace Health Promotion Research Center, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.
- 137 Tokyo Metropolitan Institute for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Itabashi, Tokyo, Japan.
- 138 Department of Public Health Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Cheras, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- 139 Medical School, The University Western Australia, Perth, WA, Australia.
- 140 Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.
- 141 Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore, Singapore.
- 142 Department of Geriatric and Palliative Medicine, Copenhagen University Hospital, Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 143 Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 144 Graduate School of Health and Sports Science, Juntendo University, Inzai, Chiba, Japan.

- ¹⁴⁵ Institute of Cardiology, Medical Academy, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania.
- ¹⁴⁶ Division of Geriatric Medicine, Department of Medicine, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- ¹⁴⁷ Tokyo Metropolitan Institute of Gerontology, Tokyo, Japan.
- ¹⁴⁸ Center for treatment of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Diseases (REMEDY), Health Service Research and Innovation Unit, Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Oslo, Norway.
- ¹⁴⁹ Department of Rehabilitation Science and Health Technology, Institute of Health Sciences, Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway.
- ¹⁵⁰ Physical Fitness Research and Health Guidance Center, Shanghai Research Institute of Sports Science (Shanghai Anti-Doping Agency), Shanghai, China.
- ¹⁵¹ Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health and Human Sciences, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA.
- ¹⁵² School for Interprofessional Health Care, Cooperative State University Baden-Wuerttemberg, Loerrach, Germany.
- ¹⁵³ Health and Social Sciences Cluster, Singapore Institute of Technology, Singapore, Singapore.
- ¹⁵⁴ Geriatric Education and Research Institute, Singapore.
- ¹⁵⁵ Institute of Health Sciences, Medical College of Rzeszow University, Rzeszow, Poland.
- ¹⁵⁶ Department of Medicine and Therapeutics, Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.
- ¹⁵⁷ CUHK Jockey Club Institute of Ageing, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.

Running title

International norms for adult handgrip strength

Corresponding author

Prof. Grant R. TOMKINSON*

- ✉ Alliance for Research in Exercise Nutrition and Activity (ARENA)
Allied Health & Human Performance
University of South Australia
GPO Box 2471
Adelaide SA 5001
Australia
- ☎ +61 8 8302 2159
- 📧 grant.tomkinson@unisa.edu.au

Word count: 5490

HIGHLIGHTS

- Handgrip strength (HGS)—maximal isometric grip force—is an excellent marker of general strength and health.
- Using a systematic review strategy, this study pooled HGS data from 100 unique observational studies representing 2.4 million adults aged 20 to 100+ years from 69 countries and territories tested from the year 2000 onwards.
- This study presents the world’s largest and most geographically comprehensive international sex- and age-specific norms for HGS across the adult lifespan. Norms for absolute and body size normalised HGS were tabulated as percentile values and visualised as smoothed percentile curves.
- These norms have utility for global peer-comparisons, health screening, and surveillance.

ABSTRACT

Background: Muscular strength is a powerful marker of current health status and robust predictor of age-related disease and disability. Handgrip strength (HGS) using isometric dynamometry is a convenient, feasible, and widely used method of assessing muscular strength among people of all ages. While adult HGS norms have been published for many countries, no study has yet synthesised available data to produce international norms.

Objective: To generate international sex- and age-specific norms for absolute and body size normalised HGS across the adult lifespan.

Methods: Systematic searches were conducted in six databases/web search engines (MEDLINE, SPORTDiscus, Embase, Web of Science, CINAHL, and Google Scholar) up to 1 December 2023. We included full-text peer-reviewed observational studies that reported normative HGS data for adults aged ≥ 20 years by sex and age. Pseudo data were generated using Monte Carlo simulation following harmonisation for methodological variation. Population-weighted Generalised Additive Models for Location, Scale and Shape were used to develop sex- and age-specific norms for absolute HGS (in kilograms [kg]) and HGS normalised by height (Ht) in metres (m) squared (i.e., HGS/Ht² in kg/m²). Norms were tabulated as percentile values (5th to 95th) and visualised as smoothed percentile curves.

Results: We included data from 100 unique observational studies representing 2,405,863 adults (51.9% female) aged 20 to 100+ years from 69 countries and territories tested from the year 2000 onwards. On average, absolute and normalised HGS values negligibly improved throughout early adulthood, peaked from age 30 to 39 years (at 47.8 kg [males] and 29.7 kg [females] for absolute HGS or 16.3 kg/m² [males] and 11.3 kg/m² [females] for HGS/Ht²), and declined thereafter. The age-related HGS declines accelerated from middle to late adulthood and were slightly larger for males than for females during middle adulthood.

Conclusion: This study provides the world's largest and most geographically comprehensive international norms for adult HGS by sex and age. These norms have utility for global peer-comparisons, health screening, and surveillance.

Trial Registration: PROSPERO CRD42022306992.

Keywords: Adult, reference values, hand strength, mass screening, population health.

1 INTRODUCTION

Physical fitness refers to the ability of the bodily systems to work well together to support physical activity and basic self-care. Several components of physical fitness are considered to be health-related because they are strongly and consistently associated with overall health.^{1,2} One such fitness component is muscular strength, which reflects the ability of a muscle or group of muscles to generate maximal force in a single contraction.³ Muscular strength is a powerful marker of current and future health. A recent overview of eight systematic reviews representing 34 studies and nearly 2-million adults revealed that low muscular strength was significantly linked with early death from all causes and cardiovascular disease, and a higher incidence of physical disability.⁴ Among adults, low muscular strength better predicts all-cause and cardiovascular mortality than do traditional risk factors like systolic blood pressure.⁵ Low muscular strength is also associated with considerable economic burden on government health care expenditure, with a 10% reduction in the prevalence of adults with low strength at the population level leading to considerable (~18%) healthcare cost savings.⁶ In their population-based public health guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour, the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommends muscle-strengthening activities (in addition to aerobic activities) using major muscle groups at a moderate or greater intensity on at least two (adults) or three (older adults) days a week.⁷ Collectively, this evidence highlights the importance of good muscular strength for mitigating health risks across the lifespan.

Although muscular strength cannot be defined by a single measure, it is widely assessed by handgrip strength (HGS) using handgrip dynamometry, which is easily applicable and recommended for use in clinical, research, and community settings.⁸⁻¹⁰ HGS is a convenient, safe, non-invasive, reliable, and feasible method of assessing muscular strength among people of all ages, which can be administered by staff with minimal experience and easily scored and interpreted.^{11,12} This strength capacity assessment has moderate-to-high construct validity and lower exclusion and dropout rates in epidemiological studies when compared to more complicated assessments of whole-body and major muscle group strength.¹³⁻¹⁵ Handgrip dynamometers are also becoming more affordable, with evidence indicating comparable HGS values between lower cost and standard dynamometers.¹⁶ Measures of HGS have excellent clinical utility,^{4,17,18} as low HGS is used in decision algorithms and assessment criteria for determining sarcopenia,¹⁹⁻²¹ dynapenia,²² and frailty.²³ HGS can also be used as a

surveillance tool to monitor temporal trends in population health and to evaluate the effectiveness and monitor the progress of healthy public policies.^{24,25}

A recognized approach to interpret HGS test results is with normative values (herein called *norms*). Norms allow for comparison to a reference population to determine how well one compares to their peers of the same sex and age. Norms can be used to identify individuals with low muscular strength who may be at risk of poor health and in need of intervention, or individuals with high muscular strength who are likely to perform in sports or occupational tasks well. They can also be used to monitor healthy ageing by examining changes in strength capacity over time. Adult HGS norms have been widely published for decades. Such norms have generally been developed using local city or district samples^{26–30} rather than national samples,^{31–35} and reported for a limited age range (often older adults)^{36–40} rather than across the adult lifespan (i.e., early, middle, and late adulthood).^{29–31,33,35} Several studies have alternatively pooled HGS data across surveys within^{41–43} or among^{44,45} countries to present norms at the national^{41–44} or regional⁴⁵ levels. Norms have almost exclusively been reported for absolute HGS, with few studies adjusting for the known influence of body size on strength capacity.^{39–41,44,46–49} To our knowledge, no study has systematically pooled published data and reported international norms for both absolute HGS and body size normalized HGS (herein called *normalised HGS*) across the adult lifespan.

The primary aim of this study was to develop international sex- and age-specific norms for absolute and normalised HGS across the adult lifespan. We expect these norms to help with the interpretation of HGS test results and to extend the utility of HGS for global peer-comparisons, health screening, and surveillance.

2 METHODS

2.1 Registration and protocol

This systematic review and meta-analysis protocol was prospectively registered with PROSPERO on the 18th of April 2022 (PROSPERO, ID: CRD42022306992). We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 statement (Supplementary Table 1).⁵⁰

2.2 Eligibility criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria:

- (1) *Population*: Adults aged ≥ 20 years at baseline following the WHO's definition of adult.⁵¹ We excluded studies on special interest groups (e.g., specific disease, illness, occupation, or athletic groups).
- (2) *Measure*: Objectively measured HGS in kilograms (kg) (or values from which kilograms could be calculated) using handgrip dynamometry and a published test protocol. Studies must have tabulated HGS norms as sample sizes, means, and standard deviations (SDs) (or values from which SDs could be calculated) stratified by sex, age, and country (for multi-country studies). We included studies that reported closed age groups to a maximum range of 10 years (e.g., 20–29 years). Studies with incomplete information on sampling, test, and normative data reporting protocols were excluded.
- (3) *Study design*: Unique observational (cross-sectional or cohort) studies reporting HGS data. For cohort studies, data from both baseline (initial) and refreshment (new) samples were included if available, but follow-up data were excluded. We excluded studies that reported duplicate or sub-group data from another included study, and data from small samples (mean sample size ≤ 20 across all sex and 5-year age group strata) because the means and SDs were less reliable than those from larger studies. Systematic reviews were also excluded.
- (4) *Publication status*: Full-text peer-reviewed published journal articles. Conference abstracts/papers, commentaries, editorials, and dissertations were excluded.
- (5) *Timeframe*: To minimise the potential bias of temporal trends and to maintain data recency, only studies reporting HGS data measured from the year 2000 onwards (i.e., the midpoint testing year was from the year 2000 onwards) were included.

2.3 Information sources

We identified studies by searching online databases and other sources including the reference lists of included studies and topical systematic reviews as recommended by the PRISMA statement.⁵⁰ We followed the recommendations of Bramer and colleagues⁵² regarding the optimal combination of online databases. Searches of databases and web search engines were performed in: MEDLINE (via OVID), SPORTDiscus (via EBSCOhost), Embase (via OVID), Web of Science (Core Collection), CINAHL (via EBSCOhost), and Google Scholar (first 200 results sorted by relevance). All searches were run from database inception to 1 December 2023.

2.4 Search strategy

We designed the online database search strategy in consultation with an academic librarian experienced in systematic reviews. No language restrictions were applied. The search strategy for databases is shown in Supplementary Tables 2a to 2f.

2.5 Selection process

Records were imported into EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA, USA) and de-duplicated, and then into Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, VIC, Australia) for further de-duplication and record screening. Titles and abstracts were independently screened against inclusion criteria by two authors well-experienced in conducting and publishing systematic reviews (GRT and LR). Full-text articles were then independently screened against inclusion criteria by the same authors. A third author (BG) resolved conflicts.

2.6 Data collection process and data items

Data were independently extracted by one of the following authors (GRT, BG, or HTB) using a pre-designed Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel, Redmond, WA), and were checked for accuracy by another author (LR). The following data were extracted from each study: name of lead author, country or dependent territory of participants' residence, study design (cross-sectional or cohort), sampling strategy (probability [i.e., random selection] or non-probability [i.e., non-random selection]), sample base (national sampling or non-national [i.e., state/provincial or city/district] sampling), cohort/survey name, additional sampling notes, testing year(s), sex/gender, age (range, mean, standard deviation [SD]), standing height (measurement units, sample size [n], mean, SD, and median), testing protocol, dynamometer (brand, model, type [electronic (i.e., used electronic load cell), hydraulic (i.e., used hydraulic fluid), or mechanical (i.e., used spring mechanism)]), body position (seated or standing), shoulder position (abducted or adducted), elbow position (extended or flexed), radioulnar position (neutral, pronated, or supinated), wrist position (neutral or other [extended or flexed]), handle position (adjusted to hand size or adjusted to a standard position), time (min) between reps on the same hand (<1 or ≥ 1), verbal support (yes or no), testing hand (left, right, non-dominant, dominant, or both), repetitions (reps) per hand (1, 2, or 3), summary statistic for normative data reporting (average, average of maxima, or maximum), HGS (measurement units, absolute HGS [n , mean, SD, and median for each sex and age stratum], body size-normalised HGS [n , mean, SD, and median for each sex and age stratum] if reported as

absolute HGS in kilograms divided by height (Ht) in metres [m] squared), additional study-specific notes, and the full citation.

2.7 Quality assessment

Study quality was assessed using the *standard quality assessment criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields* tool.⁵³ This tool includes a 14-item checklist for assessing quantitative studies by asking about study design, methods, sample size, analytical approach, confounding, study conclusions, etc. A score of “Yes” = 2, “Partial” = 1, or “No” = 0 was given to each item depending on the degree to which the criteria were met. Items considered not applicable were scored “NA” and excluded from the total score. The overall quality was calculated by summing the scores across relevant items and dividing by the total possible score (i.e., $28 - [\text{number of NA items} \times 2]$). The quality of all studies was assessed by a single author (BG), with 10% of randomly selected studies independently assessed by a second author (LR).

2.8 Synthesis methods and data analyses

We emailed the corresponding authors of each study to ask whether they could help develop international sex- and age-specific norms for adult HGS. To reduce data heterogeneity among studies, we asked study authors to clarify study details (e.g., sampling, test, and reporting protocol) and to either share deidentified raw data or to recalculate descriptive HGS data (weighted according to study-specific protocols) as per our ‘reference’ test and reporting protocol where possible. Public-use raw data were also sought. Ultimately, we had access to descriptive HGS data that were either extracted from published studies or were recalculated from raw data. We reported the descriptive characteristics of included studies as frequencies (percentage) for categorical variables and medians (interquartile [IQR]) for continuous variables.

To combine data across studies, we harmonised for methodological variation by adjusting HGS values to a common metric, test, and reporting protocol (see Supplementary Harmonisation Methods and Supplementary Tables 3a to 3e for a detailed description). First, we expressed age (in years at baseline) in closed 5-year age groups (e.g., 20–24 years, 25–29 years). Second, we expressed absolute HGS values in kilograms. According to published studies,^{46,54,55} we normalised HGS in kilograms by dividing by height in metres squared (i.e., HGS/Ht^2 in kg/m^2) because this is the most appropriate single body size dimension associated

with HGS identified by allometry. Third, we adjusted HGS values to a reference test protocol using Poisson regression models generated from available raw data ($n = 366,367$) to estimate the relative difference between the reference handgrip dynamometer and other dynamometer types, and between reference testing positions and other positions. Lastly, HGS values were adjusted to a reference reporting protocol using within-participant raw data ($n = 69,528$) to estimate the adjustment factors for testing hand, the number of reps per hand, and summary statistic.

We used Monte Carlo simulation to generate pseudo data to develop the international norms for adult HGS. Monte Carlo simulation uses a random number generator to produce approximate normal distributions based on reported means and SDs. Visual analysis of available raw data indicated that both absolute and normalised HGS were normally distributed (see Supplementary Figures 1a to 1d). We then cleaned the pseudo datasets with two approaches. First, we excluded improbable values based on available raw data (0–100 kg for absolute HGS and 0–35 kg/m² for normalised HGS). Second, we excluded outliers, which we identified as ± 3 SDs away from the sex- and age-specific mean values. This cleaning process resulted in the exclusion of $n = 10,368$ test results for absolute HGS and $n = 11,424$ test results for normalised HGS.

Norms were developed in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) using the Generalised Additive Model for Location, Scale and Shape (GAMLSS) package.^{56,57} We fitted 50 response distributions and three nonparametric smoothing functions (i.e., cubic splines, polynomial splines, and fractional polynomials). All models were stratified by sex. Each GAMLSS model was weighted using United Nations sex- and age-specific population estimates for 2021⁵⁸ to adjust for underlying country-sex-age demographics. Detrended Q-Q (worm) plots were used for visual analysis. We selected the model that provided the best balance between fit and model complexity (i.e., degree of smoothing) using the Akaike Information Criterion. The sinh-arcsinh SHASH (μ, σ, ν, τ) distribution with fractional polynomials produced the best balance between fit and smoothness for most models. This distribution is a four-parameter distribution that includes μ (approximately the median, which controls the location), σ (approximately the coefficient of variation, which controls the scale), ν (approximately the skewness, which controls the asymmetry), and τ (approximately the kurtosis). The 5th, 10th, 20th, 30th, 40th, 50th, 60th, 70th, 80th, 90th, and 95th percentiles were calculated, with mean percentile values used to summarise 16 closed age groups with a range

of 5 years between the ages of 20 and 99 years (20–24 years... 95–99 years) and one open-ended age group (100+ years). Norms were tabulated as percentile values and visualised as smoothed percentile curves.

2.9 Deviation from registered protocol

We planned to use an alternate quality assessment tool but found the *standard quality assessment criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields* tool⁵³ more suitable for use with both cross-sectional and cohort studies. While no date restriction was initially planned for our search, we included studies only reporting HGS data measured from the year 2000 onwards to minimise the potential bias of temporal trends and to maintain data recency.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Study selection

Figure 1 provides a detailed flow diagram of the literature search and screening process including reasons for full-text exclusion. A total of 15,732 records were identified from the online database search and 27 additional records were identified from other sources (e.g., reference lists of included studies and topical systematic reviews). After removing 3787 duplicates, 11,972 records were screened at the title/abstract level, which reduced to 313 papers screened in full-text. Of these, 213 papers were excluded for not meeting inclusion criteria, with 100 unique observational studies included in this review.

Insert Figure 1 about here

3.2 Study characteristics

A summary of the descriptive characteristics and HGS test protocols of the included studies is shown in Table 1, with the full list of included studies provided in Supplementary Tables 4a and 4b. Following data cleaning, absolute HGS ($n = 2,405,863$) and normalised HGS ($n = 2,328,890$) data were available for adults (51.9% female) aged 20 to 100+ years from 69 countries and territories tested since the year 2000. Because the normalised HGS dataset (generated from 89 studies and 4362 study-country-sex-age groups) was a large subset of the absolute HGS dataset (generated from 100 studies and 4621 study-country-sex-age groups), only the absolute HGS dataset was described herein.

Normative data were from 47 very high, 13 high, 7 medium, and 2 low human development index countries and territories,⁵⁹ which represented 6 of 7 continents, 17 of 22 United Nations' geographical subregions,⁶⁰ 71% of the world's population,⁵⁸ and 67% of the world's land area⁶¹. Studies presented data for a broad range of ages spanning a median of 34 years (IQR: 30, 55), including early (20–39 years), middle (40–64 years), and late adulthood (65+ years). Half of the studies represented all stages of the adult lifespan (47%) and nearly all studies represented late adulthood (92%). The median study-specific sample size was 1690 (IQR: 618, 8357) and participant age was 51 years (IQR: 37, 62). Most studies collected normative HGS data after the year 2010 (69%), using a cross-sectional study design (62%), probability sampling (61%), and a non-national sample (64%).

Insert Table 1 about here

In terms of the test protocol, most studies used a hand size adjusted (69%) hydraulic dynamometer (38%) and measured participants' HGS while seated (51%), their testing arm adducted (97%), elbow flexed (68%), and their forearm (98%) and wrist (100%) in neutral. Studies generally had participants maximally squeeze the dynamometer three times (52%) for each hand (73%), allowed less than 1-minute of rest between reps (38%), provided verbal support (67%), and statistically summarised HGS as the maximum value (90%).

3.3 Quality assessment

The quality assessments are summarised in Supplementary Table 5. The two reviewers agreed on 94% of item scores, demonstrating nearly perfect inter-rater agreement (κ [95% CI]: 0.93 [0.88, 0.98]). Four items (#5 [random allocation], #6 [interventional and investigator blinding], #7 [interventional and participant blinding], and #12 [controlled for confounding]) were considered not applicable and excluded from the total score. The median study score was 18 (IQR: 17, 19) out of a total possible score of 20, which indicated high quality overall. Common deficiencies related to partial description of subject selection (item #3) and an incomplete description of the HGS test protocol (item #8).

3.4 Synthesis of results

Tables 2 and 3 show the norms with adjustments for test and reporting protocols as tabulated percentiles (5th to 95th) for absolute and normalised HGS, respectively. Smoothed percentile curves are presented in Figure 2.

Insert Tables 2 and 3 and Figure 2 about here

On average, absolute and normalised HGS levels negligibly improved per decade throughout early adulthood (standardised [Cohen's] effect size [ES] < 0.20, equivalent to 1.0 kg [males] and 0.7 kg [females] for absolute HGS or 0.5 kg/m² [males] and 0.3 kg/m² [females] for HGS/Ht²), and peaked from age 30 to 39 years (at 47.8 kg [males] and 29.7 kg [females] or 16.3 kg/m² [males] and 11.3 kg/m² [females]) (Tables 2 and 3, and Figures 2 and 3). HGS levels declined every decade thereafter, with a negligible-to-small per decade decline in middle adulthood (ES < 0.49, equivalent to 2.8 kg [males] and 1.4 kg [females] or 0.7 kg/m² [males] and 0.4 kg/m² [females]) and a moderate per decade decline in late adulthood (ES = 0.50–0.79, equivalent to 5.6 kg [males] and 3.5 kg [females] or 1.7 kg/m² [males] and 1.3 kg/m² [females]). The age-related decline in HGS levels was slightly smaller for females than for males during middle adulthood, with age-related changes similar for males and females in early and late adulthood. The sex-related difference in HGS levels was large (ES ≥ 0.80), 0.77-fold smaller for normalised HGS than for absolute HGS, and reduced in magnitude with each decade of adult life.

Insert Figure 3 about here

The variability in HGS was greatest in later life, as evidenced by an age-related increase in relative distributional variability (i.e., the coefficient of variation) especially in late adulthood (data not shown). HGS levels also varied more for females than for males.

4 DISCUSSION

This study presents the most comprehensive international norms for HGS—an important marker of general strength and health—by sex and age across the adult lifespan. Using a systematic review strategy, we pooled HGS data from 100 unique observational studies representing 2.4 million adults aged 20 to 100+ years from 69 countries and territories to present norms for both absolute and normalised HGS. We anticipate that our findings will help support global peer-comparisons, health screening, and surveillance.

These international norms can assist future clinical, research, and surveillance efforts by providing a global benchmark to contextualise adults' HGS test results relative to their peers of the same sex and age. For instance, our norms can be used to identify individuals who may be at an increased health risk for conditions related to low muscular strength. Cut-points have been commonly used to identify individuals considered weak, as determined by low HGS. One approach is to establish criterion-referenced cut-points, where an individual's HGS level

is compared to an absolute (e.g., health- or performance-related) criterion. Criterion-referenced cut-points are often established using receiver-operating characteristic curve or classification regression tree analyses.^{19,62–67} Another approach is to establish norm-referenced cut-points. For example, sarcopenia cut-points for low HGS have been defined as 2.5 standard deviations below the mean sex-specific value for apparently healthy young adults,²⁰ or the lowest sex-specific quintile (i.e., the 20th percentile) value for older adults.²¹ While these cut-points are sex-specific and use younger or older adults as reference groups, they do not integrate age-specific norms into their definition. Alternatively, some authors have proposed a sex- and age-specific quintile framework for use with large datasets to interpret and analyse the distribution of data across the entire adult lifespan.^{46,68,69} Such an approach may improve the health- and performance-related predictive utility of HGS for young and middle-aged adults by better informing screening decisions.⁷⁰

Monitoring age-related changes in strength levels from repeated measurements over time, in addition to estimates of strength levels from a single measurement, may improve the prognostic utility of HGS. For example, several studies^{71,72} have reported a higher risk of early mortality among older adults who have experienced an accelerated loss of HGS in combination with a low level of HGS. Our norms may be useful for promoting and monitoring healthy ageing by allowing age-related changes in strength levels to be tracked against percentile (or quintile) bands to identify expected, better than expected, or worse than expected changes. Consistent with other studies that have examined HGS across the adult lifespan,^{29–31,33,35} we found that HGS levels negligibly improved throughout early adulthood, peaked from age 30 to 39 years, and declined thereafter at an increasing rate. However, caution must be taken when using our norms to estimate age-related changes in adult HGS levels because they may not reflect true within individual age-related changes.^{15,41,73–76} Furthermore, age-related changes estimated using our norms may be influenced by cohort effects (i.e., generational differences influencing HGS levels).⁴⁷ For example, if younger generations are healthier than older generations,⁷⁷ then the age-related decline in later life experienced by today's young adults may be less than that estimated by our norms. Alternatively, because our inclusion criteria resulted in samples that were likely healthier than the general population, the true age-related decline in later life may be larger than that estimated by our norms.

Our international norms can similarly be used to standardise HGS test results (i.e., to develop z-scores) for facilitating comparisons between countries or regions (i.e., comparisons of sex- and age-matched cohorts collected at a similar time), similar to approaches that have been performed elsewhere.⁷⁸ For comparisons within countries (e.g., to identify at-risk populations), scores standardized using our norms may be used as primary or complementary to scores standardized using national or regional norms, such as those presented by Leong and colleagues.⁴⁵ Scores standardised using norms can also be used to estimate temporal trends (i.e., comparisons of sex- and age-matched cohorts collected at different times). Trends in HGS at the population level may correspond to trends in general and functional health and can be used to monitor the progress and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented healthy public policies.^{24,79} Web-based monitoring and surveillance systems could likewise be used by investigators to share their data to help update these norms; to provide individuals, clinicians or sports medicine professionals with a tool to interpret test results and receive informative feedback; and to help public health policy makers with evaluation and decision making by identifying outlying subpopulations or tracking temporal trends. For example, the FitBack platform,⁸⁰ which is a web-based, open-access, multilanguage fitness platform that automatically and interactively interprets fitness test results based on sex- and age-specific norms of children and adolescents and provides advice for improvement, could potentially be expanded to include adults. Such web-based surveillance efforts could complement surveillance efforts that use objective measures. Having robust data infrastructures that enable long-term data pooling and sharing to facilitate regular and comprehensive studies are clearly needed.⁸¹ We recommend reporting standardized scores using our international norms to facilitate comparisons within and between countries and for monitoring temporal trends.

Different HGS test and reporting protocols have been used over time. We found considerable heterogeneity in the protocols of included studies, which differed by dynamometer type and handle positioning, participant positioning, testing hand(s), number of reps and rest, sensory stimuli (e.g., verbal support), and reporting method. Such differences have been previously highlighted^{8,78} and made data pooling across studies challenging. For example, our investigation attempted to account for the potential bias introduced by test and reporting differences across studies by calculating and applying adjustment factors (i.e., the risk relative to the reference protocol) that ranged from <1% to 10% for different dynamometer types and participant positions, and up to 17% for different reporting variants. Given the widespread use of HGS, there is an important need to raise awareness of the extant test and

reporting inconsistencies and to make recommendations to improve methodological consistency. Such methodological consistency will also have implications for HGS testing in clinical settings, for helping to reduce misclassification of weakness, specify risk for age-related disease and disability, and guide interventions seeking to improve muscular strength. In support of calls for standardisation,^{8,82} we recommend the following to facilitate future pooling and to improve the utility (and eventual update) of our norms:

- (1) Ideally, a single and established HGS test protocol should be used (e.g., the Southampton protocol⁸—the reference protocol used to adjust test results in the present study), with an online multilingual operations and procedures manual, including instructional videos, made available. At the very least, the test protocol should be accurately described in the main text (or in an online supplement if space is limited due to journal word counts) using the minimum protocol reporting framework provided by McGrath and colleagues;⁸²
- (2) Where possible, three reps on each hand should be performed,⁸³ with absolute HGS calculated as the maximum value irrespective of hand because it better aligns with overall strength capacity;⁸
- (3) While it might be challenging to adopt a standardised test and reporting protocol, our adjustment factors should be applied in lieu to correct HGS test results to minimise biases when comparing to our norms;
- (4) Sex- and age-specific descriptive statistics (sample sizes, means, SDs, and medians) for HGS should be reported in the main text or as supplementary. Where possible, closed age groups should be presented to a range of 5 years. The year(s) of testing should also be reported; and
- (5) To best remove the influence of body size and for comparison with our norms, HGS should be normalised to a cross-sectional or surface area measure of body size such as height-squared when relevant.^{46,54,55}

4.1 Strengths and limitations

The study pooled data from 100 unique observational studies, graded as high quality, to present international norms for HGS based on data from 2.4 million adults aged 20 to 100+ years from 69 countries and territories. We applied rigorous data treatment procedures to combine datasets and to harmonise for methodological variation, and recreated unavailable raw data to generate absolute and normalised HGS norms using population-weighted GAMLSS that provided the best balance between fit and model complexity.

Despite these strengths, this study is not without limitations. First, included studies used different sampling methods (both probability and non-probability selection) and bases (across national, state/provincial, and city/district levels), and were mostly on adults from countries with high to very high human development, who are known to exhibit higher levels of HGS than their peers from countries with low to medium human development.⁷⁸ This obviously raises the issue of representativeness. However, while more adult HGS data are needed from regions where data are few (e.g., Africa [Northern, Eastern, Southern, Western, and Middle Africa], the Caribbean, Central America, and Oceania [Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia]) to improve global representativeness, we included the best available data and applied a poststratification population weighting procedure to adjust for underlying country-sex-age demographics and to better estimate internationally representative population parameters. Second, differences in test and reporting protocols among studies, which are inherent to any large data synthesis, may have biased our results. While our norms were adjusted for test and reporting differences, it is acknowledged that we could not adjust for all test variants. Third, we examined sex as a biological variable by sex-stratifying our analyses, which is consistent with certain scientific guidelines⁸⁴ and most included studies, although some studies reported gender instead of sex. Fourth, HGS testing may have been contraindicated for adults with chronic conditions (disease, injury, or illness) or those presenting with pain, resulting in them being excluded or opting out. While such exclusions differed among studies and were not always reported, it is likely that the included samples were healthier than the general population. The absence of data from these individuals may have meant that our lower percentiles overestimated true general population values. In lieu of a global study examining adult HGS levels across a representative sample of countries using a standardised sampling, test, and reporting protocol, our international norms represent the best estimate of current global adult HGS levels.

4.2 Practical applications

Our norms provide a valuable international benchmark with which to compare and track individual HGS test results. We propose a quintile framework to interpret our international sex- and age-specific norms in clinical settings. For example, adults below the 20th percentile can be considered as having “low” strength; between the 20th and 39th percentiles as having “somewhat low” strength; between the 40th and 59th percentiles as having “moderate” strength; between the 60th and 79th percentiles as having “somewhat high” strength; and at or

above the 80th percentile as having “high” strength. Comparison to our norms may help clinicians or sports medicine professionals identify adults who may need to improve their strength capacity or may benefit from further assessment. In prospective cohort studies^{e.g., 23,85–89} the lowest quintile has been used as a threshold for defining low fitness and has been significantly linked with increased risk of poor health or early death in later life.

While there is heterogeneity in the definition of low HGS,⁹⁰ in the absence of universal sex- and age-specific criterion-referenced cut-points for low HGS, interim cut-points corresponding to our lowest quintile could be used to identify at-risk adults until better evidence for criterion-referenced health-related cut-points is established by future research.⁹¹ Adults classified as having low HGS may ‘need improvement’ and potentially be at increased future health risk if they continue to track at this level. Clinicians or sports medicine professionals can then provide feedback, advice, and intervention referral for improving overall strength capacity. For example, advice may include strategies for helping persons classified as needing improvement in their strength meet the minimum weekly threshold for muscle-strengthening activities as recommended in the WHO’s global physical activity guidelines.⁷ Provided that the prescribed muscle-strengthening activities are multimodal,⁹² value-added follow-up HGS assessments could be informative by evaluating the effectiveness of physical activity programming through monitoring progress against our percentile bands. Future research is needed to empirically validate the health-related predictive utility of our interim cut-points or to provide evidence for universal criterion-referenced health-related cut-points.

We provided sex- and age-specific norms for both absolute and normalised HGS across the adult lifespan. Because absolute HGS is significantly associated with future health outcomes^{4,5} and can be easily measured and interpreted with minimal data post-processing, clinicians and sports medicine professionals may prefer to simply compare or track individual HGS test results against our absolute HGS norms for providing more timely feedback to individuals. However, in addition to sex and age, body size is known to influence HGS, with body size strongly and positively associated with HGS.^{46,54} Therefore, when comparing or tracking test results against our absolute HGS norms, larger individuals may be unfairly advantaged (i.e., appear better than they are) and smaller individuals unfairly disadvantaged (i.e., appear worse than they are). To overcome this limitation, by removing the confounding influence of body size, HGS should be normalised to a cross-sectional or surface area

measure of body size such as height-squared.⁴⁶ Normalizing HGS to height-squared creates a ‘level playing field’ (i.e., no systematic advantage or disadvantage), providing a fairer way of comparing the HGS of adults who differ in body size. While normalized HGS test results require additional data post-processing and may be more challenging to interpret than absolute HGS test results, we recommend that both absolute and normalised HGS be assessed and compared against our norms for extra insight into how body size influences strength capacity.

Conclusion

HGS is an excellent marker of general strength and health that is widely used in clinical, research, and community settings. This study pooled, harmonised, and analysed the best available data to present the world’s largest and most geographically comprehensive international norms for HGS by sex and age across the adult lifespan. Our international norms can be used to identify adults with low or high strength relative to their peers of the same sex and age, and to monitor healthy ageing. These norms should be updated in the future to better reflect the HGS levels of future generations of adults.

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authors’ contributions

GRT conceptualized and designed the study, conducted record screening, extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, had full access to the data, led the statistical analysis, and wrote the original draft; JJL conceptualized and designed the study, led the statistical analysis, and edited the manuscript; LR conceptualized and designed the study, conducted record screening, assessed study quality, and edited the manuscript; RM conceptualized and designed the study, and edited the manuscript; BG conducted record screening, extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, assessed study quality, and edited the manuscript; TB interpreted the data, supported the statistical analysis, and edited the manuscript; MGK interpreted the data, supported the statistical analysis, and edited the manuscript; AJM extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, supported the statistical analysis, and edited the manuscript; HTB extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, and edited the manuscript; FBO interpreted the data and edited the manuscript; CC-S interpreted the data and edited the

manuscript; CGM interpreted the data and edited the manuscript; BJF interpreted the data and edited the manuscript; TK extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, and edited the manuscript; YL extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, and edited the manuscript; KC extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, and edited the manuscript; DPL extracted/acquired and interpreted the data, and edited the manuscript; and iGRIPS group authors extracted/acquired and interpreted the data.

All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agree with the order of presentation of the authors.

Ethical approval information

The University of South Australia's Human Research Ethics Committee approved this study (ID: 205086).

Disclaimer

The content and views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Government of Canada.

Data availability statement

The descriptive aggregate data used in this study are available upon reasonable request and agreement from the first author and relevant data custodians. Although we had access to some de-identified raw data, we are unable to share these datasets without permission from their data custodians.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Danielle Masursky for helping design the online database search strategy.

Funding

We would like to acknowledge the funding received by the following authors:

KB: AW: Institute for Sport & Sport Science, Karlsruhe, Germany.

CC-S: European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska Curie grant agreement No 101028929.

CC: UK Medical Research Council (MC_PC_21003; MC_PC_21001).

MCER: Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología.

BJF: National Heart Foundation of Australia Postdoctoral Fellowship (106588).

BG: Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

NCH: UK Medical Research Council (MC_PC_21003; MC_PC_21001) and NIHR Southampton Biomedical Research Centre, UK.

DPL: Clive Kearon Award, McMaster University.

MS: Royal Perth Hospital Career Advancement Fellowship and an Emerging Leader Fellowship from the Western Australian Future Health Research and Innovation Fund.

SJW: National Institutes of Health (NIH/NIAMS P30 AR072581) and the Indiana Clinical Translational Science Award/Institute (NCATS UL1TR002529-01).

LDW: UK Medical Research Council (MC_PC_21003; MC_PC_21001).

AW: Institute for Sport & Sport Science, Karlsruhe, Germany.

We would like to acknowledge the funding received by the following included studies (see online Supplementary Table 4a for study details and Supplementary References for full citations):

1000 Norms Project: Funded by National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia Centre for Research Excellence in Neuromuscular Disorders (NHMRC 1031893) and the Australian Podiatry Education and Research Foundation.

Alqahtani et al. (2019): Funded by the Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University (PSAU/2023/R/1444).

ASPREE (ASpirin in Reducing Events in the Elderly study): ASPREE was supported by a grant (U01AG029824) from the National Institute on Aging and the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health, by grants (334047 and 1127060) from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia, and by Monash University and the Victorian Cancer Agency.

CHARLS (China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study): Supported by the Behavioral and Social Research division of the National Institute on Aging of the National Institute of Health (Grants: 1-R21-AG031372-01, 1-R01-AG037031-01, and 3-R01AG037031-03S1), the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants: 70773002, 70910107022, and 71130002), the World Bank (Contracts: 7145915 and 7159234), and Peking University.

CLSA (Canadian Longitudinal Study on Ageing): Funding for the CLSA is provided by the Government of Canada through the Canadian Institutes of Health Research under grant reference: LSA 9447 and the Canada Foundation for Innovation, as well as the following

provinces, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. The CLSA is led by Drs Parminder Raina, Christina Wolfson and Susan Kirkland. **COMplete (Cardio-PuLmonary Exercise Testing health study):** Funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (182815).

EDOC (Estudo das Doenças Crônicas [English translation: Study of Chronic Diseases]): Funded by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development—CNPq [Call MCTI/CNPQ/MS-SCTIE-DECIT n. 06/2013, for Health System by the Brazilian Network for Health Technology Assessment (REBRATS)]. Acre Research Foundation—FAPAC [Calls PPSUS n. 001/2013 and n. 001/2015 of the Research Program for SUS: shared health management (MS/CNPq/ FAPAC/SESACRE).

ELSA (English Longitudinal Study of Ageing): Funded by the National Institute on Aging (Ref: R01AG017644) and by a consortium of UK government departments: Department for Health and Social Care; Department for Transport; Department for Work and Pensions, which is coordinated by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR, Ref: 198-1074). Funding has also been provided by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

ELSI-Brazil (Brazilian Longitudinal Study of Aging): Supported by the Brazilian Ministry of Health: DECIT/SCTIE (Grants: 404965/2012-1 and TED 28/2017); COPID/DECIV/SAPS (Grants: 20836, 22566, 23700, 25560, 25552, and 27510).

EPIC-Norfolk (European Prospective Investigation into Cancer-Norfolk study): The EPIC-Norfolk study (DOI 10.22025/2019.10.105.00004) was funded by the Medical Research Council (MR/N003284/1 MC-UU_12015/1 and MC_UU_00006/1) and Cancer Research UK (C864/A14136). The genetics work was funded by the Medical Research Council (MC_PC_13048). We are grateful to all the participants who have been part of the project and to the many members of the study teams at the University of Cambridge who have enabled this research.

GOS (Geelong Osteoporosis Study): Funded by The Victorian Health Promotion Foundation (ID 91-0095) and the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (ID 251638, 299831, 628582).

GenoFit: Supported by Genuity Science, University College Dublin and the Irish Research Council.

HAPIEE (Health, Alcohol and Psychosocial factors In Eastern Europe study): Funded by Wellcome Trust “Determinants of Cardiovascular Diseases in Eastern Europe: Longitudinal follow-up of a multi-centre cohort study” (The HAPIEE Project) (081081/Z/06/Z).

HCS (Hertfordshire Cohort Study): Funded by the Medical Research Council University Unit Partnership (MRC_MC_UP_A620_1014).

Hogrel (2015): Supported in part by the Association Française contre les Myopathies (AFM).

HRS (Health and Retirement Study): Sponsored by the National Institute on Aging (grant number NIA U01AG009740) and conducted by the University of Michigan.

Kjær et al. (2016): Funded and initiated by the Norwegian Directorate of Health, with the Norwegian School of Sport Sciences leading the study and contributing funding. We are grateful toward the cooperative test centers involved in this larger study: Finnmark University College, Hedmark University College, Norwegian University of Science and Technology Social research, Sogn og Fjordane University College, University of Agder, University of Nordland, University of Stavanger, Telemark University College and the Norwegian School of Sport Sciences.

KORA-Age (Kooperative Gesundheitsforschung in der Region Augsburg [English translation: Cooperative Health Research in the Region of Augsburg study]): Initiated and funded by the Helmholtz Zentrum München—German Research Center for Environmental Health, which is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and by the State of Bavaria. Data collection in the KORA study was done in cooperation with the University Hospital of Augsburg. The KORA-Age project was financed by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF FKZ 01ET0713 and 01ET1003A) as part of the ‘Health in old age’ program. We thank all participants for their long-term commitment to the KORA study, the staff for data collection and research data management and the members of the KORA Study Group (<https://www.helmholtz-munich.de/en/epi/cohort/kora>) who are responsible for the design and conduct of the study.

LASI (Longitudinal Ageing Study in India): Funded by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, the National Institute on Aging (R01 AG042778), and United Nations Population Fund, India.

MELoR (Malaysian Elders Longitudinal Research): This is now part of the Transforming Cognitive Frailty into Later-Life Self-Sufficiency (AGELESS) study which is funded by the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) Long Term Research Grant Scheme (LRGS/1/2019/UM//1/1) and was also funded by a MOHE High Impact Research fund (UM.C/625/1/HIR/MOHE/ASH/02).

MSK-FIT (Musculoskeletal, Function, Imaging, and Tissue Resource Core): National Institutes of Health (NIH/NIAMS P30 AR072581) and the Indiana Clinical Translational Science Award/Institute (NCATS UL1TR002529-01).

NAKO (NAKO Gesundheitsstudie [English translation: German National Cohort]):

Conducted with data from the German National Cohort (NAKO) (www.nako.de). Funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) (01ER1301A/B/C, 01ER1511D and 01ER1801A/B/C/D), federal states of Germany and the Helmholtz Association, the participating universities and the institutes of the Leibniz Association. We thank all participants who took part in the NAKO study and the staff of this research initiative.

PLSAW (Perth Longitudinal Study of Ageing Women): Funded by Healthway, the Western Australian Health Promotion Foundation, and by project grants 254627, 303169 and 572604 from the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia.

PNAFS (Nutrition, Physical Activity and Health Survey): Funded by the Brazilian National Research Council (CNPq; grants 471172/2001-4 and 475122/2003-8) and the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (PAPES III e Program to Support Strategic Projects in Health, no. 250.139). The authors received research productivity grants from CNPq (301076/89-8, 302992/2003-0, and 306523/2006-0).

SANSCOG (Srinivaspura NeuroSenescence, and COGnition study): Funded by the Centre for Brain Research, Indian Institute of Science, India. The funding source did not have any role in the study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the article for publication.

Shah et al. (2022): Funded by the World Health Organization Centre for Health Development (WHO Kobe Centre, WKC: K18015).

SHARE (Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe): This paper uses data from SHARE Waves 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 (DOIs: [10.6103/SHARE.w1.900](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w1.900), [10.6103/SHARE.w2.900](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w2.900), [10.6103/SHARE.w4.900](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w4.900), [10.6103/SHARE.w5.900](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w5.900), [10.6103/SHARE.w6.900](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w6.900), and [10.6103/SHARE.w7.900](https://doi.org/10.6103/SHARE.w7.900)) see Börsch-Supan et al. (2013) for methodological details. The SHARE data collection has been funded by the European Commission, DG RTD through FP5 (QLK6-CT-2001-00360), FP6 (SHARE-I3: RII-CT-2006-062193, COMPARE: CIT5-CT-2005-028857, SHARELIFE: CIT4-CT-2006-028812), FP7 (SHARE-PREP: GA N°211909, SHARE-LEAP: GA N°227822, SHARE M4: GA N°261982, DASISH: GA N°283646) and Horizon 2020 (SHARE-DEV3: GA N°676536, SHARE-COHESION: GA N°870628, SERISS: GA N°654221, SSHOC: GA N°823782, SHARE-COVID19: GA N°101015924) and by DG Employment, Social Affairs & Inclusion through VS 2015/0195, VS 2016/0135, VS 2018/0285, VS 2019/0332, VS 2020/0313 and SHARE-EUCOV: GA N°101052589 and EUCOVII: GA N°101102412. Additional funding from the German Ministry of Education and Research, the Max Planck Society for the

Advancement of Science, the U.S. National Institute on Aging (U01_AG09740-13S2, P01_AG005842, P01_AG08291, P30_AG12815, R21_AG025169, Y1-AG-4553-01, IAG_BSR06-11, OGHA_04-064, BSR12-04, R01_AG052527-02, HHSN271201300071C, RAG052527A) and from various national funding sources is gratefully acknowledged (see www.share-eric.eu).

SIHLS (Social Isolation, Health, and Lifestyles Survey): Funded by the Ministry of Social and Family Development. Development of handgrip strength normative values based on data from the survey was supported by the “Estate of Tan Sri Khoo Teck Puat” and the National University of Singapore (Khoo Student Research Award). It was also supported by a grant obtained by the Nihon University Population Research Institute from the “Academic Frontier” Project for Private Universities: matching fund subsidy from MEXT (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology), 2006–2010.

TILDA (The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing): Funded by the Irish Government, the Health Research Board (HRB) and the Atlantic Philanthropies. We would like to thank the TILDA participants without whom this research would not be possible.

Twenty-07 (West of Scotland Twenty-07 study): Funded by the UK Medical Research Council. Data originally collected by the MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit (MC_A540_53462). Supported by the MRC funded Inequalities in Health (MC_UU_00022/2) Programmes and the Chief Scientist Office (CSO) (SPHSU17). We are grateful to all of the participants in the study, and to the survey staff and research nurses who carried it out.

UKHLS (Understanding Society: The UK Household Longitudinal Study): Funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

REFERENCES

- 1 Lang JJ, Prince SA, Merucci K, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Chaput J-P, Fraser BJ, Manyanga T, McGrath R, Ortega FB, Singh B, Tomkinson GR. Cardiorespiratory fitness is a strong and consistent predictor of morbidity and mortality among adults: an overview of meta-analyses representing over 20.9 million observations from 199 unique cohort studies. *Br J Sports Med* 2024;58(10):556–566. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2023-107849.
- 2 García-Hermoso A, Cavero-Redondo I, Ramírez-Vélez R, Ruiz JR, Ortega FB, Lee D-C, Martínez-Vizcaíno V. Muscular strength as a predictor of all-cause mortality in an apparently healthy population: A systematic review and meta-analysis of data from approximately 2 million men and women. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2018;99(10):2100–2113.e5. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2018.01.008.
- 3 American College of Sports Medicine. *ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription* (11th edition). Philadelphia, PA: Wolters Kluwer; 2022.
- 4 Soysal P, Hurst C, Demurtas J, Firth J, Howden R, Yang L, Tully MA, Koyanagi A, Ilie PC, López-Sánchez GF, Schwingshackl L, Veronese N, Smith L. Handgrip strength and health outcomes: Umbrella review of systematic reviews with meta-analyses of observational studies. *J Sport Health Sci* 2021;10(3):290–295. doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2020.06.009.
- 5 Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Avezum A, Orlandini A, Seron P, Ahmed SH, Rosengren A, Kelishadi R, Rahman O, Swaminathan S, Iqbal R, Gupta R, Lear SA, Oguz A, Yusuf K, Zatonska K, Chifamba J, Igumbor E, Mohan V, Anjana RM, Gu H, Li W, Yusuf S; Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) Study investigators. Prognostic value of grip strength: findings from the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) study. *Lancet* 2015;386(9990):266–273. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62000-6.
- 6 Chaput J-P, Janssen I, Sampasa-Kanyinga H, Tomkinson GR, Lang JJ. Economic burden of low muscle strength in Canadian adults. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2023;48(8):634–638. doi: 10.1139/apnm-2022-0371.
- 7 Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, Carty C, Chaput J-P, Chastin S, Chou R, Dempsey PC, DiPietro L, Ekelund U, Firth J, Friedenreich CM, Garcia L, Gichu M, Jago R, Katzmarzyk PT, Lambert E, Leitzmann M, Milton K, Ortega FB, Ranasinghe C, Stamatakis E, Tiedemann A, Troiano RP, van der Ploeg HP, Wari V, Willumsen JF. World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity

- and sedentary behaviour. *Br J Sports Med* 2020;54(24):1451–1462. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-102955.
- 8 Roberts HC, Denison HJ, Martin HJ, Patel HP, Syddall H, Cooper C, Sayer AA. A review of the measurement of grip strength in clinical and epidemiological studies: towards a standardised approach. *Age Ageing* 2011;40(4):423–429. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afr051.
 - 9 Beudart C, Rolland Y, Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bauer JM, Sieber C, Cooper C, Al-Daghri N, Araujo de Carvalho I, Bautmans I, Bernabei R, Bruyère O, Cesari M, Cherubini A, Dawson-Hughes B, Kanis JA, Kaufman J-M, Landi F, Maggi S, McCloskey E, Petermans J, Rodriguez Mañas L, Reginster J-Y, Roller-Wirnsberger R, Schaap LA, Uebelhart D, Rizzoli R, Fielding RA. Assessment of muscle function and physical performance in daily clinical practice: A position paper endorsed by the European Society for Clinical and Economic Aspects of Osteoporosis, Osteoarthritis and Musculoskeletal Diseases (ESCEO). *Calcif Tissue Int* 2019;105(1):1–14. doi: 10.1007/s00223-019-00545-w.
 - 10 Bruyère O, Beudart C, Reginster J-Y, Buckinx F, Schoene D, Hirani V, Cooper C, Kanis JA, Rizzoli R, McCloskey E, Cederholm T, Cruz-Jentoft A, Freiburger E. Assessment of muscle mass, muscle strength and physical performance in clinical practice: An international survey. *Eur Geriatr Med* 2016;7(3):243–246. doi: 10.1016/j.eurger.2015.12.009.
 - 11 Cuenca-Garcia M, Marin-Jimenez N, Perez-Bey A, Sánchez-Oliva D, Camiletti-Moiron D, Alvarez-Gallardo IC, Ortega FB, Castro-Piñero J. Reliability of field-based fitness tests in adults: A systematic review. *Sports Med* 2022;52(8):1961–1979. doi: 10.1007/s40279-021-01635-2.
 - 12 Suni JH, Miilunpalo SI, Asikainen TM, Laukkanen RT, Oja P, Pasanen ME, Bös K, Vuori IM. Safety and feasibility of a health-related fitness test battery for adults. *Phys Ther* 1998;78(2):134–148. doi: 10.1093/ptj/78.2.134.
 - 13 Castro-Piñero J, Marin-Jimenez N, Fernandez-Santos JR, Martin-Acosta F, Segura-Jimenez V, Izquierdo-Gomez R, Ruiz JR, Cuenca-Garcia M. Criterion-related validity of field-based fitness tests in adults: A systematic review. *J Clin Med* 2021;10(16):3743. doi: 10.3390/jcm10163743.
 - 14 Bohannon RW, Magasi SR, Bubela DJ, Wang Y-C, Gershon RC. Grip and knee extension muscle strength reflect a common construct among adults. *Muscle Nerve* 2012;46(4):555–558. doi: 10.1002/mus.23350.

- 15 Kozakai R, Nishita Y, Otsuka R, Ando F, Shimokata H. Age-related changes in physical fitness among community-living middle-aged and older Japanese: A 12-year longitudinal study. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 2020;91(4):662–675. doi: 10.1080/02701367.2019.1697418.
- 16 Sánchez-Aranda L, Fernández-Ortega J, Martín-Fuentes I, Toval A, Jurak G, Ruiz JR, Csányi T, Ortega FB. Reliability and criterion validity of a low-cost handgrip dynamometer: The Camry; 2024. Preprint at <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.25.24309304>.
- 17 McGrath RP, Kraemer WJ, Al Snih S, Peterson MD. Handgrip strength and health in aging adults. *Sports Med* 2018;48(9):1993–2000. doi: 10.1007/s40279-018-0952-y.
- 18 Rijk JM, Roos PR, Deckx L, van den Akker M, Buntinx F. Prognostic value of handgrip strength in people aged 60 years and older: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2016;16(1):5–20. doi: 10.1111/ggi.12508.
- 19 Cawthon PM, Manini T, Patel SM, Newman A, Trivison T, Kiel DP, Santanasto AJ, Ensrud KE, Xue Q-L, Shardell M, Duchowny K, Erlandson KM, Pencina KM, Fielding RA, Magaziner J, Kwok T, Karlsson M, Ohlsson C, Mellström D, Hirani V, Ribom E, Correa-de-Araujo R, Bhasin S. Putative cut-points in sarcopenia components and incident adverse health outcomes: An SDOC analysis. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2020;68(7):1429–1437. doi: 10.1111/jgs.16517.
- 20 Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyère O, Cederholm T, Cooper C, Landi F, Rolland Y, Sayer AA, Schneider SM, Sieber CC, Topinkova E, Vandewoude M, Visser M, Zamboni M; Writing Group for the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People 2 (EWGSOP2), and the Extended Group for EWGSOP2. Sarcopenia: Revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age Ageing* 2019;48(1):16–31. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afy169.
- 21 Chen L-K, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung T-W, Chou M-Y, Iijima K, Jang HC, Kang L, Kim M, Kim S, Kojima T, Kuzuya M, Lee JSW, Lee SY, Lee W-J, Lee Y, Liang C-K, Lim J-Y, Lim WS, Peng L-N, Sugimoto K, Tanaka T, Won CW, Yamada M, Zhang T, Akishita M, Arai H. Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia: 2019 consensus update on sarcopenia diagnosis and treatment. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2020;21(3):300–07.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2019.12.012.
- 22 Manini TM, Clark BC. Dynapenia and ageing: An update. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2012;67(1):28–40. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glr010.

- 23 Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J, Seeman T, Tracy R, Kop WJ, Burke G, McBurnie MA; Cardiovascular Health Study Collaborative Research Group. Frailty in older adults: evidence for a phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2001;56(3):M146–156. doi: 10.1093/gerona/56.3.m146.
- 24 Dufner TJ, Fitzgerald JS, Lang JJ, Tomkinson GR. Temporal trends in the handgrip strength of 2,592,714 adults from 14 countries between 1960 and 2017: A systematic analysis. *Sports Med* 2020;50(12):2175–2191. doi: 10.1007/s40279-020-01339-z.
- 25 Lang JJ, Smith JJ, Tomkinson GR. Global surveillance of cardiorespiratory and musculoskeletal fitness. In: Brusseau TA, Fairclough SJ, Lubans DR, eds. *The Routledge handbook of youth physical activity*. London: Routledge; 2020:47–68.
- 26 Alrashdan A, Ghaleb AM, Almobarek M. Normative static grip strength of Saudi Arabia's population and influences of numerous factors on grip strength. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2021;9(12):1647. doi: 10.3390/healthcare9121647.
- 27 Amaral CA, Amaral TLM, Monteiro GTR, Vasconcellos MTL, Portela MC. Hand grip strength: Reference values for adults and elderly people of Rio Branco, Acre, Brazil. *PLoS One* 2019;14(1):e0211452. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0211452.
- 28 Ingram LA, Butler AA, Walsh LD, Brodie MA, Lord SR, Gandevia SC. The upper limb Physiological Profile Assessment: Description, reliability, normative values and criterion validity. *PLoS One* 2019;14(6):e0218553. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0218553.
- 29 Lee SY, Choo PL, Pang BWJ, Lau LK, Jabbar KA, Seah WT, Chen KK, Ng TP, Wee S-L. SPPB reference values and performance in assessing sarcopenia in community-dwelling Singaporeans—Yishun study. *BMC Geriatr* 2021;21(1):213. doi: 10.1186/s12877-021-02147-4.
- 30 Massy-Westropp NM, Gill TK, Taylor, AW, Bohannon RW, Hill CL Hand grip strength: Age and gender stratified normative data in a population-based study. *BMC Res Notes* 2011;4:127. doi: 10.1186/1756-0500-4-127.
- 31 Hoffmann MD, Colley RC, Doyon CY, Wong SL, Tomkinson GR, Lang JJ. Normative-referenced percentile values for physical fitness among Canadians. *Health Rep* 2019;30(10):14–22. doi: 10.25318/82-003-x201901000002-eng.
- 32 Kenny RA, Coen RF, Frewen J, Donoghue OA, Cronin H, Savva GM. Normative values of cognitive and physical function in older adults: Findings from The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2013;61(S2):s279–290. doi: 10.1111/jgs.12195.

- 33 Kim M, Won CW, Kim M. Muscular grip strength normative values for a Korean population from the Korea National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2014–2015. *PLoS One* 2018;13(8):e0201275. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0201275.
- 34 Ramírez-Vélez R, Rincón-Pabón D, Correa-Bautista JE, García-Hermoso A, Izquierdo M. Handgrip strength: Normative reference values in males and females aged 6–64 years old in a Colombian population. *Clin Nutr ESPEN* 2021;44:379–386. doi: 10.1016/j.clnesp.2021.05.009.
- 35 Wang Y-C, Bohannon RW, Li X, Yen S-C, Sindhu B, Kapellusch J. Summary of grip strength measurements obtained in the 2011–2012 and 2013–2014 National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys. *J Hand Ther* 2019;32(4):489–496. doi: 10.1016/j.jht.2018.03.002.
- 36 Alqahtani B, Alenazi A, Alshehri M, Alqahtani M, Elnaggar R. Reference values and associated factors of hand grip strength in elderly Saudi population: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Geriatr* 2019;19(1):271. doi: 10.1186/s12877-019-1288-7.
- 37 Albrecht BM, Stalling I, Bammann K. Sex- and age-specific normative values for handgrip strength and components of the Senior Fitness Test in community-dwelling older adults aged 65–75 years in Germany: Results from the OUTDOOR ACTIVE study. *BMC Geriatr* 2021;21(1):273. doi: 10.1186/s12877-021-02188-9.
- 38 Kemmler W, Teschler M, Goisser S, Bebenek M, von Stengel S, Bollheimer LC, Sieber CC, Freiberger E. Prevalence of sarcopenia in Germany and the corresponding effect of osteoarthritis in females 70 years and older living in the community: Results of the FORMoSA study. *Clin Interv Aging* 2015;10:1565–1573. doi: 10.2147/CIA.S89585.
- 39 Mendes J, Amaral TF, Borges N, Santos A, Padrão P, Moreira P, Afonso C, Negrão R. Handgrip strength values of Portuguese older adults: A population based study. *BMC Geriatr* 2017;17(1):191. doi: 10.1186/s12877-017-0590-5.
- 40 Reichenheim ME, Lourenço RA, Nascimento JS, Moreira VG, Neri AL, Ribeiro RM, Lustosa LP, Ferriolli E. Normative reference values of handgrip strength for Brazilian older people aged 65 to 90 years: Evidence from the multicenter Fibra-BR study. *PLoS One* 2021;16(5):e0250925. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0250925.
- 41 Frederiksen H, Hjelmberg J, Mortensen J, McGue M, Vaupel JW, Christensen K. Age trajectories of grip strength: Cross-sectional and longitudinal data among 8,342 Danes aged 46 to 102. *Ann Epidemiol* 2006;16(7):554–562. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2005.10.006.

- 42 Seino S, Shinkai S, Fujiwara Y, Obuchi S, Yoshida H, Hirano H, Kim HK, Ishizaki T, Takahashi R, TMIG-LISA Research Group. Reference values and age and sex differences in physical performance measures for community-dwelling older Japanese: A pooled analysis of six cohort studies. *PLoS One* 2014;9(6):e99487. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0099487.
- 43 Dodds RM, Syddall HE, Cooper R, Benzeval M, Deary IJ, Dennison EM, Der G, Gale CR, Inskip HM, Jagger C, Kirkwood TB, Lawlor DA, Robinson SM, Starr JM, Steptoe A, Tilling K, Kuh D, Cooper C, Sayer AA. Grip strength across the life course: Normative data from twelve British studies. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(12):e113637. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0113637.
- 44 Abdalla PP, Bohn L, Dos Santos AP, Tasinafo Junior MF, da Silva LSL, Marini JAG, Venturini ACR, Carvalho ADS, Borges GA, Ramos NC, Mota J, Machado DRL. Adjusting grip strength to body size: Analyses from 6 countries. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2022;23(5):903.e13–903.e21. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2022.01.079.
- 45 Leong DP, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Kuttly R, Lanas F, Hui C, Quanyong X, Zhenzhen Q, Jinhua T, Noorhassim I, AlHabib KF, Moss SJ, Rosengren A, Akalin AA, Rahman O, Chifamba J, Orlandini A, Kumar R, Yeates K, Gupta R, Yusufali A, Dans A, Avezum A, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Poirier P, Heidari H, Zatonska K, Iqbal R, Khatib R, Yusuf S. Reference ranges of handgrip strength from 125,462 healthy adults in 21 countries: A prospective urban rural epidemiologic (PURE) study. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2016;7(5):535–546. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12112.
- 46 Nevill AM, Tomkinson GR, Lang JJ, Wutz W, Myers TD. How should adult handgrip strength be normalized? Allometry reveals new insights and associated reference curves. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2022;54(1):162–168. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002771.
- 47 Steiber N. Strong or weak handgrip? Normative reference values for the German population across the life course stratified by sex, age, and body height. *PLoS One* 2016;11(10):e0163917. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0163917.
- 48 McGrath R, Hackney KJ, Ratamess NA, Vincent BM, Clark BC, Kraemer WJ. Absolute and body mass index normalized handgrip strength percentiles by gender, ethnicity, and hand dominance in Americans. *Adv Geriatr Med Res* 2020;2(1):e200005. doi: 10.20900/agmr20200005.
- 49 Peterson MD, Krishnan C. Growth charts for muscular strength capacity with quantile regression. *Am J Prev Med* 2015;49(6):935–938. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2015.05.013.

- 50 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hróbjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, Moher D. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
- 51 World Health Organization. *Definition of key terms*; 2013. Available at: <https://www.who.int/hiv/pub/guidelines/arv2013/intro/keyterms/en/>. [accessed 04.03.2024].
- 52 Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH. Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: A prospective exploratory study. *Syst Rev* 2017;6(1):245. doi: 10.1186/s13643-017-0644-y.
- 53 Kmet LM, Lee RC, Cook LS. *Standard quality assessment criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields*. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research (AHFMR); 2004. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7939/R37M04F16>.
- 54 Jaric S, Mirkov D, Markovic G. Normalizing physical performance tests for body size: A proposal for standardization. *J Strength Cond Res* 2005;19(2):467–474. doi: 10.1519/R-15064.1.
- 55 Maranhao Neto GA, Oliveira AJ, Pedreiro RC, Pereira-Junior PP, Machado S, Marques Neto S, Farinatti PTV. Normalizing handgrip strength in older adults: An allometric approach. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2017;70:230–234. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2017.02.007.
- 56 Stasinopoulos DM, Rigby RA. (2007). Generalized Additive Models for Location Scale and Shape (GAMLSS) in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 23(7), 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v023.i07>.
- 57 Stasinopoulos DM, Rigby RA, Voudouris V, Akantziliotou C, Enea M, Kiose D, Zeileis A. *GAMLSS: Generalized Additive Models for Location Scale and Shape*; 2024. Available from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/gamlss/index.html>. [accessed 12.01.2024].
- 58 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World Population Prospects 2022, Data Sources*. UN DESA/POP/2022/DC/NO. 9; 2022.

- 59 United Nations Development Programme. *The 2021/2022 Human Development Report: Uncertain times, unsettled lives Shaping our future in a transforming world*. New York: United Nations; 2022.
- 60 United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division. *Methodology: Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49)—Geographical regions*; 2024. Available at: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>. [accessed 26.03.2024].
- 61 The World Bank. *Land area (sq. km)*; 2024. Available at: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.LND.TOTL.K2>. [accessed 26.03.2024].
- 62 Alley DE, Shardell MD, Peters KW, et al. Grip strength cutpoints for the identification of clinically relevant weakness. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2014;69(5):559–566. doi:10.1093/gerona/glu011.
- 63 McGrath RP, Ottenbacher KJ, Vincent BM, Kraemer WJ, Peterson MD. Muscle weakness and functional limitations in an ethnically diverse sample of older adults. *Ethn Health* 2020;25(3):342–353. doi:10.1080/13557858.2017.1418301.
- 64 Peterson MD, Zhang P, Duchowny KA, Markides KS, Ottenbacher KJ, Snih SA. Declines in strength and mortality risk among older Mexican Americans: Joint modeling of survival and longitudinal data. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2016;71(12):1646–1652. doi:10.1093/gerona/glw051.
- 65 Sallinen J, Stenholm S, Rantanen T, Heliövaara M, Sainio P, Koskinen S. Hand-grip strength cut points to screen older persons at risk for mobility limitation. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010;58(9):1721–1726. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03035.x.
- 66 Su H, Sun X, Li F, Guo Q. Association between handgrip strength and cognition in a Chinese population with Alzheimer’s disease and mild cognitive impairment. *BMC Geriatr* 2021;21(1):459. doi:10.1186/s12877-021-02383-8.
- 67 Vasconcelos KS, Dias JM, Bastone Ade C, et al. Handgrip strength cutoff points to identify mobility limitation in community-dwelling older people and associated factors. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2016;20(3):306–315. doi:10.1007/s12603-015-05.
- 68 Perna FM, Coa K, Troiano RP, Lawman HG, Wang C-Y, Li Y, Moser RP, Ciccolo JT, Comstock BA, Kraemer WJ. Muscular grip strength estimates of the U.S. population from the national health and nutrition examination survey 2011–2012. *J Strength Cond Res* 2016;30(3):867–874. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000001104

- 69 Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology (CSEP). *CSEP Physical Activity Training for Health (CSEP-PATH) resource manual* (3rd edition). Ottawa, ON: Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology; 2021.
- 70 Spiers GF, Kunonga TP, Hall A, Beyer F, Boulton E, Parker S, Bower P, Craig D, Todd C, Hanratty B. Measuring frailty in younger populations: A rapid review of evidence. *BMJ Open* 2021;11(3):e047051. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-047051.
- 71 Syddall HE, Westbury LD, Dodds R, Dennison E, Cooper C, Sayer AA. Mortality in the Hertfordshire Ageing Study: Association with level and loss of hand grip strength in later life. *Age Ageing* 2017;46(3):407–412. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afw222.
- 72 Oksuzyan A, Maier H, McGue M, Vaupel JW, Christensen K. Sex differences in the level and rate of change of physical function and grip strength in the Danish 1905-cohort study. *J Aging Health* 2010;22(5):589–610. doi: 10.1177/0898264310366752.
- 73 Dodds RM, Pakpahan E, Granic A, Davies K, Sayer AA. The recent secular trend in grip strength among older adults: Findings from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Eur Geriatr Med* 2019;10(3):395–401. doi: 10.1007/s41999-019-00174-4.
- 74 Daly RM, Rosengren BE, Alwis G, Ahlborg HG, Sernbo I, Karlsson MK. Gender specific age-related changes in bone density, muscle strength and functional performance in the elderly: A-10 year prospective population-based study. *BMC Geriatr* 2013;13:71. doi: 10.1186/1471-2318-13-71.
- 75 Nahhas RW, Choh AC, Lee M, Chumlea WMC, Duren DL, Siervogel RM, Sherwood RJ, Towne B, Czerwinski SA. Bayesian longitudinal plateau model of adult grip strength. *Am J Hum Biol* 2010;22(5):648–656. doi: 10.1002/ajhb.21057.
- 76 Stenholm S, Härkänen T, Sainio P, Heliövaara M, Koskinen S. Long-term changes in handgrip strength in men and women—Accounting the effect of right censoring due to death. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2012;67(10):1068–1074. doi: 10.1093/gerona/gls064.
- 77 GBD 2017 DALYs and HALE Collaborators. Global, regional, and national disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) for 359 diseases and injuries and healthy life expectancy (HALE) for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet* 2018;392(10159):1859–1922. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32335-3.
- 78 Dodds RM, Syddall HE, Cooper R, Kuh D, Cooper C, Sayer AA. Global variation in grip strength: A systematic review and meta-analysis of normative data. *Age Ageing* 2016;45(2):209–216. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afv192.

- 79 Tomkinson GR, Kidokoro T, Dufner T, Noi S, Fitzgerald JS, McGrath RP. Temporal trends in handgrip strength for older Japanese adults between 1998 and 2017. *Age Ageing* 2020;49(4):634–639. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afaa021.
- 80 Ortega FB, Leskošek B, Blagus R, Gil-Cosano JJ, Mäestu J, Tomkinson GR, Ruiz JR, Mäestu E, Starc G, Milanovic I, Tammelin TH, Sorić M, Scheuer C, Carraro A, Kaj M, Csányi T, Sardinha LB, Lenoir M, Emeljanovas A, Mieziene B, Sidossis LS, Pihu M, Lovecchio N, Konstabel K, Tambalis KD, Štefan L, Drenowatz C, Rubín L, Gontarev S, Castro-Piñero J, Vanhelst J, O’Keeffe B, Veiga OL, Gisladottir T, Sandercock G, Misigoj-Durakovic M, Niessner C, Riso E-M, Popovic S, Kuu S, Chinapaw M, Clavel I, Labayen I, Dobosz J, Colella D, Kriemler S, Salaj S, Noriega MJ, Bös K, Sánchez-López M, Lakka TA, Tabacchi G, Novak D, Ahrens W, Wedderkopp N, Jurak G; FitBack, HELENA and IDEFICS consortia. European fitness landscape for children and adolescents: Updated reference values, fitness maps and country rankings based on nearly 8 million test results from 34 countries gathered by the FitBack network. *Br J Sports Med* 2023;57(5):299–310. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2022-106176.
- 81 Klemm K, Bös K, Kron H, Eberhardt T, Woll A, Niessner C. Development and introduction of a disciplinary data repository for sport scientists. Based on the Example MO|RE Data – eResearch Infrastructure for Motor Research Data. *Bausteine Forschungsdatenmanagement [English: Building Blocks of Research Data Management]*. 2024;1:1–14. doi:10.17192/bfdm.2024.1.8615.
- 82 McGrath R, Cawthon PM, Clark BC, Fielding RA, Lang JJ, Tomkinson GR. Recommendations for reducing heterogeneity in handgrip strength protocols. *J Frailty Aging* 2022;11(2):143–150. doi: 10.14283/jfa.2022.21.
- 83 Reijnierse EM, de Jong N, Trappenburg MC, Blauw GJ, Butler-Browne G, Gapeyeva H, Hogrel J-Y, McPhee JS, Narici MV, Sipilä S, Stenroth L, van Lummel RC, Pijnappels M, Meskers CGM, Maier AB. Assessment of maximal handgrip strength: How many attempts are needed? *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2017;8(3):466–474. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12181.
- 84 National Institutes of Health (NIH): Office of Research on Women’s Health. *NIH policy on sex as a biological variable*; 2024. Available at: <https://orwh.od.nih.gov/sex-gender/orwh-mission-area-sex-gender-in-research/nih-policy-on-sex-as-biological-variable#:~:text=NIH%20expects%20that%20sex%20as,to%20study%20only%20one%20sex>. [accessed 10.07.2024].

- 85 Blair SN, Kohl 3rd HW, Paffenbarger Jr RS, Clark DG, Cooper KH, Gibbons LW. Physical fitness and all-cause mortality. A prospective study of healthy men and women. *JAMA*. 1989;262(17):2395–401. doi: 10.1001/jama.262.17.2395.
- 86 Henriksson H, Henriksson P, Tynelius P, Ekstedt M, Berglind D, Labayen I, Ruiz JR, Lavie CJ, Ortega FB. Cardiorespiratory fitness, muscular strength, and obesity in adolescence and later chronic disability due to cardiovascular disease: A cohort study of 1 million men. *Eur Heart J*. 2020;41(15):1503–1510. doi: 10.1093/eurheartj/ehz774.
- 87 Henriksson H, Henriksson P, Tynelius P, Ortega FB. Muscular weakness in adolescence is associated with disability 30 years later: A population-based cohort study of 1.2 million men. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019;53(19):1221–1230. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-098723.
- 88 Lee Y, Kim J, Han ES, Ryu M, Cho Y, Chae S. Frailty and body mass index as predictors of 3-year mortality in older adults living in the community. *Gerontology*. 2014;60(6):475–82. doi: 10.1159/000362330.
- 89 Samper-Ternent R, Al Snih S, Raji MA, Markides KS, Ottenbacher KJ. Relationship between frailty and cognitive decline in older Mexican Americans. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2008;56(10):1845–52. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2008.01947.x.
- 90 Sousa-Santos AR, Amaral TF. Differences in handgrip strength protocols to identify sarcopenia and frailty — a systematic review. *BMC Geriatr*. 2017;17(1):238. doi: 10.1186/s12877-017-0625-y.
- 91 Institute of Medicine. *Fitness measures and health outcomes in youth*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press; 2012. doi: 10.17226/13483.
- 92 Labott BK, Bucht H, Morat M, Morat T, Donath L. Effects of exercise training on handgrip strength in older adults: A meta-analytical review. *Gerontology*. 2019;65(6):686–698. doi: 10.1159/000501203.

Table 1. Summary of the descriptive characteristics and handgrip strength test protocols of the included studies.

Characteristic	Absolute handgrip strength (<i>n</i> = 100)	Normalised handgrip strength (<i>n</i> = 89)
Year of testing (<i>n</i> [%])		
2000–09	31 (31.0)	29 (32.6)
2010–21	69 (69.0)	60 (67.4)
Stage of adult lifespan (<i>n</i> [%])		
Early (20–39 years)	55 (55.0)	46 (51.7)
Middle (40–64 years)	85 (85.0)	74 (83.1)
Late (65+ years)	92 (92.0)	83 (93.3)
All adult stages	47 (47.0)	40 (44.9)
Sample size (median [IQR])	1690 (618, 8357)	1780 (818, 8889)
Study design (<i>n</i> [%])		
Cross-sectional	62 (62.0)	52 (58.4)
Cohort	38 (38.0)	37 (41.6)
Sampling strategy (<i>n</i> [%])		
Probability	61 (61.0)	60 (67.4)
Non-probability	37 (37.0)	27 (30.3)
Both	2 (2.0)	2 (2.2)
Sample base (<i>n</i> [%])		
National	36 (36.0)	33 (37.1)
Non-national	64 (64.0)	56 (62.9)
Dynamometer (<i>n</i> [%])		
Hydraulic	38 (38.0)	30 (33.7)
Electronic	32 (32.0)	29 (32.6)
Mechanical	30 (30.0)	30 (33.7)
Body position (<i>n</i> [%])		
Seated	51 (51.0)	41 (46.1)
Standing	49 (49.0)	48 (53.9)
Shoulder position (<i>n</i> [%])		
Adducted	97 (97.0)	86 (96.6)
Abducted (slight, <45°)	3 (3.0)	3 (3.4)
Elbow position (<i>n</i> [%])		
Flexed	68 (68.0)	58 (65.2)
Extended	32 (32.0)	31 (34.8)
Radioulnar position (<i>n</i> [%])		
Neutral	98 (98.0)	87 (97.8)
Supinated	2 (2.0)	2 (2.2)

Wrist position (<i>n</i> [%])		
Neutral	100 (100.0)	89 (100)
Handle position (<i>n</i> [%])		
Adjusted to hand size	69 (69.0)	66 (74.2)
Adjusted to standard position	31 (31.0)	23 (25.8)
Time (min) between reps (<i>n</i> [%])		
<1	38 (38.0)	34 (38.2)
≥1	33 (33.0)	28 (31.5)
Not specified	29 (29.0)	27 (30.3)
Verbal support (<i>n</i> [%])		
Yes	67 (67.0)	59 (66.3)
No	15 (15.0)	14 (15.7)
Not specified	18 (18.0)	16 (18.0)
Testing hand (<i>n</i> [%])		
Both	73 (73.0)	63 (70.8)
Dominant	26 (26.0)	25 (28.1)
Non-dominant	1 (1.0)	1 (1.1)
Reps per hand (<i>n</i> [%])		
1	6 (6.0)	4 (4.5)
2	42 (42.0)	40 (44.9)
3	52 (52.0)	45 (50.6)
Summary statistic (<i>n</i> [%])		
Maximum	90 (90.0)	83 (93.3)
Average	9 (9.0)	5 (5.6)
Average of maxima	1 (1.0)	1 (1.1)

Notes: Year of testing was calculated as the mid-year of the testing period. At least 5-years' worth of data had to be available to count for the corresponding stage of adult lifespan. Sample sizes were extracted from published reports or were recalculated from raw data. Additional information can be found in Supplementary Notes and Abbreviations.

Abbreviations: % = percent; IQR = interquartile range; min = minute; *n* = sample size; reps = repetitions.

Table 2. Normative values (percentiles) for absolute handgrip strength in kilograms by sex and age based on data from 2,405,863 adults aged 20 to 100+ years representing 69 countries and territories.

Age (y)	P ₅	P ₁₀	P ₂₀	P ₃₀	P ₄₀	P ₅₀	P ₆₀	P ₇₀	P ₈₀	P ₉₀	P ₉₅
<i>Males</i>											
20–24	33.9	36.8	40.5	43.2	45.7	48.0	50.4	52.9	56.0	60.1	63.6
25–29	35.5	38.5	42.1	44.8	47.1	49.3	51.5	53.9	56.7	60.7	64.0
30–34	35.0	38.3	42.2	45.0	47.4	49.7	52.0	54.4	57.4	61.5	64.9
35–39	33.8	37.3	41.5	44.5	47.1	49.5	51.9	54.4	57.5	61.8	65.3
40–44	32.3	36.0	40.4	43.6	46.3	48.8	51.2	53.9	57.1	61.5	65.1
45–49	30.6	34.4	39.0	42.3	45.1	47.6	50.2	52.9	56.2	60.7	64.4
50–54	28.9	32.8	37.4	40.7	43.5	46.2	48.8	51.6	54.8	59.4	63.1
55–59	27.2	31.0	35.6	38.9	41.7	44.4	47.0	49.8	53.1	57.7	61.4
60–64	25.5	29.1	33.6	36.9	39.7	42.4	45.0	47.8	51.1	55.6	59.3
65–69	23.7	27.2	31.5	34.7	37.5	40.1	42.8	45.6	48.8	53.2	56.8
70–74	21.9	25.2	29.3	32.4	35.1	37.7	40.3	43.1	46.3	50.6	54.1
75–79	20.0	23.1	27.0	29.9	32.5	35.1	37.6	40.3	43.5	47.7	51.1
80–84	18.0	20.8	24.5	27.3	29.8	32.3	34.8	37.5	40.5	44.7	48.0
85–89	15.9	18.5	21.9	24.6	27.0	29.4	31.8	34.4	37.4	41.5	44.6
90–94	13.7	16.1	19.2	21.7	24.0	26.3	28.7	31.2	34.2	38.1	41.2
95–99	11.3	13.5	16.4	18.8	20.9	23.1	25.4	27.9	30.8	34.6	37.5
100+	8.8	10.8	13.5	15.7	17.8	19.8	22.0	24.5	27.2	30.9	33.8
<i>Females</i>											
20–24	19.7	21.7	24.0	25.7	27.2	28.6	30.0	31.6	33.6	36.6	39.1
25–29	20.0	22.0	24.5	26.3	27.9	29.4	30.9	32.6	34.6	37.4	39.7
30–34	19.6	21.8	24.4	26.4	28.1	29.7	31.3	33.1	35.2	38.0	40.4
35–39	19.0	21.3	24.1	26.2	28.0	29.7	31.4	33.2	35.4	38.4	40.8
40–44	18.3	20.7	23.7	25.8	27.6	29.4	31.1	33.0	35.2	38.3	40.8
45–49	17.6	20.1	23.1	25.2	27.1	28.9	30.6	32.5	34.8	37.9	40.4
50–54	16.9	19.4	22.4	24.5	26.4	28.2	29.9	31.8	34.0	37.1	39.7
55–59	16.1	18.5	21.5	23.7	25.5	27.3	29.0	30.9	33.0	36.1	38.6
60–64	15.2	17.6	20.6	22.7	24.5	26.2	27.9	29.7	31.8	34.9	37.4
65–69	14.3	16.6	19.5	21.6	23.3	25.0	26.6	28.4	30.5	33.4	35.8
70–74	13.2	15.5	18.3	20.3	22.0	23.6	25.2	26.9	28.9	31.8	34.1
75–79	12.0	14.3	17.0	18.9	20.5	22.1	23.6	25.2	27.2	29.9	32.2
80–84	10.7	12.9	15.5	17.4	18.9	20.4	21.9	23.5	25.3	28.0	30.2
85–89	9.3	11.4	13.9	15.7	17.2	18.6	20.0	21.5	23.3	25.9	28.0
90–94	7.8	9.8	12.2	13.9	15.3	16.7	18.0	19.5	21.2	23.6	25.7
95–99	6.1	8.0	10.3	11.9	13.3	14.6	15.9	17.3	18.9	21.2	23.2
100+	4.2	6.1	8.3	9.8	11.2	12.4	13.6	14.9	16.5	18.7	20.6

Notes: Population-weighted smoothed percentiles were calculated using the Generalised Additive Model for Location, Scale and Shape method. Percentiles were adjusted to the reference test and reporting protocol (i.e., dynamometer type = hydraulic, body position = seated, elbow position = flexed, radioulnar position = neutral, handle position = adjusted to hand size, testing hand = both, reps per hand = 3, and summary statistic = maximum). No statistical adjustment was made for shoulder or wrist position (see Supplementary Harmonisation Methods for details). The ages shown represent 5-year age groups (e.g., 20–24 = 20.00–24.99). *Abbreviations:* P = percentile (e.g., P₅ = 5th percentile); y = years.

Table 3. Normative values (percentiles) for normalised handgrip strength (handgrip strength in kilograms divided by height in metres squared) by sex and age based on data from 2,328,890 adults aged 20 to 100+ years representing 69 countries and territories.

Age (y)	P ₅	P ₁₀	P ₂₀	P ₃₀	P ₄₀	P ₅₀	P ₆₀	P ₇₀	P ₈₀	P ₉₀	P ₉₅
<i>Males</i>											
20–24	11.0	12.0	13.2	14.1	14.8	15.6	16.3	17.1	18.0	19.3	20.4
25–29	11.5	12.5	13.7	14.6	15.3	16.1	16.8	17.6	18.5	19.8	20.9
30–34	11.6	12.6	13.8	14.7	15.5	16.3	17.0	17.8	18.7	20.0	21.1
35–39	11.5	12.5	13.8	14.7	15.5	16.2	17.0	17.8	18.8	20.1	21.1
40–44	11.2	12.3	13.6	14.5	15.3	16.1	16.9	17.7	18.6	20.0	21.0
45–49	10.8	11.9	13.2	14.2	15.0	15.8	16.6	17.4	18.4	19.7	20.8
50–54	10.4	11.5	12.8	13.8	14.6	15.4	16.2	17.1	18.0	19.4	20.5
55–59	9.9	11.0	12.4	13.3	14.2	15.0	15.8	16.6	17.6	19.0	20.1
60–64	9.3	10.5	11.8	12.8	13.6	14.4	15.2	16.0	17.0	18.4	19.6
65–69	8.7	9.9	11.2	12.2	13.0	13.8	14.6	15.4	16.4	17.8	19.0
70–74	8.1	9.3	10.6	11.6	12.4	13.1	13.8	14.7	15.6	17.1	18.3
75–79	7.5	8.6	9.9	10.8	11.6	12.3	13.1	13.8	14.8	16.2	17.5
80–84	6.9	8.0	9.2	10.1	10.8	11.5	12.2	13.0	13.9	15.3	16.6
85–89	6.2	7.3	8.5	9.3	10.0	10.6	11.2	12.0	12.9	14.3	15.6
90–94	5.5	6.5	7.7	8.4	9.1	9.6	10.2	10.9	11.8	13.2	14.6
95–99	4.8	5.7	6.8	7.5	8.1	8.6	9.2	9.8	10.7	12.1	13.4
100+	4.0	4.9	5.9	6.5	7.1	7.5	8.0	8.6	9.4	10.8	12.2
<i>Females</i>											
20–24	7.4	8.1	9.0	9.7	10.3	10.8	11.4	12.0	12.7	13.8	14.7
25–29	7.6	8.3	9.3	10.0	10.6	11.1	11.7	12.4	13.1	14.2	15.0
30–34	7.6	8.4	9.3	10.1	10.7	11.3	11.9	12.5	13.3	14.4	15.2
35–39	7.5	8.3	9.3	10.0	10.7	11.3	11.9	12.6	13.4	14.4	15.3
40–44	7.3	8.2	9.2	10.0	10.6	11.2	11.9	12.5	13.3	14.4	15.3
45–49	7.2	8.0	9.1	9.8	10.5	11.1	11.7	12.4	13.2	14.3	15.2
50–54	7.0	7.8	8.9	9.6	10.3	10.9	11.5	12.2	13.0	14.1	15.0
55–59	6.7	7.6	8.6	9.4	10.1	10.7	11.3	12.0	12.7	13.8	14.7
60–64	6.4	7.3	8.3	9.1	9.7	10.4	11.0	11.6	12.4	13.5	14.4
65–69	6.1	6.9	8.0	8.7	9.4	10.0	10.6	11.2	12.0	13.0	14.0
70–74	5.7	6.5	7.6	8.3	8.9	9.5	10.1	10.7	11.5	12.5	13.4
75–79	5.2	6.1	7.1	7.8	8.4	9.0	9.5	10.1	10.9	11.9	12.8
80–84	4.6	5.5	6.6	7.3	7.9	8.4	8.9	9.5	10.2	11.2	12.1
85–89	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.6	7.2	7.7	8.2	8.8	9.4	10.5	11.4
90–94	3.1	4.1	5.2	5.9	6.5	6.9	7.4	7.9	8.6	9.6	10.5
95–99	2.2	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.6	6.1	6.5	7.0	7.7	8.7	9.6
100+	1.1	2.3	3.5	4.2	4.7	5.1	5.5	6.0	6.6	7.6	8.6

Notes: Population-weighted smoothed percentiles were calculated using the Generalised Additive Model for Location, Scale and Shape method. Percentiles were adjusted to the reference test and reporting protocol (i.e., dynamometer type = hydraulic, body position = seated, elbow position = flexed, radioulnar position = neutral, handle position = adjusted to hand size, testing hand = both, reps per hand = 3, and summary statistic = maximum). No statistical adjustment was made for shoulder or wrist position (see Supplementary Harmonisation Methods for details). The ages shown represent 5-year age groups (e.g., 20–24 = 20.00–24.99). *Abbreviations:* P = percentile (e.g., P₅ = 5th percentile); y = years.

FIGURES

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram showing the flow of studies through different phases of the systematic review.






Figure 2. Smoothed percentile curves (P₅ to P₉₅) for absolute handgrip strength in kilograms (kg) and normalised handgrip strength (handgrip strength in kilograms divided by height in metres squared [kg/m²]) for adults aged 20 to 100+ years.



Notes: Smoothed percentile curves for absolute handgrip strength (top panels) and normalised handgrip strength (bottom panels) are shown separately for males (left panels) and females (right panels). Population-weighted smoothed percentiles were calculated using the Generalised Additive Model for Location, Scale and Shape method. Percentiles were adjusted to the reference test and reporting protocol (i.e., dynamometer type = hydraulic, body position = seated, elbow position = flexed, radioulnar position = neutral, handle position = adjusted to hand size, testing hand = both, reps per hand = 3, and summary statistic = maximum). No statistical adjustment was made for shoulder or wrist position (see Supplementary Harmonisation Methods for details). Large, high-resolution images for each panel are provided as Supplementary Figures 2a to 2d.

Figure 3. Sex- and age-related differences in mean absolute handgrip strength and normalised handgrip strength for adults aged 20 to 100+ years.



Notes: Sex-related (i.e., the standardised difference in absolute handgrip strength [top left panel] and normalized handgrip strength [top right panel] between males and females in 5-year age intervals) and age-related differences (i.e., the standardised difference in absolute handgrip strength [bottom left panel] and normalized handgrip strength [bottom right panel] with each 5-year age interval relative to age 20 years) with adjustment for test and reporting protocols are shown as standardised (Cohen's) effect sizes. The limits of the grey zone represent a large, standardised effect size (i.e., 0.8 or -0.8). Positive sex-related differences indicate higher handgrip strength for males than for females (top panels). Age-related differences are standardised to age 20 years = 0. Positive age-related differences indicate higher handgrip strength for adults aged >20 years than for adults aged 20 years, and negative age-related differences indicate lower handgrip strength for adults aged >20 years than for adults aged 20 years (bottom panels).