

Concern regarding quality and quality of muscle

Creatinine and myoglobin are poor predictors of anaerobic threshold in colorectal cancer and health. It certainly has been agreed upon that lean muscle mass (LMM) is essential in predicting aerobic performance of healthy and non-disseminated colorectal cancer (CRC) patients. It was confirmed that LMM is a powerful predictor of aerobic performance and mortality.^{1,2} Additionally, there are some reports that creatinine and myoglobin were surrogates for muscle mass.^{3,4} We believed this is a very important study and congratulate the authors for their innovative study. However, anaerobic threshold was significantly lower in the CRC patients compared with healthy controls, although there was no significant difference in serum creatinine, myoglobin, and LMM in this study. There is no significant correlation between serum creatinine or myoglobin and aerobic performance. I would like to address three issues to understanding of findings this study.

The first issue concerns the current hypothesis that myoglobin levels were affected by muscle mass and myoglobin-rich-type fibres. Therefore, myoglobin levels are usually reduced in cachexia patients associated with the muscle wasting and weight loss.⁵ However, serum myoglobin level in CRC patients was within normal range, and CRC patients were also heavier than the controls in this study. Therefore, there is a possibility that non-disseminated CRC patients do not suffer from progressive cancer-related muscle wasting.⁶ The authors also described that 'Results of this study might not extend to the sarcopenic and/or obese patient'.

We would like to point out the necessity of further studies to analyse the correlation between serum creatinine or myoglobin and aerobic performance in non-disseminated CRC patients with cachexia-related muscle wasting.

The second issue concerns the accepted notion that peak VO_2 is more sufficient maker of aerobic performance rather than anaerobic threshold (AT). The authors defined AT as indicator of aerobic performance, based on a pragmatic clinical decision. However, several reports used peak VO_2 as a pre-operative predictor of mortality or morbidity in cardiac and non-cardiac surgery, because peak VO_2 is reported the highest test–retest reliability in variable of cardiopulmonary exercise test.⁷

We would like to point out that peak VO_2 is seen as the more sufficient maker of aerobic performance. Actually, peak

VO_2 has been used as biomarker of aerobic performance in a previous report that confirmed the relationship between myoglobin and muscle mass.³

The third issue concerns the current opinion that muscle strength/muscle power is also important as well as muscle mass. Recently, some researchers reported low muscle strength, as a maker of muscle quality, is more strongly associated with mortality than low muscle mass as a maker of muscle quantity.^{8,9} Actually, aerobic performance is closely related to muscle strength/muscle power rather than muscle mass.

The relationship between muscle strength/muscle power and serum creatinine or myoglobin in non-disseminated CRC patients with cachexia-related muscle wasting is a very interesting field that needs to be studied further.

Acknowledgements

The authors certify that they comply with the ethical guidelines for authorship and publishing of the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle (von Haehling S, Morley JE, Coats AJS, Anker SD. Ethical guidelines for authorship and publishing in the Journal of Cachexia, Sarcopenia and Muscle. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. 2010;1:7–8).

Masakazu Saitoh

*Innovative Clinical Trials, Department of Cardiology & Pneumology, University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG), Göttingen, Germany
msaitoh@shi.heart.or.jp*

Junichi Ishida

Innovative Clinical Trials, Department of Cardiology & Pneumology, University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG), Göttingen, Germany

Masaaki Konishi

Innovative Clinical Trials, Department of Cardiology & Pneumology, University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG), Göttingen, Germany

Jochen Springer

Innovative Clinical Trials, Department of Cardiology & Pneumology, University Medical Center Göttingen (UMG), Göttingen, Germany

References

1. Palus S, von Haehling S, Springer J. Muscle wasting: an overview of recent developments in basic research. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2014; **5**: 193–198.
2. Anker SD, Coats AJ, Morley JE, Rosano G, Bernabei R, von Haehling S, *et al*. Muscle wasting disease: a proposal for a new disease classification. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2014; **5**: 1–3.
3. Weber MA, Kinscherf R, Krakowski-Roosen H, Aulmann M, Renk H, Künkele A, *et al*. Myoglobin plasma level related to muscle mass and fiber composition—a clinical marker of muscle wasting? *J Mol Med* 2007; **85**: 887–896.
4. Stimpson SA, Leonard MS, Clifton LG, Poole JC, Turner SM, Shearer TW, *et al*. Longitudinal changes in total body creatinine pool size and skeletal muscle mass using the D3-creatinine dilution methods. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2013; **4**: 217–223.
5. Gould DW, Lahart I, Carmichael AR, Koutedakis Y, Metsios GS. Cancer cachexia prevention via physical exercise: molecular mechanism. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2013; **4**: 111–124.
6. Farkas J, von Haehling S, Kalantar-Zadeh K, Morley JE, Anker SD, Lainscak M. Cachexia as a major public health problem: frequent, costly, and deadly. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle* 2013; **4**: 173–178.
7. Barron A, Dhutia N, Mayet J, Hughes AD, Francis DP, Wensel R. Test–retest repeatability of cardiopulmonary exercise test variables in patients cardiac or respiratory disease. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2014; **21**: 445–453.
8. Newman AB, Kupelian V, Visser M, Simonsick EM, Goodpaster BH, Kritchevsky SB, *et al*. Strength, but not muscle mass, is associated with mortality in the health, aging and body composition study cohort. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2006; **61**: 72–77.
9. Isoyama N, Qureshi AR, Avesani CM, Lindholm B, Båràny P, Heimbürger O, *et al*. Comparative associations of muscle mass and muscle strength with mortality in dialysis patients. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2014; **9**: 1720–1728.