medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Efficacy of a multiple-component and multifactorial personalized fall prevention program in community-dwelling older adults at moderate-to-high fall risk: The PRE.C.I.S.A. Randomized Controlled Trial

Fabio La Porta[1] Serena Caselli[2]

On behalf of Giada Lullini, Franco Valzania, Chiara Mussi, Claudio Tedeschi, Giulio Pioli, Massimo Bondavalli, Marco Bertolotti, Federico Banchelli, Roberto D'Amico, Roberto Vicini, Silvia Puglisi, Pierina Viviana Clerici, Lorenzo Chiari and the PRECISA Group

[1]IRCCS Istituto delle Scienze Neurologiche di Bologna

[2] Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Modena

[3] Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia

[4] Department of Electrical, Electronic, and Information Engineering 'Guglielmo Marconi' (DEI), University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

[5] Health Sciences and Technologies Interdepartmental Center for Industrial Research (CIRI-SDV), University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

*** Correspondence:**
Corresponding Author: Fabio La Porta
fabio.laporta@ausl.bologna.it

Keywords: Primary Prevention, Secondary Prevention, Accidental Falls, Aged, Independent Living, Nervous System Diseases, Rehabilitation

Abstract

Background: The fall risk in the elderly is a major public health issue due to the immediate injury-related consequences and the risk of associated long-term disability. However, the delivery of effective interventions for fall prevention in usual clinical practice still represents a challenge.

Aim: To evaluate the efficacy of a multiple-component intervention combined with a multifactorial personalized intervention in reducing fall rates in community-dwelling older adults at moderate-to-high fall risk compared to usual care.

Design: Randomized Controlled Trial (unique identifier NCT03592420, clinicaltrials.gov).

Setting: Outpatients in two Italian centers.

Population: 403 community-dwelling older adults at moderate-to-high fall risk, including subjects with Parkinson's Disease and stroke.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods: Subjects were randomized to the intervention (n=203) or the control group (n=200). A multiple-component and multifactorial personalized interventions were administered to the experimental intervention group. Participants allocated to the control group received usual care and recommendations to minimize the fall risk factors. In addition, each participant was given a diary to record falls and was followed for 12 months with monthly telephone contacts. The primary endpoint was represented by the total number of falls in each group over 12 months. The secondary endpoints were other fall-related indicators (fall rate of subjects with one or more falls, fall rate associated with hospitalization, fall severity, fall probability, and time to the first fall) recorded at the 12-month follow-up. Besides, several clinical scales were used to assess baseline (T1) and 3-month follow-up (T3) functioning.

Results: A total of 690 falls were reported at 12-month follow-up, 337 (48.8%) in the intervention group and 353 (51.2%) in the control group with 1.66 (± 3.5) and 1.77 (± 3.2) mean falls per subject, respectively. The number of subjects with at least one fall was 236 (58.6%), with 119 (58.6%) and 117 falls (58.5%) in the intervention and control groups, respectively. No statistically significant differences were observed between groups regarding the number of falls, the fall probability, and the time to the first fall at 12-month follow-up. Furthermore, according to the subgroup analysis, no significant differences were reported between subgroups (i.e., the four etiological class categories of interest for the study). Finally, considering the two groups at pre-test (T1) and post-test (T3) evaluations, a statistically significant difference was found only for the Fullerton Advanced Balance Scale (p=0.006) and the Mini-BESTest (p=0.004) in favor of the intervention group.

Conclusions: The proposed intervention was ineffective in reducing the number of falls, the fall probability, and the time to the first fall at 12-month follow-up in community-dwelling older adults at moderate-to-high fall risk. However, a lower number of falls, lower fall rates in multiple fallers, a lower mean number of falls per participant, and a lower rate of fall-related severe injuries were recorded for the intervention group, although not significant. Finally, a significant improvement for two balance-related indicators was recorded in the intervention group between pre and post-test evaluations. Future studies are needed to explore different effects of combined multiple-component and personalized multifactorial interventions to reduce falls and subsequent consequences. Future studies should also be planned with the clear aim of overcoming the limitations highlighted in the PRE.C.I.S.A. study.

1 Introduction

Fall risk in the elderly is a major public health issue due to the immediate injury-related consequences and the risk of associated long-term disability (1). One out of three older people over 65 years is estimated to fall each year, and this rate increases to 50% in the elderly over 80 years old (2). Around 15% of older adults are multiple fallers, experiencing more than one fall each year, thus increasing morbidity and mortality (1). In 2 to 10% of cases, falls can lead to hip fractures strictly related to functional decline, death, and increase in hospitalization costs, even though falls alone are known to limit social participation and increase the risk of institutionalization (3). Moreover, the costs for the acute management of the 85,762 hospitalizations for hip fractures that occurred in Italy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

in 2005 were estimated to be around 467 million Euros, with rehabilitation costs reaching 532 million Euros in the same year (4). Recently, in Regione Emilia-Romagna (Italy), Berti and colleagues (5) reported 5904 yearly hip fractures in 2017. Referring to a conceptual framework for a hip fracture integrated episode of care, defined as Continuum-Care Episode (CCE), they estimated a median cost of 7,404.5 euros for the acute phase and a median cost of 3,449.6 euros for the rehabilitative one. Therefore, an effective fall prevention intervention is of primary importance also to reduce socioeconomic burden.

A systematic literature review and meta-analysis analyzed fall risk factors in community-dwelling older people (6), highlighting that falling results from an interaction between environmental hazards and inadequate physiology to cope with them, such as gait problems, poor vision, impaired peripheral sensation, lower limb strength, dizziness, and the use of psychotropic medications or polypharmacy (6,7). In older adults presenting for medical attention after a fall or who have gait or balance problems, guidelines recommend a multifactorial fall risk assessment (8). This strategy implies identifying modifiable risk factors and implementing targeted interventions for fall prevention (3). However, the delivery of effective treatments for fall prevention in usual clinical practice still represents a challenge (9,10).

According to a recent Cochrane review (1) on fall prevention for older people living in the community, three kinds of effective interventions were identified: single, multiple, and multifactorial interventions. This systematic review identified that both multifactorial intervention and exercise alone, either delivered as a multiple-component group exercise or home-based exercise, reduce fall rates but only exercise reduced fall risk. Multifactorial programs also effectively reduced falls, even though trials on this kind of intervention are quite heterogeneous (11). In a recent ongoing Randomized Control Trial (RCT) (12), a combination of multiple and multifactorial interventions was employed to prevent falls in community-dwelling older people, but results on treatment effectiveness are not available yet. In 2020 Lamb et al. demonstrated that screening by mail followed by a targeted exercise intervention or multifactorial approach to preventing falls did not result in a lower rate of fractures than advice by mail alone (13). Moreover, RCTs in the Cochrane systematic review did not include subjects with neurological conditions, such as Parkinson's Disease (PD) and stroke.

Evidence from the literature showed that among people affected by these neurological conditions, a high proportion of fallers is recorded together with a high rate of participation restriction (14,15). Previous studies suggested that exercise can improve balance in PD, even though the fall rate and fall risk reduction were not achieved (16–18). A recent study (19) investigated a combination of educational and exercise interventions to reduce falls in people with neurological conditions: results from this RCT did not show a reduction in fall risk. However, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no studies were conducted on a combined intervention to prevent falls in the elderly living in the community, including participants affected by neurological conditions, and with a synergy between group exercise and personalized home exercise to increase compliance and chances that home exercise becomes an integral part of a long-term more active and healthier lifestyle.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Thus, the current study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of a multiple-component intervention, associated with a personalized multifactorial intervention, to reduce fall rates in community-dwelling older adults who can walk but are at risk of falling, including those with PD and stroke, compared to usual care. We hypothesized that the intervention group would present a lower number of falls, a lower fall probability, and a longer time to the first fall at 12-month follow-up than the control group.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Study design

This study was a multicenter randomized controlled trial where individuals randomized to the treatment group (TG) received an 11-week multiple-component and personalized multifactorial intervention to reduce fall risk, whereas participants in the control group (CG) received only usual care. Pre-test and post-test assessments were conducted, respectively, before randomization and twelve weeks after the commencement of the intervention. Primary and secondary endpoints were assessed at a 12-month follow-up. The study design is presented in Figure 1.

[Figure 1]

The study was conducted in two Italian Public Hospitals (Ospedale Civile di Baggiovara in Modena and Arcispedale Santa Maria Nuova in Reggio Emilia) between 2015 and 2016. It was registered in clinicaltrials.gov (unique identifier NCT03592420) and approved by the local Ethical Committee (Provincial Ethics Committee of Modena 1141/CE/2014). Furthermore, all participants gave written informed consent to participate in the study, which was conducted in strict adherence to the ethical principles of the Helsinki Declaration (19).

2.2 Participants

Inclusion criteria were: age ≥65 years, moderate-to-high fall risk associated with age and/or neurological conditions (i.e., PD and stroke), ability to walk for at least 10 meters without assistance (possible use of a walking aid), and agreement to give written informed consent to the study.

Exclusion criteria were: severe general health conditions interfering with physical exercise, cognitive impairment (Mini-Mental Test score <24 or cognitive conditions interfering with test administration), severe deafness, severe vision impairment, severe aphasia or visual-spatial disorders, subjective and objective vertigo in the last three months, ongoing physiotherapy likely to influence the target variables (at the time of enrolment).

2.3 Enrolment algorithm

Any subject over 65 years old, with or without a diagnosis of PD or stroke, considered ‘at fall risk’ by a health professional (medical specialist or general practitioner) or by him/herself, was signaled to an enrolment office shared between the two centers (‘Punto Unico di Arruolamento’, PUA) through

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

an ad hoc case report form. The subject's compliance with the inclusion and exclusion criteria was declared in this form.

After the initial contact, potentially eligible participants were screened for inclusion and exclusion criteria. Eligible subjects underwent a further assessment in subsequential steps:

1. Anamnestic Assessment of Eligibility (AAE):
    - This assessment was the PRE.C.I.S.A. first selection step. It was administered by a PUA's trained nurse, through a telephone call, to older adults who had been signaled as 'at fall risk';
    - The aim was to confirm the inclusion/exclusion criteria for the study recruitment and evaluate the most influential fall risk factors. In particular, the PUA's nurse verified the subject's adherence to inclusion and exclusion criteria. Furthermore, the subject was submitted to the Fall Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT, Nandy, 2004) (20), was asked if he/she was afraid to fall, and it was verified his/her ability to walk 10 meters without assistance;
    - Later, each subject was classified as 'not eligible and/or at low risk', 'moderate' or 'high' fall risk according to the defined algorithm in Table 1;

[Table 1]

    - Those who resulted at 'low fall risk' or 'not satisfying study criteria' were excluded. The study protocol allowed to contact these subjects after one year by the PUA's nurse to record any eventual fall that occurred and, thus, provided helpful quantitative information for the post-hoc validation of the screening algorithm;
    - After combining the assessment results, people who resulted at 'moderate-to-high fall risk' accessed the successive selection step (Objective Assessment of Eligibility - OAE).
2. Objective Assessment of Eligibility (OAE):
    - This assessment constituted the PRE.C.I.S.A. second selection step, and it was administered during an outpatient visit by a trained physiotherapist to individuals selected at 'moderate-to-high fall risk' during the previous selection step (AAE);
    - The aim was to evaluate in detail all fall risk factors described in the literature and, hence, to confirm the eligibility for the study (be at 'moderate-to-high fall risk' after the combination of the assessment results). In particular, the prospective participant was submitted to the Falls Risk for Older People in the Community Screen (FROP-Com Screen) (21), to the Fall Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT, Stapleton, 2009) (22), to several mobility and balance tests (10 Meters Walking Test, Timed Up&Go test, Tandem stance from the 4 Stage Balance Test, 30-second Chair Standing test, Short Physical Performance Battery, Functional Reach Test), to the Abbreviated Mental Test Score, and the visual acuity assessment (Snellen Chart);

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Those who obtained an 'eligible coefficient' ≥1, calculated from the FROP-Com Screen and the FRAT (Stapleton, 2009) total scores, was judged as 'eligible' to be enrolled in the study (Table 1);
- Any individual re-classified at 'low risk' following this second assessment step was excluded from the enrolment and contacted one year later by the PUA's trained nurse to collect the number of falls (study outcome).

2.4 Randomization

After the enrolment, subjects judged as 'eligible' participants underwent the pre-test assessments, which were conducted by a Physiatrist (P), a Physiotherapist (PT), a Geriatrician (G), and a Neurologist (N), as described in the following outcome measures section. These assessments helped determine in detail the individual fall risk profile.

Subsequently, the last assessor, who performed the pre-test evaluation, randomized the enrolled subject to the intervention group (IG) or the control group (CG). A web-based database was developed ad hoc for this study, and computer-based randomization was implemented to guarantee the allocation concealment. The randomization sequence was created using random block sizes of 4. Participants were stratified by risk classes (older adults 65-79 years without associated neurological disease; older adults ≥80 years without associated neurological disease; older adults with stroke; older adults with PD) and independently for each center.

After the randomization, all enrolled subjects were informed about the allocation arm and received a 'usual care' intervention based on:

- a report on their individual risk factor profile;
- an illustrated brochure on fall prevention;
- personalized suggestions to minimize the fall risk addressed to their General Practitioner (GP).

Furthermore, all participants were provided with a one-year fall report diary, integrated with a physical activity monitoring diary, and several copies of a 'fall report' that had to be filled by the participant, in case of a fall, with more detailed information about the event.

2.5 Interventions

Participants in the IG were taken in charge by an interdisciplinary team, including the four professionals mentioned above who administered synergically the following five interventions, described in detail in Appendix 1.

2.5.1 Group exercise sessions

This intervention was based on eleven weekly group sessions (including six participants) for 60 minutes. Each session was composed of the following parts:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Warming (5 minutes): head, neck, trunk, and ankle movements, back and knee extensions, walking on the spot;
- Circuit training (35 minutes): muscular strength exercises, balance exercises, and recovery techniques from falling (23);
- Dynamic balance and walking exercises specific for the risk class (10 minutes).

The remaining 10 minutes were used to check the physical activity report diary.

On the first session, the PT delivered a weight vest to each IG participant and verified the initial level for each cited three circuit training station.

At each group session, the participant needed to have his/her weight vest, his/her fall-physical activity report diary of the current month, and his/her manual of the home exercise program (see next point 4). During rest periods from exercises, the participant delivered his/her fall-physical activity report diary and, in case of at least one fall during the week, the completed 'fall report'. At the end of the session, the PT updated the manual of the home exercise program with the week level progression of the exercises (the passage changed every two weeks, but depending on individual need, it was possible to add other series of the same exercise in the intermediate weeks).

2.5.2 Group education sessions on fall risk factors

The IG participants received a 30-minute educational session after each weekly group exercise session, focussing on different modifiable fall risk factors or avoidable risky behavior. The educational session was divided into two parts:

i. a 10-minute frontal lesson on a specific theme held by a component of the interdisciplinary team;

ii. a 20-minute group discussion on the lesson content (involving participants, caregivers, and professionals). A handbook summarizing these topics was provided to each participant at the beginning of the first education session.

2.5.3 Personalized plan for reducing domestic fall risk factors

During the first week of treatment, a PT performed a home visit for each IG participant. During this visit, usually lasting 60 to 90 minutes, the PT:

- Filled the 'Home environmental risks questionnaire' and compared it with the same questionnaire compiled by the participant at the pre-test assessment;
- Gave specific recommendations with proposals for correcting the detected modifiable risk factors by delivering the 'Suggestions for the reduction of environmental risks at home' information sheet where the actual hazards were highlighted;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Verified the presence of the fall-physical activity report diary, delivered at the time of recruitment, in a position that facilitated the compilation in case of fall (e.g., hanging on the wall in the living room/ kitchen, etc.);
- During the subsequent three home visits, related to the personalized home exercise program, the PT checked the implementation of the recommended interventions proposed during the first home access and filled the 'Check-list of correction of environmental risk factors at home'.

2.5.4 Personalized home exercise program

This intervention was coordinated with the group exercise program aimed at improving strength, static and dynamic balance, with the specific aim of enabling the participants to develop a long-term daily habit of exercising and performing physical activity in the context of a progressive and permanent adoption of a healthy and active lifestyle.

- The PT devised this program in the context of an initial home visit (on the 2nd week) and subsequently monitored within two further home visits (on the 4th and 6th weeks).
- During the initial home visit, an illustrated manual containing strength and balance exercises was provided and explained to each participant based on the first group exercise session. These exercises were chosen between those the subject performed with greater safety in the group session.
- Besides, the PT gave indications about recommended training frequency and time and registration of the performed physical activity in his/her fall-physical activity report diary of the current month.
- During the subsequent two visits, the PT verified i) the setting adequacy, ii) the modality in which the participant performed the suggested exercises, and iii) the update of the fall-physical activity report diary.
- Finally, in all three home accesses linked to the home exercise program, the PT checked the implementation/maintenance of the recommendations on risk factors correction given in the first-week home visit.

2.5.5 Multifactorial personalized intervention

This intervention aimed at modifying additional risk factors, which were performed by the interdisciplinary team and included the following interventions:

- Review of medications, including psychotropic medications (N and G), antiparkinsonian drugs (N), and cardiovascular medications (G);
- Management of unaddressed visual impairments (G): ophthalmologist referral, lens prescription, suggestions regarding the limitation of bifocal lenses;
- Management of unaddressed cardiovascular issues (G), such as postural hypotension, covert cardiac failure, and abnormalities of cardiac rhythm, eventual cardiology referral;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Vitamin D prescription (G);
- Improvement of nutritional state (G), with prescription of caloric-proteic integration and/or nutritional referral;
- Management of muscle-skeletal issues, including spasticity (P and PT);
- Education about foot self-care, including podologist referral if appropriate (P);
- Assessment, prescription, and final testing of orthosis and mobility aids, including proper shoes (P and PT).

2.5.6 Interventions delivery

Interventions one to four were administered to all IG participants (multiple-component intervention), whereas the multifactorial intervention (intervention five) was personalized based on the individual fall risk profile devised on the pre-test assessment. Furthermore, interventions one, two, and five were conducted within an outpatient setting, while interventions three and four were home-based.

2.6 Comparator

Participants allocated to the CG received only the usual care, as described in the randomization section. The management of the fall risk of each individual enrolled in the CG was delegated to the participant's GP.

2.7 Outcome measures

Participants' demographic and clinical characteristics were collected during the baseline pre-test visit, including age, sex, fall risk according to epidemiological criteria, and Falls Risk for Older People in the Community (FROP-Com) criteria.

Further several indicators were used to assess functioning at pre-test (T1) and 3-month follow-up (T3), linkable to the International Classification of Functioning (ICF(24)) domains (body functions, activity and participation, environmental factors). In addition, even instruments administered at the OAE assessment were recollected at the 3-month follow-up (T3) (see Appendix 2 for details).

The primary endpoint was represented by the total number of falls in each group over 12 months. The secondary endpoints were other fall-related indicators (fall rate of subjects with one or more falls, fall rate associated with hospitalization, fall severity, fall probability, and time to the first fall) recorded at the 12-month follow-up.

Each participant was provided with their own fall diary and was followed up for 12 months with monthly telephone contacts to record the primary and secondary endpoints. During these monthly calls, each participant was inquired about any incurred falls at each contact, with date, circumstances, underlying cause, and related injuries. A fall was defined as an 'unexpected event where a person inadvertently comes to rest on the ground, floor, or lower level' (25,26). The primary endpoint was further verified at the end of the study by returning the fall diary.

The blindness of the assessments was guaranteed with various strategies:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- For both pre-test and post-test evaluations, as the former was performed before randomization, whereas the latter by the other center's assessors, unaware of the allocation arms of the participants' within the enrolling center;
- Furthermore, subjects in both groups were instructed not to discuss their allocation with other participants and assessors during the post-test assessments;
- Finally, at the monthly follow-up calls, as the assessor was unaware of the allocation arms.

2.8 Statistical Analyses

2.8.1 Sample size calculation

The study was dimensioned on the assumption that the fall risk in the control group was equal to 50% and that the experimental intervention was able to reduce this risk by 30%, that is, to obtain a fall risk in the treatment group equal to 35%. Fixing the alpha error at 0.05 (95% confidence levels) and the beta error at 0.20 (80% power), it was decided to enlist at least 366 subjects (183 per group).

It should be noted that the calculation of the sample size was carried out considering the expected fall risk in the enlisted population, while the fall rate represented the primary endpoint. Since the latter endpoint is always higher than the fall risk due to the presence of 'multiple fallers', the estimate of sample size was considered sufficient in consenting to accommodate up to 15%-20% of subjects eventually lost to follow-up.

2.8.2 Descriptive statistics for all participants

Descriptive statistics were calculated at the time of enrolment in the study. Summary statistics were means and standard deviations for quantitative variables, median and interpercentile ranges for categorical variables, and absolute frequencies and percentages for nominal variables.

2.8.3 Primary and secondary endpoint calculations

The number of falls recorded monthly by telephone interview was the basic element for the primary endpoint calculation. In particular, the monthly fall number was added for all 12 months of follow-up to obtain the number of falls observed during the entire period of inclusion in the study of each participant.

To calculate the time to the first fall (secondary endpoint), both the start and end date of the follow-up were needed. To calculate the first one, the date of randomization for each subject was considered as the start date for the follow-up. The end date of the follow-up was calculated differently for participants with at least one fall and those without falls. For the former, we considered the least recent date among the dates of telephone interviews in which at least one fall was reported. For the latter, the most recent date among telephone interviews was considered. Thus, the follow-up time in months was equal to the difference in days between the start and end follow-up dates, divided by 30.4 (mean duration of a month).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2.8.4 Analysis of the differences between groups (IG and CG)

Concerning the study's primary endpoint, the comparison of observed fall incidences in the two groups was evaluated using statistical regression methodologies for counting data, particularly by a model that assumes a negative binomial distribution for the response variable (number of falls occurred). The results were expressed as the Incidence Rate Ratio (IRR) with a 95% confidence interval (95CI%) and a p-value, comparing the experimental and control groups.

Concerning the secondary endpoint 'fall probability', the results were expressed as Relative Risk (RR) with a 95%CI and a p-value, referring to the comparison between IG and CG.

Analyses of the secondary endpoint 'time to the first fall' were performed using a Cox regression model. The results were expressed as Hazard Ratio (HR) with a 95%CI and a p-value, comparing the two groups. In addition, the cumulative probabilities of occurrence of at least one fall were graphically represented as Kaplan-Meier survival curves, reporting the survival point estimate from falls at 3, 6, and 12 months, with relative confidence intervals.

2.8.5 Analysis of the differences between sub-groups (four etiological risk class categories)

All assessments of the observed differences between randomization arms (IG and CG) were repeated separately in the four subgroups identified by the four etiological risk class categories considered in the study: age between 65 and 80, age over 80, elderly with Parkinson's Disease, elderly with a previous stroke.

2.8.6 Analysis of the differences between groups (IG and CG) for T3 endpoints (post-test)

2.8.6.1 Rasch analysis

Preliminary to comparing the two groups on post-test with ANCOVA, we performed a Rasch analysis of the scale and questionnaires involved in the comparison. Rasch analysis was conducted because ANCOVA is a parametric statistical analysis requiring continuous variables, whereas the total scores of scales and questionnaires deliver ordinal data. Indeed, within Rasch analysis, it may be possible to transform the ordinal total score of a scale or a questionnaire into interval-level person estimates of ability, should the data fit the requirement of the Rasch model (i.e., the mathematical model upon which Rasch analysis relies) (27). In particular, the Rasch analysis focused on the following indicators:

- FROP-Com (28);
- Berg Balance Scale (BBS (29,30));
- Performance-Oriented Mobility Assessment (POMA (30,31));
- Fullerton Advanced Balance Scale (FABS (30,32));
- Mini-BESTest (33).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The FROP-Com is a global fall risk indicator, while the other four indicators all quantify balance, although with differences related to the measurement range. Therefore, two Rasch analyses were carried out separately: the first for the FROP-Com and the second for the four balance indicators. Given their conceptual equivalence (30), items of single balance scales were treated as testlets in the latter analysis. Testlets (or super-items) are sum scores from a set of associated items. Thus, the Rasch analysis was conducted on four testlets, one for each balance scale (34). This approach has the advantage of absorbing the local dependence existing within items of the balance scales (30,34–36).

2.8.6.2 Pre-test vs. post-test differences between groups (IG and CG)

The values of the above five indicators, calculated before and after the intervention, were compared between the two groups using parametric statistical techniques. In particular, we reported the mean values of these parameters at the pre-test and post-test levels. The post-intervention values were compared between the groups through a linear regression model that uses the treatment and the pre-intervention value as independent variables (ANCOVA model). This analysis was reported as mean differences (MD) with 95% and p-value confidence interval.

2.8.7 Cases lost to follow-up

Whenever possible, the reasons for any cases lost to follow-up were recorded. Concerning logistic regression, an analysis that considered all randomized subjects without considering any follow-up loss was initially conducted, according to the principle of the intention to treat. In case of loss to follow-up due to death or other causes, information collected up to that time was considered. Should a subject be lost to follow-up, independently from experiencing a fall or not (primary outcome), his/her data were considered for the analysis. Thus, it was possible to conduct sensitivity analyses that hypothesized various scenarios of the outcomes considered for loss to follow-up.

Regarding the analysis of survival curves, any loss to follow-up data was treated as censored since the last available information for these subjects. However, it was possible to conduct further sensitivity analyses even in this context.

2.8.8 Statistical software

Statistical analyses were performed using the Stata 14 software (StataCorp LP, College Station) and R 3.4.3 (the R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Wien) by the Medical Statistics Unit of the University of Modena e Reggio Emilia, using a 95% confidence level (p 0.05). In addition, Rasch analyses were carried out using the software RUMM 2030 (version 5.4 for Windows. RUMM Laboratory Pty Ltd, Perth, Australia: 1997-2017; www.rummlab.com).

3 Results

3.1 Descriptive statistics for all participants (n=403)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Seven hundred ninety-one participants were assessed for eligibility, and four hundred and three were included in the study and randomized to either the CG (n=200) or the IG (n=203) (table II and figure 2). Seventy-one subjects (forty-eight in the CG and twenty-three in the IG group) were lost to follow-up (figure 2). The two centers enrolled almost an equal number of patients (49.1% and 50.9% at Modena and Reggio Emilia, respectively).

[Figure 2]

[Table II]

The mean age of enrolled participants was 76.2 years (SD: 6.3), and about two-thirds of them (65.5%) were females. About two-thirds of the enrolled patients (65.2%) were elderly with an estimated fall risk at one year comprised between 33% and 50%, as 43.7% and 21.6% were classified within the 65 to 80 and >80 risk classes, respectively. The remaining 34.7% were elderly patients with an associated neurological condition. Their estimated fall risk at one year was between 60% and 70%, as 19.4% and 15.4% of them had a diagnosis of Parkinson's Disease or stroke, respectively. Considering the estimated fall risk of the enrollment patients, only 7.9% could be considered at 'low risk' according to the FROP-Com, whereas the enrollment algorithm classified the remaining 92.1% of patients correctly as being at moderate (36.2%) or high fall risk (55.8%) according to the FROP-Com. There were no statistically significant differences between the subjects' baseline characteristics of the two groups.

Amongst the participants, the majority of them (58.6%) experienced at least one or more falls. In particular, 21.8% and 14.6% experienced one or two falls, respectively, whereas the percentage of multiple fallers (>2 falls) was 22.1% (table III). The rate of fallers defined as those with at least two falls was about one-third (36.7%). Regarding the primary endpoint, six hundred ninety falls were reported at 12-month follow-up (table III), with a mean number of falls per participant equal to 1.71 (SD 3.36).

[Table III]

The majority of falls (67.4%) led to no injury, whereas the remaining 32.6% was associated with various degrees of injury. In particular, 6.4% of them led to serious injury requiring hospitalization, whereas 10.9% and 15.4% of falls were associated with minor injury requiring or not a medical consultation, respectively.

The median time of occurrence of the first fall was 11.1 months. A probability of absence of falls of 77.6% (CI95% [73.7, 81.8%]), 65.0% (CI95% [60.5, 69.8%]) and 47.3% (CI95% [42.6, 52.4%]) were recorded, respectively, at three, six and twelve months.

3.2 Differences between groups (CG and IG)

In the CG and the IG, most participants (58.5% and 58.6%, respectively) fell at least one or more times. In particular, 20.0% and 23.6% experienced one fall, 13.0% and 16.3% two falls, whereas the percentage of multiple fallers (>2 falls) was 25.5% and 18.7%, respectively (table III). The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

percentage of fallers defined as those with at least two falls were 38.5% and 35%, in the CG and the IG, respectively. Regarding the primary endpoint, 353 falls were reported at 12-month follow-up in CG, compared to 337 in the IG (table III), with a mean number of falls per participant equal to 1.77 (SD 3.21) and 1.66 (SD 3.51) falls, respectively. Fall distribution by groups is reported in figure 3.

[Figure 3]

[Table III]

For both groups, most falls (67.4%) led to no injury, whereas the remaining one-third was associated with various degrees of injury. In particular, 6.8% of them in the CG and 5.9% in the IG led to serious injury requiring hospitalization, whereas 9.6% and 12.2% of falls were associated with minor injury requiring medical consultation, respectively. Finally, 16.2% in the CG and 14.5% in the IG of falls led to minor injury not requiring medical consultation (table III).

A probability of absence of falls of 76.5% (CI95% [70.8, 82.6%]) and 78.8% (CI95% [73.4, 84.6%]) in the first three months were recorded, respectively for CG and IG. No statistically significant differences were observed between groups regarding the number of falls (Incidence Rate Ratio - IRR=0.94, CI95% [0.69-1.29], p=0.693), and the fall probability (Risk Ratio - RR=0.94, CI95% [0.79- 1.12], p=0.503) (table IV).

The median time to the first fall was 11.1 months (CI95% 7.6-12.3) in the CG and 11.2 months (CI95% 9.7-NA) in the CG. No statistically significant differences were observed between groups regarding the time to the first fall (Hazard Ratio - HR=0.89, CI95% [0.69-1.16], p=0.398) (Table IV).

[Table IV]

3.3 Differences between sub-groups (four etiological risk class categories in the CG and IG)

Regarding the number of falls (table V), the comparison between CG and IG showed a trend towards a lower (although not significant) risk of falling for elderly aged 65-80 (IRR=0.79; CI95% [0.50, 1.25]), elderly aged >80 (IRR=0.85; CI95% [0.51, 1.40]), and elderly with associated Parkinson's Disease (IRR=0.94; CI95% [0.52, 1.72]) in the IG. The risk appeared lower (although not significant) for elderly with stroke sequelae (IRR=2.39; CI95% [0.88, 6.49]) in the CG.

[Table V]

Concerning the fall probability, elderly aged 65-80 and elderly with Parkinson in the IG had a lower (although not significant) probability of falling than those randomized in the CG (RR=0.86, CI95% [0.65, 1.13] and, respectively, RR=0.93; CI95% [0.70, 1.23]). On the other hand, elderly aged >80 and elderly with stroke in the IG had a higher (although not significant) probability of falling if randomized in the IG (RR=1.03, CI95% [0.74, 1.47] and, respectively, RR=1.22, CI95% [0.63, 2.35]).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Considering the endpoint 'time to the first fall', elderly aged 65-80, elderly aged >80 and elderly with Parkinson had a lower (although not significant) hazard ratio if randomized in the IG in comparison to the CG (HR= 0.83, CI95% [0.56, 1.25]); HR=0.92, CI95% [0.54, 1.59]; HR=0.83, CI95% [0.49, 1.41], respectively), Instead, the hazard ratio was higher (HR=1.32; CI95% [0.58, 3.01]) for elderly with stroke sequelae randomized in the IG.

3.4 Rasch analysis

The final solutions for both the FROP-Com and the Balance scales showed adequate fitness to the Rasch Model (Table VI). Hence, it was possible to devise conversion tables from ordinal scores to interval-level measurements (unit of measurement: logit), which were then used for the subsequent analysis.

[Table VI]

3.5 Pre-test vs. post-test differences between groups (CG and IG)

The ANCOVA analysis (table VII) showed no significant difference between the CG and the IG for the post-test FROP-Com (MD=-0.03 logits; 95%CI [-0.13, 0.07]), BBS (+0.15 logits; CI95% [-0.13, 0.07]), and POMA measures (+0.12 logits (CI95% [-0.14, 0.37]) after controlling for the pre-test values.

[Table VII]

However, there were statistically significant differences for the post-test FABS (MD=+0.21 logits; CI95% [0.06, 0.36]; p=.006) and MBT measures (MD=+0.42 logits; CI95% [0.03, 0.81]; p=0.035) between the two groups after controlling for the pre-test measures.

4 Discussion

In the PRE.C.I.S.A RCT study, we evaluated the efficacy of the simultaneous administration of a multiple-component and a multifactorial personalized intervention in reducing fall rates in community-dwelling older adults at moderate-to-high fall risk compared to usual care. Another innovative aspect of the study was the inclusion in the sample of elderly with an even higher fall risk because of a concomitant diagnosis of Parkinson's Disease or stroke sequelae. The results showed no statistically significant differences between groups regarding the number of falls, the fall probability, and the time to the first fall at 12-month follow-up. According to the subgroup analysis, no significant differences were reported between groups. However, a lower number of falls, lower fall rates in multiple fallers, a lower mean number of falls per participant, and a lower rate of fall-related severe injuries were recorded for the intervention group, although the differences were not significant. Finally, a significant improvement for two balance-related indicators at post-test was recorded in the intervention after controlling for the pre-test measures.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Several previous studies investigated the effects of different interventions on fall prevention in community-dwelling older adults. However, their effectiveness in reducing falls and their highly disabling consequences is still controversial (37–39). Moreover, no evidence was available on multiple-component and multifactorial interventions simultaneously undertaken to manage fall risk (12). Furthermore, RCTs aiming at reducing falls in the elderly usually exclude those with an even higher risk of falling because of an associated neurological condition, such as Parkinson's Disease (PD) and stroke. Thus, this trial was built upon two innovative hypotheses. First of all, we hypothesized that combining a multiple-component intervention with a personalized multifactorial intervention could reduce fall rates in community-dwelling older adults. Secondly, considering that most of the risk factors for falling are independent from the diseases associated with falls, we hypothesized that most of those risk factors could be targeted by the same interventions independently from the participant's risk class. Considering that the devised multicomponent intervention included also elements of physical exercise which were disease-specific, we were able to enroll elderly who are at a high risk of falling, such as those affected by PD and stroke (40–48,48)

According to our results, the total number of recorded falls was substantial (690), with a fall incidence of 58.6%, and a mean of 1.71 (SD: 3.36) falls accounted for each included subject. These data are in contrast with those reported in the literature, where the overall fall incidence in elderly over 65 years was around 28 to 35% and about 32 to 42% in those over 75 years (49), with 0.2-1.6 fall for each included subject (2). Furthermore, the prevalence of 'multiple fallers' observed in our trial (22.1%) was higher than that reported by previous studies (15%) in older adults (45). Indeed, several subjects reported more than ten falls in our sample while participating in the trial, with a subject reporting up to thirty-three falls (2.8 falls per month). The observed discrepancies between our results and literature data may be explained considering the inclusion of participants affected by neurological conditions who are well known to be multiple fallers and present, according to previous studies, a fall risk around 50% in Parkinson's Disease (50) and 43 to 70% in stroke (51). Indeed, the reported incidence of multiple fallers within persons with neurological conditions in literature is around 15% in stroke subjects (51) and over 50% incidence in PD, where up to 13% of patients fall more than once a week (45). The prevalence of severe injuries in our sample (6.8% in the CG and 5.9% in the IG; 6.4% for the whole sample) was instead similar to the value (10%) reported for the elderly population (49).

The statistical analyses revealed no significant differences in fall rate and related parameters between IG and CG, i.e., fall severity, probability of absence of falls, and time to the first fall. These results align with Lamb's and Cattaneo's works (13,37). However, a systematic (although not significant) trend of better outcomes was reported for the IG in comparison to the CG. In particular, we recorded a lower number of falls, lower fall rates in multiple fallers, a lower mean number of falls per participant, and a lower rate of fall-related severe injuries in the IG.

The subgroup analysis yielded similar results, considering the absence of significant differences between the CG and IG regarding the number of falls, the fall probability, or the time to the first fall

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(all p>0.05) across all the four considered subgroups (older adults 65 to 79 years; older adults ≥80 years; older adults with PD; older adults with stroke). As per the general group, there was a general, although not significant, trend of better outcomes for the IG group. The stroke subgroup made an exception, as the risk of falling was apparently higher (although not significant) for patients enrolled in the IG. The fall risk for persons with stroke is notoriously high, being reported to be around 43 to 70% in the previous trials (51). Although intravenous thrombolysis (52) and endovascular treatments for large vessel occlusions have significantly improved the long term prognosis of ischemic stroke both in terms of survival and functional outcome (53), it is not clear what is their impact on balance and other fall risk factors. Our results could also be explained in light of the literature data which report an increase of the exposure to circumstances leading to falls (and, thus, an increase in the number of falls) brought about by an increase in physical activity (54).

The analysis of the differences between baseline (T1) and 3-month follow-up (T3) across CG and IG was preceded by a Rasch Analysis. The latter was performed because scales' total scores are ordinal in nature and, as such, should not be used with parametric statistical techniques as ANCOVA (55,56), as it may lead to erroneous results (57). The Rasch analysis allowed to elaborate conversion tables of the scales' total scores into invariant interval-level estimates of ability (whose unit of measurement is the logit) that satisfy the mathematical requirements of a general measurement theory called Additive Conjoint Measurement (58,59). In other words, interval-level estimates produced by Rasch analysis are comparable in measurement properties to those delivered by instruments measuring physical variables such as a thermometer. Thus, those interval-level estimates were employed in an analysis of covariance where the post-test measurements of a comprehensive fall risk indicator (FROP-Com) and four balance scales were compared between the CG and IG after adjusting for the baseline values. In this way, we were able to compare the differences between groups ascribable to the administered intervention, without introducing any bias due to the use of ordinal metrics with a parametric statistical method such as ANCOVA which requires continuous measures.

In a previous study evaluating the effects of a home-based exercise program in reducing falls in the elderly population, Vogler et al. observed an improvement in reducing fall risk and balance indicators at the end of the 12 weeks treatment and a subsequent return to baseline values after 24 weeks (60). Indeed, the ANCOVA showed a significant effect on balance within the intervention group only for two of the four balance indicators (FABS and Mini-BESTest). This result could be explained considering that the latter indicators are more challenging, in terms of balance ability required, than BBS and POMA (30,61). In other words, no effect was likely shown with BBS and POMA because the ability range of the sample was higher than the difficulty level of the two scales. Considering that the effect size of the balance change was small, we must conclude that the ratio between treatment benefits and cost of administering physical exercise for the overall study duration (12 months), as suggested by some authors (60), may be unfavorable.

Indeed, the main hypothesis behind this study was that all the proposed interventions could contribute equally to avoiding the detraining effect by facilitating the adoption of a habit of regularly performing exercise and physical activity. However, the study results seem to contradict this hypothesis. First, it appears that there was no significant reduction of the overall burden of fall risk

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

factors on post-test, as shown by the results of ANCOVA performed on FROP-Com. Second, participants in the IG provided informal positive feedback on some but not all the interventions. Indeed, the activities involving social participation, such as group exercise, educational sessions, and physiotherapy home visits, were particularly appreciated. This could be explained considering that these activities also offered socializing opportunities, thus contrasting the social isolation, which, per se, might be a fall risk factor (62) and may have a highly significant negative impact on the health and wellbeing of older people (63). At the same time, this could be an indirect indication of a lower appreciation of the home physical exercise program. Finally, if the home exercise program was not integrated early into the participants' daily routine, this could have led, in turn, to a lower engagement at home. The latter may have facilitated a detraining effect after the eleven treatment weeks, thus losing any eventual long-term beneficial effect of the combined treatment strategy.

4.1 Study limitations

The present study results should be considered in light of some limitations. First, we considered a 'faller' a subject falling once, and a 'multiple faller' a subject falling twice or more. However, in a recent study (49), a 'faller' is defined as a subject falling twice and a 'multiple faller' three times or more. The analysis in our trial was conducted based on the first definition.

Second, although the physical activity report diaries suggested a lower adherence to physical exercise in the home setting for the Intervention Group, it cannot be excluded that the information provided by participants was not reliable enough. For this reason, the use of wearable sensors (64), i.e., portable inertial measurement units to continuously record the subject's activity and adherence to home physical exercise, together with remote telemedicine support, could be strategic to achieve participants' compliance to treatment and better monitor executed exercises. Further studies should be conducted to explore fall risk management properly in a similar scenario.

Third, the home fall diaries reporting were not reliable enough. Participants were expected to report on the diary each occurred fall accurately, but this might have happened only partially. As previously experienced in other trials, many participants reported falls inconsistently. This difficulty of older subjects in recalling is well documented in the literature, turning out to be underestimating single falls and overestimating multiple falls (9,65). To prevent this bias, completing a daily diary was tested (66); however, people reporting a high number of falls turned out not to return the diary at the end of the trial (67). Different options were proposed in the literature to deal with this issue: monthly diary return through postal service (66), monthly follow-up calls to punctually record falls (68), incentives for monthly diary return (69), and personalization of the latter (69). In this study, a monthly follow-up call was performed investigating falls recorded in the previous month, but these data did not match those observed at 12-month follow-up when diaries were returned. Moreover, several participants did not return the diary or filled it only partially. Thus, data recorded during monthly phone calls were used to estimate the fall rate for statistical analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Finally, we observed limited participation with a higher drop-out rate and low adherence to trial post-test assessment in the Control Group. Therefore, a placebo treatment should be considered to be offered to controls to avoid this event in further investigations.

4.2 Conclusions

This trial was an attempt to provide a new concept of intervention aimed at reducing falls in a mixed population of elderly people. The intervention showed the potentiality of improving balance at postest, leading to a positive trend towards lower number of falls, lower fall rates in multiple fallers, a lower mean number of falls per participant, and a lower rate of fall-related severe injuries for the intervention group. However, as these differences were not significant, the proposed intervention has to be considered ineffective in reducing the number of falls, the fall probability, and the time to the first fall at 12-month follow-up in community-dwelling older adults at moderate-to-high fall risk.

Unfortunately, other recent RCTs have reached similar conclusions (13,37,70). The temptation would be high to sustain that, as there are no effective interventions, no further efforts should be made to prevent falls and fall-related injuries, as well as to improve safe physical mobility in our aging societies. Indeed, as proposed by a recent commentary (71), there is a need for new better concepts to increase the efficacy of interventions aimed at reducing falls and their consequences. In this respect, the widespread use of ICT solutions could represent an opportunity to be explored. For instance, regarding this trial, the results might have been different if an ICT-based solution could be adopted both to monitor the participants' activity levels as well as to record automatically any eventual falls occurred. In this way we would have overcome the limitations imposed by the unreliability of the fall diaries.

We believe that future studies exploring different effects of combined multiple-component and personalized multifactorial interventions to reduce falls and subsequent consequences should be planned with a clear plan for overcoming the limitations highlighted in the PRE.C.I.S.A. study.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to all professionals who collected data during the PRE.C.I.S.A. study.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally to the manuscript and read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

This study was financed by the Agenzia Socio-Sanitaria Regionale della Regione Emilia-Romagna (Italy) in the context of the Programma di Ricerca Regione-Università 2013 (PRUA2-2013-00002056)

Conflicts of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

1. Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Gillespie WJ, Sherrington C, Gates S, Clemson LM, Lamb SE. Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the community. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2012)CD007146. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007146.pub3

2. Rubenstein LZ, Josephson KR. The epidemiology of falls and syncope. *Clin Geriatr Med* (2002) **18**:141–158. doi: 10.1016/s0749-0690(02)00002-2

3. Tinetti ME, Kumar C. The patient who falls: "It's always a trade-off." *JAMA* (2010) **303**:258–266. doi: 10.1001/jama.2009.2024

4. Piscitelli P, Iolascon G, Argentiero A, Chitano G, Neglia C, Marcucci G, Pulimeno M, Benvenuto M, Mundi S, Marzo V, et al. Incidence and costs of hip fractures vs strokes and acute myocardial infarction in Italy: comparative analysis based on national hospitalization records. *Clin Interv Aging* (2012) **7**:575–583. doi: 10.2147/CIA.S36828

5. Golinelli D, Boetto E, Mazzotti A, Rosa S, Rucci P, Berti E, Ugolini C, Fantini MP. Cost Determinants of Continuum-Care Episodes for Hip Fracture. *Health Serv Insights* (2021) **14**:1178632921991122. doi: 10.1177/1178632921991122

6. Deandrea S, Lucenteforte E, Bravi F, Foschi R, La Vecchia C, Negri E. Risk factors for falls in community-dwelling older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiol Camb Mass* (2010) **21**:658–668. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181e89905

7. Moreland J, Richardson J, Chan DH, O'Neill J, Bellissimo A, Grum RM, Shanks L. Evidence-based guidelines for the secondary prevention of falls in older adults. *Gerontology* (2003) **49**:93–116. doi: 10.1159/000067948

8. Panel on Prevention of Falls in Older Persons, American Geriatrics Society and British Geriatrics Society. Summary of the Updated American Geriatrics Society/British Geriatrics Society clinical practice guideline for prevention of falls in older persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2011) **59**:148–157. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2010.03234.x

9. Rubenstein LZ, Powers CM, MacLean CH. Quality indicators for the management and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

prevention of falls and mobility problems in vulnerable elders. *Ann Intern Med* (2001) **135**:686–693. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-135-8_part_2-200110161-00007

10. Nevitt MC, Cummings SR, Hudes ES. Risk factors for injurious falls: a prospective study. *J Gerontol* (1991) **46**:M164-170. doi: 10.1093/geronj/46.5.m164

11. Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Gillespie WJ, Lamb SE, Gates S, Cumming RG, Rowe BH. Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the community. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2009)CD007146. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007146.pub2

12. de Negreiros Cabral K, Perracini MR, Soares AT, de Cristo Stein F, Sera CTN, Tiedemann A, Sherrington C, Filho WJ, Paschoal SMP. Effectiveness of a multifactorial falls prevention program in community-dwelling older people when compared to usual care: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial (Prevquedas Brazil). *BMC Geriatr* (2013) **13**:27. doi: 10.1186/1471-2318-13-27

13. Lamb SE, Bruce J, Hossain A, Ji C, Longo R, Lall R, Bojke C, Hulme C, Withers E, Finnegan S, et al. Screening and Intervention to Prevent Falls and Fractures in Older People. *N Engl J Med* (2020) **383**:1848–1859. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001500

14. Ellis TD, Cavanaugh JT, Earhart GM, Ford MP, Foreman KB, Thackeray A, Thiese MS, Dibble LE. Identifying clinical measures that most accurately reflect the progression of disability in Parkinson disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* (2016) **25**:65–71. doi: 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2016.02.006

15. Viscogliosi C, Belleville S, Desrosiers J, Caron CD, Ska B, BRAD Group. Participation after a stroke: changes over time as a function of cognitive deficits. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* (2011) **52**:336–343. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2010.04.020

16. Goodwin VA, Richards SH, Henley W, Ewings P, Taylor AH, Campbell JL. An exercise intervention to prevent falls in people with Parkinson's disease: a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* (2011) **82**:1232–1238. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2011-300919

17. Allen NE, Sherrington C, Paul SS, Canning CG. Balance and falls in Parkinson's disease: a meta-analysis of the effect of exercise and motor training. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* (2011) **26**:1605–1615. doi: 10.1002/mds.23790

18. Tomlinson CL, Patel S, Meek C, Herd CP, Clarke CE, Stowe R, Shah L, Sackley CM, Deane KHO, Wheatley K, et al. Physiotherapy versus placebo or no intervention in Parkinson's disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2013)CD002817. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002817.pub4

19. World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA* (2013) **310**:2191–2194. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.281053

20. Nandy S, Parsons S, Cryer C, Underwood M, Rashbrook E, Carter Y, Eldridge S, Close J, Skelton D, Taylor S, et al. Development and preliminary examination of the predictive validity of the Falls Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT) for use in primary care. *J Public Health Oxf Engl* (2004) **26**:138–143. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdh132

21. Russell MA, Hill KD, Day LM, Blackberry I, Gurrin LC, Dharmage SC. Development of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Falls Risk for Older People in the Community (FROP-Com) screening tool. *Age Ageing* (2009) **38**:40–46. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afn196

22. Stapleton C, Hough P, Oldmeadow L, Bull K, Hill K, Greenwood K. Four-item fall risk screening tool for subacute and residential aged care: The first step in fall prevention. *Australas J Ageing* (2009) **28**:139–143. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-6612.2009.00375.x

23. Reece AC, Simpson JM. Preparing Older People to Cope after a Fall. *Physiotherapy* (1996) **82**:227–235. doi: 10.1016/S0031-9406(05)66877-0

24. Organization WH. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health*. World Health Organization (2001). 352 p.

25. Lamb SE, Jørstad-Stein EC, Hauer K, Becker C, Prevention of Falls Network Europe and Outcomes Consensus Group. Development of a common outcome data set for fall injury prevention trials: the Prevention of Falls Network Europe consensus. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2005) **53**:1618–1622. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53455.x

26. World Health Organization. WHO Global Report on Falls Prevention in Older Age. (2007)

27. Christensen K, Kreiner S, Mesbah M. *Rasch Models in Health*. Hoboken NJ: ISTE Ltd and John Wiley&Sons. London UK (2013).

28. Russell MA, Hill KD, Blackberry I, Day LM, Dharmage SC. The reliability and predictive accuracy of the falls risk for older people in the community assessment (FROP-Com) tool. *Age Ageing* (2008) **37**:634–639. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afn129

29. Berg KO, Wood-Dauphinee SL, Williams JI, Maki B. Measuring balance in the elderly: validation of an instrument. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique* (1992) **83 Suppl 2**:S7-11.

30. La Porta F, Franceschini M, Caselli S, Cavallini P, Susassi S, Tennant A. Unified Balance Scale: an activity-based, bed to community, and aetiology-independent measure of balance calibrated with Rasch analysis. *J Rehabil Med* (2011) **43**:435–444. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0797

31. Tinetti ME. Performance-oriented assessment of mobility problems in elderly patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (1986) **34**:119–126. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.1986.tb05480.x

32. Rose DJ, Lucchese N, Wiersma LD. Development of a multidimensional balance scale for use with functionally independent older adults. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2006) **87**:1478–1485. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2006.07.263

33. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric techniques to improve the Balance Evaluation Systems Test: the mini-BESTest. *J Rehabil Med* (2010) **42**:323–331. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0537

34. Prodinger B, O'Connor RJ, Stucki G, Tennant A. Establishing score equivalence of the Functional Independence Measure motor scale and the Barthel Index, utilising the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health and Rasch measurement theory. *J Rehabil Med* (2017) **49**:416–422. doi: 10.2340/16501977-2225

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

35. La Porta F, Caselli S, Susassi S, Cavallini P, Tennant A, Franceschini M. Is the Berg Balance Scale an Internally Valid and Reliable Measure of Balance Across Different Etiologies in Neurorehabilitation? A Revisited Rasch Analysis Study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2012) **93**:1209–1216. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2012.02.020

36. La Porta F, Giordano A, Caselli S, Foti C, Franchignoni F. Is the Berg Balance Scale an effective tool for the measurement of early postural control impairments in patients with Parkinson's disease? Evidence from Rasch analysis. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* (2015) **51**:705–716.

37. Cattaneo D, Gervasoni E, Pupillo E, Bianchi E, Aprile I, Imbimbo I, Russo R, Cruciani A, Turolla A, Jonsdottir J, et al. Educational and Exercise Intervention to Prevent Falls and Improve Participation in Subjects With Neurological Conditions: The NEUROFALL Randomized Controlled Trial. *Front Neurol* (2019) **10**:865. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2019.00865

38. Oakley A, Dawson MF, Holland J, Arnold S, Cryer C, Doyle Y, Rice J, Hodgson CR, Sowden A, Sheldon T, et al. Preventing falls and subsequent injury in older people. *Qual Health Care QHC* (1996) **5**:243–249. doi: 10.1136/qshc.5.4.243

39. Lamb SE, Jørstad-Stein EC, Hauer K, Becker C, Prevention of Falls Network Europe and Outcomes Consensus Group. Development of a common outcome data set for fall injury prevention trials: the Prevention of Falls Network Europe consensus. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2005) **53**:1618–1622. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53455.x

40. Snijders AH, Nonnekes J, Bloem BR. Recent advances in the assessment and treatment of falls in Parkinson's disease. *F1000 Med Rep* (2010) **2**:76. doi: 10.3410/M2-76

41. Beghi E, Gervasoni E, Pupillo E, Bianchi E, Montesano A, Aprile I, Agostini M, Rovaris M, Cattaneo D, NEUROFALL Group. Prediction of Falls in Subjects Suffering From Parkinson Disease, Multiple Sclerosis, and Stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2018) **99**:641–651. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.10.009

42. Xu T, Clemson L, O'Loughlin K, Lannin NA, Dean C, Koh G. Risk Factors for Falls in Community Stroke Survivors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2018) **99**:563-573.e5. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.06.032

43. Fereshtehnejad S-M. Strategies to maintain quality of life among people with Parkinson's disease: what works? *Neurodegener Dis Manag* (2016) **6**:399–415. doi: 10.2217/nmt-2016-0020

44. Walsh ME, Horgan NF, Walsh CD, Galvin R. Systematic review of risk prediction models for falls after stroke. *J Epidemiol Community Health* (2016) **70**:513–519. doi: 10.1136/jech-2015-206475

45. Allen NE, Schwarzel AK, Canning CG. Recurrent falls in Parkinson's disease: a systematic review. *Park Dis* (2013) **2013**:906274. doi: 10.1155/2013/906274

46. Batchelor FA, Mackintosh SF, Said CM, Hill KD. Falls after stroke. *Int J Stroke Off J Int Stroke Soc* (2012) **7**:482–490. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-4949.2012.00796.x

47. Fasano A, Canning CG, Hausdorff JM, Lord S, Rochester L. Falls in Parkinson's disease: A complex and evolving picture. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* (2017) **32**:1524–1536. doi: 10.1002/mds.27195

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

48. Denissen S, Staring W, Kunkel D, Pickering RM, Lennon S, Geurts AC, Weerdesteyn V, Verheyden GS. Interventions for preventing falls in people after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2019) **10**:CD008728. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008728.pub3

49. Masud T, Morris RO. Epidemiology of falls. *Age Ageing* (2001) **30 Suppl 4**:3–7. doi: 10.1093/ageing/30.suppl_4.3

50. Morris ME, Menz HB, McGinley JL, Huxham FE, Murphy AT, Iansek R, Danoudis M, Soh S-E, Kelly D, Watts JJ. Falls and mobility in Parkinson's disease: protocol for a randomised controlled clinical trial. *BMC Neurol* (2011) **11**:93. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-11-93

51. Weerdesteyn V, de Niet M, van Duijnhoven HJR, Geurts ACH. Falls in individuals with stroke. *J Rehabil Res Dev* (2008) **45**:1195–1213.

52. Muruet W, Rudd A, Wolfe CDA, Douiri A. Long-Term Survival After Intravenous Thrombolysis for Ischemic Stroke: A Propensity Score-Matched Cohort With up to 10-Year Follow-Up. *Stroke* (2018) **49**:607–613. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.019889

53. Yang W, Zhang L, Yao Q, Chen W, Yang W, Zhang S, He L, Li H, Zhang Y. Endovascular treatment or general treatment: how should acute ischemic stroke patients choose to benefit from them the most?: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* (2020) **99**:e20187. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000020187

54. Klenk J, Kerse N, Rapp K, Nikolaus T, Becker C, Rothenbacher D, Peter R, Denkinger MD, ActiFE Study Group. Physical Activity and Different Concepts of Fall Risk Estimation in Older People--Results of the ActiFE-Ulm Study. *PloS One* (2015) **10**:e0129098. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0129098

55. Küçükdeveci A, Tennant A, Grimby G, Franchignoni F. Strategies for assessment and outcome measurement in Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine: An educational review. *J Rehabil Med* (2011) **43**:661–672. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0844

56. Grimby G, Tennant A, Tesio L. The use of raw scores from ordinal scales: Time to end malpractice? *J Rehabil Med* (2012) **44**:97–98. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0938

57. Kahler E, Rogausch A, Brunner E, Himmel W. A parametric analysis of ordinal quality-of-life data can lead to erroneous results. *J Clin Epidemiol* (2008) **61**:475–480. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.05.019

58. Perline R, Wright BD, Wainer H. The Rasch Model as Additive Conjoint Measurement. *Appl Psychol Meas* (1979) **3**:237–255. doi: 10.1177/014662167900300213

59. Pellicciari L, Piscitelli D, Basagni B, De Tanti A, Algeri L, Caselli S, Ciurli MP, Conforti J, Estraneo A, Moretta P, et al. 'Less is more': validation with Rasch analysis of five short-forms for the Brain Injury Rehabilitation Trust Personality Questionnaires (BIRT-PQs). *Brain Inj* (2020) **34**:1741–1755. doi: 10.1080/02699052.2020.1836402

60. Vogler CM, Menant JC, Sherrington C, Ogle SJ, Lord SR. Evidence of detraining after 12-week home-based exercise programs designed to reduce fall-risk factors in older people recently

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

discharged from hospital. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2012) **93**:1685–1691. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2012.03.033

61. Godi M, Franchignoni F, Caligari M, Giordano A, Turcato AM, Nardone A. Comparison of reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the mini-BESTest and Berg Balance Scale in patients with balance disorders. *Phys Ther* (2013) **93**:158–167. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20120171

62. Burr J, Quach L. SOCIAL ISOLATION AND FALLS RISK AMONG COMMUNITY DWELLING OLDER ADULTS: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF DEPRESSION. *Innov Aging* (2019) **3**:S293–S293. doi: 10.1093/geroni/igz038.1078

63. Nicholson NR. A Review of Social Isolation: An Important but Underassessed Condition in Older Adults. *J Prim Prev* (2012) **33**:137–152. doi: 10.1007/s10935-012-0271-2

64. Casamassima F, Ferrari A, Milosevic B, Ginis P, Farella E, Rocchi L. A wearable system for gait training in subjects with Parkinson's disease. *Sensors* (2014) **14**:6229–6246. doi: 10.3390/s140406229

65. Optimizing the tracking of falls in studies of older participants: comparison of quarterly telephone recall with monthly falls calendars in the MOBILIZE Boston Study - PubMed. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20360242/ [Accessed August 8, 2020]

66. Cameron ID, Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Murray GR, Hill KD, Cumming RG, Kerse N. Interventions for preventing falls in older people in care facilities and hospitals. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2012) **12**:CD005465. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD005465.pub3

67. Perry L, Kendrick D, Morris R, Dinan S, Masud T, Skelton D, Iliffe S, ProAct65+ Study Team. Completion and return of fall diaries varies with participants' level of education, first language, and baseline fall risk. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* (2012) **67**:210–214. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glr175

68. Ganz DA, Higashi T, Rubenstein LZ. Monitoring falls in cohort studies of community-dwelling older people: effect of the recall interval. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2005) **53**:2190–2194. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.00509.x

69. Stark SL, Silianoff TJ, Kim HL, Conte JW, Morris JC. Tailored Calendar Journals to Ascertain Falls Among Older Adults. *OTJR Occup Particip Health* (2015) **35**:53–59. doi: 10.1177/1539449214561764

70. Bhasin S, Gill TM, Reuben DB, Latham NK, Ganz DA, Greene EJ, Dziura J, Basaria S, Gurwitz JH, Dykes PC, et al. A Randomized Trial of a Multifactorial Strategy to Prevent Serious Fall Injuries. *N Engl J Med* (2020) **383**:129–140. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002183

71. Becker C. Shake, rattle and get moving again. *Age Ageing* (2021) **50**:1889–1890. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afab187

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table I – AAE and OAE enrolment algorithms

Anamnestic assessment of eligibility (AAE) algorithm	Objective assessment of eligibility (OAE) algorithm
Not eligible and/or at low risk • the absence of at least one inclusion criteria OR • the presence of at least one exclusion criteria OR the inability to walk 10 meters without assistance OR • the ability to walk 10 meters without assistance AND a FRAT (Nandy, 2004) total score equal to 0 AND the absence of fear of falling.	*FROP-Com Screen* Total score 0-1: low risk (eligible coefficient = 0) Total score 2-4: medium risk (eligible coefficient = 1) Total score 5-9: high risk (eligible coefficient = 2)
Moderate risk • the ability to walk 10 meters without assistance AND the absence of previous fall(s) AND • a FRAT (Nandy, 2004) total score ≤2 OR • the presence of fear of falling.	*FRAT (Stapleton, 2009)* Total score 5-11: low risk (eligible coefficient = 0) Total score 12-15: medium risk (eligible coefficient = 1) Total score 16-20: high risk (eligible coefficient = 2).
High risk • the ability to walk 10 meters without assistance AND • the presence of previous fall(s) OR • a FRAT (Nandy, 2004) total score ≥3.	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

3 **Table II - Clinical and demographic sample characteristics**

Variable			Total sample		Control Group		Intervention Group	
Participants	n	(%)	403	(100%)	200	(49.6%)	203	(50.3%)
Center								
Modena	n	(%)	198	(49.1%)	98	(24.3%)	100	(24.8%)
Reggio Emilia	n	(%)	205	(50.9%)	102	(25.3%)	103	(25.6%)
Age (years)	Mean	(SD)	76.2	(6.3)	(76.1	(6.2)	76.3	(6.4)
Gender								
Females	n	(%)	264	(65.5%)	130	(65.0%)	134	(66.0%)
Males	n	(%)	139	(34.5%)	70	(35.0%)	69	(34.0%)
Group stratification by risk classes								
Elderly, age 65-80	n	(%)	176	(43.7%)	85	(42.5%)	91	(44.8%)
Elderly, age >80	n	(%)	87	(21.6%)	46	(23.0%)	41	(20.2%)
Elderly, Parkinson	n	(%)	78	(19.4%)	39	(19.5%)	39	(19.2%)
Elderly, Stroke	n	(%)	62	(15.4%)	30	(15.0%)	32	(15.8%)
Estimated fall risk (FROP-Com criterion)								
Low	n	(%)	32	(7.9%)	15	(7.5%)	17	(8.4%)
Medium	n	(%)	146	(36.2%)	72	(36.0%)	74	(36.5%)
High	n	(%)	225	(55.8%)	113	(56.5%)	112	(55.2%)

4 *Abbreviations: sd = standard deviation.*

Table III - Endpoint evaluation between groups (IG and CG)

			Total		Control Group		Intervention Group	
Participants	n	(%)	403	-	200		203	
Participants by falls (no falls vs. ≥1 falls)								
0 falls	n	(%)	167	(41.4%)	83	(41.5%)	84	(41.4%)
≥1 falls	n	(%)	236	(58.6%)	117	(58.5%)	119	(58.6%)
One fall	n	(%)	88	(21.8%)	40	(20.0%)	48	(23.6%)
Two falls	n	(%)	59	(14.6%)	26	(13.0%)	33	(16.3%)
More than two falls (multiple fallers)	n	(%)	89	(22.1%)	51	(25.5%)	38	(18.7%)
Participants by falls (0-1 falls vs. ≥2 falls)								
No fallers (0-1 falls)	n	(%)	255	(63.3%)	123	(61.5%)	132	(65.0%)
Fallers (≥2 falls)	n	(%)	148	(36.7%)	77	(38.5%)	71	(35.0%)
Fall rate (primary endpoint)								
Total number of falls	n	(%)	690	-	353	(51.2%)	337	(48.8%)
Mean number of falls per participant	Mean	(SD)	1.71	(3.36)	1.77	(3.21)	1.66	(3.51)
Falls by injury*								
No injury	n	(%)	465	(67.4%)	238	(67.4%)	227	(67.4%)
Minor injury, no medical consultation	n	(%)	106	(15.4%)	57	(16.2%)	49	(14.5%)
Minor injury, with medical consultation	n	(%)	75	(10.9%)	34	(9.6%)	41	(12.2%)
Serious injury	n	(%)	44	(6.4%)	24	(6.8%)	20	(5.9%)
Probability of absence of falls (Kaplan-Meier)								
Time to the first fall in months	Median	(95%CI)	11.1	(9.4-12.3)	11.1	(7.6-12.3)	11.2	(9.7-NA)
at 3 months	%	(95%CI)	77.6%	(73.7-81.8%)	76.5%	(70.8-82.6%)	78.8%	(73.4-84.6%)
at 6 months	%	(95%CI)	65.0%	(60.5-69.8%)	63.4%	(57.0-70.4%)	66.5%	(60.3-73.3%)
at 12 months	%	(95%CI)	47.3%	(42.6-52.4%)	46.8%	(40.3-54.2%)	47.8%	(41.4-55.2%)

(*) = the information is reported only for subjects with at least one fall, for whom only the most severe fall is considered.
Abbreviations: sd = standard deviation; CI95% = confidence interval at 95% level.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table IV - Analysis of observed differences between IG and CG

Outcome	Statistic	Estimate	CI95%		p-value
No falls vs. ≥1 falls					
Number of falls	IRR	0.94	0.69	1.29	0.693
Fall probability	RR	0.94	0.79	1.12	0.503
Time to the first fall	HR	0.89	0.69	1.16	0.398

Abbreviations: CI95% = Confidence Interval at 95% level; IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio; RR = Relative Risk; HR = Hazard Ratio.
Notes: the association measures are expressed as a comparison between the intervention group and the control group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table V - Analysis of observed differences between subgroups (four etiological risk class categories) in the IG and CG

Outcome	Statistics	Estimate	95CI%		p-value
No falls vs. ≥1 falls					
Number of falls					
Age 65-80	IRR	0.79	0.50	1.25	0.313
Age >80	IRR	0.85	0.51	1.40	0.519
Parkinson	IRR	0.94	0.52	1.72	0.849
Stroke	IRR	2.39	0.88	6.49	0.086
Fall probability					
Age 65-80	RR	0.86	0.65	1.13	0.276
Age >80	RR	1.03	0.74	1.47	0.829
Parkinson	RR	0.93	0.70	1.23	0.615
Stroke	RR	1.22	0.63	2.35	0.553
Time to the first fall					
Age 65-80	HR	0.83	0.56	1.25	0.381
Age >80	HR	0.92	0.54	1.59	0.776
Parkinson	HR	0.83	0.49	1.41	0.497
Stroke	HR	1.32	0.58	3.01	0.509

Abbreviations: CI95% = Confidence Interval at 95% level; IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio; RR = Relative Risk; HR = Hazard Ratio.
Notes: the association measures are expressed as a comparison between the four subgroups in the IG and CG.

Table VI - Rasch analysis results (final analyses) on scales used for pre-test vs. post-test differences analysis

		Fitness to the Rasch Model						Targeting		Separation reliability	
		Fit Residual Items		Fit Residual Persons		Item-trait interaction		Person location			
Analysis	**Description of Analysis**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	χ^2_{df}	**P**	**Mean**	**SD**	**PSI**	**α**
FROP-Com	Final analysis	-0.322	1.557	-0.483	0.810	26.160_{36}	0.509	-0.660	0.555	0,711	-
Balance scales	Final analysis	1.260	4.697	0.418	0.991	42.647_{27}	1.202	1.045	1.169	0,962	-
Expected values		*0*	*1*	*0*	*1*		*n.s.*	*≈0*	-	*≥.900: person measurement* *≥.700: group measurement*	

Abbreviations: FROP-Com = Fall Risk for Older People living in the Community; SD = standard deviation; df = degrees of freedom; P = Bonferroni-corrected p-value; PSI = person separation index; α = Cronbach's alpha.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table VII - Analysis of pre-test vs. post-test differences for FROP-Com and balance indicators

Variable		Control group			Intervention group			Comparison	
		mean	sd	n	mean	sd	n	MD (CI95%)	p
FROP-Com	pre	-0.5	0.5	200	-0.5	0.5	203		
	post	-0.9	0.6	132	-0.9	0.6	153		
	post - pre	-0.3	0.4	132	-0.3	0.4	153	-0.03 (-0.13;0.07)	0.543
BBS	pre	2.2	1.6	200	2.1	1.6	203		
	post	2.5	1.8	156	2.6	1.8	184		
	post - pre	0.1	2.7	156	0.5	2.3	184	0.15 (-0.23;0.53)	0.445
POMA	pre	2.6	1.8	200	2.6	1.9	203		
	post	3.0	1.9	156	3.1	1.9	182		
	post - pre	0.2	1.2	156	0.3	1.3	182	0.12 (-0.14;0.37)	0.363
FABS	pre	0.4	1.2	200	0.4	1.2	203		
	post	0.4	1.2	156	0.4	1.3	184		
	post - pre	0.1	0.7	156	0.3	0.7	184	**0.21 (0.06;0.36)**	**0.006**
MBT	pre	0.6	2.3	198	0.4	2.4	200		
	post	1.0	2.5	156	1.2	2.7	182		
	post - pre	0.2	1.8	155	0.6	2.0	179	**0.42 (0.03;0.81)**	**0.035**

Abbreviations: sd = standard deviation; MD =mean differences in post-test values adjusted for pre-test values; CI95% = Confidence Interval at 95% level; FROP-Com= Fall Risk for Older People in the Community; BBS = Berg Balance Scale; POMA = Performance Oriented Mobility Assessment; FABS = Fullerton Advanced Balance Scale; MBT = Mini-BESTest.

Notes: in bold, significant pre-test vs. post-test differences were reported.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1 Study summary flow chart



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Figure 2 CONSORT 2010 flow diagram



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Figure 3 Fall number distribution by group



The intervention group is represented by the red bars, the control group by the blue bars.

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Supplementary Material

Appendix 1 – Group intervention protocol details

As described in the Methods section, participants in the IG were taken in charge by an interdisciplinary team including a Physiatrist (P), a Physiotherapist (PT), a Geriatrician (G), and a Neurologist (N) who administered synergically the following five interventions.

1. **Group exercise sessions:** one weekly 6-person group session of 60 minutes for eleven weeks. Each session was composed of the following parts:

   i. Warming (5 minutes): head, neck, trunk, and ankle movements, back and knee extensions, walking on the spot;

   ii. Circuit training (35 minutes):

      - Station 1 – Muscular strength exercises: ankle plantarflexion, squat, chair standing, and frontal step (all these exercised were realized with hand support and, when possible, wearing a weight vest).
      - Station 2 – Balance exercises: reaching in standing position, tandem standing, and single-leg standing (1-6 weeks); sidewalk, tandem walk, and toe walk (7-11 weeks).
      - Station 3 – Recovery techniques from falling: seven steps with 'backward-chaining method', starting from the sitting or standing position(23).

   iii. Dynamic balance and walking, considering the base pathology (10 minutes):

      - Obstacle courses (walking with motor and dual cognitive tasks);
      - Walking exercises (direction and speed changes, associated activities with arms, in crowded contexts; in PD use of visual and auditory cues);
      - Climbing stairs.

   The remaining 10 minutes were destined to rest and the control of the physical activity report diary.

   At the first session, the Physiotherapist delivered a weight vest to each IG participant and verified the initial level for each of the cited three circuit training stations. Specifically:

   - Station 1 – Muscular strength exercises:
     - First session: for each exercise and each side (in case of bilateral exercises), the Physiotherapist calculated the subject's maximum weight (1RM) based on the highest number of consecutive repetitions performed by him/her (starting from 1,5 kg, then calculate the 1RM and the percentage of 65% of the 1RM using ad hoc tables built on the average result of three spread formulas (Brzycki, Baechle, Epley)) and noted it in the participant's group treatment chart.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

- Third-Fifth-Seventh-Ninth session: for each exercise and side, the Physiotherapist checked the possible progression (starting from the current working weight, increasing progressively 500 grams to recalculate the 65% of 1RM as described) and noted it in the participant's group treatment chart.

During the 1RM, the participant had to work to a CR-10 Borg Scale level of '10 – extremely strong', while during muscular strength group exercise with a CR-10 Borg Scale level of '5 – Strong'.

- Station 2 – Balance exercises:
  - First session: for each exercise, the Physiotherapist defined the initial difficulty level (4 levels A-B-C-D of increasing difficulty). He started from medium-high C level, then receded or advanced according to the subject's condition verified during pre-test evaluations.
  - Third-Fifth-Seventh-Ninth session: for each exercise, the Physiotherapist checked the possible progression to the next level, which could occur if the participant realized the exercise in safety condition.
- Station 3 – Recovery techniques from falling:
  - In the first session, the Physiotherapist proposed performing steps 1 and 2, then further 5 steps (to 7), one for each session.
  - It was recommended that the Physiotherapist review the steps of the previous weeks and set the next step for every session.
  - The subject passed to the next step only when he/she could safely perform the previous steps.

At each group session, the participant must have his/her weight vest, his/her fall-physical activity report diary of the current month, and his/her manual of the home exercise program (see next point 4).

During rest periods from exercises, the participant delivered his/her fall-physical activity report diary and, in case of at least one fall during the week, the completed 'fall report'. In addition, at the end of the session, the Physiotherapist updated the manual of the home exercise program with the weekly level progression of the exercises (the passage changed every two weeks, but depending on individual need it was possible to add other series of the same exercise in the intermediate weeks).

2. **Group education sessions on fall risk factors:** one weekly 30-minute session (held after the group exercise session) for eleven weeks focused on modifiable fall risk factors and risky behaviors. Two parts constituted each session: a 10-minute frontal lesson on a specific theme held by a component of the interdisciplinary team, followed by a 20-minute group discussion on the lesson content (participants, their caregivers, and the professional). During the eleven weeks, the following topics were proposed:

   i. Why is it important to prevent falls? Why do you fall? (G)

   ii. The importance of regular physical exercise (P)

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

iii. Behaviors at risk of falling (PT)

iv. Drugs and falls (G)

v. Home safety (PT)

vi. Postural hygiene of feet and footwear (PT)

vii. The benefits of a healthy and proper diet and the adoption of healthy lifestyles in fall prevention (G)

viii. Attention and falls (N)

ix. Vision impairment and falls (G)

x. Osteoporosis and falls (G)

xi. Why is it important to continue exercising? (PT)

A handbook summarizing these topics was provided to each participant at the beginning of the first education session.

3. **A personalized plan of reducing domestic fall risk factors following a home visit performed by the Physiotherapist within the first week of treatment.** During this visit, lasting 60-90 minutes, the Physiotherapist filled the 'Home environmental risks questionnaire' and compared it with the same questionnaire compiled by the participant at the pre-test assessment. This questionnaire investigated the following macro-areas related to modifiable risk factors:

- Slippery floors (outside the house, inside the house);
- Stairs (handrail, height, tread, scale width);
- Lighting;
- Carpets, doormats, movable floor coverings, electric wires;
- Isolated steps, important disconnections;
- Furniture and ornaments (chairs, table, protruding feet);
- Objects at high height;
- Bed height;
- Bathroom fixtures (toilet height, shower/bath surfaces).

Then, the Physiotherapist gave specific recommendations with proposals for correcting the detected modifiable risk factors by delivering the 'Suggestions for the reduction of environmental risks at home' sheet in which the actual present hazards were highlighted. He/she also verified the presence of the fall-physical activity report diary, delivered at the time of recruitment, in a position that facilitated the compilation in case of fall (e.g., hanging on the wall in the living room/ kitchen, etc.).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND-4.0 International license.

Finally, during the following three home visits, related to the personalized home exercise program, the Physiotherapist checked the implementation of recommended corrections in the first home access and filled the 'Check-list of correction of environmental risk factors at home'.

4. **A personalized home exercise program**, coordinated with the group exercise program aimed at improving strength, static and dynamic balance, and acquiring a long-term daily habit of exercise and physical activity in the context of a progressive and permanent adoption of a healthy and active lifestyle. The Physiotherapist devised this program in the context of an initial home visit (2nd week) and subsequently monitored within two further home visits (4th and 6th weeks).

   During the initial home visit, an illustrated manual containing strength and balance exercises was provided and explained to each participant, based on the first group exercise session (in which the subject's maximum weight (1RM) for strength exercises and the initial difficulty level for balance exercises were calculated). These exercises were chosen between those that the subject performed with greater safety in the group session. The indication given to the subject was to:

   - Perform muscular strength and balance exercises two more times a week, in addition to the group session performed at the center, for about 30 minutes, possibly on alternate days to allow rest between one session and the following;
   - Perform a 30-minute walking session on rest-days from exercises, at least twice a week. These sessions could be divided into shorter sessions (e.g., at the beginning three 10-minute sessions, alternate with rest, and then increasing reaching a single 30-minute session);
   - Register the performed physical activity in his/her fall-physical activity report diary of the current month, which the Physiotherapist checked during the weekly group session.

   During the following two visits, the Physiotherapist verified the setting adequacy and modality in which the participant performed the suggested exercises and the update of the fall-physical activity report diary.

   Finally, in all the three home access linked to the home exercise program, the Physiotherapist checked the implementation/maintenance of the recommendations on risk factors correction given in the first-week home visit.

5. **A multifactorial personalized intervention aiming at modifying additional risk factors** which were performed by the interdisciplinary team and included the following interventions:

   - Review of medications, including psychotropic medications (N and G), antiparkinsonian drugs (N), and cardiovascular medications (G);
   - Management of unaddressed visual impairments (G): ophthalmologist referral, lens prescription, suggestions regarding the limitation of bifocal lenses;

This is a provisional file, not the final typeset article

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

- Management of unaddressed cardiovascular issues (G), such as postural hypotension, covert cardiac failure, and abnormalities of cardiac rhythm, eventual cardiology referral;
- Vitamin D prescription (G);
- Improvement of nutritional state (G), with prescription of caloric-proteic integration and/or nutritional referral;
- Management of muscle-skeletal issues, including spasticity (P and PT);
- Education about foot self-care, including podologist referral if appropriate (P);
- Assessment, prescription, and final testing of orthesis and mobility aids, including proper shoes (P and PT).

Interventions one to four were administered to all IG participants (multiple-component intervention), whereas the multifactorial intervention (intervention five) was personalized based on the individual fall risk profile devised on the pre-test assessment. Furthermore, interventions one, two, and five were conducted within an outpatient setting, while interventions three and four were home-based.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Supplementary Material

Appendix 2 – Outcome measure details (VAE and VOE assessments)

Instrument	ICF domain	ICF chapter	Assessed variable	Assessor
30-second Chair Standing test (CS)(67)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance (screening)	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Abbreviated Mental Test Score (AMTS)(68)	Body functions	b1 Mental functions	Cognitive functioning (screening)	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Activity-specific Balance Confidence Scale (ABC Scale)(69)	Body functions	b1 Mental functions	Confidence in his/her own balance	Physiatrist
Addenbrooke's Cognitive Examination-Revised (ACE-R)[49]	Body functions	b1 Mental functions	Cognitive functioning	Geriatrician
Barthel Index (BI)(70)	Activity and participation	d5 Self-care	ADL independence	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)
Berg Balance Scale (BBS)(28)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)
Body Mass Index (BMI)(71)	Body functions	b5 Functions of the digestive, metabolic and endocrine systems	Body mass	Geriatrician
Body weight	Body functions	b5 Functions of the digestive, metabolic and endocrine systems	Body weight	Geriatrician
COMPosite Autonomic Symptoms Score (COMPASS-31)(72)	Body functions	b4 Functions of the cardiovascular, haematological, immunological, and respiratory systems	Autonomic symptoms	Geriatrician
Cumulative Illness Rating Scale (CIRS)(73)	-	-	Comorbidity profile	Geriatrician
Fall Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT)_Stapleton(22)	-	-	Global fall risk	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Falls Efficacy Scale-International (FES-I)(74)	Body functions	b1 Mental functions	Fear of falling	Physiatrist
Freezing Of Gait Questionnaire (FOG)(75)	Body functions	b7 Neuromusculoskeletal and movement-related functions	Freezing in people with PD	Neurologist
FROP-Com(27) and FROP-Com Screen(21)	-	-	Global fall risk	Interdisciplinary
Fugl-Meyer Assessment-Lower extremity	Body	b7 Neuromusculoskeletal and movement-	Motor and sensitive functioning of	Physiotherapist (Pre-

(FMA-LE)(76)	functions	related functions	lower extremities	test)
Fullerton Advanced Balance Scale (FABS)(31)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)
Functional Reach Test (FRT)(77)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance (screening)	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS)(78)	Body functions	b1 Mental functions	Mood	Geriatrician
Lawton's index (LI)(79)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility, d6 Domestic life, d8 Major life areas	IADL independence	Geriatrician
Mini Balance Evaluation - System Test (Mini-BESTest)(32)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)
Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA)(80)	Body functions	b5 Functions of the digestive, metabolic and endocrine systems	Nutritional status	Geriatrician
Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)(81)	Body functions	b1 Mental functions	Cognitive functioning	Geriatrician
National Institute of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS)(82)	-	-	Stroke impairment profile	Neurologist
Number of home environment-related risks	Environmental factors	e115 Products and technology for personal use in daily living	Home environment-related risks	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Number of medications	Environmental factors	e110 Products or substances for personal consumption	Medications	Geriatrician
Orthostatic Hypotension test	Body functions	b4 Functions of the cardiovascular, haematological, immunological, and respiratory systems	Orthostatic hypotension	Geriatrician
Parkinson's Disease Questionnaire-39 (PDQ-39)(83)	-	-	Quality of life	Neurologist
Performance-Oriented Mobility Assessment (POMA)(84)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance and walking (Tinetti scales)	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)
Rivermead Mobility Index (RMI)(85)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Mobility (according to the subject)	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)
Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)(86)	-	-	Quality of life	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Short Physical Performance Battery (SPPB)(87)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Lower extremity strength (screening)|	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Six Minutes Walking Test (6minWT)(88)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Walking: endurance	Physiotherapist (Pre-test)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Snellen Chart	Body functions	b2 Sensory functions and pain	Visual acuity	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Standing Balance (from 4 Stage Balance Test) (SB)(89)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance (screening)	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Stroke Specific Quality of Life scale (SS-QOL)(90)	-	-	Quality of life in people with stroke	Neurologist
Ten Meters Walking Test (10mtWT)(91)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Walking: speed	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Timed Up&Go Test (TUG)(92)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Balance (screening)	Physiotherapist (VOE)
Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS I-VI)(93)	-	-	PD functioning profile	Neurologist
Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)(94)	Body functions	b2 Sensory functions and pain	Neuromusculoskeletal pain	Physiatrist
Walking Handicap Scale (Perry&Garret) (WHS)(95)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility	Walking independence	Physiatrist
WHO Rose questionnaire(96)	Body functions	b4 Functions of the cardiovascular, haematological, immunological, and respiratory systems	Claudicatio intermittens	Geriatrician
Word Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 - 12 item version (WHODAS 2.0)(97)	Activity and participation	d4 Mobility, d5 Self care, d6 Domestic life, d7 Interpersonal interactions, and relationships	Social participation	Physiatrist
World Health Organization Quality of Life – Older adults (WHOQoL-OLD)(98)	-	-	Quality of life in older people	Geriatrician

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.26.22272987; this version posted March 31, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .