medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Getting seniors back on their bicycle; a case-control study on the improvement of bicycle balance control

Eric Maris*, #

Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition, and Behaviour, Radboud University, P.O. Box 9104 HE Nijmegen

#

Corresponding Author:

Eric Maris

e-mail: eric.maris@donders.ru.nl

tel: +31243612651

The total number of words of the manuscript, including entire text from title page to figure legends: **5443**

The number of words of the abstract: 165

The number of figures: **2**

The number of tables: 0

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Abstract

This paper reports on a case-control study that evaluates the effectiveness of an intervention aimed at improving bicycle balance control (BC) in a group of senior citizens (N=23) that had quit cycling (N=19) or that were about to do so (N=4). The intervention was designed to increase the difficulty of the bicycle BC task in a stepwise fashion, gradually approaching the difficulty of bicycle BC on the public roads. The intervention lasted 11 weeks and involved three components: (1) training on an exercise bicycle, (2) BC training on a bicycle simulator, and (3) cycling on the public roads with a safe start-and-stop technique that was practiced on the bicycle simulator. This intervention produced a very large improvement (Cohen's d = 1.8) in BC skills and confidence on the public roads. The fact that bicycle BC skills and confidence can be drastically improved over a relatively short period does not rule out the likely role of the slower process of acquiring a sufficient lower body strength.

Keywords

Balance control, bicycle balance, motor skill training, bicycle simulator, senior citizens, elderly, mobility, intervention study, case-control.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

With age, there is a sharp decrease in the percentage of citizens that continues to ride their bicycle. This is well documented in the Netherlands, where everyone learns to cycle at a young age, and cycling is the default means of transportation for short distances. In the Netherlands, the percentage of inhabitants that cycles at least several times per month fluctuates around 77% between age 30 and 70 [1]. However, over an average period of 15 years, this percentage drops to 39% [1]. Thus, a substantial fraction of the senior citizens stops cycling before the end of their life, which is on average 16 years after one has reached 70 years [2].

The physical health benefits of cycling are well documented [3, 4]. For instance, there is a strong inverse relationship between commuter cycling and all-cause mortality [4]. Because the pedaling force can be easily controlled (e.g., by cycling uphill), cycling is an excellent training stimulus for the improvement of lower body strength and power. In addition, as compared to running, it has a very low impact on the joints. Cycling also contributes to our mental health, because it offers increased mobility options that are necessary for a meaningful social life.

In this paper, I will describe, motivate, and evaluate a rehabilitation intervention focused on balance control (BC) skills that aims at getting senior citizens back on their bicycle. Bicycle BC pertains to two centers of gravity (CoGs) that both must be kept above their respective area of support (AoS): (1) the CoG of the rider-bicycle combination must be kept above the line that connects the two wheel-road contact points, and (2) the CoG of the rider's upper body must be kept above the saddle [5]. To keep the combined and the upper body CoG above their respective AoS, steering (turning the handlebars) is the most important control action [5, 6].

BC can be understood from the perspective of optimal feedback control (OFC) [5, 7-13], which is the dominant theory in the neural control of movement (see Fig. 1). This theory can be used to distinguish between the neuronal and the non-neuronal determinants of BC: (1) the neuronal determinants pertain to the BC skill as implemented in the neuronal

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

networks of our central nervous system (CNS), and (2) the non-neuronal determinants (the human part of the mechanical system; see Fig. 1) pertain to strength, power and joint range-of-motion as implemented in the muscles, tendons, and joints. Our nervous system also has a
somatic nervous system (SNS) which establishes the connection between the CNS and the mechanical system, both for sending out motor commands and receiving sensory feedback (see Fig. 1). OFC takes the mechanical and the SNS as given, and postulates that the CNS achieves an optimal BC under the constraints of the mechanical and the SNS (e.g., torque limits of the mechanical system, accuracy of the sensory feedback). Note that OFC achieves optimal BC separately for every balance task; there is no set of component BC skills that is assembled in different ways according to different sets of task requirements.



Fig. 1: A closed-loop feedback control model for bicycle balance. The model has four components: (1) a sensory system that represents the sensory division of the somatic nervous system (SNS), consisting of the eyes, the inner ear (labyrinth, vestibular organ), the proprioceptive sensory organs (muscle spindles and Golgi tendon organs), and their afferent axons, (2) a computational system that represents the central NS (CNS), (3) a motor output system that represents the sensory division of the somatic NS, consisting of the efferent axons of the spinal motor neurons, and (4) a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

mechanical system that represents the non-neuronal part of the human body (extrafusal muscle fibers, skeleton, …) and the bicycle.

Different types of training exist for standing and walking balance, with and without perturbations, which can be both predictable and unpredictable [14]. There is strong evidence that the effects of balance training are specific to the balance task that is trained [15, 16]. This agrees with the fact that the performances on different balance tasks are uncorrelated, at least within a group of similar ages [17]. Because of the task-specificity of the balance training effects, one cannot generalize an effect to other balance tasks that are part of activities of daily living (ADL). For a bicycle BC training, this could imply that a training effect would not generalize to cycling on the public roads.

I designed a bicycle BC training with the objective of realizing training effects that generalize to bicycle BC on the public roads. The guideline in this design was to increase the difficulty of the bicycle BC task in a stepwise fashion, gradually approaching the difficulty of bicycle BC on the public roads. In line with this guideline, I consider BC skill as a continuum that is defined by BC challenges. BC challenges are perturbations (of muscular and non-muscular origin) that distort the balance and therefore require control actions to restore this balance.

An important BC challenge of muscular origin are the spill-over forces that result from pedaling. During pedaling, our legs push against gravity, and this involves our upper body: the downward force on a pedal will only move that pedal if the upward reaction force (acting at the hips) is balanced by a downward gravitational force that is bounded by the mass of the upper body. The more compliant (not stiff) the upper body, the larger the part of the upward reaction force that will go into spill-over forces that deform the upper body and perturb the steering. Thus, in a compliant upper body (low core stability) pedaling will perturb the steering.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 impact of a BC challenge is modulated by the cycling speed, which is reflected in the fact that it is much easier to balance a bicycle when we are up to speed, as compared to when we are close to a standstill. The modulating role of speed follows from two mechanical properties of commercial bicycles: a bicycle's front frame experiences (1) self-stabilizing forces (forces that steer the bicycle to the lean) and (2) aligning forces (forces that align the front with the rear frame), which both increase with speed [6]. The self-stabilizing forces allow steering to be guided by the passive movements of the handlebars, which are always in the correct direction (the direction that will bring the bicycle upright). And the aligning forces smoothen/filter steering inaccuracies; with low aligning forces, a small steering inaccuracy will result in a large steering angle deviation that needs to be corrected. Both forces increase with speed, and this reduces the BC challenge that results from an inaccurate steering torque.

In the bicycle BC training, I make use of the fact that the BC challenge level increases with pedaling force and decreases with speed: I first practice BC skill at a low BC challenge level (low pedaling forces at a high speed), and then gradually increase it. To control the BC challenge level, I have developed a bicycle simulator (see Methods) that requires the same type of BC as on the public roads. This bicycle simulator also allows for different types of BC challenges (getting up to speed from standstill, tapping the road surface with one's feet) that will be described in the Methods.

On the bicycle simulator, one can also train a start-and-stop technique that drastically improves the rider's safety when he cycles outdoors on his own bicycle. Specifically, the rider is trained on the simulator to start and stop with a saddle height that allows him to touch the ground with his feet. With this technique, a sufficient safety level for cycling outdoors is created allowing the rider can continue with the BC exercises that he has practiced on the simulator.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

Study setup/Methods

Participants

Participants were recruited via an article in a local newspaper (De Gelderlander) about the goal of the study. The article invited participants that had stopped cycling at least six months ago, and that wanted to get back on their bicycle. A total of 105 candidates replied, which were all invited for an information session. A total of 60 candidates participated in an information session, and these were all sent a questionnaire about their cycling history and their current medical status. I excluded candidates that still cycled occasionally or suffered from balance-relevant sensory disorders related to the proprioceptive and the vestibular system (peripheral neuropathy, labyrinthitis, vestibular neuritis, …). From the remaining group, I selected 15 participants that were living at a location nearby the Radboud University campus, the location of the intervention. After the intervention had already started, I learned that three participants suffered from a medical condition that was unrelated to balance-relevant sensory feedback, but that visibly affected their operation of a bicycle (cardiac and cerebrovascular injuries, bursitis).

All subjects gave their informed consent for inclusion before they participated in the study. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and the protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the faculty of Social Sciences (ECSS) of the Radboud University (ECSS-2020-132).

The intervention started with cycling on a stationary exercise bicycle (spinning). In the third spinning week, a second newspaper article was published in which the location of the intervention (the Radboud University sports center) was revealed. After this publication, 8 additional candidates spontaneously joined the spinning sessions, which were public, and requested to participate in the study. I agreed. Four of these additional

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

participants still cycled occasionally but had noticed that their BC skill was getting worse.

A total of 23 participants started the BC training on the bicycle simulator, and 17 participants completed it (mean age 75,3 years, age range 66-88 years). From the 6 participants that dropped out, 2 did so for a reason that was related to the BC training: one participant's legs were so short that she could not touch the ground while sitting on the saddle, and one participant lacked a sufficient force to keep herself balanced on top of a stationary bicycle that was supported by the trainers; this was also apparent on the exercise bicycle, but to a lesser degree. Four participants dropped out for reasons that were unrelated to the BC training: a fracture due to a fall at home (two participants), bursitis, and an urgent eye surgery.

The 17 participants that completed the BC training were matched to 17 candidates (the control group) that were not selected for the study because they were living farther away from the location of the intervention as compared to the experimental group. The matching criteria were gender and age. However, even without the matching, the two groups are expected to be very similar with respect to BC-relevant variables. In fact, there is no obvious reason why the selection criterium (distance between home address and the location of the intervention) should be related to these BC-relevant variables.

Bicycle simulator

The bicycle simulator [18] is shown in Fig. 1. The core elements of the simulator are three rollers with a width equal to the width of an average Dutch bicycle path (1.75 m). The two front rollers are covered with a conveyer belt that is supported from underneath by a low-friction platform. The bicycle's front wheel rests on the conveyer belt and the rear wheel rests on the rear roller. The rollers' rotational inertia is close to the linear inertia of the average Dutch rider-bicycle combination, and this ensures that the acceleration response to a pedal stroke feels natural. However, the resistance of the rollers is higher than the resistance on the public roads. This excess

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

resistance can be overcome by a torque motor that is attached to the axis of the rear roller. This torque motor is also essential to assist weak participants in the first stages of the training, as will described in the section on the intervention. Finally, the bicycle simulator has a virtual-reality (VR) component that projects an animation of a bicycle lane and that is controlled by the cycling speed and the cyclist's lateral position on the left-right axis of the simulator. The input for this VR component is a roller-attached speedometer and the position of the rider's head as measured using a motion capture system.

[Because of privacy regulations, the photograph that should appear here could not be included in the paper that was uploaded to the preprint server. Readers may contact the author to obtain a digital copy of this photograph.]

Fig. 1: Participant riding on the bicycle simulator.

In between the front and the rear rollers, there is a platform on which the rider can place his feet and the trainers can stand. The possibility for the trainers to stand close to the rider is especially important in the beginning of the training. Typically, the rider has one trainer on every side, supporting him by means of gentle pushes on his shoulders. As the rider's BC skills improve, the trainers increase their distance from the rider.

The rider can wear a safety harness with which he is connected to a support construction above the rider's head (see Fig. 1). The safety harness does not prevent the rider from falling, but in case he does, his knees will not touch the floor before the suspension becomes active.

Intervention

The intervention was over a period of 11 weeks. In that period, the participants engaged in (1) spinning, (2) BC training on the bicycle simulator, and (3) cycling on the public roads with a safe start-and-stop technique that was practiced on the bicycle simulator. The three components of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

intervention were also administered in this order, with spinning and BC training overlapping in time for the last 8 weeks.

Spinning

The first three weeks of the intervention only involved spinning. Because a spinning/exercise bicycle is stationary, the objective of the spinning training only pertained to the second of the two BC problems involved in cycling: keeping the CoG of the rider's upper body above the saddle while dealing with the perturbations caused by pedaling [5]. Although the spinning training was intended as the first step in a BC skill training, it is also a power training. This is especially true for the intervention in this study, because the participants trained at individually determined power levels. Specifically, the training intensity (from 0 to 100) was relative to the so-called one-minute functional threshold power (1minFTP), which is the highest power a participant can maintain for one minute while cycling at 60 revolutions per minute (RPM). The 1minFTP was determined by having participants monitor their breath after a one-minute effort at some power level: if the participant could say only a few words at a time (a proxy for reaching the ventilatory threshold), the 1minFTP was reached.

During the first three weeks, the participants learned (1) to operate an exercise bicycle, which was new to all of them, and (2) to determine their 1minFTP. Especially the latter required guidance from the trainers because many participants found it difficult to produce a constant power output.

One spinning session lasted 45 min., excluding warming-up and cooling-down, but including a 5 min. break in the middle. The sessions had the structure of an interval training built around high intensity blocks at 1minFTP. The high intensity blocks lasted at most 1 min. and were alternated with low intensity blocks at 70 percent of 1minFTP that lasted at most 2,5 min. The switch from low to high intensity was achieved either by increasing the resistance (and keeping the RPM fixed) or by increasing the RPM (and keeping the resistance fixed).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

Bicycle simulator BC training

BC training started in the fourth week of the intervention. A BC training session lasted approximately 30 min. At the start, participants put on a safety harness and were connected to the support construction. The saddle height was adjusted such that the participant's feet touched the platform in between the front and the rear rollers. Because of the size of the bicycle (size M), this was not possible for one participant, and a few participants had to tiptoe. During the training, there was always one trainer on both sides of the participant. When the participant showed signs of fear, the trainers gently pushed their hands against the participant's shoulders and gradually released the pressure as the participant gained confidence. In the whole experiment, it never happened that a participant had to rely on the safety harness to prevent him from falling.

The guiding principle in the BC training was increasing the difficulty in small steps and following the participant's progressing skill and confidence. Every session started with a BC challenge level at which the participant was comfortable, and that level was slowly increased if the participant agreed. In the first session, the bicycle was brought up to a speed of approximately 12 km./h. by means of the motor that drives the rear roller of the simulator. The participants gently followed the rotations of the rear wheel by keeping a little pressure on the pedals. In this condition, the participant's only task was turning the handlebars for balance control.

The BC challenge level was increased in four ways: (1) by decreasing the speed, (2) by decreasing the assistive force at the rear roller, (3) by asking participants to accelerate from standstill and to stop at any desired moment, and (4) by asking the participant to tap the support surface with both feet, place them back on the pedals, and to continue pedaling (feet tapping exercise). These four ways of increasing the BC challenge level were used in approximately the same order as listed above; sometimes the resistance was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

temporarily reduced (by increasing the assistive force) if the participant had difficulties with accelerating from standstill or the feet tapping exercise.

Cycling outdoors

The participant was instructed to start cycling outdoors on his own bicycle when he could do 10 feet taps in a row without stopping in between, and at a resistance level slightly above the resistance on the public roads. The participant was instructed to use the safe start-and-stop technique (feet touching the road surface) that was practiced on the bicycle simulator. He was also instructed to start cycling in an environment without other road users (a park, a parking lot) and to gradually move to more busy environments. After the participant had started cycling outdoors, he still participated in one or two BC training sessions, but now the focus was more on solving problems that the participant had encountered when cycling on his own bicycle.

Cycling skill questionnaire

To evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention, I used a simple questionnaire consisting of three multiple-choice questions with three answer options each. The introduction to the questionnaire was the following:

> Three environments will be described, and you must indicate whether you ride your bicycle in that environment. By “riding your bicycle”, we mean starting from a standstill and stopping at a desired location. For every environment, you must indicate what applies to you:
>
> 1. I do not ride my bicycle here.
> 2. I ride my bicycle here, but I try to avoid it.
> 3. I ride my bicycle here without problems.

The three environments are the following:

1. Without traffic (e.g., a park, a parking lot).
2. With little traffic (e.g., small roads in an outside area, a bicycle lane on a quiet moment).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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. In busy traffic (e.g., in the city center during traffic hours, around a busy market place).

The answers to every question/environment were converted into a score by assigning 0 points to the first answer option ("I do not ride … "), 1 point to the second option (" … I try to avoid it."), and 2 points to the third option (" … without problems."). Summing these scores over the three questions/environments results in a number between 0 and 6, which is the study's operationalization of cycling skill/confidence.

In the experimental group, this questionnaire was administered twice, the first time in the beginning of the intervention and the second time six weeks after the end of the intervention. The questionnaire was sent as an attachment to an email, and participants returned the completed version. In the control group, the questionnaire was administered only once and at around the same time that the second questionnaire was sent to the experimental group. None of the control group participants was still riding their bicycle at the start of the intervention and they were therefore only asked whether they had ridden their bicycle in the meantime. If they had done so, they had to indicate their cycling skill/confidence by means of the questionnaire.

Statistical analysis

The effect of the intervention was evaluated by comparing the experimental and the control group participants with respect to their difference scores (post-pre relative to the intervention) on the cycling skill/confidence questionnaire. Starting from the matched pairs (see Participants) a statistical comparison was performed by means of a dependent samples t-test.

Results

I conducted a case-control study to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention aimed at improving BC skill. The experimental group consisted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

of 23 participants, of which 17 completed the intervention. The reasons for the dropout (6 participants) are described in the Methods.

The intervention lasted 11 weeks and involved three components: (1) cycling on a stationary exercise bicycle (spinning), (2) BC training on a bicycle simulator, and (3) cycling on the public roads with a safe start-and-stop technique that was practiced on the bicycle simulator (see Methods). The effectiveness of the intervention was evaluated by means of a questionnaire that assessed the participant's skill/confidence on his own bicycle when cycling outdoors (see Methods). This questionnaire was administered twice, first in the beginning of the intervention, and then six weeks after the intervention. The post-pre difference score on the questionnaire assessed the improvement with respect to skill/confidence in cycling outdoors using one's own bicycle.

The improvement in cycling skill/confidence was significantly larger in the experimental group (M=3.1, SD=1.7) compared to a matched control group (M=0, SD=0), $t(16)=7.5$, $p<.001$. Note that the mean and the standard deviation of the improvement in the control group are both equal to 0. This is because none of the control group participants had a spontaneous recovery of their cycling skill/confidence. The effect size was calculated as Cohen's d, which was 1.8. This is between a very large and a huge effect [19]. This effect was obtained with an average of 4.8 simulator BC training sessions of 30 min. each.

It was my original plan to also quantify the improvement in power output on the exercise bicycle, and to use the one-minute functional threshold power (1minFTP) for that. However, I decided not to do this because participants indicated large between-session differences in their ability to reach their 1minFTP. I did collect from the participants the 1minFTP value that they had used in most spinning sessions. The mean 1minFTP was 93.6 Watt (sd=17.2). FTP is usually expressed relative to bodyweight, and in this participant group the average 1 minute power-to-weight ratio was 1.2 Watt/kg (sd=0.3). For reference, it is useful to compare this value with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

published 1 minute power-to-weight ratios for amateur cyclists that cycle with a power meter [20]. The 5 percent lowest (5-th percentile) 1 minute power-to-weight ratio for this population (corresponding to untrained cyclists) was 3.9 for males and 3.3 for females [20]. Thus, the participants in this study had an average 1 minute power-to-weight ratio that is approximately three times smaller than that of an untrained cyclist.

Discussion and conclusions

The main conclusion of this study is that it is possible to realize a very large improvement in senior cyclists' BC skills and confidence, even if that person has quit cycling for a long time. The very large effect size is most likely due to two factors that are both related to the bicycle simulator. First, the bicycle simulator allows to increase the difficulty of the BC task in small steps, while guaranteeing full safety at every moment. And second, all participants could safely continue their BC training on their own bicycle because they had learned a safe start-and-stop technique on the bicycle simulator.

The very large improvement in BC skills and confidence does not imply that all participants now can cycle safely in all conditions. There are several BC challenges to which my participants have not been exposed, and it is thus unknown whether they can deal with them successfully. For example, a high curbstone, a deep pothole, or a sharp turn at high speed. These BC challenges require a sufficient lower body strength to prevent perturbations from affecting the steering movements. For example, (1) standing on the pedals while covering an obstacle, and (2) in a sharp turn at high speed, contracting one's core muscles to prevent the centrifugal force from rotating the upper body to the outside of the turn.

Cycling safely not only involves BC (to stay upright) but also navigation (to avoid obstacles and/or follow a track). The focus of the intervention is completely on BC, but one may not ignore that navigation requires additional skills such as selective attention, anticipation, and planning. However, the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

focus on BC can be defended by the fact that navigation depends on BC but not the other way around.

It cannot be ruled out that part of the intervention's effect is due to an increase in power output that may have resulted from the spinning training. The existing literature on the relation between (1) muscle strength and power, and (2) the incidence of falls and balance task performance is inconsistent: one systematic review on muscle strength/power and falls concludes that the incidence of falls is strongly related to lower body strength [21], but another systematic review on muscle strength/power and balance task performance concludes that they are only very weakly related [22]. This inconsistency is probably related to the fact that falls cannot be predicted from the performance on balance tasks, at least not in a sample of physically active community-dwelling older adults [23].

These results show that the relation between muscle strength/power, balance control, and falls, is a complicated one, and there are many possible reasons for it. First, many studies have been conducted in homogeneous groups (institutionalized participants, a small age range, …) and this restriction-of-range results in an underestimation of the correlation in the heterogeneous/unselected population. Second, most people are aware of the range of BC challenges that their BC skill allows, and they try to stay within this range. For example, most 75-year-olds will not attempt bouldering. This restriction-of-range at the individual level reduces the correlation between BC skills and the incidence of falls. Third, there may be large differences between muscle groups and their associated joint ranges-of-motion with respect to their relevance for BC. In most studies, only leg strength/power was measured, but the core muscles (the trunk and hip muscles that surround the spine, abdomen, and hip) may very well be more relevant for BC. Fourth, in line with the previous point, BC not only depends on the muscles for bringing the AoS under the CoG (the muscles' motor role) but also for informing the CNS about the position of CoG relative to the AoS, which depends on the muscle spindles (the muscles' sensory feedback role) [13, 24]. In fact, accurate steering requires accurate sensory feedback about

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 upper body and the combined rider-bicycle CoG lean angle, and this sensory feedback very likely depends on muscle spindle sensory feedback [13]. To be useful, muscle spindle output must reflect the tension in the force-producing fibers, and these are also the ones whose strength decreases with age. Thus, the quality of the muscle spindle sensory feedback may very well depend on the same processes that are responsible for muscle strength.

In sum, in this intervention study, I have demonstrated that it is possible to realize a very large improvement in a senior cyclist's BC skills and confidence. This is most likely because (1) the bicycle simulator BC training increased the difficulty of the BC task in small steps, and (2) the participants could continue their BC training on their own bicycle using a newly learned safe start-and-stop technique. The fact that bicycle BC skills can be improved over a relatively short period (11 weeks) does not rule out the likely role for the slower process of building (and loosing) muscular strength/power.

References

1. Mobycon. Research facts and numbers 'Cycling for everyone' [Onderzoek feiten en cijfers 'Fietsen voor Iedereen']. Delft: Mobycon, commissioned by the Ministery of Infrastructure and Water Management.; 2022.

2. VZinfo.nl. Bilthoven: RIVM; 2024 [cited 2024 25 January]. Available from: https://www.vzinfo.nl/levensverwachting/leeftijd-en-geslacht#Levensverwachting.

3. De Hartog JJ, Boogaard H, Nijland H, Hoek G. Do the health benefits of cycling outweigh the risks? Environmental health perspectives. 2010;118(8):1109-16.

4. Oja P, Titze S, Bauman A, De Geus B, Krenn P, Reger-Nash B, et al. Health benefits of cycling: a systematic review. Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports. 2011;21(4):496-509.

5. Maris E. A bicycle can be balanced by stochastic optimal feedback control but only with accurate speed estimates. PLoS one. 2023;18(2):e0278961.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

6. Meijaard JP, Papadopoulos JM, Ruina A, Schwab AL. Linearized dynamics equations for the balance and steer of a bicycle: a benchmark and review. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences. 2007;463(2084):1955-82.

7. Åström KJ. Introduction to stochastic control theory: Courier Corporation; 2012.

8. Todorov E. Optimality principles in sensorimotor control. Nature neuroscience. 2004;7(9):907-15.

9. Todorov E, Jordan MI. Optimal feedback control as a theory of motor coordination. Nature neuroscience. 2002;5(11):1226-35.

10. Wolpert DM. Computational approaches to motor control. Trends in cognitive sciences. 1997;1(6):209-16.

11. Scott SH. Optimal feedback control and the neural basis of volitional motor control. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2004;5(7):532-45.

12. Wolpert DM, Ghahramani Z, Jordan MI. An internal model for sensorimotor integration. Science. 1995;269(5232):1880-2.

13. Maris E. An internal sensory model allows for balance control based on non-actionable proprioceptive feedback. arXiv. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2403.00951.

14. Lesinski M, Hortobágyi T, Muehlbauer T, Gollhofer A, Granacher U. Effects of balance training on balance performance in healthy older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports medicine. 2015;45:1721-38.

15. Giboin L-S, Gruber M, Kramer A. Task-specificity of balance training. Human movement science. 2015;44:22-31.

16. Kümmel J, Kramer A, Giboin L-S, Gruber M. Specificity of balance training in healthy individuals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports Medicine. 2016;46:1261-71.

17. Muehlbauer T, Besemer C, Wehrle A, Gollhofer A, Granacher U. Relationship between strength, power and balance performance in seniors. Gerontology. 2012;58(6):504-12.

18. Maris E, inventorBicycle simulator [Patent]. The Netherlands2022 01 June 2022.

19. Sawilowsky SS. New effect size rules of thumb. Journal of modern applied statistical methods. 2009;8(2):26.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.17.24305755; this version posted April 17, 2024. 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 .

20. Johnstone D. How does your cycling power output compare? 2018 [cited 2024 29-2]. Available from: https://www.cyclinganalytics.com/blog/2018/06/how-does-your-cycling-power-output-compare.

21. Moreland JD, Richardson JA, Goldsmith CH, Clase CM. Muscle weakness and falls in older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2004;52(7):1121-9.

22. Muehlbauer T, Gollhofer A, Granacher U. Associations between measures of balance and lower-extremity muscle strength/power in healthy individuals across the lifespan: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sports medicine. 2015;45:1671-92.

23. Boulgarides LK, McGinty SM, Willett JA, Barnes CW. Use of clinical and impairment-based tests to predict falls by community-dwelling older adults. Physical therapy. 2003;83(4):328-39.

24. Proske U, Gandevia SC. The proprioceptive senses: their roles in signaling body shape, body position and movement, and muscle force. Physiological reviews. 2012.