

1 **Nurses' Fall Risk Judgements - Cognitive Biases and Contextual Factors**
2 **Explaining Variability: A multi-centre cross-sectional study**

3
4 **Author names:**

5 Miyuki Takase¹

6 Naomi Kisanuki¹

7 Sato Yoko²

8 Kazue Mitsunaka²

9 Masako Yamamoto¹

10
11 **Affiliations:**

12 ¹ Yasuda Women's University, School of Nursing, 6-13-1 Yasuhigashi, Asaminami-Ku,
13 Hiroshima-Shi, Hiroshima, JAPAN 7310153

14 ² Hiroshima University Hospital, Department of Nursing, 1-2-3 Kasumi, Minami-Ku,
15 Hiroshima-Shi, Hiroshima, JAPAN 7340037

16
17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Miyuki Takase

19 Yasuda Women's University, School of Nursing, 6-13-1 Yasuhigashi, Asaminami-Ku,
20 Hiroshima-Shi, Hiroshima, JAPAN 7310153

21 Email address: takase@yasuda-u.ac.jp

36 **Abstract**

37 **Background:** Assessing fall risk is a complex process requiring the integration of
38 diverse information and cognitive strategies. Despite this complexity, few studies have
39 explored how nurses make these judgements. Moreover, existing research suggests
40 variability in nurses' fall risk assessments, but the reasons for this variation and its
41 appropriateness remain unclear.

42 **Objective:** This study aimed to investigate how nurses judge fall risk, and the factors
43 associated with their judgements.

44 **Methods:** Using purposive sampling, 335 nurses from six hospitals in eastern Japan
45 participated in an online survey. The participants rated the likelihood of falls in 18
46 patient scenarios and completed measures of base-rate neglect, belief bias, and
47 availability bias. A linear mixed-effects regression tree was used to identify factors
48 related to their judgements, and a linear mixed-effects regression model examined
49 associations between judgement variability, cognitive biases, and clinical specialty.

50 **Results:** Nurses' fall risk assessments were primarily influenced by whether patients
51 called for assistance, followed by the use of sleeping pills, the presence of a tube or
52 drain, and patient mobility status. Judgement variability was linked to nurses' gender,
53 education, clinical specialty, and susceptibility to availability bias.

54 **Conclusion:** Variability in clinical judgement may be justified when reflecting
55 personalised, context-specific care. However, inconsistencies arising from cognitive
56 biases are problematic. Healthcare organisations should offer targeted training to
57 enhance contextual expertise and reduce the influence of cognitive biases on fall risk
58 assessments.

59

60 **Keywords:** Nurses, Falls, Risks, Judgement, Cognitive bias, Clinical specialty,
61 Regression tree

62

63

64

65

66

67

68 **Introduction**

69 A patient fall is a major adverse event in healthcare settings. Falls are defined as
70 “inadvertently coming to rest on the ground, floor, or other lower level, excluding
71 intentional changes in position” (World Health Organization, 2007). Each year, a
72 significant number of patients experience falls; for instance, an estimated 700,000 to
73 1,000,000 falls occur in U.S. hospitals (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality,
74 2013), and in Japan, the rate is 2.76 per 1,000 patients (Japan Hospital Association,
75 2023). Recent studies indicate that 55-60% of patients are at risk of falling (Wu et al.,
76 2019, Yasan et al., 2020), a figure likely to rise as the population ages. Falls can result in
77 severe harm, including death (Takase, 2023), highlighting the importance of addressing
78 this issue. To prevent falls, nurses must assess patients and environmental cues, judge
79 fall risk, and implement appropriate preventive measures (Tanner, 2006).

80 Nurses’ clinical judgement is crucial in this process, as they are the primary
81 healthcare providers responsible for fall prevention. Clinical judgement involves a
82 reflective and reasoning process, drawing on available data and an extensive knowledge
83 base (Connor et al., 2023). This judgement is a complex cognitive task. Previous studies
84 show that nurses assess fall risk using criteria developed through clinical experience,
85 often relying on cognitive strategies such as adding, subtracting, and weighing various
86 risk factors based on patient characteristics (Takase et al., 2024). Nurses also use fall
87 risk assessment tools, though these have limitations, including variations in criteria and
88 poor predictive validity (Alvarado et al., 2023, Vlaeyen et al., 2021). Assessing fall risk
89 is a complex procedure that requires synthesising information on patient conditions,
90 treatment regimens, and the clinical environment. Despite this complexity, few studies
91 have explored how nurses make these judgements. Moreover, previous research
92 indicates that nurses’ judgements of fall risk can vary (Takase et al., 2024), but it is
93 unclear why this variation occurs or whether it is justified. Such discrepancies can lead
94 to inconsistent care, and if these variations are due to cognitive biases, they may
95 compromise patient safety. Therefore, understanding how nurses make these
96 judgements and identifying the factors that influence them are critical for improving
97 patient care and safety.

98

99

100 **Background**

101 Nurses' judgement of risk of falling

102 The literature identifies various risk factors for falls, which are generally classified into
103 intrinsic (patient-related) and extrinsic (environment-related) categories. Intrinsic
104 factors include sex and age (Wabe et al., 2024), unstable gait and balance (Deandrea et
105 al., 2010, Shao et al., 2023), decline in activities of daily living (Shao et al., 2023),
106 elimination issues such as urgency, frequency of voiding, nocturia, and incontinence
107 (Moon et al., 2021, Noguchi et al., 2016), impaired cognition (Fhon et al., 2023), the
108 use of hypnotics and sedatives (Shao et al., 2023), frailty (Xu et al., 2022), and a
109 tendency to perform tasks independently (Sato et al., 2022). Extrinsic factors include
110 unsafe footwear (Kobayashi et al., 2017), the presence of tubes and drains (Nakanishi et
111 al., 2021), and wet or slippery floors (Lee et al., 2022).

112 Nurses must make complex judgements based on available information. For
113 example, they need to evaluate a patient's fall risk by weighing each risk factor,
114 determining the relative importance of factors when multiple risks are present, and
115 considering how these risks interact when combined. Previous studies have explored the
116 common risk factors nurses perceive (Innab, 2022, Tzeng and Yin, 2013), as well as the
117 alignment between nurses' assessments of fall risk and patients' perspectives (Choi et
118 al., 2024). However, no study has investigated the specific criteria or algorithms nurses
119 use to make fall risk judgements. Given that nurses' assessments directly influence the
120 initiation of preventive interventions (Rice et al., 2022), further research into the
121 methods and decision-making processes they use to judge fall risk is needed.

122

123 Factors related to the variation in judgement

124 Another issue yet to be fully explored is the source of variation in nursing judgement.
125 Given that clinical judgement involves complex cognitive processes, differences in
126 judgement among healthcare professionals are often inevitable. Variability in clinical
127 judgement and decision-making has been observed among physicians (Hancock et al.,
128 2012, McDonnell et al., 2023, Sutherland and Levesque, 2020), across different
129 professions (Honda et al., 2015, Taggart et al., 2021), between nurses and nursing
130 students (Shinnick and Cabrera-Mino, 2021, Yang and Thompson, 2016), and among
131 nurses themselves (Fernández-de-Maya and Richart-Martínez, 2012, Ferrario, 2003,

132 Thompson et al., 2009). Regarding the fall risk judgement, Vlaeyen et al. (2021) found
133 that the accuracy of risk judgements varied among physiotherapists, nurses, and nurse
134 aides in nursing homes. Similarly, Takase et al. (2024) reported that the fall risk factors
135 deemed critical by nurses differed between individuals.

136 Several factors may account for these variations, with clinical context playing a
137 significant role. Patient characteristics, presenting symptoms, and treatments differ by
138 clinical setting, influencing which factors nurses prioritise when assessing fall risk. For
139 example, in rehabilitation or aged care wards where many patients have physical
140 limitations, nurses may place greater emphasis on cognitive dysfunction than gait
141 disturbances alone, as patients with cognitive impairments may engage in risky
142 behaviours despite limited mobility. Conversely, in surgical wards, unstable gait might
143 be a higher priority risk due to the presence of post-surgical drains and potential
144 anaemia. Thus, differing clinical contexts necessitate different risk assessments,
145 contributing to variation in nurses' judgements.

146 Another potential source of variation in judgement is cognitive bias, defined as
147 systematic tendencies or dispositions that distort information processing, leading to
148 inaccurate judgements or decisions (Crowley et al., 2013, Korteling et al., 2023,
149 Korteling and Toet, 2021). Such biases typically arise when individuals rely on intuition
150 and mental shortcuts (Crowley et al., 2013, Korteling et al., 2023, Korteling and Toet,
151 2021). While over 50 types of cognitive biases have been identified in healthcare
152 settings (Croskerry and Ryle, 2019), this study focuses on three key biases: base-rate
153 neglect, belief bias, and availability bias. These biases influence probability estimation
154 and logical reasoning, potentially leading to variability in nurses' judgements.

155 Base-rate neglect refers to the tendency to ignore underlying incidence rates,
156 prior probabilities, or base rates, either by inflating or reducing them (Croskerry, 2003,
157 Croskerry and Ryle, 2019, Kahneman and Tversky, 1982, O'Sullivan and Schofield,
158 2018). It is a type of representativeness heuristic (i.e., judging based on how
159 representative A is of B) (Blanco, 2020, Tversky and Kahneman, 1973), and often
160 results from disregarding statistical rules (Ceschi et al., 2019). For example, consider
161 the following.

Among the 1000 people that participated in the study, there were 995 nurses and five doctors. John is a randomly chosen participant in this research. He is 34 years old. He

lives in a nice house in a fancy neighbourhood. He expresses himself nicely and is very interested in politics. He invests a lot of time in his career. Which is more likely?
a) John is a nurse.
b) John is a doctor. (Erceg et al., 2022)

162 Many people chose b) because John's characteristics seem more representative
163 of a doctor. However, given that 99.5% of participants are nurses, a) is statistically more
164 likely. Similarly, nurses may overlook base rates and overestimate or underestimate
165 specific risks. For instance, a nurse might overestimate the fall risk associated with
166 Medication A after seeing one patient fall while on it, despite the medication rarely
167 causing falls. Since fall risk assessment involves predicting future fall probabilities,
168 adherence to probability principles is essential (Wright et al., 2009, Wright et al., 1994).
169 Ignoring these principles may lead to inaccurate judgements.

170 Belief bias is "the tendency to accept or reject data depending on one's
171 personal belief system, especially when the focus is on the conclusion and not the
172 premises or data" (Croskerry and Ryle, 2019). For example, when asked to assess the
173 validity of the following syllogism:

Premise 1: All Eastern countries are communist.
Premise 2: Canada is not an Eastern country.
Conclusion: Canada is not communist. (Erceg et al., 2022)

174 Many might incorrectly judge this as valid, as the conclusion appears correct
175 despite faulty logic (denying the antecedent). In fall risk assessment, nurses must use
176 sound logic to avoid bias. If they accept seemingly correct conclusions without
177 evaluating the premises, they may misjudge risk. For example, a nurse might think, "A
178 patient with weak legs is likely to fall. Patient A does not have weak legs. Therefore,
179 Patient A will not fall," which is a logical error.

180 Availability bias is the tendency to mistakenly judge events as more frequent if
181 they are recent or easily recalled (i.e., readily available in memory) (Croskerry, 2003,
182 O'Sullivan and Schofield, 2018, Tversky and Kahneman, 1973). People tend to recall
183 events that are frequent, recent, distinctive, or associated with other notable events
184 (Tversky and Kahneman, 1973). An example question illustrates this bias:

Which cause of death is more likely?
Commercial airplane crash vs. Bicycle-related (Erceg et al., 2022)

185 Although the correct answer is “bicycle-related,” many people select
186 “commercial airplane crash” due to its distinctiveness and memorability, especially
187 following recent incidents. Similarly, nurses may overestimate or underestimate risks if
188 certain events come easily to mind. Availability bias is especially relevant in fall risk
189 assessment, as nurses rely on past experiences when judging a patient’s fall risk (Takase
190 et al., 2024). However, basing decisions on memorable but isolated experiences can lead
191 to biased judgements.

192 While variation due to clinical context may be justifiable, variation due to
193 cognitive biases is not. Thus, identifying and addressing sources of variation is
194 essential. Although a few studies have examined the relationship between clinical
195 context and nurses’ fall risk judgements (e.g., Takase et al., 2024), most studies on
196 cognitive biases in clinical judgement focus on physicians’ diagnostic decisions (e.g.,
197 Crowley et al., 2013, Saposnik et al., 2016) or nurses’ assessments of patient acuity or
198 medication administration (Al-Moteri et al., 2022, Essa et al., 2023, Martin et al., 2022).
199 No studies have explored cognitive biases in nurses’ fall risk assessments.

200

201 **Aims**

202 This study aimed to address two questions:

- 203 1. How do nurses judge the risk of falling?
- 204 2. What influences their judgements (i.e., what are the sources of variation in their
205 judgements)?

206 Answering these questions could inform measures to improve nurses’ fall risk judgements.

207

208 **Methods**

209 Study design

210 This cross-sectional study is part of a larger investigation into how nurses assess fall
211 risk. The study has two parts: a pilot study (Part 1) and a study addressing the research
212 questions posed above (Part 2). This paper reports the findings of the Part 2 study.

213

214 Participants

215 Using purposive sampling, participants were recruited from six hospitals (public and
216 private) in eastern Japan, with capacities ranging from 175 to 740 beds and providing

217 acute, rehabilitation, or extended care. Inclusion criteria required participants to be
218 registered nurses responsible for direct patient care. Exclusion criteria included working
219 in paediatric wards, operating theatres, intensive care units, outpatient departments, or
220 holding managerial roles.

221 The dependent variable (nurses' fall risk assessment) consisted of $18 \times N$
222 (sample size) correlated observations. Regression tree analysis and linear mixed-effects
223 modelling were used to address research questions 1 and 2. For the regression tree
224 analysis, simulation studies indicate that a sample of 1,000 independent observations
225 provides reasonable accuracy and precision (Althnian et al., 2021, Rajput et al., 2023,
226 Sordo and Zeng, 2005). To achieve an effective sample size of 1000 with an intraclass
227 correlation (ICC) of 0.25-0.30, 292-339 participants were needed (see Killip et al.,
228 2004). For the mixed-effects model, sample size simulations using the mixedpower R
229 package (Kumle et al., 2021) indicated that, with $b=0.1$ for main effects, $b=0.05$ for
230 interaction terms, and $\alpha=0.05$, a sample of $N=200$ would achieve over 80% power. A
231 total of 900 nurses were recruited to meet these requirements.

232

233 Instruments

234 The following instruments were administered to the participants.

235 *Nurses' fall risk judgements*

236 Patient scenarios were developed to assess nurses' judgement of fall risk. Each scenario
237 comprised six statements about patient conditions: mobility issues, cognitive
238 impairment and personality, urinary issues, presence of tubes (e.g., intravenous lines and
239 indwelling catheters) or drains, medication use, and age. Each condition had three risk
240 levels (1 = low risk to 3 = high risk) (see Table 1). Scenarios were created following a
241 literature review, consultations with three experienced nurses in risk management, and
242 pilot testing with five academic and three practising nurses. Since the full factorial
243 design would yield 729 scenarios, a fractional orthogonal array was generated using the
244 DoE.base R package (Grömping, 2018), resulting in 18 scenarios (see Supplementary
245 Table 1). Nurses rated fall probability from 0-100% in 5% increments, which were later
246 converted to a probability of 0-1.00 in 0.05 increments for the analysis.

247

[Table 1 around here]

248

249 *Cognitive biases*

250 Existing scales for cognitive biases contain general statements, with some items
251 irrelevant in Japanese settings. Therefore, new scales were developed specifically for
252 fall risk judgements, targeting base-rate neglect, belief bias, and availability biases,
253 based on established scales. Each scale had three items with two response choices—one
254 indicating bias (scored 1) and the other non-bias (scored 0). The scales were pilot-tested
255 with five academics and three nurses, and then administered to 55 nurses for reliability
256 testing. The Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR20) coefficients of base-rate neglect, belief and
257 availability biases were 0.70, 0.65, and 0.41 respectively. The reliability of the
258 availability bias was low, but an item response analysis showed good discriminant
259 validity. Moreover, a reliable measure of availability bias is lacking (Berthet, 2021),
260 especially in the Japanese context. Thus, we retained the original items. In all the
261 cognitive bias scales, responses were aggregated for a total score from 0 to 3; scores of
262 2 or more indicated cognitive bias. Sample questions are presented in Table 2.

263 [Table 2 around here]

264

265 *Demographics*

266 These questions gathered data on participants' age, sex, highest educational degree,
267 years of clinical experience, and current specialty.

268

269 *Data collection procedures*

270 After receiving approval from each institution's Director of Nursing, invitation letters
271 were distributed to potential participants in August, 2024. The letter explained the
272 study's purpose, methods, and ethical considerations, and provided a QR code and a
273 URL link to a Google Forms survey. Interested participants were directed to the online
274 survey site to complete the questionnaire, with consent assumed upon submission.
275 Participants had four weeks to complete the questionnaire.

276

277 *Analysis*

278 Exploratory factor analysis based on a tetrachoric correlation matrix with oblique
279 rotation and KR20 were computed to assess the construct validity and internal
280 consistency of the cognitive bias scales. Descriptive statistics were then computed, and

281 variable distributions were checked. As will be shown, there was a small portion of
282 missing responses in some question items (2.4% at maximum). Thus, the subsequent
283 analyses were conducted by replacing missing values, i.e., those in the continuous or
284 ordinal variables were replaced with the median values, while those in categorical
285 variables were replaced with the most representative category.

286 To explore how nurses assess fall risk (research question 1), a regression tree
287 analysis was performed. Each nurse provided 18 responses, one for each patient
288 scenario, resulting in correlated data. Thus, a linear mixed-effects model tree with a
289 random intercept was fitted to account for intraclass correlation, followed by 10-fold
290 cross-validation to calculate explained variance. The glmertree R package (Fokkema et
291 al., 2018) was used.

292 To identify sources of variation in nurses' judgements (research question 2), a
293 mixed-effects regression model was applied. This model included dichotomised
294 responses on cognitive biases, risk variables (Table 1), clinical specialty, and
295 demographic factors as main effects, along with interaction terms between risk variables
296 and clinical specialty to examine if weighting differed by specialty. Risk variables were
297 collapsed into two levels (combining levels 2 and 3) and clinical specialties into six
298 categories to reduce comparisons and avoid overfitting. Analyses were performed using
299 StataNow (version 18.0, StataCorp, Texas, USA) and R (version 4.4.1).

300

301 *Ethical considerations*

302 This study complies with the Declaration of Helsinki developed by the World Medical
303 Association, and approval was obtained from the institutional review board prior to the
304 data collection.

305

306 **Results**

307 A total of 337 nurses completed the online survey, yielding a response rate of 37.4%. Of
308 these, two nurses did not provide their judgements on the patient scenarios, leaving 335
309 questionnaires for further analysis. The characteristics of the participants are described
310 in Table 3.

311

[Table 3 about here]

312

Figure 1 presents the nurses' judgements on the risk of falling, represented as

313 the estimated probability of falling on a scale from 0 to 1. Scenario 8 (i.e., a patient with
314 a risk level of 3 across all variables) was rated as the highest risk, while Scenario 17
315 (i.e., a patient with a risk level of 1 across all variables) was rated as the lowest. The
316 ICC of judgements within nurses was 0.279 (standard error = 0.018).

317 [Figure 1 about here]

318 Supplementary Table 2 presents the results of factor analysis on the cognitive
319 bias scales, along with their reliability coefficients. As shown in the table, three factors
320 representing base-rate neglect, belief bias, and availability bias were identified,
321 explaining 64.3% of the variance. However, the KR-20 coefficients were low,
322 particularly for the base-rate neglect (KR-20 = 0.323) and the belief bias scale (KR-20 =
323 0.434). These low reliabilities were due to the majority of nurses consistently choosing
324 biased responses for base-rate neglect (68.66%) and belief bias items (35.52%),
325 resulting in small variances (see Supplementary Table 3). An opposite trend was
326 observed in the availability bias scale.

327 Figure 2 presents the results of a regression tree analysis, illustrating how
328 nurses judged the risk of patient falls. The first variable used to differentiate between the
329 nurses' judgements was the patient's inability to call for assistance due to cognitive
330 impairment. If a patient could not call for help, the second variable used to differentiate
331 between the judgements was whether the patient had taken a sleeping pill, followed by
332 whether the patient had stable or unstable gait. When a patient had cognitive
333 impairment, could not call for assistance, was taking a sleeping pill, and did not have an
334 unstable gait (but required assistance with ambulation), nurses' judgement of fall risk
335 was highest (see Node 28). Scenario 8 represents this patient's characteristics.

336 Nurses judged the risk of falling as the second highest when a patient had
337 cognitive impairment, took a sleeping pill, and had an unstable gait (see Node 29,
338 representing Scenario 4). The next highest judgements of fall risk were for a patient
339 with cognitive impairment and unstable gait (Node 26, representing Scenario 7), and for
340 a patient who was hesitant to call nurses, had one tube/drain, and an unstable gait (Node
341 20, representing Scenario 3).

342 The regression tree model showed that nurses assigned progressively lower
343 probabilities of falls to the following risk factors in descending order: patients' age,
344 intake of anti-hypertensive agents, and presence of urinary issues. Only the need for

345 assistance with transfers was associated with a fall probability below 50% (see Node 7),
346 while a patient without any of these conditions was still judged to have a small chance
347 of falling (23.2%).

348 Finally, the regression tree model suggests that there was variation in nurses'
349 judgement. In fact, the tree accounts for 58.7% of the variance, while a large portion
350 (27.3%) was explained by a random effect.

351 [Figure 1 about here]

352 A mixed-effects regression model was used to identify factors that could be
353 associated with this variation (see Table 4; see also Supplementary Table 4 for a
354 correlation analysis). The results indicated that participants' sex, educational
355 background, clinical specialty, and susceptibility to availability bias were associated
356 with differences in nurses' judgement of fall risk, along with the presence of the risk
357 factors listed in Table 1. Female nurses and those with a diploma tended to judge the
358 risk of falling to be higher than their counterparts (6.7% and 4.7% respectively). Nurses
359 working in convalescent rehabilitation or community-based care wards judged patients'
360 risk 9.3% to be higher than those in other specialties. Additionally, nurses more
361 susceptible to availability bias tended to judge the risk as 3% lower than those who were
362 less susceptible.

363 [Table 4 about here]

364 Several interaction terms were also significant. Compared to nurses working in
365 gastrointestinal wards, the judgements of nurses in convalescent rehabilitation,
366 community-based care, long-term care, and palliative care wards were less associated
367 with patients' mobility issues (see Figures 3a and 3b). The judgements of nurses
368 specialising in long-term and palliative care were also less associated with whether
369 patients called for assistance, compared to those in gastrointestinal wards (see Figure
370 3c). Although not reaching $p < 0.05$, rehabilitation and community-based care nurses
371 showed a tendency to attach less importance to whether patients had tubes/drains and
372 were over 65 years old, when judging the risk of falling.

373

374 **Discussion**

375 This study examined how nurses judge fall risk, with attention to variations related to
376 their clinical specialty and tendencies toward cognitive biases. Regression tree analysis

377 revealed that nurses' judgements were primarily based on whether patients called for
378 assistance when needed, followed by other fall-related factors such as the use of
379 sleeping pills, mobility disorders, the presence of medical devices, and urinary issues.
380 Patients with cognitive impairment, inability to call for help, use of sleeping pills, and
381 mobility disorders were identified as being at the highest risk. Previous studies have
382 shown that most falls are unwitnessed (Francis-Coad et al., 2020, Takase, 2023), and
383 tend to happen to patients inclined to act independently (Satoh et al., 2023).
384 Additionally, factors such as hypnotic use, cognitive impairment, and mobility disorders
385 have been consistently associated with fall risk in numerous studies, including a recent
386 systematic review (Heinzmann et al., 2024). Consequently, patients who engage in
387 activities independently, despite underlying fall risks, are perceived as being particularly
388 vulnerable to falling. Nurses' belief that falls can be prevented by accompanying
389 patients highlights their emphasis on a patient's ability to seek nursing assistance as a
390 primary consideration in fall risk assessment.

391 Patients who did not call for assistance despite lacking cognitive impairment,
392 having a tube or drain, and experiencing gait issues (e.g., unstable walking or requiring
393 transfer assistance) were also judged by nurses to have a high risk of falling. One study
394 reported that approximately 90% of patients at risk of falling had a tube or drain
395 inserted (Sakai et al., 2016). Given that most participants in this study worked in acute
396 care hospitals, where many patients have tubes or drains, nurses' heightened concern
397 about the impact of these devices on fall risk (Takase et al., 2024) is understandable.

398 While mobility issues were identified as a key factor in nurses' fall risk
399 judgements, requiring assistance with transfers alone was associated with less than a
400 50% perceived risk of falling. Several explanations may account for this. First, studies
401 suggest that fall rates do not always correspond to fall frequency (Inoue et al., 2024).
402 Thus, even if mobility impairment is recognised as a high-risk factor, the frequency of
403 falls may be low if few patients exhibit such impairments. Given that the majority
404 worked in acute settings, the number of patients requiring transfer assistance may have
405 been small, leading to fewer incidents. This could create an impression among nurses
406 that fall risk is moderate. Second, nurses may feel confident that falls can be prevented
407 if patients call for assistance. Finally, mobility issues may be viewed as amplifying
408 rather than independently driving fall risk. For instance, a study found that the presence

409 of mobility impairments heightened fall risk in cognitively impaired patients (Martin et
410 al., 2013). Consequently, in the absence of other risk factors, the overall risk may be
411 considered moderate.

412 The results also revealed variation in nurses' judgements, which usually
413 stemmed from differences in how they weighed each risk factor (Stamp, 2012,
414 Thompson et al., 2009). In this study, factors such as nurses' gender, educational
415 background, clinical specialty, and susceptibility to availability bias were associated
416 with how they evaluated each risk. The mixed-effects regression model indicated that
417 nurses in convalescent rehabilitation and community-based care wards rated patients'
418 fall risk significantly higher than those on gastrointestinal wards. In these settings,
419 patients are in the process of regaining mobility and transitioning back to their
420 communities, which inherently increases their fall risk (Kato et al., 2022). High fall
421 rates in convalescent rehabilitation wards have been reported in other studies as well
422 (Ainuddin et al., 2019, Kato et al., 2022). By contextualising each scenario within their
423 practice, nurses in these wards might have assessed fall risk more severely than their
424 gastrointestinal counterparts.

425 Additionally, nurses in convalescent rehabilitation/community-based care, and
426 long-term/palliative care wards perceived the risks associated with mobility disorders
427 and the inability to call for assistance differently from nurses in gastrointestinal settings.
428 For nurses in rehabilitation and community care, mobility disorders had less impact on
429 their judgement compared to those in gastrointestinal nursing. This could be explained
430 by two factors. First, nurses in rehabilitation and community care settings may perceive
431 mobility limitations as universal among their patients, thus not significantly influencing
432 fall risk. A recent study found no difference in mobility between patients who fell and
433 those who did not in stroke rehabilitation (Hong et al., 2024). Alternatively, nurses may
434 believe that patients in these settings have an inherent fall risk, regardless of their
435 mobility status. Kato et al. (2022) found that although patients with functional
436 impairments had a higher risk of falling, recovery from mobility impairment led to
437 greater activity levels, which resulted in increased fall rates over time. This may explain
438 why nurses rated patients without mobility issues as higher risk than their
439 gastrointestinal counterparts.

440 Similarly, nurses in long-term/palliative care rated the impact on fall risk of

441 mobility disorders and the inability to call for assistance lower than nurses in
442 gastrointestinal nursing. This may be because nurses in long-term/palliative care
443 settings may not view cognitive or mobility impairments as distinguishing factors for
444 fall risk, as the majority of patients in these wards experience these conditions.
445 Additionally, patients in long-term/palliative care are often frail, dependent, depressed,
446 and suffer from multiple chronic comorbidities, such as congestive heart failure and
447 chronic pulmonary diseases, all of which are associated with increased fall risk (Oren et
448 al., 2022, Prabhakaran et al., 2020, Xu et al., 2022). Thus, a single risk factor may not
449 carry as much weight as it does in other specialties. In contrast, on acute care wards like
450 gastrointestinal medicine and surgery, diseases and treatments can dramatically alter
451 patients' mobility and cognitive function (Milisen et al., 2012, Perell et al., 2001).
452 Consequently, changes in functional status have more visible impacts on fall risk. These
453 differing characteristics of clinical specialties probably explain the variation in how
454 these risk factors are prioritised.

455 While variation due to contextual clinical judgement may be justified, variation
456 stemming from individual factors such as gender, educational background, and
457 susceptibility to cognitive biases is not justifiable. This is because there is no clinical
458 evidence to suggest that such factors affect fall risk. Gender differences in risk
459 perception are well-documented, with studies consistently showing that females tend to
460 perceive greater susceptibility to and severity of various risk factors (Brown et al., 2021,
461 Harris and Jenkins, 2006, Kim et al., 2018), often resulting in them recommending more
462 preventive measures compared to their male counterparts (Alsharawy et al., 2021). The
463 present study observed a similar phenomenon. Additionally, nurses with diplomas rated
464 the risk of falling significantly higher than their degree-holding counterparts. This
465 contrasts with findings from other studies, which suggest that individuals with higher
466 educational levels tend to perceive higher probabilities of risk (Pfortner and Hower,
467 2022, Rattay et al., 2021, Röpcke et al., 2024). It is not certain why this difference
468 occurred. One possible explanation is that nurses with diplomas may have received
469 training that emphasised patient safety and risk during their pre-licensure education.

470 The final source of judgement variation is cognitive bias. Availability bias was
471 observed in 42.39% of nurses, who rated scenarios approximately 3% lower than their
472 counterparts. Although this difference was small, the findings align with previous

473 research showing that cognitive bias affects nurses' decision-making and practice (Jala
474 et al., 2023, Whyte et al., 2022). Availability bias increases with the ease of recalling
475 relevant examples (Tversky and Kahneman, 1973). Therefore, if nurses recalled recent
476 instances where patients with similar characteristics fell, their fall risk estimates would
477 increase, while recalling instances where such patients did not fall would lead to
478 underestimation. In this study, nurses probably recalled situations where patients with
479 similar characteristics did not fall, which contributed to their underestimation of risk.

480 Although base-rate neglect and belief bias did not appear to impact nurses'
481 judgements, attention should be given to their susceptibility to these cognitive biases.
482 Our findings revealed that 93.44% of nurses exhibited base-rate neglect, while 69.25%
483 were affected by belief bias. These findings are consistent with those of Al-Moteri et al.
484 (Al-Moteri et al., 2020), who reported that 63% of their sample showed cognitive bias.
485 Base-rate neglect occurs when nurses disregard underlying probabilities, while belief
486 bias arises when nurses base their judgement on the believability of conclusions rather
487 than logic. Given that nurses often express discomfort with probabilities (Lavoie et al.,
488 2020), and rely on intuition (Honda et al., 2015), these findings are not surprising.
489 Correct application of probability theory and logical reasoning is essential for accurate
490 judgement and forecasting (Wright et al., 2009). Therefore, these cognitive biases could
491 still affect nurses' judgements and interventions. Future studies using more reliable
492 instruments would provide a clearer understanding of the impact of these biases.

493

494 **Implications for nursing management and research**

495 The results of the regression tree analysis suggest that nurses do not assign equal weight
496 to each risk factor. A comparison of nurses' judgements with existing fall assessment
497 scales highlights clear distinctions. For example, in the Morse Fall Scale (Morse et al.,
498 1989), patients' mental status (e.g., forgetting limitations and moving independently) is
499 assigned only half the points (15 points) compared to the use of ambulatory aids (30
500 points). However, nurses in this study regarded the former as a greater risk. Similarly, in
501 the STRATIFY Risk Assessment Tool (Oliver et al., 1997), all risk factors are equally
502 weighted, yet nurses did not treat them as such, with the weight assigned varying by
503 clinical specialty. Nurses' contextual knowledge, which has not been integrated into
504 existing models, may provide valuable insights for improving fall assessment scales

505 (Önkál-Atay et al., 2004).

506 At the same time, nurses and healthcare organisations may need to reconsider
507 their approach to fall prevention. A goal of zero falls may be unrealistic, particularly in
508 rehabilitation units where patients push their physical and cognitive limits to regain
509 optimal functioning (Singh et al., 2019). In their efforts to prevent falls, nurses often
510 instruct patients to call for assistance when ambulating. However, this practice may
511 restrict patients' independence and dignity (Kerr et al., 2023). A shift in focus toward
512 preventing recurrent falls and minimising fall-related injuries may be more practical and
513 patient-centred.

514 Finally, this study emphasises the importance of reducing nurses' cognitive
515 biases. To achieve this, organisations should offer training in probabilistic reasoning and
516 logical inference to enhance nurses' reasoning strategies (Čavojová et al., 2020). Such
517 training can help reduce base-rate neglect, belief bias, and availability bias.
518 Additionally, encouraging slow thinking and fostering judgement verification through
519 peer consultation can further minimise cognitive bias. Organisations should also
520 establish a framework that supports a reflective clinical culture.

521

522 **Limitations**

523 The current study has several limitations. First, the scenarios were based on a limited set
524 of fall risks, which may not fully capture the complexity of nurses' judgement
525 strategies. Second, only three types of cognitive bias were examined, and there are
526 many other types that may influence nurses' judgements. Further research is needed to
527 explore the impact of additional cognitive biases and identify their sources of variation.
528 Third, the reliability of the cognitive bias scales was low, partly due to small variances
529 in nurses' responses, which tended to concentrate around specific answers. The low
530 reliability of these scales has been noted in other studies, with potential remedial
531 solutions suggested by Berthet (2021). Developing more reliable, context-specific scales
532 is essential for improving the accuracy of cognitive bias measurement.

533

534 **Conclusions**

535 Judging fall risk is a complex process that involves identifying risk factors and
536 assessing their relative importance, while also considering potential synergies and

537 counteractions between them. Contextual factors further influence this judgement, as the
538 significance of risk factors can vary across different clinical areas. Due to this
539 complexity, human judgement is essential, although it is this very judgement that may
540 contribute to clinical variation. While variation in clinical judgement is generally seen
541 as undesirable because it can lead to inconsistent practices, not all variation results in
542 unjustified care. For example, variation in nurses' fall risk judgements may be justified
543 when it reflects personalised, context-specific nursing care. In contrast, errors arising
544 from cognitive bias, which leads to inconsistent judgements, are unjustified. Nurses'
545 clinical judgement is directly linked to the effectiveness of fall prevention measures.
546 Consequently, healthcare organisations should provide targeted training to enhance
547 nurses' contextual expertise while mitigating cognitive biases.

548

549 **Data availability**

550 Data not available.

551 The participants were assured raw data would remain confidential and would not be
552 shared.

553

554 **Conflicts of interest**

555 All authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

556 Although the study received funding, the funder had no involvement in the study's
557 conceptualization, design, data collection, analysis, decision to publish, or manuscript
558 preparation.

559

560 **Funding statement**

561 This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI [grant Numbers 22K10749].

562

563 **Acknowledgements**

564 The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dr. Marjolein Fokkema for her
565 assistance in conducting a linear mixed-effects model tree and a 10-fold cross-
566 validation.

567

568

569 **Supplementary Materials**

570 The supplementary file includes patient scenarios used in the study, factor analysis results
571 of the cognitive scales and reliability coefficients, response frequencies for cognitive
572 biases, and Spearman correlation coefficients between variables.

573

References

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2013. Preventing falls in hospitals: A toolkit for improving quality of care.
- Ainuddin, H.A., Romli, M.H., Salim, M.S.F., Hamid, T.A.T.A., Mackenzie, L., 2019. Stroke rehabilitation for falls and Risk of Falls in Southeast Asia: A Scoping Review with Stakeholders' Consultation. *Age and Ageing* 48 (Supplement_4), iv4-iv5, [10.1093/ageing/afz164](https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afz164).16.
- Al-Moteri, M., Cooper, S., Symmons, M., Plummer, V., 2020. Nurses' cognitive and perceptual bias in the identification of clinical deterioration cues. *Australian Critical Care* 33 (4), 333-342, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2019.08.006>.
- Al-Moteri, M., Plummer, V., Cooper, S., 2022. Decision-Making Errors During Recognizing and Responding to Clinical Deterioration: Gaze Path-Cued Retrospective Think-Aloud. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing* 73, 29-36, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2022.08.002>.
- Alsharawy, A., Spoon, R., Smith, A., Ball, S., 2021. Gender Differences in Fear and Risk Perception During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Front Psychol* 12, 689467, [10.3389/fpsyg.2021.689467](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.689467).
- Althnian, A., AlSaeed, D., Al-Baity, H., Samha, A., Dris, A., Alzakari, N., Abou Elwafa, A., Kurdi, H., 2021. Impact of dataset size on classification performance: An empirical evaluation in the medical domain. *Applied Sciences* 11, 796, [10.3390/app11020796](https://doi.org/10.3390/app11020796).
- Alvarado, N., McVey, L., Wright, J., Healey, F., Dowding, D., Cheong, V.L., Gardner, P., Hardiker, N., Lynch, A., Zaman, H., Smith, H., Randell, R., 2023. Exploring variation in implementation of multifactorial falls risk assessment and tailored interventions: a realist review. *BMC Geriatrics* 23 (1), 381, [10.1186/s12877-023-04045-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-023-04045-3).
- Berthet, V., 2021. The Measurement of Individual Differences in Cognitive Biases: A Review and Improvement. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12, [10.3389/fpsyg.2021.630177](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.630177).
- Blanco, F., 2020. Cognitive bias. In: Vonk, J., Todd, S. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of animal cognition and behavior*. Cham.
- Brown, G.D., Largey, A., McMullan, C., 2021. The impact of gender on risk perception: Implications for EU member states' national risk assessment processes. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 63, 102452, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102452>.
- Čavojová, V., Šrol, J., Jurkovič, M., 2020. Why should we try to think like scientists? Scientific reasoning and susceptibility to epistemically suspect beliefs and cognitive biases. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 34 (1), 85-95, <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3595>.
- Ceschi, A., Costantini, A., Sartori, R., Weller, J., Di Fabio, A., 2019. Dimensions of decision-making: An evidence-based classification of heuristics and biases. *Personality and Individual Differences* 146, 188-200, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.07.033>.
- Choi, J., Lee, S., Park, E., Ku, S., Kim, S., Yu, W., Jeong, E., Park, S., Park, Y., Kim, S.R., 2024. Congruency and its related factors between patients' fall risk perception and nurses' fall risk assessment in acute care hospitals. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 56 (4), 507-516, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12964>.

- Connor, J., Flenady, T., Massey, D., Dwyer, T., 2023. Clinical judgement in nursing – An evolutionary concept analysis. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 32 (13-14), 3328-3340, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.16469>.
- Croskerry, P., 2003. The importance of cognitive errors in diagnosis and strategies to minimize them. *Acad Med* 78 (8), 775-780, 10.1097/00001888-200308000-00003.
- Croskerry, P., Ryle, C.A., 2019. Croskerry's List of 50 Common Biases: 50 Cognitive and Affective Biases in Medicine (Alphabetically). In, *Risk and Reasoning in Clinical Diagnosis*. Oxford University Press, pp. 0.
- Crowley, R.S., Legowski, E., Medvedeva, O., Reitmeyer, K., Tseytlin, E., Castine, M., Jukic, D., Mello-Thoms, C., 2013. Automated detection of heuristics and biases among pathologists in a computer-based system. *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 18 (3), 343-363, 10.1007/s10459-012-9374-z.
- Deandrea, S., Lucenteforte, E., Bravi, F., Foschi, R., La Vecchia, C., Negri, E., 2010. Risk factors for falls in community-dwelling older people: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiology* 21 (5), 658-668.
- Erceg, N., Galic, Z., Bubić, A., 2022. Normative responding on cognitive bias tasks: Some evidence for a weak rationality factor that is mostly explained by numeracy and actively open-minded thinking. *Intelligence* 90, 101619, 10.1016/j.intell.2021.101619.
- Essa, C.D., Victor, G., Khan, S.F., Ally, H., Khan, A.S., 2023. Cognitive biases regarding utilization of emergency severity index among emergency nurses. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 73, 63-68, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2023.08.021>.
- Fernández-de-Maya, J., Richart-Martínez, M., 2012. Variability of clinical practice in nursing: An integrative review. *ACTA Paulista de Enfermagem* 25 (5), 809-816.
- Ferrario, C.G., 2003. Experienced and less-experienced nurses' diagnostic reasoning: Implications for fostering students' critical thinking. *International Journal of Nursing Terminologies and Classifications* 14 (2), 41-52, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-618X.2003.tb00059.x>.
- Fhon, J.R.S., Silva, A.R.F., Lima, E.F.C., Santos Neto, A.P.D., Henao-Castaño Á, M., Fajardo-Ramos, E., Püschel, V.A.A., 2023. Association between sarcopenia, falls, and cognitive impairment in older people: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 20 (5), 4156, 10.3390/ijerph20054156.
- Fokkema, M., Smits, N., Zeileis, A., Hothorn, T., Kelderman, H., 2018. Detecting treatment-subgroup interactions in clustered data with generalized linear mixed-effects model trees. *Behav Res Methods* 50 (5), 2016-2034, 10.3758/s13428-017-0971-x.
- Francis-Coad, J., Hill, A.-M., Jacques, A., Chandler, A.M., Richey, P.A., Mion, L.C., Shorr, R.I., 2020. Association between characteristics of injurious falls and fall preventive interventions in acute medical and surgical units. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A* 75 (10), e152-e158, 10.1093/gerona/glaa032.
- Grömping, U., 2018. R Package DoE.base for factorial experiments. *Journal of Statistical Software* 85 (5), 1 - 41, 10.18637/jss.v085.i05.
- Hancock, H.C., Mason, J.M., Murphy, J.J., 2012. Using the method of judgement analysis to

- address variations in diagnostic decision making. *BMC Res Notes* 5, 139, [10.1186/1756-0500-5-139](https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-5-139).
- Harris, C.R., Jenkins, M., 2006. Gender Differences in Risk Assessment: Why do Women Take Fewer Risks than Men? *Judgment and Decision Making* 1 (1), 48-63, [10.1017/S1930297500000346](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500000346).
- Heinzmann, J., Rossen, M.L., Efthimiou, O., Baumgartner, C., Wertli, M.M., Rodondi, N., Aubert, C.E., Liechti, F.D., 2024. Risk factors for falls among hospitalized medical patients – A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2024.06.015>.
- Honda, H., Ogawa, M., Murakoshi, T., Masuda, T., Utsumi, K., Nei, D., Wada, Y., 2015. Variation in risk judgment on radiation contamination of food: Thinking trait and profession. *Food Quality and Preference* 46, 119-125, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2015.07.014>.
- Hong, S., Kim, J.S., Choi, Y.A., 2024. Predictive Validity of the Johns Hopkins Fall Risk Assessment Tool for Older Patients in Stroke Rehabilitation. *Healthcare (Basel)* 12 (7), [10.3390/healthcare12070791](https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12070791).
- Innab, A.M., 2022. Nurses' perceptions of fall risk factors and fall prevention strategies in acute care settings in Saudi Arabia. *Nursing Open* 9 (2), 1362-1369, [10.1002/nop2.1182](https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1182).
- Inoue, S., Otaka, Y., Mori, N., Matsuura, D., Tsujikawa, M., Kawakami, M., Kondo, K., 2024. Blind spots in hospital fall prevention: Falls in stroke patients occurred not only in those at a high risk of falling. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 25 (1), 160-166.e161, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2023.10.034>.
- Jala, S., Fry, M., Elliott, R., 2023. Cognitive bias during clinical decision-making and its influence on patient outcomes in the emergency department: A scoping review. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 32 (19-20), 7076-7085, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.16845>.
- Japan Hospital Association, 2023. QI project report. Tokyo.
- Kahneman, D., Tversky, A., 1982. On the psychology of prediction. In: Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., Tversky, A. (Eds.), *Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 48-68.
- Kato, Y., Kitamura, S., Katoh, M., Hirano, A., Senjyu, Y., Ogawa, M., Maeda, H., Mukaino, M., Hirano, S., Sakurai, H., Shibata, S., Otaka, Y., 2022. Stroke patients with nearly independent transfer ability are at high risk of falling. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 31 (1), 106169, [10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2021.106169](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2021.106169).
- Kerr, L., Newman, P., Russo, P., 2023. 'I don't want to impose on anybody': Older people and their families discuss their perceptions of risk, cause and care in the context of falls. *Int J Older People Nurs* 18 (6), e12578, [10.1111/opn.12578](https://doi.org/10.1111/opn.12578).
- Killip, S., Mahfoud, Z., Pearce, K., 2004. What is an intraclass correlation coefficient? Crucial concepts for primary care researchers. *Ann Fam Med* 2 (3), 204-208, [10.1370/afm.141](https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.141).
- Kim, Y., Park, I., Kang, S., 2018. Age and gender differences in health risk perception. *Cent Eur J Public Health* 26 (1), 54-59, [10.21101/cejph.a4920](https://doi.org/10.21101/cejph.a4920).
- Kobayashi, K., Imagama, S., Ando, K., Inagaki, Y., Suzuki, Y., Nishida, Y., Nagao, Y., Ishiguro, N.,

2017. Analysis of falls that caused serious events in hospitalized patients. *Geriatrics and Gerontology International* 17 (12), 2403-2406, [10.1111/ggi.13085](https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.13085).
- Korteling, J.E., Paradies, G., Sassen-van Meer, J., 2023. Cognitive bias and how to improve sustainable decision making. *Frontiers in Psychology* 14, 1129835, [10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129835](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129835).
- Korteling, J.E., Toet, A., 2021. Cognitive biases. In: Della Sala, S. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of behavioural neuroscience*. Elsevier, pp. 610-619.
- Kumle, L., Vö, M.L.-H., Draschkow, D., 2021. Estimating power in (generalized) linear mixed models: An open introduction and tutorial in R. *Behavior Research Methods* 53, 2528-2543.
- Lavoie, P., Clarke, S.P., Clausen, C., Purden, M., Emed, J., Mailhot, T., Fontaine, G., Frunchak, V., 2020. Nurses' judgments of patient risk of deterioration at change-of-shift handoff: Agreement between nurses and comparison with early warning scores. *Heart & Lung* 49 (4), 420-425, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrtlng.2020.02.037>.
- Lee, F.S., Sararaks, S., Yau, W.K., Ang, Z.Y., Jailani, A.S., Abd Karim, Z., Naing, L., Krishnan, T., Chu, A.R., Junus, S., Ahmad, M.S., Sapiee, N., Veloo, V.W., Manoharan, S., A. Hamid, M., 2022. Fall determinants in hospitalised older patients: a nested case control design - incidence, extrinsic and intrinsic risk in Malaysia. *BMC Geriatrics* 22 (1), 179, [10.1186/s12877-022-02846-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-02846-6).
- Martin, K., Bickle, K., Lok, J., 2022. Investigating the impact of cognitive bias in nursing documentation on decision-making and judgement. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 31 (4), 897-907, <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12997>.
- Martin, K.L., Blizzard, L., Srikanth, V.K., Wood, A., Thomson, R., Sanders, L.M., Callisaya, M.L., 2013. Cognitive function modifies the effect of physiological function on the risk of multiple falls--a population-based study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 68 (9), 1091-1097, [10.1093/gerona/glt010](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glt010).
- McDonnell, T., Nicholson, E., Bury, G., Collins, C., Conlon, C., De Brún, A., Doherty, E., McAuliffe, E., 2023. The role of contextual factors in decision-making by General Practitioners on paediatric referral to the Emergency Department in Ireland: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *Health Policy* 132, 104813, [10.1016/j.healthpol.2023.104813](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2023.104813).
- Milisen, K., Coussement, J., Flamaing, J., Vlaeyen, E., Schwendimann, R., Dejaeger, E., Surmont, K., Boonen, S., 2012. Fall prediction according to nurses' clinical judgment: Differences between medical, surgical, and geriatric wards. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 60 (6), 1115-1121, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.03957.x>.
- Moon, S., Chung, H.S., Kim, Y.J., Kim, S.J., Kwon, O., Lee, Y.G., Yu, J.M., Cho, S.T., 2021. The impact of urinary incontinence on falls: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 16 (5), e0251711, [10.1371/journal.pone.0251711](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251711).
- Morse, J.M., Morse, R.M., Tylko, S.J., 1989. Development of a scale to identify the fall-prone patient. *Canadian Journal on Aging / La Revue canadienne du vieillissement* 8 (4), 366-377, [10.1017/S0714980800008576](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0714980800008576).

- Nakanishi, T., Ikeda, T., Nakamura, T., Yamanouchi, Y., Chikamoto, A., Usuku, K., 2021. Development of an algorithm for assessing fall risk in a Japanese inpatient population. *Scientific Reports* 11 (1), 17993, [10.1038/s41598-021-97483-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-97483-1).
- Noguchi, N., Chan, L., Cumming, R.G., Blyth, F.M., Naganathan, V., 2016. A systematic review of the association between lower urinary tract symptoms and falls, injuries, and fractures in community-dwelling older men. *Aging Male* 19 (3), 168-174, [10.3109/13685538.2016.1169399](https://doi.org/10.3109/13685538.2016.1169399).
- O'Sullivan, E.D., Schofield, S.J., 2018. Cognitive bias in clinical medicine. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb* 48 (3), 225-232, [10.4997/jrcpe.2018.306](https://doi.org/10.4997/jrcpe.2018.306).
- Oliver, D., Britton, M., Seed, P., Martin, F.C., Hopper, A.H., 1997. Development and evaluation of evidence based risk assessment tool (STRATIFY) to predict which elderly inpatients will fall: case-control and cohort studies. *BMJ* 315 (7115), 1049-1053, [10.1136/bmj.315.7115.1049](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.315.7115.1049).
- Önkâl-Atay, D., Thomson, M.E., Pollock, A.C., 2004. Judgmental forecasting. In: Michael P. Clements, David F. Hendry (Eds.), *A Companion to Economic Forecasting*. Wiley-Blackwell, New Jersey, US, pp. 133-151.
- Oren, G., Jolkovsky, S., Tal, S., 2022. Falls in oldest-old adults hospitalized in acute geriatric ward. *Eur Geriatr Med* 13 (4), 859-866, [10.1007/s41999-022-00660-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-022-00660-2).
- Perell, K.L., Nelson, A., Goldman, R.L., Luther, S.L., Prieto-Lewis, N., Rubenstein, L.Z., 2001. Fall risk assessment measures: An analytic review. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A* 56 (12), M761-M766, [10.1093/gerona/56.12.M761](https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/56.12.M761).
- Pförtner, T.K., Hower, K.I., 2022. Educational inequalities in risk perception, perceived effectiveness, trust and preventive behaviour in the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in Germany. *Public Health* 206, 83-86, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2022.02.021>.
- Prabhakaran, K., Gogna, S., Pee, S., Samson, D.J., Con, J., Latifi, R., 2020. Falling again? Falls in geriatric adults-risk factors and outcomes associated with recidivism. *J Surg Res* 247, 66-76, [10.1016/j.jss.2019.10.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2019.10.041).
- Rajput, D., Wang, W.-J., Chen, C.-C., 2023. Evaluation of a decided sample size in machine learning applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* 24 (1), 48, [10.1186/s12859-023-05156-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-023-05156-9).
- Rattay, P., Michalski, N., Domanska, O.M., Kaltwasser, A., De Bock, F., Wieler, L.H., Jordan, S., 2021. Differences in risk perception, knowledge and protective behaviour regarding COVID-19 by education level among women and men in Germany. Results from the COVID-19 Snapshot Monitoring (COSMO) study. *PLoS One* 16 (5), e0251694, [10.1371/journal.pone.0251694](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251694).
- Rice, H., Garabedian, P.M., Shear, K., Bjarnadottir, R.I., Burns, Z., Latham, N.K., Schentrup, D., Lucero, R.J., Dykes, P.C., 2022. Clinical decision support for fall prevention: defining end-user needs. *Appl Clin Inform* 13 (3), 647-655, [10.1055/s-0042-1750360](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-1750360).
- Röpcke, A., Brinkmann, C., Neumann-Böhme, S., Sabat, I., Barros, P.P., Schreyögg, J., Torbica, A., Brouwer, W., Hajek, A., Stargardt, T., 2024. Understanding health risk perception: insights from an eight-country panel study during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of*

- Public Health, 10.1007/s10389-024-02351-7.
- Sakai, M., Rossaneis, A., Ângela, M., Haddad, F.L., do Carmo, M., Dagmar, W.V., 2016. Risk of bed falls in Adult patients and prevention measures. *Journal of Nursing UFPE / Revista de Enfermagem UFPE* 10, 4720-4726, 10.5205/reuol.8200-71830-3-SM.1006sup201602.
- Saposnik, G., Redelmeier, D., Ruff, C.C., Tobler, P.N., 2016. Cognitive biases associated with medical decisions: a systematic review. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 16 (1), 138, 10.1186/s12911-016-0377-1.
- Satoh, M., Miura, T., Shimada, T., 2023. Development and evaluation of a simple predictive model for falls in acute care setting. *J Clin Nurs* 32 (17-18), 6474-6484, 10.1111/jocn.16680.
- Satoh, M., Miura, T., Shimada, T., Hamazaki, T., 2022. Risk stratification for early and late falls in acute care settings. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 10.1111/jocn.16267.
- Shao, L., Shi, Y., Xie, X.-Y., Wang, Z., Wang, Z.-A., Zhang, J.-E., 2023. Incidence and Risk Factors of Falls Among Older People in Nursing Homes: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 24 (11), 1708-1717, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2023.06.002>.
- Shinnick, M.A., Cabrera-Mino, C., 2021. Predictors of nursing clinical judgment in simulation. *Nurs Educ Perspect* 42 (2), 107-109, 10.1097/01.Nep.0000000000000604.
- Singh, H., Craven, B.C., Flett, H.M., Kerry, C., Jaglal, S.B., Silver, M.P., Musselman, K.E., 2019. Factors influencing fall prevention for patients with spinal cord injury from the perspectives of administrators in Canadian rehabilitation hospitals. *BMC Health Serv Res* 19 (1), 391, 10.1186/s12913-019-4233-8.
- Sordo, M., Zeng, Q., 2005. On sample size and classification accuracy: A performance comparison. In: *Biological and Medical Data Analysis*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 193-201.
- Stamp, K.D., 2012. How nurse practitioners make decisions regarding coronary heart disease risk: a social judgment analysis. *Int J Nurs Knowl* 23 (1), 29-40, 10.1111/j.2047-3095.2011.01196.x.
- Sutherland, K., Levesque, J.F., 2020. Unwarranted clinical variation in health care: Definitions and proposal of an analytic framework. *J Eval Clin Pract* 26 (3), 687-696, 10.1111/jep.13181.
- Taggart, S., Skylas, K., Brannelly, A., Fairbrother, G., Knapp, M., Gullick, J., 2021. Using a clinical judgement model to understand the impact of validated pain assessment tools for burn clinicians and adult patients in the ICU: A multi-methods study. *Burns* 47 (1), 110-126, 10.1016/j.burns.2020.05.032.
- Takase, M., 2023. Falls as the result of interplay between nurses, patient and the environment: Using text-mining to uncover how and why falls happen. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences* 10 (1), 30-37, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2022.12.003>.
- Takase, M., Kisanuki, N., Nakayoshi, Y., Uemura, C., Sato, Y., Yamamoto, M., 2024. Exploring nurses' clinical judgment concerning the relative importance of fall risk factors: A mixed method approach using the Q Methodology. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 153, 104720, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2024.104720>.

- Tanner, C.A., 2006. Thinking like a nurse: a research-based model of clinical judgment in nursing. *The Journal of nursing education* 45 6, 204-211.
- Thompson, C., Bucknall, T., Estabrookes, C.A., Hutchinson, A., Fraser, K., de Vos, R., Binnecade, J., Barrat, G., Saunders, J., 2009. Nurses' critical event risk assessments: a judgement analysis. *J Clin Nurs* 18 (4), 601-612, [10.1111/j.1365-2702.2007.02191.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2007.02191.x).
- Tversky, A., Kahneman, D., 1973. Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology* 5 (2), 207-232, [10.1016/0010-0285\(73\)90033-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(73)90033-9).
- Tzeng, H.M., Yin, C.Y., 2013. Frequently observed risk factors for fall-related injuries and effective preventive interventions: a multihospital survey of nurses' perceptions. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality* 28 (2), 130-138, [10.1097/NCQ.0b013e3182780037](https://doi.org/10.1097/NCQ.0b013e3182780037).
- Vlaeyen, E., Poels, J., Colemonts, U., Peeters, L., Leysens, G., Delbaere, K., Dejaeger, E., Dobbels, F., Milisen, K., 2021. Predicting falls in nursing homes: A prospective multicenter cohort study comparing fall history, staff clinical judgment, the care home falls screen, and the fall risk classification algorithm. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association* 22 (2), 380-387, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamda.2020.06.037>.
- Wabe, N., Meulenbroeks, I., Huang, G., Silva, S.M., Gray, L.C., Close, J.C.T., Lord, S., Westbrook, J.I., 2024. Development and internal validation of a dynamic fall risk prediction and monitoring tool in aged care using routinely collected electronic health data: a landmarking approach. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 31 (5), 1113-1125, [10.1093/jamia/ocae058](https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocae058).
- Whyte, S., Rego, J., Fai Chan, H., Chan, R.J., Yates, P., Dulleck, U., 2022. Cognitive and behavioural bias in advance care planning. *Palliat Care Soc Pract* 16, 26323524221092458, [10.1177/26323524221092458](https://doi.org/10.1177/26323524221092458).
- World Health Organization, 2007. WHO Global Report on Falls Prevention in Older Age. Accessed: April, 2022. <https://extranet.who.int/agefriendlyworld/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/WHO-Global-report-on-falls-prevention-in-older-age.pdf>.
- Wright, G., Bolger, F., Rowe, G., 2009. Expert judgement of probability and risk. In: Williams, T.M., Samset, K., Sunnevåg, K.J. (Eds.), *Making essential choices with scant information: Front-end decision making in major projects*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, pp. 213-229.
- Wright, G., Rowe, G., Bolger, F., Gammack, J., 1994. Coherence, calibration, and expertise in judgmental probability forecasting. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 57 (1), 1-25, <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1001>.
- Wu, M.W., Lee, T.T., Lai, S.M., Huang, C.Y., Chang, T.H., 2019. Evaluation of electronic health records on the nursing process and patient outcomes regarding fall and pressure injuries. *Comput Inform Nurs* 37 (11), 573-582, [10.1097/cin.0000000000000548](https://doi.org/10.1097/cin.0000000000000548).
- Xu, Q., Ou, X., Li, J., 2022. The risk of falls among the aging population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Public Health* 10, 902599, [10.3389/fpubh.2022.902599](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.902599).
- Yang, H., Thompson, C., 2016. Capturing judgement strategies in risk assessments with improved quality of clinical information: How nurses' strategies differ from the ecological model.

BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making 16 (1), 7, 10.1186/s12911-016-0243-1.
Yasan, C., Burton, T., Tracey, M., 2020. Nurses' documentation of falls prevention in a patient centred care plan in a medical ward. Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing 37 (2), 19-24, 10.37464/2020.372.103.

Table 1. The structure of patient scenarios and examples

Conditions						
Risk level	Mobility issues	Cognitive impairment and personality (Does not call nurses)	Urinary issues	Presence of tubes or drains	Medication use	Age
1	Independent	No cognitive impairment and calls nurses when necessary	No urinary problems	No tube or drain inserted	Antibiotic	Less than 65 years old
2	Walks alone but unstable	No cognitive impairment, but reserved and does not call nurses when necessary	Nocturia	One tube or drain inserted	Anti-hypertensive	65-79 years old
3	Needs assistance in transfer	Impaired cognition and does not call nurses when necessary	Urinary frequency	Multiple tubes and/or drains inserted	Sleeping pill	80 years old and over

Example: Please read the following 18 scenarios and assess on a scale of 0-100% the probability that the patient shown in each scenario will fall. Note that all cases are male patients with no history of falls.

1) Mr. A is a patient who exhibits the following characteristics#.

- (1) Urinates at night.
- (2) Takes a sleeping pill.
- (3) Under 65 years old.
- (4) Needs assistance in transfer.
- (5) Has no drain or tube inserted.
- (6) Has no cognitive impairment, but reserved and does not call nurses when necessary.

Note: # In the scenarios, patients' characteristics are presented in a random order.

Table 2. Sample items of the cognitive bias scale

<p><u>Base-rate neglect</u></p> <p>Hospital B has 1,000 patient falls each year. About 50 of these falls are due to vertigo, and the remaining 950 are due to unstable gait. Ms. Yasuda is a randomly selected patient at Hospital B. She is a 90-year-old woman admitted for treatment of heart failure. Her face is pale, and when she stands up, she complains, “Sometimes my eyes go completely black”. She sometimes wobbles. Which is more likely?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ms. Yasuda falls because of vertigo. (Biased response)2. Ms. Yasuda falls because of unstable gait. (Correct response)
<p><u>Belief bias</u></p> <p>We will now solve syllogisms. First, two premises are presented, following a conclusion. You are to determine if the conclusion follows logically from the premises. Assume that all of the premises are true. Now read the following syllogism and choose 1 if it is logically correct or 2 if it is incorrect.</p> <p>Premise 1: Patients who can move on their own are prone to falls.</p> <p>Premise 2: Ms. A cannot move by herself and is bedridden.</p> <p>Conclusion: Therefore, her risk of falling is low.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Correct (Biased response)2. Incorrect (Correct response)
<p><u>Availability bias</u></p> <p>Which do you think leads to more deaths? Please choose the one you think causes more deaths.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Fall (Correct response)2. Traffic accident (Biased response)

Table 3. Characteristics of the participants

Variables	Mean/Frequency	Standard deviation/Proportion
Age	34.06	10.97
Length of experience	10.52	9.45
Sex		
Male	35	9.86%
Female	298	88.96%
Missing	2	0.60%
Education		
Diploma	212	63.28%
Bachelor & Postgraduate	119	35.52%
Missing	4	1.19%
Clinical specialty [#]		
Respiratory/Cardiovascular wards	28	8.36%
Convalescent rehabilitation/Community-based Care wards	87	25.98%
Orthopaedic /Neurology wards	30	8.96%
Long-term/Palliative care wards	46	13.74%
Gastrointestinal wards	45	13.44%
Others	93	27.77%
Missing	6	1.8%

Note: There are six missing values (1.8%) in age and eight missing values (2.4%) in the length of experience.

[#] Nurses were categorised into six groups based on their main clinical specialty.

Table 4. The results of a mixed-effect model

Fall risk	b	Robust SE	z	p	95% CI	
Constant	0.254	0.046	5.550	0.000	0.164	0.344
Sex (0: Female, 1: Male)	-0.067	0.027	-2.510	0.012	-0.120	-0.015
Length of experience	-0.001	0.001	-1.450	0.148	-0.003	0.000
Education (0: Diploma, 1: Degree)	-0.047	0.017	-2.830	0.005	-0.079	-0.014
Clinical specialty (0: Gastrointestinal wards)						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	0.011	0.042	0.270	0.790	-0.072	0.094
Rehabilitation/Community-based care	0.093	0.034	2.730	0.006	0.026	0.159
Orthopaedic/Neurology	-0.055	0.040	-1.380	0.169	-0.133	0.023
Long-term/Palliative care	0.031	0.039	0.780	0.432	-0.046	0.107
Others	-0.002	0.032	-0.050	0.960	-0.064	0.061
Cognitive bias (0: Total score < 2, 1: Total score ≥ 2)						
Base-rate neglect	0.002	0.037	0.050	0.960	-0.071	0.075
Belief bias	-0.006	0.016	-0.350	0.727	-0.038	0.027
Availability bias	-0.029	0.015	-1.980	0.047	-0.058	0.000
Risks of falling (0: Risk level = 1, 1: Risk level ≥ 2)						
Mobility issues	0.157	0.013	11.760	0.000	0.131	0.183
Does not call nurse	0.216	0.016	13.550	0.000	0.184	0.247
Urinary issues	0.028	0.010	2.800	0.005	0.009	0.048
Tubes/drains	0.072	0.010	7.320	0.000	0.053	0.091
Medication use	0.053	0.009	5.740	0.000	0.035	0.072
Patient's age	0.076	0.011	6.870	0.000	0.054	0.097
Mobility issues x Clinical specialty						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	-0.008	0.020	-0.400	0.692	-0.047	0.031
Rehabilitation/Community-based care	-0.042	0.016	-2.550	0.011	-0.074	-0.010
Orthopaedic/Neurology	-0.002	0.022	-0.080	0.937	-0.045	0.041
Long-term/Palliative care	-0.055	0.019	-2.930	0.003	-0.093	-0.018
Others	-0.011	0.016	-0.690	0.493	-0.043	0.021
Not call nurse x Clinical specialty						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	-0.002	0.026	-0.090	0.931	-0.053	0.048
Rehabilitation/Community-based care	-0.026	0.021	-1.230	0.218	-0.066	0.015
Orthopaedic/Neurology	0.008	0.028	0.290	0.768	-0.046	0.063
Long-term/Palliative care	-0.047	0.024	-1.980	0.048	-0.093	0.000
Others	-0.011	0.019	-0.550	0.585	-0.049	0.027
Urinary issues x Clinical specialty						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	0.007	0.015	0.450	0.650	-0.023	0.036
Rehabilitation/Community-based care	0.004	0.013	0.290	0.774	-0.021	0.029
Orthopaedic/Neurology	0.025	0.018	1.420	0.155	-0.010	0.060
Long-term/Palliative care	0.024	0.015	1.620	0.104	-0.005	0.054
Others	0.010	0.013	0.830	0.407	-0.014	0.035
Tubes or drains x Clinical specialty						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	-0.016	0.015	-1.060	0.291	-0.045	0.013
Rehabilitation/Community-based care	-0.023	0.013	-1.870	0.062	-0.048	0.001
Orthopaedic/Neurology	0.028	0.018	1.560	0.118	-0.007	0.063
Long-term/Palliative care	0.000	0.014	0.010	0.991	-0.028	0.028
Others	-0.007	0.012	-0.570	0.569	-0.031	0.017
Medication use x Clinical specialty						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	0.001	0.016	0.070	0.947	-0.030	0.032
Rehabilitation/Community-based Care	-0.011	0.011	-1.030	0.305	-0.033	0.010
Orthopaedic/Neurology	0.015	0.017	0.910	0.362	-0.018	0.048
Long-term/Palliative care	0.011	0.015	0.740	0.458	-0.018	0.040
Others	0.002	0.011	0.160	0.871	-0.020	0.024
Age x Clinical specialty						
Respiratory/Cardiovascular	0.003	0.018	0.190	0.852	-0.032	0.039
Rehabilitation/Community-based care	-0.025	0.014	-1.820	0.069	-0.051	0.002
Orthopaedic/Neurology	0.018	0.018	1.000	0.319	-0.017	0.052
Long-term/Palliative care	0.014	0.017	0.830	0.404	-0.019	0.047
Others	-0.002	0.013	-0.180	0.859	-0.029	0.024
Random-effects parameters	Estimate		Robust SE		95% CI	
Variance (Random intercept)	0.015		0.001		0.013	0.018
Variance (Residual)	0.023		0.001		0.021	0.025
Variance explained by all predictors via fixed slopes					0.318	
Variance explained by outcome cluster means via random intercept variation					0.272	
Variance explained by the whole model					0.590	




Figure 1. The means and standard deviation of nurses' judgement of the risk of falling in each scenario

Variance explained by all predictors via
fixed slopes = 0.314

Variance explained by the whole model
(including random slope) = 0.587






Figure 2. Regression tree illustrating nurses' judgement in the risk of falling


Note: The numeric values in the boxes indicate the mean probability of falling estimated by nurses, and 'RSS' indicates the residual sum of squares. N indicates the number of observations (335×18=6030 observations in total). In this analysis, patient conditions (see Table 1) were dummy-coded, with the risk level 1 variable serving as the reference category for each condition.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 3. Moderating effects between the risk factors and clinical specialty