Title

Perturbation-Based Balance Training Reduces Falls and Fall Injuries in Older People: Insights on Mechanisms and Optimal Training Parameters from a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Authors and affiliation

Shivam Sharma[1,2,3], Ildiko-Zsuzsa Szabo[4], Mathias Brix Danielsen[4,5], Stig Andersen[4,5], Jens Eg Nørgaard[4], Stephen R. Lord[1,2], Yoshiro Okubo[1,2], Martin Gronbech Jørgensen[4,5]

[1] School of Population Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney (Australia)

[2] Falls, Balance and Injury Research Centre, Neuroscience Research Australia, Sydney (Australia)

[3] Movement Care Lab (MCL), Chandigarh (India)

[4] Department of Geriatric Medicine, Aalborg University Hospital, Denmark

[5] Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Denmark

Correspodning Author

Yoshiro Okubo, PhD

Email: y.okubo@neura.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Falls are common among older adults and significantly impact their quality of life. Perturbation-based balance training (PBT) is a task-specific intervention designed to improve reactive balance. This systematic review evaluated the efficacy of PBT in reducing falls, injurious falls, and fall risk factors in older adults. PubMed, CINAHL, EMBASE, and Cochrane databases were searched from inception to June 2024. Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) assessing the effects of PBT on falls or fall risk factors, including reactive balance via laboratory-induced perturbations, were included. Two reviewers independently screened studies and extracted data. Meta-analyses were conducted using a random-effects model, and certainty of evidence was assessed using the GRADE approach. Twenty-five RCTs involving 2,659 participants were included. PBT significantly reduced fall rates by 23% (rate ratio [RR]=0.77, 95% CI 0.60–0.99; I^2=57%, low certainty) and injurious falls by 24% (RR=0.76, 95% CI 0.58–0.98; I^2=0%) compared to controls. PBT improved reactive balance (e.g., lab-induced falls) but had

limited effects on other fall risk factors (e.g., gait). In the dosage subgroup analysis, only PBT programs for at least 6 hours reduced falls by 33%. PBT reduces falls and related injuries, likely through enhanced reactive balance rather than physical improvements. While many PBT programs are low doses (~2 hours), higher doses (6+ hours) likely offer greater fall protection. Further high-quality trials using accessible PBT methods are needed to support scalable implementation.

Key Words: Accidental falls, Aged, reactive balance training, risk factors, exercise therapy, postural balance, independent living

INTRODUCTION

Falls in older people are a global health challenge associated with serious injuries such as hip fractures and head trauma, hospitalisations, nursing home admissions, fear of falling, poor quality of life and death (Shumway-Cook et al., 2009; World Health Organization, 2021). Age-related functional declines may be manifested as poor static balance (Lord et al., 1991), slow gait (Quach et al., 2011), decreased mobility (Beauchet et al., 2011) and poor executive function (Kearney et al., 2013) which have been the target of many conventional exercise interventions (Di Lorito et al., 2021). However, most falls in community-dwelling older people stem from unexpected perturbations such as tripping or slipping while walking (Berg et al., 1997). When such a mechanical perturbation abruptly shifts the center of mass (CoM) beyond the base of support, quick and large reactive stepping and sufficient limb support are necessary to avoid falling (Hof et al., 2005; Okubo, Schoene, et al., 2021; Patla, 2003). Reactive balance control against varied perturbations is essential for fall prevention in older adults but is not adequately addressed by conventional exercises (Kim et al., 2021).

Perturbation-based balance training (PBT), also known as reactive balance training, is a task-specific intervention designed to enhance reactive balance control through repeated exposure to postural perturbations (McCrum et al., 2022). Since its emergence in the early 2000s, various modalities of PBT have been explored, including specialised treadmills (Lurie et al., 2020; Jon D Lurie et al., 2013; Nørgaard et al., 2023), simulated slips and trips (Pai et al., 2010; Y. C. Pai et al., 2014), and manual perturbation techniques (Mansfield et al., 2018). Our previous review (2017) demonstrated that PBT could reduce by approximately 50% in older adults (Okubo et al., 2017). More recently, a review reported a 39% reduction in falls following reactive balance training (Devasahayam et al., 2022); however, this analysis included younger and disease-specific populations, potentially limiting its relevance to older adults.

As the body of evidence surrounding PBT continues to grow, with some inconsistencies emerging across trials (Aviles et al., 2019; Rogers et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022), an updated systematic review is warranted to synthesise current findings and address unresolved clinical questions. Specifically, it remains unclear whether PBT reduces fall-related injuries and risk factors such as reactive balance and static balance, gait, mobility, and executive function. Furthermore, optimal training parameters—including dosage, perturbation type and combination with other exercises, have yet to be established, and it is unknown whether effects differ across subgroups of older adults with varying fall risk profiles.

This review aims to clarify the efficacy of PBT in reducing falls and fall-related injuries among older adults, while also evaluating its impact on key risk factors. It further explores optimal training parameters and examines whether effects differ across older adults at high versus low risk of falling, to inform clinical practice and fall-prevention guidelines.

METHODS

Protocol and registration

This review complies with the Preferred Reporting of Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) (Ardern et al., 2022) in the sport and exercise medicine, musculoskeletal rehabilitation and sports science field (PERSIST) (Ardern et al., 2022). The protocol of the review was prospectively at the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO: CRD42022343368).

Eligibility criteria

Type of studies:

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) conducted in all settings were included. Only articles published in English or Japanese were included.

Participants:

The population of interest was adults aged 60 years or older. To evaluate the effect on non-diseases specific population as seen in a municipal or open clinic training offers, we excluded studies that specifically recruited people diagnosed with neurological diseases (e.g., Parkinson's, dementia, multiple sclerosis) or conditions (e.g., stroke).

Intervention:

To be included in this review, studies had to include PBT in at least one intervention arm. PBT is defined as *balance training that uses repeated, externally applied mechanical perturbations to trigger rapid reactions to regain postural stability in a safe and controlled environment* (McCrum et al., 2022).

Comparators:
All types of comparators (e.g. exercise without perturbation or no intervention) were included. However, studies were excluded if all intervention arms received PBT. If multiple comparators were reported, the most passive comparator was included as the comparator.

Outcome measures:
The primary outcomes were fall rates, proportion of fallers, injurious falls, and laboratory-based measures of reactive balance. These outcomes were chosen because of their clinical relevance to fall prevention and frequent reporting in PBT literature. Secondary outcomes, including measures of static balance (keeping the centre of pressure (CoP) within the static base of support) (Paillard & Noé, 2015), gait speed, mobility (e.g., Timed Up-and-Go test), fear of falling, and other biomechanical markers (e.g., margin of stability), were included to explore broader effects of PBT on fall-related risk factors.

Duration of follow-up:
No limitation on the duration of follow-up was imposed. Although if the outcome is assessed at multiple time points, the one closest to 12 months was used.

Information sources and search strategy

Systematic searches were performed in four electronic databases (PubMed, CINAHL, EMBASE, and Cochrane) from inception to June 2023. An updated search was conducted in July 2024. The search string was built with a research librarian using key terms for population, intervention, and study design (clinical trials, RCTs). No language restriction was imposed during the data-base search. Reference lists of included studies and relevant systematic reviews were also manually searched, and experts in the field were contacted to identify any missing studies. Search strategy is available in supplementary material.

Study selection

Two reviewers (ISZ, JEN/SS) independently screened abstracts and titles based on the eligibility criteria. The reviewers (ISZ, JEN/SS) also assessed the full text of the retrieved studies to determine inclusion. Conflicting opinions were solved by discussions between reviewers and, if necessary, by consulting a

third reviewer (MGJ/YO). The study selection process was conducted in RAYYAN (Ouzzani et al., 2016) and Covidence (for updated searches).

Data collection process

Two reviewers (ISZ, SS) independently extracted data in Covidence using a template covering study design, participants, interventions, outcomes, and results. Disagreements were resolved through discussion or additional reviewers (MGJ, YO). List of extracted data items is available in the supplementary material.

Risk of bias assessment

Two authors (SS, MBD) individually assessed risk of bias in the included studies using the Cochrane risk of bias tool 2 (ROB 2) (Sterne et al., 2019). All outcomes were separately assessed using ROB 2. Disagreements during the consensus process were resolved through mutual discussion between reviewers (YO, MGJ), with final decisions made following appropriate justification. When available, trial protocols and registrations were retrieved and reviewed to supplement information provided in the included studies.

Strategy for data analysis

The results from studies with sufficiently similar methodologies were combined in a series of meta-analyses using DerSimonian and Laird inverse variant random effect model in Cochrane Review Manager software (RevMan 5.0). Fall rates were reported as incidence rate ratios (IRRs) with their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Binary outcomes, including the proportion of fallers, injurious fallers, and laboratory fallers, were presented as risk ratios (RRs) with 95% CIs. For continuous variables, such as margin of stability, hip height, step height, fear of falling, mobility, static balance and gait speed, results were reported as mean differences or standardised mean differences with their respective 95% CIs. Statistical heterogeneity was determined by visual inspection of forest plots and I^2 statistics (≥75%; considerable heterogeneity).

Planned subgroup analyses were conducted to examine the differences in fall rates by (i) participant characteristics (higher risk of falling vs lower risk of falling) (e.g. based on fall history, balance impairment), (ii) PBT type (walkway vs treadmill vs manual/standing perturbation), (iii) training dosage (≤ 6 hours vs >6 hours), and (iv) intervention type (PBT alone vs combined PBT, such as PBT plus resistance training) and (v) exercise without perturbation vs no intervention compared with PBT as

common comparator. We chose these subgroups because prior evidence suggests effectiveness varies by dosage, perturbation type, and risk profile.

Sensitivity analyses were performed comparing the results of the low-risk bias studies with the high-risk bias studies. Leave-one-out analyses were performed to assess the robustness of our findings on fall rates and to evaluate whether the exclusion of individual studies significantly altered the overall effect size or heterogeneity.

Publication bias

Publication bias was assessed by visually inspecting funnel plots to identify potential asymmetry, which could indicate selective reporting of results.

Grading of Evidence

The certainty of evidence was evaluated using the GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool (Table 1) (McMaster University, 2023). The overall quality of evidence was determined as high (further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect), moderate (further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate), low (further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate), or very low (any estimate of effect is very uncertain).

RESULTS

Study Selection

The initial search identified 1932 articles after removal of duplicates. Of these, 53 articles were retrieved for full text assessment, and 23 were identified as meeting all criteria and were thus considered eligible for inclusion in our review. An additional updated search was conducted in July 2024 to include any new studies published while the review was underway. The updated search revealed 144 new studies after the removal of duplicates, and after full-text screening, two studies met the inclusion criteria. Consequently, 25 studies were deemed eligible for inclusion after the full-text screening.

Study Characteristics

Of the 25 RCTs included in this review, six used perturbation walkaways (e.g. sliding tiles, pop-up obstacles) (Allin et al., 2020) (Bhatt et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2021; Y Okubo et al., 2019; Y.-C. Pai et al., 2014; Rogers et al., 2021), 16 used treadmills (e.g. belt accelerations/decelerations)(Aviles et al., 2019; Bieryla et al., 2007; Brull et al., 2023; Gerards et al., 2023; Gimmon et al., 2018; Kurz et al., 2016; Lurie et

al., 2020; J. D. Lurie et al., 2013; Nørgaard et al., 2023; Obuchi et al., 2004; Rieger et al., 2020; Shimada et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2022) and four used manual/standing perturbations (e.g. surface translation) (Maki et al., 2008; Mansfield et al., 2010; Parijat & Lockhart, 2012; Wang et al., 2022) as their PBT modality. Out of 25 studies only one study had no intervention for the control group (Brull et al., 2023). Rest all other studies had non-PBT exercises. Training doses were >6 hours (average 9.8 hours) in seven studies (Aviles et al., 2019; Brull et al., 2023; Gimmon et al., 2018; Kurz et al., 2016; Maki et al., 2008; Rogers et al., 2021; Shimada et al., 2004), and ≤6 hours (average 1.6 hours) in the remaining included studies. Eight studies (Brull et al., 2023; Gerards et al., 2023; Lurie et al., 2020; Jon D Lurie et al., 2013; Maki et al., 2008; Mansfield et al., 2010; Rieger et al., 2024; Shimada et al., 2004) included older people at increased risk of falls while the other studies included general samples of older people. A detailed methodology of these RCTs is reported in Supplementary Table 1. The intensity of perturbation was reported inconsistently and often inadequately across studies, with treadmill belt accelerations ranging from 0.1 to 20 m/s^2, and moveable platform slip distances varying from 10 cm to 90 cm. Only one study (Rieger et al., 2024) reported the use of harness-supported falls during training.

Results of syntheses

Effect of PBT intervention on fall outcomes

Eleven trials (n=1231) included data on total falls (rate ratio) and fallers (risk ratio). Meta-analyses of these trials showed significant reductions in the rate of falls (Figure 1; rate ratio: 0.77, 95% CI: 0.60 to 0.99, p=0.040, I^2=57%) and proportion of fallers (Figure 2; risk ratio=0.83, 95% CI 0.74 to 0.93, p=0.001, I^2=0). A significant reduction in injurious falls was also observed across four studies, with a pooled risk ratio of 0.76 (Figure 3; risk ratio=0.76, 95% CI: 0.58 to 0.98, p=0.030, I^2=0%).

Insert Figure 1, 2 and 3

Effect of PBT intervention on fall-related risk factors

Laboratory-assessed falls related to reactive balance demonstrated a significant reduction following PBT intervention across nine trials (Figure 4; risk ratio =0.42, 95% CI: 0.31 to 0.58, p<0.001, I^2 =38%). There were also improvements in margin of stability (5 studies, n =381, MD (m)=0.47, 95% CI: −0.01 to 0.94, p =0.050, I^2=68%) and hip height (4 studies, n =206, SMD (m)=0.43, 95% CI: 0.05 to 0.940, p =0.05, I^2=68%). Secondary fall-related risk factors including fear of falling (6 studies, n =579), gait speed (5 studies, n =126), static balance (4 studies, n =527), step length (8 studies, n =288), and performance on the Timed Up and Go (TUG) test (5 studies, n =418) were analysed. However, none of these outcomes demonstrated statistically significant improvements following PBT intervention compared to control

groups. Individual forest plots for each factor are presented in the supplementary appendices. Eight studies reported adverse events during training (Brull et al., 2023; Gerards et al., 2017; Kurz et al., 2016; Lurie et al., 2020; Mansfield et al., 2010; Nørgaard et al., 2023; Y Okubo et al., 2019; Y. Okubo et al., 2019; Rogers et al., 2021) but other 17 studies did not.

Insert Figure 4

Subgroup analyses

Since not all included studies reported all secondary outcomes, only studies that reported the outcome of interest were included in the meta-analysis. Forest plots for each subgroup analysis are provided in the online supplementary. Regarding combination, PBT combined with exercise significantly reduced falls (rate ratio = 0.26; 95% CI: 0.13 to 0.54, $p < 0.001$) but not PBT alone (rate ratio = 0.81; 95% CI: 0.62 to 1.06; $p = 0.120$). The falls reduction was significantly greater for PBT combined with exercise (p for subgroup = 0.004). When stratified by training dosage (<6 hours vs 6+ hours), subgroup difference was not significant (p for subgroup = 0.46), but only PBT with higher training dose (>6 hours) significantly reduced falls (rate ratio = 0.67; 95% CI: 0.46 to 0.97; $p = 0.03$). Similarly, no significant subgroup differences were observed in participant characteristics (healthy vs high-risk, $p = 0.79$) and PBT type (walkway vs treadmill vs manual/standing; $p = 0.27$) but only walkway PBT significantly reduced falls (rate ratio = 0.50; 95% CI = 0.28, 0.9; $p = 0.02$). Regarding the control type, no significant subgroup difference was observed between trials comparing PBT against exercise without perturbations, and those comparing PBT against no exercise (p for subgroup = 0.10).

Sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analysis comparing studies with low versus high risk of bias revealed no significant difference in effect size for the total number of falls ($p = 1.00$; $I^2 = 0\%$). Influence analysis using a leave-one-out approach for daily falls indicated that the overall effect size became non-significant when certain studies (Jon D Lurie et al., 2013; Nørgaard et al., 2023; Y. C. Pai et al., 2014; Rieger et al., 2024; Rogers et al., 2021; Shimada et al., 2004) were excluded, with heterogeneity (I^2) ranging from 44% to 59%. Notably, heterogeneity was substantially reduced from 55% to 16% when the study by Lurie et al. (2020) (Lurie et al., 2020) was omitted ($p = 0.050$).

Publication bias

Due to the limited number of included studies, the funnel plots for total number of falls, number of fallers, and injurious falls lacked a discernible funnel shape, preventing meaningful interpretation (supplementary file). However, the funnel plot for laboratory falls indicated potential publication bias. Upon removal of suspected outlier studies (Liu et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2021; Parijat & Lockhart, 2012), the effect size was no longer statistically significant, suggesting that these studies may have disproportionately influenced the original findings.

Risk of bias (ROB) and certainty of evidence

The GRADE assessment indicated that the certainty of evidence was low for outcomes related to risk of falls, injurious falls, and moderate for the risk of fallers and laboratory-assessed falls. These ratings were primarily influenced by methodological limitations across the included studies, such as lack of concealed allocation, absence of blinding procedures, potential selective outcome reporting, and incomplete outcome data due to attrition.

Insert table 1

DISCUSSION

This review revealed PBT reduced fall rates in older adults by 23% compared to control groups receiving exercise without perturbation or no exercise/intervention. However, the certainty of this evidence was rated as low. Similarly, PBT was associated with a 24% reduction in injurious falls, also supported by low-certainty evidence. In contrast, the proportion of older adults experiencing at least one fall decreased by 17%, with moderate certainty in the estimate. PBT enhanced reactive balance responses to sudden perturbations. PBT did not significantly affect static balance, gait speed, or fear of falling, suggesting that fall reduction might stem from improved reactive balance rather than broader physiological or psychological changes.

Mechanisms

PBT differs fundamentally from traditional balance training. (Sherrington et al., 2019; Sherrington et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022) While conventional exercises often focus on maintaining the center of mass within a reduced base of support (e.g., single-leg stance), PBT targets reactive balance, i.e.: the ability to recover from sudden, unexpected perturbations. This is a critical mechanism of fall prevention that conventional programs do not adequately address. (Grabiner et al., 2014; McCrum et al., 2022) PBT

achieves this by exposing individuals to repeated, controlled perturbations, allowing them to develop predictive and reactive motor strategies to maintain balance.

Improved Reactive Balance and Transfer to Daily Life

The review found that PBT was associated with a 58% reduction in laboratory-induced falls, suggesting a improvement in reactive balance. Further, reduction in real-world falls was more dampened at approximately 25%. This difference may reflect the complexity and unpredictability of real-life environments, which current PBT protocols may not fully replicate (Phu et al., 2024; Song et al., 2021). Moreover, many PBT programs are delivered over short timeframes, and their protective effects may diminish over time. For instance, one trial reported a 57% reduction in injurious falls at three months follow-up, but this benefit was lost at 12 months (Lurie et al., 2020). These findings highlight the potential value of booster sessions to maintain long-term benefits (Bhatt et al., 2012).

Biomechanical outcomes also support the efficacy of PBT. Improvements were observed in margin of stability and hip height, suggesting enhanced postural control. However, changes in other measures, such as recovery step length, were not significant, likely due to variability in perturbation types (e.g., slips vs. trips), which elicit different motor adaptations (Phu et al., 2024). This underscores the need for more standardised outcome measures in future studies.

Dose and intensity of PBT

Interestingly, most PBT programs included in this review involved relatively low training doses, averaging just 1.6 hours across 3–6 sessions. This suggests, PBT may reduce falls through motor learning, enabling quick gait and posture adaptation. Studies show that older adults often adjust within 3–24 trials in a single session using predictive strategies like forward center-of-mass shifts (Bohm et al., 2015; Pai et al., 2010; Y. C. Pai et al., 2014). However, in the dosage subgroup analysis, only PBT programs with at least 6 hours reduced falls by 33%. While optimal training dose may vary for each individual, several hours of PBT may be necessary to develop familiarity with perturbations, learn effective reactive balance strategies, and automate these responses (Okubo et al., 2018; Y Okubo et al., 2019), especially in frailer individuals who benefit from gradual progression starting from lower-intensity perturbations. However, six hours are still substantially lower than the recommended dose for conventional exercises (3 hours/week on an ongoing basis) (Sherrington et al., 2017).

Due to the inherent heterogeneity of PBT methods, the intensity of interventions has been reported inconsistently and lacks reproducibility across studies. We recommend that future research consistently

report the number and rate of harness-supported falls as a universal and objective indicator of PBT intensity (Rieger et al., 2024). Incorporating such measures may facilitate tailored interventions and enhance clinical outcomes.

Different PBT Methods

Subgroup analyses did not reveal statistically significant differences between PBT delivery methods—such as treadmills, walkways, or manual/standing perturbations. However, walkway interventions showed a larger effect size, suggesting a potential trend toward greater efficacy. Some studies report generalisation of skills from treadmill to overground settings, while others highlight distinct adaptations and limited transferability (Lee et al., 2018; Phu et al., 2024; Song et al., 2021). These Mixed findings question whether all PBT modalities are equally effective, underscoring the need to identify methods that best mimic real-world perturbations.

Complementing Conventional Exercise

Since PBT did not significantly improve other risk factors, balance, gait speed, or fear of falling, in our opinion it should be considered a complementary intervention rather than a substitute for conventional exercise. Notably, subgroup analysis based on one study revealed that combining PBT with lower-limb strength training reduced falls by 74%, a significantly greater effect than PBT alone. This supports the idea that muscle strength, particularly in the hips, is essential for executing rapid reactive steps (Okubo, Duran, et al., 2021; Rogers et al., 2021). As it is a single-study analysis, the conclusion remains uncertain and future research should focus on this approach. For now, we suggest integrating PBT with traditional strength and balance exercises, as this combination may offer synergistic benefits and address multiple fall risk factors. Additionally, there was no significant subgroup difference when comparing exercise without perturbation and no exercise against PBT. However, it is noteworthy that PBT reduced falls by 45% compared to no exercise ($p = 0.02$), but only by 13% compared to exercise without PBT ($p = 0.24$).

Clinical Implications

PBT effectively improves reactive balance and should be integrated into fall prevention programs for both healthy and high-risk older adults. Brief PBT sessions can provide benefit, but programs should aim for higher doses (≥6 hours) when feasible to achieve sustainable neuromuscular adaptations. Combining PBT with exercise might offer synergistic benefits. Manual perturbations are practical and low-cost for widespread implementation, while walking-based perturbations may enhance generalisability to real-life

situations when resources allow. However, given the low certainty of the current evidence, more rigorous high-quality trials are needed.

Limitations

Despite its strengths, this review has several limitations. First, the possibility of publication bias and missed studies in including those not published in English or Japanese cannot be ruled out. Second, there was substantial heterogeneity in PBT protocols, including differences in training modality, dosage, and delivery, which may have influenced the pooled results. Third, although sensitivity and subgroup analyses were conducted, these one-dimensional approaches cannot fully account for the complex confounding present across studies. Fourth, moderate heterogeneity (I^2 = 55%) was observed in the meta-analysis, which was reduced to 16% upon excluding Lurie et al. (2020) (Lurie et al., 2020), indicating it may have disproportionately contributed to between-study variability, likely due to its pragmatic design and lack of a standardized PBT protocol (e.g., session range: 1–25). Lastly, the limited number of studies included and their methodological weaknesses, resulted in low to moderate certainty of evidence. These limitations highlight the need for high-quality, standardised trials to strengthen the evidence base and clarify optimal PBT practices.

Conclusion

This review provides evidence that PBT reduces all fall rates in older adults compared to exercises without perturbations or no exercise. PBT clearly improves reactive balance control, as indicated by a 58% reduction in laboratory-induced falls and improved dynamic stability following perturbations. Low-dose PBT (1.5 hours) likely promotes rapid motor learning and anticipatory strategies, whereas high-dose PBT (>6 hrs) may drive more sustainable, generalizable neuromuscular adaptations for fall prevention. Combining PBT with exercise may offer synergistic benefits, as PBT alone may not improve other risk factors. Evidence for delivery methods is mixed: fall reduction was demonstrated clearly in walkway-based PBT, while differences from treadmill-based and manual PBT remain inconclusive. Thus, manual/standing perturbation techniques remain a feasible, low-cost option for clinical implementation.

Overall, PBT is a clinically relevant and effective intervention that can be integrated into routine exercise programs to strengthen fall prevention strategies in older adults. Given the limited evidence, high-quality trials using accessible and scalable PBT delivery methods are needed to confirm its effectiveness for widespread community implementation.

Contributors

All authors contributed to the development of the study protocol and design. IZS and MGJ performed the literature searches. IZB and JEN screened titles, abstracts, and full-text articles. SS, MBD, YO, and MGJ were responsible for data extraction and risk of bias assessment. Certainty of evidence was assessed by MGJ and YO. SS and YO conducted the data analysis and drafted the initial manuscript. YO served as the study guarantor. SRL and SA reviewed and approved the final manuscript after comments of all authors.

Funding information

No funding was provided for this review.

Patient involvement and consent

Not applicable.

Conflict of interest

None.

Ethics approval

Not applicable.

Equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) statement

Not applicable.

Data sharing statement

All data relevant to this study are included within the article and supplementary material.

PROSPERO Registration: CRD42022343368

REFERENCES

Allin, L. J., Brolinson, P. G., Beach, B. M., Kim, S., Nussbaum, M. A., Roberto, K. A., & Madigan, M. L. (2020). Perturbation-based balance training targeting both slip- and trip-induced falls among older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr*, *20*(1), 205. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-020-01605-9

Ardern, C. L., Büttner, F., Andrade, R., Weir, A., Ashe, M. C., Holden, S., Impellizzeri, F. M., Delahunt, E., Dijkstra, H. P., Mathieson, S., Rathleff, M. S., Reurink, G., Sherrington, C., Stamatakis, E., Vicenzino, B., Whittaker, J. L., Wright, A. A., Clarke, M., Moher, D.,…Winters, M. (2022). Implementing the 27 PRISMA 2020 Statement items for systematic reviews in the sport and exercise medicine, musculoskeletal rehabilitation and sports science fields: the PERSiST (implementing Prisma in Exercise, Rehabilitation, Sport medicine and SporTs sc. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, *56*(4), 175-195. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2021-103987

Aviles, J., Allin, L. J., Alexander, N. B., Van Mullekom, J., Nussbaum, M. A., & Madigan, M. L. (2019). Comparison of Treadmill Trip-Like Training Versus Tai Chi to Improve Reactive Balance Among Independent Older Adult Residents of Senior Housing: A Pilot Controlled Trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*, *74*(9), 1497-1503. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glz018

Beauchet, O., Fantino, B., Allali, G., Muir, S. W., Montero-Odasso, M., & Annweiler, C. (2011). Timed up and go test and risk of falls in older adults: A systematic review. *The Journal of Nutrition, Health & Aging*, *15*(10), 933-938. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12603-011-0062-0

Berg, W. P., Alessio, H. M., Mills, E. M., & Tong, C. (1997). Circumstances and consequences of falls in independent community-dwelling older adults. *Age Ageing*, *26*(4), 261-268. https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/26.4.261

Bhatt, T., Wang, Y., Wang, S., & Kannan, L. (2021). Perturbation Training for Fall-Risk Reduction in Healthy Older Adults: Interference and Generalization to Opposing Novel Perturbations Post Intervention. *Front Sports Act Living*, *3*, 697169. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2021.697169

Bhatt, T., Yang, F., & Pai, Y. C. (2012). Learning to resist gait-slip falls: long-term retention in community-dwelling older adults. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, *93*(4), 557-564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2011.10.027

Bieryla, K. A., Madigan, M. L., & Nussbaum, M. A. (2007). Practicing recovery from a simulated trip improves recovery kinematics after an actual trip. *Gait Posture*, *26*(2), 208-213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.09.010

Bohm, S., Mademli, L., Mersmann, F., & Arampatzis, A. (2015). Predictive and Reactive Locomotor Adaptability in Healthy Elderly: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med*, *45*(12), 1759-1777. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-015-0413-9

Brull, L., Hezel, N., Arampatzis, A., & Schwenk, M. (2023). Comparing the Effects of Two Perturbation-Based Balance Training Paradigms in Fall-Prone Older Adults: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Gerontology*, *69*(7), 910-922. https://doi.org/10.1159/000530167

Devasahayam, A. J., Farwell, K., Lim, B., Morton, A., Fleming, N., Jagroop, D., Aryan, R., Saumur, T. M., & Mansfield, A. (2022). The Effect of Reactive Balance Training on Falls in Daily Life: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Physical Therapy*, *103*(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/pzac154

Di Lorito, C., Long, A., Byrne, A., Harwood, R. H., Gladman, J. R. F., Schneider, S., Logan, P., Bosco, A., & van der Wardt, V. (2021). Exercise interventions for older adults: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Journal of Sport and Health Science*, *10*(1), 29-47. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2020.06.003

Gerards, M., Marcellis, R., Senden, R., Poeze, M., de Bie, R., Meijer, K., & Lenssen, A. (2023). The effect of perturbation-based balance training on balance control and fear of falling in older adults: a single-blind randomised controlled trial. *BMC Geriatr*, *23*(1), 305. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-023-03988-x

Gerards, M. H. G., McCrum, C., Mansfield, A., & Meijer, K. (2017). Perturbation-based balance training for falls reduction among older adults: Current evidence and implications for clinical practice. *Geriatr Gerontol Int*, *17*(12), 2294-2303. https://doi.org/10.1111/ggi.13082

Gimmon, Y., Riemer, R., Kurz, I., Shapiro, A., Debbi, R., & Melzer, I. (2018). Perturbation exercises during treadmill walking improve pelvic and trunk motion in older adults-A randomized control trial. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*, *75*, 132-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2017.12.004

Grabiner, M. D., Crenshaw, J. R., Hurt, C. P., Rosenblatt, N. J., & Troy, K. L. (2014). Exercise-based fall prevention: can you be a bit more specific? *Exerc Sport Sci Rev*, *42*(4), 161-168. https://doi.org/10.1249/JES.0000000000000023

Hof, A. L., Gazendam, M. G., & Sinke, W. E. (2005). The condition for dynamic stability. *J Biomech*, *38*(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.03.025

Kearney, F. C., Harwood, R. H., Gladman, J. R., Lincoln, N., & Masud, T. (2013). The relationship between executive function and falls and gait abnormalities in older adults: a systematic review. *Dementia and Geriatric Cognitive Disorders*, *36*(1-2), 20-35. https://doi.org/10.1159/000350031

Kim, Y., Vakula, M. N., Bolton, D. A. E., Dakin, C. J., Thompson, B. J., Slocum, T. A., Teramoto, M., & Bressel, E. (2021). Which Exercise Interventions Can Most Effectively Improve Reactive Balance

in Older Adults? A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, *13*, 764826. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2021.764826

Kurz, I., Gimmon, Y., Shapiro, A., Debi, R., Snir, Y., & Melzer, I. (2016). Unexpected perturbations training improves balance control and voluntary stepping times in older adults - a double blind randomized control trial. *BMC Geriatr*, *16*, 58. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-016-0223-4

Lee, A., Bhatt, T., Liu, X., Wang, Y., & Pai, Y. C. (2018). Can higher training practice dosage with treadmill slip-perturbation necessarily reduce risk of falls following overground slip? *Gait Posture*, *61*, 387-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.01.037

Liu, J., Lockhart, T. E., Parijat, P., McIntosh, J. D., & Chiu, Y. P. (2015). Comparison of Slip Training in VR Environment And on Moveable Platform. *Biomed Sci Instrum*, *51*, 189-197. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25996717

Liu, X., Bhatt, T., Wang, Y., Wang, S., Lee, A., & Pai, Y. C. (2021). The retention of fall-resisting behavior derived from treadmill slip-perturbation training in community-dwelling older adults. *Geroscience*, *43*(2), 913-926. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11357-020-00270-5

Lord, S. R., Clark, R. D., & Webster, I. W. (1991). Physiological factors associated with falls in an elderly population. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, *39*(12), 1194-1200. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1960365

Lurie, J. D., Zagaria, A. B., Ellis, L., Pidgeon, D., Gill-Body, K. M., Burke, C., Armbrust, K., Cass, S., Spratt, K. F., & McDonough, C. M. (2020). Surface Perturbation Training to Prevent Falls in Older Adults: A Highly Pragmatic, Randomized Controlled Trial. *Phys Ther*, *100*(7), 1153-1162. https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/pzaa023

Lurie, J. D., Zagaria, A. B., Pidgeon, D. M., Forman, J. L., & Spratt, K. F. (2013). Pilot comparative effectiveness study of surface perturbation treadmill training to prevent falls in older adults. *BMC Geriatrics*, *13*(1), 1-8.

Lurie, J. D., Zagaria, A. B., Pidgeon, D. M., Forman, J. L., & Spratt, K. F. (2013). Pilot comparative effectiveness study of surface perturbation treadmill training to prevent falls in older adults. *BMC Geriatr*, *13*, 49. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-13-49

Maki, B. E., Cheng, K. C., Mansfield, A., Scovil, C. Y., Perry, S. D., Peters, A. L., McKay, S., Lee, T., Marquis, A., Corbeil, P., Fernie, G. R., Liu, B., & McIlroy, W. E. (2008). Preventing falls in older adults: new interventions to promote more effective change-in-support balance reactions. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol*, *18*(2), 243-254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2007.06.005

Mansfield, A., Aqui, A., Danells, C. J., Knorr, S., Centen, A., DePaul, V. G., Schinkel-Ivy, A., Brooks, D., Inness, E. L., & Mochizuki, G. (2018). Does perturbation-based balance training prevent falls among individuals with chronic stroke? A randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*, *8*(8), e021510. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021510

Mansfield, A., Peters, A. L., Liu, B. A., & Maki, B. E. (2010). Effect of a perturbation-based balance training program on compensatory stepping and grasping reactions in older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *Phys Ther*, *90*(4), 476-491. https://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20090070

McCrum, C., Bhatt, T. S., Gerards, M. H. G., Karamanidis, K., Rogers, M. W., Lord, S. R., & Okubo, Y. (2022). Perturbation-based balance training: Principles, mechanisms and implementation in clinical practice. *Front Sports Act Living*, *4*, 1015394. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2022.1015394

McMaster University. (2023). *GRADEpro GDT: GRADEpro guideline development tool [Software]*. Evidence Prime, Inc. https://www.gradepro.org

Nørgaard, J. E., Andersen, S., Ryg, J., Stevenson, A. J. T., Andreasen, J., Oliveira, A. S., Danielsen, M. B., & Jorgensen, M. G. (2023). Effect of Treadmill Perturbation-Based Balance Training on Fall Rates in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*, *6*(4), e238422. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.8422

Obuchi, S., Kojima, M., Shiba, Y., Shimada, H., & Suzuki, T. (2004). [A randomized controlled trial of a treadmill training with the perturbation to improve the balance performance in the community dwelling elderly subjects]. *Nihon Ronen Igakkai Zasshi*, *41*(3), 321-327. https://doi.org/10.3143/geriatrics.41.321

Okubo, Y., Brodie, M. A., Sturnieks, D., Hicks, C., Carter, H., Toson, B., & Lord, S. (2018). Exposure to trips and slips with increasing unpredictability while walking can improve balance recovery responses with minimum predictive gait alterations. *PloS One*, *13*(9).

Okubo, Y., DL, S., Brodie, M. A., Duran, L., & Lord, S. (2019). Effect of reactive balance training involving repeated slips and trips on balance recovery in older adults: A blinded randomized controlled trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glz021

Okubo, Y., Duran, L., Delbaere, K., Sturnieks, D. L., Richardson, J. K., Pijnappels, M., & Lord, S. R. (2021). Rapid Inhibition Accuracy and Leg Strength Are Required for Community-Dwelling Older People to Recover Balance From Induced Trips and Slips: An Experimental Prospective Study. *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy*. https://doi.org/10.1519/JPT.0000000000000312

Okubo, Y., Schoene, D., Caetano, M. J., Pliner, E. M., Osuka, Y., Toson, B., & Lord, S. R. (2021). Stepping impairment and falls in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of volitional and reactive step tests. *Ageing Res Rev*, *66*, 101238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arr.2020.101238

Okubo, Y., Schoene, D., & Lord, S. R. (2017). Step training improves reaction time, gait and balance and reduces falls in older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*, *51*(7), 586-593. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-095452

Okubo, Y., Sturnieks, D. L., Brodie, M. A., Duran, L., & Lord, S. R. (2019). Effect of Reactive Balance Training Involving Repeated Slips and Trips on Balance Recovery Among Older Adults: A Blinded Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*, *74*(9), 1489-1496. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glz021

Ouzzani, M., Hammady, H., Fedorowicz, Z., & Elmagarmid, A. (2016). Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*, *5*(1), 210. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4

Pai, Y.-C., Bhatt, T., Yang, F., & Wang, E. (2014). Perturbation training can reduce community-dwelling older adults' annual fall risk: a randomized controlled trial. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences & Medical Sciences*, *69*(12), 1586-1594. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glu087

Pai, Y. C., Bhatt, T., Wang, E., Espy, D., & Pavol, M. J. (2010). Inoculation against falls: rapid adaptation by young and older adults to slips during daily activities. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*, *91*(3), 452-459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2009.10.032

Pai, Y. C., Bhatt, T., Yang, F., & Wang, E. (2014). Perturbation training can reduce community-dwelling older adults' annual fall risk: a randomized controlled trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*, *69*(12), 1586-1594. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glu087

Paillard, T., & Noé, F. (2015). Techniques and Methods for Testing the Postural Function in Healthy and Pathological Subjects. *BioMed Research International*, *2015*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/891390

Parijat, P., & Lockhart, T. E. (2012). Effects of moveable platform training in preventing slip-induced falls in older adults. *Ann Biomed Eng*, *40*(5), 1111-1121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-011-0477-0

Patla, A. E. (2003). Strategies for dynamic stability during adaptive human locomotion. *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine*, *22*(2), 48-52. https://doi.org/10.1109/MEMB.2003.1195695

Phu, S., Sturnieks, D. L., Song, P. Y. H., Lord, S. R., & Okubo, Y. (2024). Neuromuscular adaptations to perturbation-based balance training using treadmill belt accelerations do not transfer to an

obstacle trip in older people: A cross-over randomised controlled trial. *Hum Mov Sci*, *97*, 103273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2024.103273

Quach, L., Galica, A. M., Jones, R. N., Procter-Gray, E., Manor, B., Hannan, M. T., & Lipsitz, L. A. (2011). The nonlinear relationship between gait speed and falls: the Maintenance of Balance, Independent Living, Intellect, and Zest in the Elderly of Boston Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*, *59*(6), 1069-1073. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03408.x

Rieger, M. M., Papegaaij, S., Pijnappels, M., Steenbrink, F., & van Dieen, J. H. (2020). Transfer and retention effects of gait training with anterior-posterior perturbations to postural responses after medio-lateral gait perturbations in older adults. *Clinical Biomechanics (Bristol, Avon)*, *75*, 104988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.104988

Rieger, M. M., Papegaaij, S., Steenbrink, F., van Dieën, J. H., & Pijnappels, M. (2024). Effects of Perturbation-Based Treadmill Training on Balance Performance, Daily Life Gait, and Falls in Older Adults: REACT Randomized Controlled Trial. *Phys Ther*, *104*(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/pzad136

Rogers, M. W., Creath, R. A., Gray, V., Abarro, J., McCombe Waller, S., Beamer, B. A., & Sorkin, J. D. (2021). Comparison of Lateral Perturbation-Induced Step Training and Hip Muscle Strengthening Exercise on Balance and Falls in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Blinded Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*, *76*(9), e194-e202. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glab017

Sherrington, C., Fairhall, N. J., Wallbank, G. K., Tiedemann, A., Michaleff, Z. A., Howard, K., Clemson, L., Hopewell, S., & Lamb, S. E. (2019). Exercise for preventing falls in older people living in the community. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, *1*(1), CD012424. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012424.pub2

Sherrington, C., Michaleff, Z. A., Fairhall, N., Paul, S. S., Tiedemann, A., Whitney, J., Cumming, R. G., Herbert, R. D., Close, J. C. T., & Lord, S. R. (2017). Exercise to prevent falls in older adults: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*, *51*(24), 1750-1758. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-096547

Shimada, H., Obuchi, S., Furuna, T., & Suzuki, T. (2004). New intervention program for preventing falls among frail elderly people: the effects of perturbed walking exercise using a bilateral separated treadmill. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*, *83*(7), 493-499. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.phm.0000130025.54168.91

Shumway-Cook, A., Ciol, M. A., Hoffman, J., Dudgeon, B. J., Yorkston, K., & Chan, L. (2009). Falls in the Medicare population: incidence, associated factors, and impact on health care. *Phys Ther*, *89*(4), 324-332. https://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20070107

Song, P., Sturnieks, D. L., Davis, M., Lord, S. R., & Okubo, Y. (2021). Perturbation-based balance training using repeated trips on a walkway versus a treadmill: A cross-over randomised controlled trial in community-dwelling older adults. *Front Sports Act Living*, *in press*.

Sterne, J. A. C., Savovic, J., Page, M. J., Elbers, R. G., Blencowe, N. S., Boutron, I., Cates, C. J., Cheng, H. Y., Corbett, M. S., Eldridge, S. M., Emberson, J. R., Hernan, M. A., Hopewell, S., Hrobjartsson, A., Junqueira, D. R., Juni, P., Kirkham, J. J., Lasserson, T., Li, T.,…Higgins, J. P. T. (2019). RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*, *366*, l4898. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898

Wang, Y., Bhatt, T., Liu, X., Wang, S., Lee, A., Wang, E., & Pai, Y. C. (2019). Can treadmill-slip perturbation training reduce immediate risk of over-ground-slip induced fall among community-dwelling older adults? *Journal of Biomechanics*, *84*, 58-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2018.12.017

Wang, Y., Wang, S., Liu, X., Lee, A., Pai, Y. C., & Bhatt, T. (2022). Can a single session of treadmill-based slip training reduce daily life falls in community-dwelling older adults? A randomized controlled trial. *Aging Clin Exp Res*, *34*(7), 1593-1602. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40520-022-02090-3

World Health Organization. (2021). *Step Safely: Strategies for preventing and managing falls across the life-course*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/978924002191-4

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1- Result of meta-analyses for rate ratio of falls

(Rogers 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip strengthening; Rogers 2021b – induced step training vs flexibility and relaxation). Risk of bias (A) Randomisation process, (B) Deviations from the intended interventions, (C) Missing outcome data, (D), Measurement of the outcome, (E) Selection of the reported result, (F) Overall

Figure 2- Result of meta-analyses for risk ratio (fallers)

(Rogers 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip strengthening; Rogers 2021b – induced step training vs flexibility and relaxation). Risk of bias (A) Randomisation process, (B) Deviations

from the intended interventions, (C) Missing outcome data, (D), Measurement of the outcome, (E) Selection of the reported result, (F) Overall

Figure 3 -Result of meta-analyses for risk ratio (Injurious falls)

Risk of bias (A) Randomisation process, (B) Deviations from the intended interventions, (C) Missing outcome data, (D), Measurement of the outcome, (E) Selection of the reported result, (F) Overall

Figure 4 -Result of meta-analyses for risk ratio (laboratory fallers)

(Liu 2020a - overground slip-perturbation training vs Ot: overground slip-perturbation training; Liu 2020b – treadmill perturbation training vs treadmill control; Allins 2020a – slip training vs control). Risk of bias (A) Randomisation process, (B) Deviations from the intended interventions, (C) Missing outcome data, (D), Measurement of the outcome, (E) Selection of the reported result, (F) Overall

1

e 2. Results of GRADE evaluation

Certainty assessment							No. of patients		Effect		Certainty
udies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Perturbation-based balance training	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	
of falls (follow-up: range 3 months to 12 months; assessed with: Calendars)											
	randomised trials	serious[a]	serious[b]	not serious	not serious	none	881/619 (1.42)	842/612 (1.38)	**Rate ratio 0.77** (0.60 to 0.99)	**32 per 100 people per year** (from 1.4 to 56 fewer falls)	⊕⊕◯◯ Low[a,b]
n of fallers (%) (follow-up: range 3 months to 12 months; assessed with: Calendars)											
	randomised trials	serious[a]	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	233/621 (37.5%)	282/605 (46.6%)	**RR 0.83** (0.74 to 0.93)	**8 fewer per 100 people per year** (from 3 to 12 fewer fallers)	⊕⊕⊕◯ Moderate[a]
falls (%) (follow-up: range 1 months to 12 months; assessed with: Medical record)											
	randomised trials	serious[c]	not serious	not serious	serious[d]	none	76/423 (18.0%)	101/418 (24.2%)	**RR 0.76** (0.58 to 0.98)	**6 fewer per 100 people per year** (from 5 to 10 fewer fallers)	⊕⊕◯◯ Low[c,d]
ry falls (assessed with: Video or harness load cell)											
	randomised trials	serious[a]	not serious[e]	not serious	not serious	none	110/398 (27.6%)	140/283 (49.5%)	**Rate ratio 0.42** (0.31 to 0.58)	**29 fewer per 100 people** (from 21 to 34 fewer falls)	⊕⊕⊕◯ Moderate[a,d,e]

ence interval; RR: risk ratio

ons:

raded due to concerns with randomization, missing outcome data, outcome measurement, and selective reporting.

raded due to visual inconsistency and statistical heterogeneity.

raded due to risk of bias: one study had high risk, two had some concerns, and only one had low risk.

raded due to a relatively low number of events.

ngrade due to heterogeneity not being statistically significant.

Supplementary material 1: SEARCH HISTORY

Search string for PubMed

#1 Population	"Aged"[MeSH Terms] OR "senior*"[Text Word] OR "elder*"[Text Word] OR "older*"[Text Word] OR "Aged"[Text Word] OR "ageing"[Text Word] OR "aging"[Text Word]
#2 Intervention	"perturb*"[Text Word] OR "reactive balanc*"[Text Word] OR "surface*" [Text Word] OR "platform*"[Text Word] OR "dynamic balanc*"[Text Word] OR "slip*" [Text Word] OR "trip*" [Text Word]
#3 Intervention	"train*" [Text Word] OR "exercis*" [Text Word] OR "rehab*" [Text Word] OR "practice*" [Text Word]
#4 Intervention	#2 AND #3
#5 Intervention	#4 AND #1
# 6 Publication type	"Randomized Controlled Trial"[Publication Type] OR "Controlled Clinical Trial" [Publication Type] OR "random*" [Text Word] OR "placebo*"[Text Word] OR "trial"[Text Word] OR "groups"[Text Word]
#7 Collected	#5 AND #6 ("Randomized Controlled Trial"[Publication Type] OR "Controlled Clinical Trial"[Publication Type] OR "random*"[Text Word] OR "placebo*"[Text Word] OR "trial"[Text Word] OR "groups"[Text Word]) AND (("train*"[Text Word] OR "exercis*"[Text Word] OR "rehab*"[Text Word] OR "practice*"[Text Word]) AND ("perturb*"[Text Word] OR "reactive balanc*"[Text Word] OR "surface translat*"[Text Word] OR "platform translat*"[Text Word] OR "dynamic balanc*"[Text Word] OR "slip*"[Text Word] OR "dynamic stabil*"[Text Word] OR "trip"[Text Word] OR "tripping"[Text Word] OR "trips"[Text Word]) AND ("Aged"[MeSH Terms] OR "senior*"[Text Word] OR "elder*"[Text Word] OR "older*"[Text Word] OR "Aged"[Text Word] OR "aging"[Text Word] OR "ageing"[Text Word]))

Search results for Pubmed

Records found incl. duplicates	When?	By whom?
1373	13th June 2022	Ildikó Zsuzsa Szabó
158	12th June 2024	Ildikó Zsuzsa Szabó

Search string for EMBASE

#1 Population	'aged'/exp OR 'senior*':ti,ab,kw OR 'elder*':ti,ab,kw OR 'older*':ti,ab,kw OR 'aged':ti,ab,kw OR 'aging':ti,ab,kw OR 'ageing':ti,ab,kw
#2 Intervention	((train* OR exercis* OR rehab* OR practice*) NEAR/4 (perturb* OR 'reactive balanc*' OR 'surface translat*' OR 'platform translat*' OR 'dynamic balanc*' OR slip* OR 'dynamic stabil*' OR trip OR tripping OR trips)):ti,ab,kw
#3 Intervention	#1 AND #2
#4 Publication type	'controlled clinical trial'/exp OR (random*:ti,ab,kw OR placebo*:ti,ab,kw OR trial:ti,ab,kw OR groups:ti,ab,kw)
# 5 Collected	#3 AND #4 (('aged'/exp OR (senior*:ti,ab,kw OR elder*:ti,ab,kw OR older*:ti,ab,kw OR aged:ti,ab,kw OR aging:ti,ab,kw OR ageing:ti,ab,kw)) AND ((train* OR exercis* OR rehab* OR practice*) NEAR/4 (perturb* OR 'reactive balanc*' OR 'surface translat*' OR 'platform translat*' OR 'dynamic balanc*' OR slip* OR 'dynamic stabil*' OR trip OR tripping OR trips)):ti,ab,kw) AND ('controlled clinical trial'/exp OR (random*:ti,ab,kw OR placebo*:ti,ab,kw OR

	trial:ti,ab,kw OR groups:ti,ab,kw))

Search results for EMBASE

Records found incl. duplicates	When?	By whom?
241	13th June 2022	IZS
39	12th June 2024	IZS

Search string for COCHRANE

#1 Population	MeSH descriptor: [Aged] explode all trees
#2 Population	(senior* OR elder* OR older* OR aged OR aging OR ageing):ti,ab,kw
#3 Population	#1 OR #2
#4 Intervention	((train* OR exercis* OR rehab* OR practice*) Near/4 (perturb* OR "reactive balanc*" OR "surface translat*" OR "platform translat*" OR "dynamic balanc*" OR slip* OR "dynamic stabil*" OR trip OR tripping OR trips)):ti,ab,kw
# 5 Collected	#3 AND #4

Search results for COCHRANE

Records found incl. duplicates	When?	By whom?
136	13th June 2022	IZS
3	12th June 2024	IZS

Search string for CINAHL

S1 Population	(MH "Aged+")
S2 Population	"senior*" OR "elder*" OR "older*" OR "Aged" OR "ageing" OR "aging"
S3 Intervention	“train*” OR “exercis*” OR “rehab*” OR “practice*” OR “perturb*” OR “reactive balanc*” OR “surface translat*” OR “platform translat*” OR “dynamic balanc*” OR “slip*” OR “dynamic stabil*” OR “trip” OR “tripping” OR “trips”
S4 Population	S1 OR S2
S5 Intervention	S3 AND S4
S6 Design	(MH "Clinical Trials+")
S7 Design	“random*” OR “placebo*” OR “trial” OR “groups”
S8 Collected	S6 OR S7
S9 Collected	S5 AND S8

Search results for CINAHL

Records found incl. duplicates	When?	By whom?
182	13th June 2022	IZS
41	12th June 2023	IZS

Overview - search 2022

Database	Nr. of articles incl. duplicates	Summarized	Result after exclusion of duplicates
PubMed	1373	1932	1515
Embase	241		
Cochrane	136		

Cinahl	182		

Overview – updated search 2024

Database	Nr. of articles incl. duplicates	Summarized	Result after exclusion of duplicates
PubMed	158	214	144
Embase	39		
Cochrane	3		
Cinahl	41		

Supplementary material 2: PRIORITIZED LIST FOR TITLE AND ABSTRACT

Study design	
Inclusion	**Exclusion**
1. Randomised, controlled trials 2. Cluster Randomised, controlled trials	1. Systematic review and meta-analysis 2. Cohort Study 3. Case-control study 4. Cross-sectional study 5. Case reports or series
Population	
Inclusion	**Exclusion**
1. ≥ 60 years 2. Community-dwelling 3. No information about location of recruitment and administration of intervention 4. Participants with increased risk of falling a. e.g. previous fallers, mild cognitive impairment 5. No information about conditions or diseases	1. If specific conditions or diseases is stated as an inclusion criteria a. e.g. Parkinson's, stroke, multiple sclerosis, osteoporosis) 2. If participants are in-patients at hospitals, departments, or wards 3. If participants are enrolled at nursing or residential care facilities
Intervention	
Inclusion	**Exclusion**
1. Gait adaptability training a. Definition; "training consisting of voluntary gait and/or stepping that is dictated by the cognitive processing of unpredictable sensory stimuli" i. Music-based multitask training (e.g. Dalcroze Eurhythmics) ii. Obstacle course training iii. Target stepping training iv. Virtual-reality step and/or gait training v. Step or gait-based exergaming 2. Multimodal exercises will be included a. Studies were gait adaptability training is combined with another training modality	b. Strength/resistance training c. Balance training d. Endurance training e. General physical activity f. Dual-task training with unrelated cognitive-task b. Walking while during verbal fluency, arithmetic or likewise. g. Flexibility training h. 3D interventions a. e.g. dance, tai-chi, Qi gong
Comparator	
Inclusion	**Exclusion**
All comparators will be included	Not applicable
Outcomes	
Inclusion	**Exclusion**
1. Fall data collected prospectively for at least 6 months	1. No fall data is collected. 2. Fall data is collected for less than 6 months.

Supplementary material 3: DATA ITEMS EXTRACTED

General information	
Author(s)	Report the lead author and full name list
Publication year	Report publication year
Title of study	Report title of study
Protocol registry	Report registry name
Protocol registry number	Report registry number
Publication type	Journal article/Abstract/Other: elaborate
Years of study	Report period of time the study was conducted
Country of study	Report where the study was conducted
Funding source of study	Report source of study
Potential conflict of interest from funding	Yes/None declared/No/Unclear
Type of study	Individually randomized, controlled trial/Cluster randomized, controlled trial/Pilot controlled trial/Other: elaborate
Primary aim of study	The effect on falls/Effect on fall-related risk factors/Not clear/Other: elaborate
Participant characteristics	
Inclusion and exclusion criteria	Report criteria for participation and exclusion stated in the study?
Participant setting	Report the residential status of the participants
Participant health status	Report if increased risk of falling or not
Age	Mean (SD or SE) or age range of included participants
Gender	Report %-female participants
Fall history	Report proportion of the population that have had prior falls
Participants randomized	Report total, intervention group and control group
Number of dropouts	Report total, intervention group and control group
Intervention characteristics	
Intervention description	Report the perturbation-based balance training protocol
Category of perturbation used	Overground walkways with movable platform and tripboards/specialized treadmills that produce well-timed accelerations/treadmills with ankle-mounted brake-and-release system/therapist-applied perturbations/movable platforms that make sudden movements/other: elaborate
Multimodal intervention?	Yes/no
Intervention setting	Report where the intervention was conducted
Supervised training	Yes/no/unclear
Training duration	Report length of training session
Training sessions per week	Report number of training sessions per week
Intervention dose	Report duration of intervention in weeks
Intervention duration	Report duration of intervention in weeks
Control description	Report the comparator used
Control training duration	Report length of comparator training session
Control training sessions per week	Report number of comparator training sessions per week
Control intervention dose	Report duration of intervention in weeks
Outcome measures	
Main outcome: Daily life fall and fall rate (fall per person-year)	Report primary outcome measures assessed in the study: - definition of fall

	- method of fall assessment (fall calendar/retrospective recall of falls/unclear/other: elaborate) - report months of data collected - is fall rate reported? - is proportion of fallers reported? - is proportion of fall-related injuries reported? - is proportion of fall-related fractures reported? - is proportion of healthcare-contact reported?
Additional outcomes: Laboratory fall	Report laboratory fall outcome measures assessed in the study: - does the study report laboratory fall metrics? - how is laboratory fall defined in the study? - method of laboratory fall assessment (Percentage of body weight supported in harness/Video review/Other: elaborate) - time of assessment (pre-intervention/post-intervention/follow-up/not clear) - report months of data collected - is rate of laboratory falls reported in the study? - is proportion of laboratory falls reported in the study?
Additional outcomes: Reactive balance	Report reactive balance outcome measures assessed in the study: - does the study report laboratory fall metrics? - method of reactive balance assessment (Margin of stability/Hip height/Step length/Other: elaborate) - time of assessment (pre-intervention/post-intervention/follow-up/not clear) - report months of data collected - is the reactive balance following laboratory induced slips assessed in the study? - is the reactive balance following laboratory induced trips assessed in the study?
Additional outcomes: Fall-related risk factors (including gait pattern, balance, mobility, executive function, health-related quality of life and fear of falling)	Report fall-related risk factors outcome measures assessed in the study. For all elements included: - does the study report these measures? - describe how was the outcome measured - time of assessment (pre-intervention/post-intervention/follow-up/not clear)
Results	
Main outcome: Daily life fall and fall rate	Report the results regarding daily life fall and fall rate (falls per person-year); incidence rate ratio; p-values
Additional outcomes: Laboratory fall	Report the results regarding laboratory fall
Additional outcomes: Reactive balance	Report the results regarding reactive balance
Additional outcomes: Fall-related risk factors	Report the results of gait pattern, balance, mobility, executive function, health-related quality of life and fear of falling; pre- and post-scores (SD/SE) and difference (SD/SE).

Supplementary material 4: Leave one out meta-analysis

Daily falls (rate ratio)

Omitted study	Effect size with 95% CI	p-value	I2 (heterogeneity) %
Original	0.77 [0.59, 0.99]	**0.04**	**57**
Aviles 2019	0.77 [0.59, 1.00]	0.05	47
Lurie 2020	0.71 [0.56, 0.90]	0.005	19
Pai 2014	0.82 [0.64, 1.05]	0.12	50
Shimada 2004	0.79 [0.61, 1.03]	0.07	57
Lurie, 2013	0.83 [0.66, 1.06]	0.11	47
Maki 2008	0.76 [0.58, 0.99]	0.04	61
Mansfield, 2010	0.75 [0.57, 0.98]	0.03	60
Rogers, 2021a	0.76 [0.58, 1.00]	0.05	60
Rogers, 2021b	0.81 [0.63, 1.04]	0.11	49
Wang 2022	0.72 [0.54, 0.96]	0.02	60
Norgaard, 2023	0.75 [0.56, 1.02]	0.07	57
Rieger 2023	0.77 [0.58, 1.01]	0.05	60

Fallers (risk ratio)

Omitted study	Effect size with 95% CI	p-value	I2 (heterogeneity) %
Original	0.86 [0.78, 0.96]	**0.001**	**0**
Aviles 2019	0.86 [0.78, 0.96]	0.001	0
Lurie 2020	0.87 [0.73, 1.03]	0.11	0
Pai 2014	0.88 [0.79, 0.98]	0.05	0
Shimada 2004	0.87 [0.78, 0.97]	0.02	0
Lurie, 2013	0.87 [0.78, 0.97]	0.02	0
Maki 2008	0.87 [0.78, 0.96]	0.002	0
Mansfield, 2010	0.86 [0.77, 0.96]	0.001	0
Rogers, 2021a	0.86 [0.77, 0.96]	0.001	0
Rogers, 2021b	0.85 [0.76, 0.95]	0.003	0
Wang 2022	0.86 [0.77, 0.96]	0.0008	0
Norgaard, 2023	0.86 [0.77, 0.97]	0.002	0
Rieger 2023	0.87 [0.78, 0.96]	0.001	0

Laboratory falls (risk ratio)

Omitted study	Effect size with 95% CI	p-value	I2 (heterogeneity) %
Original	0.42 [0.31, 0.58]	**<0.00001**	**38**
Allins, 2020a	0.42 [0.30, 0.60]	**<0.00001**	45
Bhatt, 2021	0.37 [0.26, 0.54]	**<0.00001**	16
Liu 2015	0.43 [0.31, 0.59]	**<0.00001**	42
Liu 2020 a	0.43 [0.32, 0.59]	**<0.00001**	32
Liu 2020 b	0.41 [0.28, 0.60]	**<0.00001**	45
Wang, 2019	0.54 [0.46, 0.63]	**<0.00001**	12
Parijat 2012	0.40 [0.28, 0.58]	**<0.00001**	32
Norgaard, 2023	0.41 [0.28, 0.60]	**<0.00001**	39
Okubo, 2019	0.38 [0.26, 0.56]	**<0.00001**	43

Injurious falls

Omitted study	Effect size with 95% CI	p-value	I2 (heterogeneity) %
Original	**0.76 [0.59, 0.98]**	**0.03**	**0**
Lurie, 2020	0.64 [0.41, 1.00]	0.05	0

Pai, 2014	0.77 [0.59, 1.01]	0.06	0
Norgaard, 2023	0.77 [0.57, 1.04]	0.08	0
Lurie, 2013	0.77 [0.59, 1.00]	0.05	0

Author, year	Sample and study characteristics					Perturbation-based balance training (PBT)			Control		Adverse events during training
	N	Gender (% women)	Age (Mean ± SD or Range)	Population	Duration	Training Program	Progression (Intensity)	Dosage	Intervention	Dosage	
Allin 2020	34	55.8%	Range: 61 - 75 y	Healthy	2 weeks	Slips by stepping on nylon fabric and trips by sudden treadmill starts with a foam block	No slip progression reported Trips: Increase belt accelerations (speed varied from 0.5 to 2.4 mph)	60-80 trials in 0.5 hours/session 4 sessions Total = 2 hours	General balance exercise adapted from the Otago Exercise Program	4 sessions 0.5 hours/session Total = 2 hours	NR
Aviles 2019	35	PBT[a]: 68.4% TaiChi: 68.7%	PBT[a]: 80.9 ± 6.2 TaiChi: 82.6 ± 4.5	Healthy	4 weeks	Specialized treadmill: Treadmill perturbations (n=40) vary in speed from 0.5 to 2.4 mph for backward belt movement and set to 0.5 mph for forward belt movement	Increase speeds (0.2 to 1.1 m/s) progressively during each session as participant performance improves	40 perturbations/ session, 12 sessions 0.5 hours/session Total = 6 hours	Tai-Chi training	12 sessions 0.5 hours/session Total = 6 hours	NR
Bhatt 2021	165	N/A	Overall: 69.6 ± 6.4 St[b]: 69.6 ± 6.8 Tt[c]: 69.9 ± 6.2 Ctrl[d]: 69.9 ± 6.2	Healthy	1 day	St[b]:24 slips low-friction, movable platforms on sliding tracks embedded in the middle of the left and right sides of the 7-m walkway Tt[c]: 24 trips perturbations were induced by an obstacle device which was embedded on the left side of the walkway	No progression	1 session session duration N/A	Ctrl: Normal walking session	1 session session duration N/A	NR
Bieryla 2007	12	50%	Range: 63 - 83 y	Healthy	1 day	Trip recovery training from a sudden obstacle on modified treadmill	Increasing/decreasing speed (0.089 m/s) as per participant performance and recovery	20 trials, 1 session 0.25 hours/session Total = 0.25 hours	Normal treadmill walking	1 session 0.25 hours/session Total = 0.25 hours	NR
Brüll 2023	71	PBT tm[e]: 56.5% PBT st[f]: 55.6% Control: 85.7%	PBT tm: 76.5 ± 5.3 PBT st: 73.9 ± 5.9 Control: 74.3 ± 6.5	High-risk	6 weeks	The perturbations during the four blocks varied in intensity (up to 30 levels of magnitude), four different directions (in mediolateral and anteroposterior axis), perturbed leg side on specialized treadmill	Progression in task challenges was adjusted individually including the judgment of the trainer and the participant using 5-point scale of subjectively perceived difficulty and anxiety Intensity: Variable gait speed (preferred to increment of 0.08m/s), starting perturbation intensities (mediolateral: 14/30, anterior: 11/30, posterior: 10/30), and perturbation	0.5 – 0.6 hours/session, 3 sessions/week Total = 10.8 hours approx.	No treatment	N/A	PBT group: 7 participants (30%) reported mild tendon/muscle pain (lower limb and back region) Control group: No adverse events occurred (0%)

							frequency of 3-5/minute.				
Gerards 2023	82	PBT: 81.5% Control: 79%	PBT: 73 ± 10 Control: 73 ± 8	High-risk	3 weeks	Uni-lateral treadmill belt accelerations or decelerations, and platform translations and rotations in various direction were delivered via dual-belt treadmill alongside usual care.	Training progression by increasing the perturbation intensity (difficulty level 1 to 7, displacement 5 to 20 cm and speed 0.11 to 0.41 sec) and gait speed	3 sessions 0.5 hours/session Total = 1.5 hours	Usual care physiotherapy	Variable (not reported)	PBT group: 1 participant (2.5%) reported mild knee pain (resolved in 2 days)
Gimmon 2018	53	PBT: 62% Ctrl: 79%	PBT: 78.2 ± 5.6 Ctrl[d]: 81.4 ± 4.3	Healthy	24 weeks	Treadmill gait training program with perturbations (listed platform translation unannounced perturbations were delivered in an unpredictable randomized sequence)	The perturbation training program had 24 levels of difficulty with increasing levels of perturbations (i.e., increased displacement, velocity (increased from 0.4 m/s to 0.8 m/s in steps of 0.08 m/s^2).and accelerations of horizontal translations). The level of perturbation was adjusted to match each subject's ability and to be continuously challenging	48 sessions 0.3 hours/session Total = 14 hours approx	Usual treatment - treadmill gait training w/o perturbations	48 sessions 0.3 hours/session Total = 14 hours approx	NR
Kurz 2016	53	PBT: 62% Control: 79%	Overall: 80.1±5.6 PBT: 78.2 ± 5.6 Control: 81.4 ± 4.3	Healthy	12 weeks	Single belt, treadmill walking with AP and ML platform translations	The intensity level was adjusted according to the subject abilities, starting from the lowest level of 1 cm displacement at 0.1 m/s velocity and 0.5 m/s^2 acceleration at the first training session.	24 sessions 0.3 hours/session Total = 7.2 hours approx,	Treadmill walking	24 sessions 0.3 hours/session Total = 7.2 hours approx,	Mild muscle soreness reported in few participants (exact number NR)
Liu 2015	36	Overall: 50% MPT: 50% Ctrl: 50%	MPT[i]: 71.2 ± 6.82 VRT[j]: 70.54 ± 6.63 Ctrl[d]: 74.18 ± 5.82	Healthy	1 day	MPT: Movable platform training on platform with slip board VRT: Virtual reality (A sudden virtual slip was induced by tilting the environment 25 degrees in the pitch plane at 60 degree/s)	Slip was induced by moving the platform 0.3 m at a speed of 1.2 m/s (acceleration at 20 m/s^2).	24 trials of slips in 1 session	Normal walking session	1 session	NR
Liu 2020	224	Tc: 67% Tt: 68% Oc: 88% Ot: 57%	Tc[k]: 73.0 ± 6.1 Tt[l]: 72.9 ± 6.6 Oc[m]: 74.4 ± 5.8 Ot[n]: 72.8 ± 6.0	Healthy	1 day	Tt: Treadmill slip trials (perturbation was delivered by sudden acceleration in forward direction) Ot: Overground slip trials (overground slip was induced by sudden release of two side-by-side, low-friction, mov able platforms embedded near the	Subjects received progressively graded slip perturbations in the ascending phase. The intensity of each perturbation profile (P1-P5) was	40 trials in 1 session, 0.5 hours/session Total = 0.5 hours	Tc: Treadmill walking (usual treatment)	1 session 0.5 hours/session Total = 0.5 hours Oc: NA	NR

						middle of the 7-walk way)	determined by the acceleration of the belt (either 5 or 6 m/s^2) and the duration of its application (ranging from 0.2 to 0.45 s at 5 m/s^2 or 0.3–0.55 s at 6 m/s^2)		Oc: No treatment		
Lurie 2013	64	Overall: 59.3% SPTT: 50% Control: 67%	SPTT[c]: 81.1 ± 6.53 Ctrl[d]: 79.2 ± 7.65	High-risk	3 months	Standard PT with the addition of the surface perturbation treadmill training trip (sudden backward motion of the treadmill belts that resulted in forward-directed rotation of the subject's torso) or a slip (sudden forward motion of the treadmill belts that resulted in backward-directed rotation of the subject's torso)	Magnitude of the disturbances during training sessions progressed from level 1 to level 5 in the ActiveStep treadmill.	Variable sessions - determined clinically by therapist	Standard PT	Variable: determined clinically by therapist	NR
Lurie 2020	506	PBT: 47% Ctrl: 47%	PBT[a]: 78 (65-96) Ctrl[d]: 78 (65-95)	High-risk	4-6 weeks	Usual gait/balance intervention with addition of surface perturbation treadmill training Perturbations typically occurred in both forward (trip) and backward (slip) directions, with occasional use of sideways perturbations	Magnitude of the disturbances during training sessions progressed from level 1 to level 5 in the ActiveStep treadmill.	Variable sessions determined clinically by therapist 0.25 hours PBT/0.75 hours Total = 5-6 hours approx.	Usual gait/balance intervention	Variable session nr. determined clinically by therapist 0.25 hours PBT/0.75 hours Total = 6 hours approx.	No adverse events occurred (0%)
Maki 2008	8	PBT: 25% Ctrl: 50%	PBT: 81.5 ± 8.2 Ctrl: 79.3 ± 7.2	High-risk	6 weeks	Multi-directional moving platform perturbations to stance to train reactive stepping and grasping	Not available	3 sessions 0.5 hours/session for 6 weeks Total = 9 hours approx.	Voluntary step and reach-to-grasp training	3 sessions 0.5 hours/session for 6 weeks Total = 9 hours approx.	No information
Mansfield 2010	34	PBT: 50% Ctrl: 50%	PBT: 70.3 ± 4.7 Ctrl[d]: 69.1 ± 3.8	High-risk	6 weeks	PBT on custom built motion platform training, where stepping and grasping reactions were evoked during training using a custom-built motion platform, which translated unpredictably in 4 directions	Perturbation magnitude was increased progressively according to the capabilities of each individual	18 sessions 0.5 hours/session Total = 9 hours	Passive muscular relaxation and flexibility exercises	18 sessions 0.5 hours/session Total = 9 hours	No adverse events occurred (0%)
Nørgaard 2023	140	Overall: 56% PBT: 59% Ctrl: 54%	Overall: 72 (5) PBT: 72.7 (4.7) Ctrl[d]: 72.0 (4.7)	Healthy	24 weeks	Slips: Slip perturbations were induced by a quick-forward acceleration at heel strike (0% of the gait cycle), causing a reversal in the treadmill movement direction. The trip perturbations were induced by a sudden deacceleration followed by a greater backward acceleration at mid-swing	Intensity was adjusted with varying slip durations 0.2 to 0.55 sec at belt deceleration of -6 m/s^2 or trip accelerations 4 to 11 m/s^2	4 sessions 0.3 hours/session Total = 1.3 hours approx.	Treadmill walking	4 sessions 0.3 hours/session Total = 1.3 hours approx.	PBT group: 2 injuries (2.8%) were reported (one knee injury and one thigh strain)

Obuchi 2004	30	Overall: 44.83% PBT: 42.85% Ctrl: 46.66%	Overall: 69.2 ± 5.2 PBT: 69.0 ± 5.8 Ctrl[d]: 69.3 ± 4.9	Healthy	4 weeks	PBT on specialized treadmill (treadmill speed at 1.12 m/s)	Walking belt was decelerated on one side for 0.5 seconds, starting with a 20% speed reduction, increasing to 40% in week 2, and 60% from week 3 onward.	8 sessions 0.25 hours min/session Total = 2 hours	Treadmill walking	8 sessions 0.25 hours min/session Total = 2 hours	NR
Okubo 2019	44	PBT: 59% Control: 55%	PBT[a]: 73.3 ± 5.9 Control: 70.8 ± 4.9	Healthy	2 days	Reactive balance training on trip and slip walkway Slips: Slips were induced by a movable tile on two hidden rails with linear bearings that could slide forward up to 70 cm on foot contact. Trips: Trips were induced using a 7 or 14 cm height tripping board that flipped up from the walkway at mid-swing.	At the end of each sub session, participant anxiety and perceived difficulty levels were assessed using a 5-point scale. When these levels exceeded a given threshold, in agreement with the participant, gait speed gait speed (40%–90% of individual's normal gait), trip board height (7-14 cm), slip distance (10-40 cm) were adjusted	3 sessions 0.6 hours/session Total = 2 hours	Target step training on walkway without perturbations	3 sessions 0.6 hours/session Total = 2 hours	PBT group: 5 participants (groin, shoulder and/or back pain due to the impact of being caught and one hamstring strain) Control group: No adverse events occurred (0%)
Pai 2014	212	PBT: 65.7% Ctrl: 78.3%	PBT: 72.0 ± 5.5 Control group: 73.7±5.3	Healthy	1 day	Slips: Slips were induced through the electromechanical unlocking of a pair of side-by-side low-friction, movable platforms embedded in a 7-m walkway (24 trials)	Constant intensity of low-friction slips (up to 90 cm)	1 session	Movable platform with one single slip	1 session	NR
Parijat 2012	24	50%	MPT[p]: 71.24 ± 6.82 Ctrl[d]: 74.18 ± 5.82	Healthy	1 day	Slips: Slips were induced usings slippery surface (i.e., top of one the force plates) covered with a water and clear jelly mixture on 15 m walkaway	A simulated slip was induced by moving the platform 0.3 m at a speed of 1.2 m/s (acceleration at 20 m/s^2).	1 session, 0.25–0.3 hours /session Total = 0.3 hours	Normal walking trials	1 session 0.25–0.3 hours /session Total = 0.3 hours	NR
Rieger 2019	30	PBT: 50% Ctrl: 50%	PBT: 70.33(3.99) Ctrl: 71.67(4.98)	Healthy	1 day	16 AP perturbations (8 belt accelerations and 8 belt decelerations) at either low or high intensity	For AP perturbations, the treadmill decelerated by 9 m/s^2 for 0.12 s. For ML perturbations, the treadmill moved 5 cm in 0.31 s to the contralateral side.	1 session	8-min treadmill walking	1 session	NR
Rieger 2023	70	REACT: 50% Ctrl: 50%	REACT: 75.5 (5.4) Ctrl: 73.9 (5.9)	High-risk	4 weeks	Treadmill based PBT gait training under cognitive dual-task conditions	Training progression was in order of priority of: Increase walking speed, increase perturbation difficulty every week, by increasing the levels of acceleration/decelerat	2 sessions/ week, (total 4 weeks), 0.5 hours/session Total = 4 hours	Ctrl: Gait training under cognitive dual-task conditions without perturbation.	2 sessions/ week, (total 4 weeks), 0.5 hours/session Total = 4 hours	NR

							ion intensities and duration, without the participant's needing to grab the handrail to recover; and increase the difficulty level of the dual task every week, by increasing the game speed and complexity.				
Rogers 2021	102	CMB: 41.2% IST: 60.0% HST: 63.2% SFR: 71.7%	CMB[u]: 73.6 ± 6.5 IST[r]: 73.7 ± 6.3 HST[s]: 72.5 ± 7.2 SFR[t]: 70.8 ± 4.4	Healthy	12 weeks	IST: Induced step training {Participants received 43 randomly presented waist-pull trials that induced stepping (2 directions × 20 pulls plus 3 catch trials with no perturbation applied) in blocks of 10 trials} HST: Hip muscles strengthening CMK: Combined IST/HST FR: Flexibility and relaxation	Progression consisted of 10% incremental increases in pull intensity, and occurred when a participant either (a) did not step 5 times within a 10-pull block or (b) executed 5 consecutive single steps within a 10-pull block. Intensity varied across 10 levels ranging from low to high acceleartion (increase in low accelerations (+/-1 to +/-5.5 m/s^2, 0.3 to 0.35 s) and high accelerations (+/-3 to +/-6 m/s^2, 0.1 to 0.3 s)	36 sessions 0.3 hours/ duration Total = 12 hours	Standard flexibility and relaxation exercises (SFR)	36 sessions 0.3 hours/ duration Total = 12 hours	CMB (n = 5), IST (n = 6), HST (n = 4), and SFR (n = 1), Participant dropout reasons possibly related to training were CMB (knee pain, foot injury during fall at home), IST (knee pain, abdominal pressure/burpin g, swelling of scrotum, groin injury), HST (back pain, unresolved hypertension in 3 cases), and SFR (pain and tingling in neck/upper back).
Shimada 2004	32	Tt: 56.2% Ctrl: 43.8%	Tt: 81.8 (5.9) Tc: 83.1 (6.4)	High-risk	6 months	Perturbed gait exercise on a treadmill was delivered in 8 different phases	Perturbation stimuli progressively increased in magnitude and finally involved 100% reductions in speed. Intensity varied in walking speed (50-70% of maximum speed) and perturbation deceleration (0-100%)	1-3 times/week Total = 10 hours	Physical therapy for pain (hot packs, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation), stretching exercises, resistance training, gait training over level surfaces, outdoor walking, balance	Not mentioned	NR

									training, ascending and descending of stairs, and group exercises		
Wang 2019	146	Tt: 45% Tc: 62%	Tt: 72.8 (6.2) Tc: 72.5 (6)	Healthy	1 day	40 Treadmill-slips induced by the ActiveStep treadmill (Simbex, Lebanon, NH) through sudden acceleration and deceleration	The slip distance received by participants ranged from 0.1 to 0.51 m at an acceleration of 5 m/ s^2 and from 0.27 to 0.91 m at an acceleration of 6 m/ s^2 .The intensity of each perturbation profile (P1-P5) was determined by the acceleration of the belt (either 5 or 6 m/s^2) and the duration of its application (ranging from 0.2 to 0.45 s at 5 m/s^2 or 0.3–0.55 s at 6 m/s^2).	1 session 0.5 hours Total = 0.5 hours	Treadmill walking	1 session 0.5 hours Total = 0.5 hours	NR
Wang 2022	143	PBT: 64.3% Ctrl: 63.5%	PBT: 72.5 (6.2) Ctrl[d]: 72.9 (6.1)	Healthy	1 day	40 Treadmill slips induced by the ActiveStep treadmill (Simbex, Lebanon, NH) through sudden acceleration and deceleration	Similar to Wang et 2019, the slip distance received by participants ranged from 0.1 to 0.51 m at an acceleration of 5 m/ s^2 and from 0.27 to 0.91 m at an acceleration of 6 m/ s^2 .The intensity of each perturbation profile (P1-P5) was determined by the acceleration of the belt (either 5 or 6 m/s^2) and the duration of its application (ranging from 0.2 to 0.45 s at 5 m/s^2 or 0.3–0.55 s at 6 m/s^2). (Similar to Wang et 2019)	1 session 0.5 hours Total = 0.5 hours	Treadmill walking	1 session 0.5 hours Total = 0.5 hours	NR

[k]: treadmill control; [l]: treadmill slip trial; [m]: no treatment; [n]: overground slip trials; [o]: standard physical training and treadmill training; [p]:movable platform training; [r]: induced step training; [s]: hip muscle strengthening; [t]: standard flexibility and relaxation; [u]: combined IST/HST; [v]: dual belt training; NR = Not reported

Supplementary Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of included studies

Supplementary Figures

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
3.8.1 High fall risk					
Lurie, 2013	-0.92	0.36	7.8%	0.40 [0.20, 0.81]	+ + + − ? −
Lurie, 2020	0.1	0.06	19.2%	1.11 [0.98, 1.24]	+ + ? + + ?
Maki 2008	0	0.71	2.8%	1.00 [0.25, 4.02]	− ? − − ? −
Mansfield, 2010	0.34	0.65	3.3%	1.40 [0.39, 5.02]	+ + − − − −
Rieger 2023	-0.23	0.42	6.4%	0.79 [0.35, 1.81]	+ + + + + +
Shimada 2004	-0.63	0.46	5.7%	0.53 [0.22, 1.31]	? + ? ? ? ?
Subtotal (95% CI)			**45.2%**	**0.79 [0.52, 1.23]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.13; Chi² = 10.77, df = 5 (P = 0.06); I² = 54%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.04 (P = 0.30)					
3.8.2 Healthy					
Aviles, 2019	-0.29	0.67	3.1%	0.75 [0.20, 2.78]	? + ? ? ? ?
Norgaard, 2023	-0.23	0.17	14.9%	0.79 [0.57, 1.11]	+ + + + + +
Pai, 2014	-0.69	0.3	9.6%	0.50 [0.28, 0.90]	? + ? + ? ?
Rogers, 2021a	-0.16	0.38	7.3%	0.85 [0.40, 1.79]	+ + − ? ? −
Rogers, 2021b	-0.81	0.34	8.4%	0.44 [0.23, 0.87]	+ + − ? ? −
Wang 2022	0.17	0.25	11.4%	1.19 [0.73, 1.93]	− + ? + + −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**54.8%**	**0.74 [0.55, 1.00]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.05; Chi² = 7.72, df = 5 (P = 0.17); I² = 35%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)					
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.77 [0.60, 0.99]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.08; Chi² = 25.33, df = 11 (P = 0.008); I² = 57%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.03 (P = 0.04)					
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.07, df = 1 (P = 0.79), I² = 0%					



Risk of bias legend

(**A**) Randomisation process
(**B**) Deviations from the intended interventions
(**C**) Missing outcome data: Daily falls
(**D**) Measurement of the outcome: Daily falls
(**E**) Selection of the reported result: Daily falls
(**F**) Overall: Daily falls

Sup Figure 2 - Rate ratio- Subgroup analysis Intervention – high risk/healthy
(Rogers 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip strengthening; Rogers 2021b – induced step training vs flexibility and relaxation)

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
3.7.1 Combined PBT with Exercise					
Rogers, 2021c	-1.34	0.37	8.2%	0.26 [0.13, 0.54]	+ + − ? ? −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**8.2%**	**0.26 [0.13, 0.54]**	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.62 (P = 0.0003)					
3.7.2 PBT alone					
Aviles, 2019	-0.29	0.67	4.0%	0.75 [0.20, 2.78]	? + ? ? ? ?
Lurie, 2013	-0.92	0.36	8.4%	0.40 [0.20, 0.81]	+ + + − ? −
Lurie, 2020	0.1	0.06	15.1%	1.11 [0.98, 1.24]	+ + ? + + ?
Maki 2008	0	0.71	3.6%	1.00 [0.25, 4.02]	− − − − − −
Mansfield, 2010	0.34	0.65	4.2%	1.40 [0.39, 5.02]	+ + − − − −
Norgaard, 2023	-0.23	0.17	13.0%	0.79 [0.57, 1.11]	+ + + + + +
Pai, 2014	-0.69	0.3	9.8%	0.50 [0.28, 0.90]	? + ? + ? ?
Rieger 2023	-0.23	0.42	7.2%	0.79 [0.35, 1.81]	+ + + + + +
Rogers, 2021b	-0.81	0.34	8.9%	0.44 [0.23, 0.87]	+ + − ? ? −
Shimada 2004	-0.63	0.46	6.5%	0.53 [0.22, 1.31]	? + ? ? ? ?
Wang 2022	0.17	0.25	11.0%	1.19 [0.73, 1.93]	− + ? + + −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**91.8%**	**0.76 [0.58, 1.00]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.09; Chi² = 25.17, df = 10 (P = 0.005); I² = 60%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.98 (P = 0.05)					
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.68 [0.51, 0.93]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.16; Chi² = 37.87, df = 11 (P < 0.0001); I² = 71%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.44 (P = 0.01)					
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 7.26, df = 1 (P = 0.007), I² = 86.2%					



Risk of bias legend

(**A**) Randomisation process
(**B**) Deviations from the intended interventions
(**C**) Missing outcome data: Daily falls
(**D**) Measurement of the outcome: Daily falls
(**E**) Selection of the reported result: Daily falls
(**F**) Overall: Daily falls

Sup Figure 3- Rate ratio- Subgroup analysis Intervention – Combined PBT with exercise versus PBT alone (Rogers 2021c – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs flexibility and relaxation)

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
3.1.1 Overground walkaway					
Pai, 2014	-0.69	0.3	9.6%	0.50 [0.28, 0.90]	? + ? + ? ?
Subtotal (95% CI)			**9.6%**	**0.50 [0.28, 0.90]**	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.30 (P = 0.02)					
3.1.2 Treadmill					
Aviles, 2019	-0.29	0.67	3.1%	0.75 [0.20, 2.78]	? + ? ? ? ?
Lurie, 2013	-0.92	0.36	7.8%	0.40 [0.20, 0.81]	+ + + − ? −
Lurie, 2020	0.1	0.06	19.2%	1.11 [0.98, 1.24]	+ + ? + + ?
Norgaard, 2023	-0.23	0.17	14.9%	0.79 [0.57, 1.11]	+ + + + + +
Rieger 2023	-0.23	0.42	6.4%	0.79 [0.35, 1.81]	+ + + + + +
Shimada 2004	-0.63	0.46	5.7%	0.53 [0.22, 1.31]	? + ? ? ? ?
Wang 2022	0.17	0.25	11.4%	1.19 [0.73, 1.93]	− + ? + + −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**68.5%**	**0.85 [0.64, 1.12]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.06; Chi² = 13.65, df = 6 (P = 0.03); I² = 56%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.18 (P = 0.24)					
3.1.3 Standing/Manual					
Maki 2008	0	0.71	2.8%	1.00 [0.25, 4.02]	− ? − − ? −
Mansfield, 2010	0.34	0.65	3.3%	1.40 [0.39, 5.02]	+ + − − − −
Rogers, 2021a	-0.16	0.38	7.3%	0.85 [0.40, 1.79]	+ + − ? ? −
Rogers, 2021b	-0.81	0.34	8.4%	0.44 [0.23, 0.87]	+ + − ? ? −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**21.9%**	**0.71 [0.44, 1.15]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.03; Chi² = 3.44, df = 3 (P = 0.33); I² = 13%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.38 (P = 0.17)					
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.77 [0.60, 0.99]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.08; Chi² = 25.33, df = 11 (P = 0.008); I² = 57%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.03 (P = 0.04)					
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 2.55, df = 2 (P = 0.28), I² = 21.4%					



Risk of bias legend

(**A**) Randomisation process
(**B**) Deviations from the intended interventions
(**C**) Missing outcome data: Daily falls
(**D**) Measurement of the outcome: Daily falls
(**E**) Selection of the reported result: Daily falls
(**F**) Overall: Daily falls

ure 4 - Rate ratio- Subgroup analysis Intervention type

s 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip strengthening; Rogers 2021b – induced step training vs flexibility and relaxa

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
3.9.1 Higher dose (>6 hours)					
Aviles, 2019	-0.29	0.67	3.1%	0.75 [0.20, 2.78]	? + ? ? ? ?
Maki 2008	0	0.71	2.8%	1.00 [0.25, 4.02]	− ? − − ? −
Mansfield, 2010	0.34	0.65	3.3%	1.40 [0.39, 5.02]	+ + − − − −
Rogers, 2021a	-0.16	0.38	7.3%	0.85 [0.40, 1.79]	+ + − ? ? −
Rogers, 2021b	-0.81	0.34	8.4%	0.44 [0.23, 0.87]	+ + − ? ? −
Shimada 2004	-0.63	0.46	5.7%	0.53 [0.22, 1.31]	? + ? ? ? ?
Subtotal (95% CI)			**30.6%**	**0.67 [0.46, 0.97]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 3.74, df = 5 (P = 0.59); I² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.11 (P = 0.03)					
3.9.2 Lower dose (<6 hours)					
Lurie, 2013	-0.92	0.36	7.8%	0.40 [0.20, 0.81]	+ + + − ? −
Lurie, 2020	0.1	0.06	19.2%	1.11 [0.98, 1.24]	+ + ? + + ?
Norgaard, 2023	-0.23	0.17	14.9%	0.79 [0.57, 1.11]	+ + + + + +
Pai, 2014	-0.69	0.3	9.6%	0.50 [0.28, 0.90]	? + ? + ? ?
Rieger 2023	-0.23	0.42	6.4%	0.79 [0.35, 1.81]	+ + + + + +
Wang 2022	0.17	0.25	11.4%	1.19 [0.73, 1.93]	− + ? + + −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**69.4%**	**0.80 [0.59, 1.10]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.09; Chi² = 17.07, df = 5 (P = 0.004); I² = 71%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.37 (P = 0.17)					
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.77 [0.60, 0.99]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.08; Chi² = 25.33, df = 11 (P = 0.008); I² = 57%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.03 (P = 0.04)					
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.55, df = 1 (P = 0.46), I² = 0%					



Risk of bias legend

(**A**) Randomisation process
(**B**) Deviations from the intended interventions
(**C**) Missing outcome data: Daily falls
(**D**) Measurement of the outcome: Daily falls
(**E**) Selection of the reported result: Daily falls
(**F**) Overall: Daily falls

Sup Figure 5- Rate ratio - Subgroup analysis Training dosage (Higher dose versus lower dose)
(Rogers 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip strengthening; Rogers 2021b – induced step trainin and relaxation)

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI
3.2.1 PBT vs no exercise				
Mansfield, 2010	0.34	0.65	3.3%	1.40 [0.39, 5.02]
Pai, 2014	-0.69	0.3	9.6%	0.50 [0.28, 0.90]
Rogers, 2021b	-0.81	0.34	8.4%	0.44 [0.23, 0.87]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**21.3%**	**0.55 [0.34, 0.90]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.04; Chi² = 2.55, df = 2 (P = 0.28); I² = 21%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.40 (P = 0.02)				
3.2.2 PBT vs Exercise without perturbation				
Aviles, 2019	-0.29	0.67	3.1%	0.75 [0.20, 2.78]
Lurie, 2013	-0.92	0.36	7.8%	0.40 [0.20, 0.81]
Lurie, 2020	0.1	0.06	19.2%	1.11 [0.98, 1.24]
Maki 2008	0	0.71	2.8%	1.00 [0.25, 4.02]
Norgaard, 2023	-0.23	0.17	14.9%	0.79 [0.57, 1.11]
Rieger 2023	-0.23	0.42	6.4%	0.79 [0.35, 1.81]
Rogers, 2021a	-0.16	0.38	7.3%	0.85 [0.40, 1.79]
Shimada 2004	-0.63	0.46	5.7%	0.53 [0.22, 1.31]
Wang 2022	0.17	0.25	11.4%	1.19 [0.73, 1.93]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**78.7%**	**0.87 [0.68, 1.10]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.04; Chi² = 13.89, df = 8 (P = 0.08); I² = 42%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.18 (P = 0.24)				
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.77 [0.60, 0.99]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.08; Chi² = 25.33, df = 11 (P = 0.008); I² = 57%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.03 (P = 0.04)				
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 2.71, df = 1 (P = 0.10), I² = 63.1%				



Sup Figure 6- Rate ratio – PBT versus Exercise without perturbation/No exercise
(Rogers 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip strengthening; Rogers 2021b – induced step training vs flexibility and relaxation)

r Subgroup	PBT Mean	PBT SD	PBT Total	Control Mean	Control SD	Control Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of A	B	C	D
020a	-11.8	3.1	11	-10	0	5		Not estimable	?	+	−	−
020b	-10.5	1.4	8	-13	1	5	3.4%	1.83 [0.43, 3.23]	?	+	−	−
23	-8.5	1.7	23	-8.7	1.9	21	13.8%	0.11 [-0.48, 0.70]	+	+	+	−
, 2023	-20.77	4.29	39	-21.79	6.19	43	20.1%	0.19 [-0.25, 0.62]	+	+	+	−
16	-21.33	7.22	21	-23.55	6.14	18	12.6%	0.32 [-0.31, 0.96]	+	+	+	−
013	12	12.56	26	13.45	11.02	33	16.6%	-0.12 [-0.64, 0.39]	+	+	−	−
020	11.1	16.1	177	12.1	17.3	168	33.6%	-0.06 [-0.27, 0.15]	+	+	?	−
5% CI)			**305**			**293**	**100.0%**	**0.11 [-0.15, 0.38]**				

eneity: Tau² = 0.04; Chi² = 8.79, df = 5 (P = 0.12); I² = 43%
overall effect: Z = 0.84 (P = 0.40)



bias legend
domisation process
ations from the intended interventions
ing outcome data: Fear of falling
surement of the outcome: Fear of falling
ction of the reported result: Fear of falling
all: Fear of falling

ure 7- Meta-analyses for Fear of falling
020a – slip training vs control; Allins 2020b – trip training vs control)

	PBT			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Risk
· Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	A B C
)20a	1.55	0.11	11	1.53	0.13	5	19.1%	0.02 [-0.11, 0.15]		? + −
)20b	1.47	0.09	8	1.53	1.47	5	0.2%	-0.06 [-1.35, 1.23]		? + −
2007	0.02	0.14	6	0.06	0.22	6	7.6%	-0.04 [-0.25, 0.17]		? + −
23	1.3	0.17	23	1.29	0.14	21	39.1%	0.01 [-0.08, 0.10]		+ + +
2019	1.13	0.16	19	1.22	0.16	22	34.1%	-0.09 [-0.19, 0.01]		+ + +
5% CI)			**67**			**59**	**100.0%**	**-0.03 [-0.08, 0.03]**		



eneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 2.72, df = 4 (P = 0.61); I² = 0%
overall effect: Z = 0.89 (P = 0.37)

ias legend
omisation process
ations from the intended interventions
ng outcome data: Gait speed
urement of the outcome: Gait speed
tion of the reported result: Gait speed
all: Gait speed

e 8- Meta-analyses for Gait speed (m/s)
20a – slip training vs control; Allins 2020b – trip training vs control)

	PBT			Control				Std. Mean Difference	Risk
ubgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	A B C
0b	41.1	3.7	8	36.9	2.2	5	8.2%	1.21 [-0.04, 2.46]	? + −
9	0.61	0.09	16	0.63	0.05	15	14.5%	-0.27 [-0.97, 0.44]	? + ?
2010	6.6	4.4	16	0.7	4.78	14	13.3%	1.25 [0.46, 2.05]	+ + +
9 a	0.62	0.1	19	0.66	0.07	22	15.8%	-0.46 [-1.08, 0.16]	+ + +
0	0.58	0.044	15	0.57	0.035	15	14.4%	0.24 [-0.47, 0.96]	? + +
21a	0.45	0.16	25	0.34	0.19	26	16.8%	0.62 [0.05, 1.18]	+ + −
21b	0.45	0.21	25	0.37	0.25	26	16.9%	0.34 [-0.21, 0.89]	+ + −
, CI)			**124**			**123**	**100.0%**	**0.35 [-0.10, 0.80]**	

eity: Tau² = 0.23; Chi² = 17.00, df = 6 (P = 0.009); I² = 65%
erall effect: Z = 1.54 (P = 0.12)



s legend
nisation process
ons from the intended interventions
outcome data: Step length
ement of the outcome: Step length
on of the reported result: Step length
Step length

e 9- Meta-analyses for Recovery step length (cm)
20b – trip training vs control; Okubo 2019a – slip training vs control; Rogers 2021a – induced step training plus hip strengthening vs hip ening; Rogers 2021b – induced step training vs flexibility and relaxation)

Subgroup	PBT Mean	PBT SD	PBT Total	Control Mean	Control SD	Control Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI
20a	17	12.3	11	13.6	6.8	5	12.6%	0.29 [-0.77, 1.36]
20b	-31.7	9.1	8	-56.4	24.7	5	9.7%	1.39 [0.10, 2.67]
21	1.23	0.34	134	1.27	0.28	31	27.5%	-0.12 [-0.51, 0.27]
019	6.9	4.3	19	3.9	5.4	22	21.2%	0.60 [-0.03, 1.23]
)19	-0.12	0.16	73	-0.24	0.18	73	28.9%	0.70 [0.37, 1.04]
% CI)			**245**			**136**	**100.0%**	**0.47 [-0.01, 0.94]**

neity: Tau² = 0.17; Chi² = 12.59, df = 4 (P = 0.01); I² = 68%
verall effect: Z = 1.93 (P = 0.05)





as legend
omisation process
tions from the intended interventions
ng outcome data: Margin of Stability
urement of the outcome: Margin of stability
tion of the reported result: Margin of stability
ll: Margin of stability

e 10- Meta-analyses for Margin of stability during a recovery step (m)
20a – slip training vs control; Allins 2020b – trip training vs control)

	PBT			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference	Risk
Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	A B C
0a	-7.7	1.4	11	-7.6	1.3	5	15.8%	-0.10 [-1.51, 1.31]		? + −
0b	-7.5	0.9	8	-8.4	0.5	5	25.0%	0.90 [0.14, 1.66]		? + −
	-7.8	1.3	23	-7.4	1.3	21	24.9%	-0.40 [-1.17, 0.37]		+ + +
3	3.38	3.38	20	2.6	3.44	23	10.0%	0.78 [-1.26, 2.82]		+ + ?
)	2	3.2	149	2.9	3.9	153	24.3%	-0.90 [-1.70, -0.10]		+ + −
; CI)			**211**			**207**	**100.0%**	**-0.03 [-0.81, 0.74]**		

eity: Tau² = 0.48; Chi² = 11.69, df = 4 (P = 0.02); I² = 66%
erall effect: Z = 0.08 (P = 0.94)



s legend
nisation process
ons from the intended interventions
g outcome data: Timed-up and Go test
rement of the outcome: Timed-up and Go test
on of the reported result: Timed-up and Go test
: Timed-up and Go test

11- Meta-analyses for the Timed Up & Go test
)a – slip training vs control; Allins 2020b – trip training vs control)

	PBT			Control				Std. Mean Difference	Risk of
ubgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	A B C D
	17	4.3	23	19.1	3.3	21	9.0%	-0.53 [-1.14, 0.07]	+ + + +
23	-23.49	3.63	39	-23.34	3.42	43	17.1%	-0.04 [-0.48, 0.39]	+ + + +
	4.91	4.65	22	4.46	12.82	24	9.8%	0.05 [-0.53, 0.62]	+ + ? +
	6	5.2	175	5.8	5.2	180	64.1%	0.04 [-0.17, 0.25]	+ + ? +
CI)			**259**			**268**	**100.0%**	**-0.03 [-0.21, 0.16]**	

ity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 3.16, df = 3 (P = 0.37); I² = 5%
rall effect: Z = 0.28 (P = 0.78)



legend
ıisation process
ns from the intended interventions
outcome data: Balance (normal)
ement of the outcome: Balance (normal)
ı of the reported result: Balance (normal)
Balance (normal)

.2- Meta-analyses for Static Balance (normal)

	PBT			Control				Std. Mean Difference	Risk
ubgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	A B C
)a	86.2	4.4	11	82	5.7	5	11.4%	0.83 [-0.28, 1.93]	? + −
)b	90.5	2.8	8	86.9	7.1	5	10.4%	0.69 [-0.47, 1.86]	? + −
	0.505	0.02	134	0.5	0.03	31	69.6%	0.22 [-0.17, 0.62]	? + −
)7	2.5	3.1	6	-0.5	0.7	6	8.6%	1.23 [-0.05, 2.51]	? + −
CI)			**159**			**47**	**100.0%**	**0.43 [0.05, 0.81]**	



eity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 3.20, df = 3 (P = 0.36); I² = 6%
erall effect: Z = 2.20 (P = 0.03)

s legend
nisation process
ons from the intended interventions
outcome data: Hip height
ement of the outcome: Hip height
on of the reported result: Hip height
Hip height

L3- Meta-analyses for Hip height during a recovery step
a – slip training vs control; Allins 2020b – trip training vs control)



Sup Figure 14- Funnel plot (rate ratio - falls)



Sup Figure 15- Funnel plot (risk ratio - fallers)



Sup Figure 16- Funnel plot (injurious fallers)



Sup Figure 17- Funnel plot (lab falls)



Supplementary Figure 1. Flow diagram for this systematic review including searches of databases, registers and other sources. Studies that reported the outcome of interest were included in the meta-analysis.