Title

Perturbation-based balance training improves reactive balance and reduces falls in older people: A systematic review and meta-analysis.

Title

Perturbation-based balance training improves reactive balance and reduces falls in older people: 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

Aim: Falls are common among older adults and deteriorate their quality of life. Perturbation-based balance training (PBT) is a task-specific exercise designed to improve reactive balance. This systematic review synthesised current evidence on the efficacy of PBT in reducing falls and fall-related risk factors in community-dwelling older adults.

Methodology: PubMed, CINAHL, EMBASE, and Cochrane databases were systematically searched from inception to June 2024. Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating the effects of PBT on falls or fall risk factors, including reactive balance assessed through laboratory-induced perturbations, were included. Two reviewers independently screened studies, extracted data, and assessed risk of bias. A

random-effects model was used for meta-analyses. Certainty of evidence was evaluated using the GRADE approach.

Results: Twenty-five RCTs involving 2,659 participants were included. Meta-analyses showed that PBT significantly reduced: fall rate by 23% (rate ratio 0.77, 95% CI [confidence interval]: 0.60–0.99, I^2=57%, low certainty), proportion of fallers by 17% (risk ratio 0.83, 95% CI: 0.74–0.93, I^2=0%), injurious falls by 24% (risk ratio 0.76, 95% CI: 0.58–0.98, I^2=0%), and laboratory falls by 58% (risk ratio 0.42, 95% CI: 0.31–0.58, I^2=43%). Improvements in reactive balance measures (e.g., margin of stability, hip height) were observed but not in other fall risk factors (e.g., gait).

Conclusion: PBT effectively improves reactive balance and reduces falls, including injurious falls, thus may effectively complement conventional exercise programs. Further high-quality trials are needed to optimise PBT protocols, identify key components, assess long-term benefits, and develop scalable, accessible delivery models suitable for routine clinical use.

Protocol registration PROSPERO: CRD42022343368

Key Words: Accidental falls, Aged, perturbation training, risk factors, exercise therapy.

What is already known

- Falls are common among older adults and contribute significantly to injury, disability, and healthcare burden.
- Most exercise-based interventions reduce falls by improving strength and voluntary balance control.
- Perturbation-based balance training (PBT) targets reactive balance—the ability to recover from unexpected slips or trips.
- Prior studies have suggested that PBT may reduce falls, but findings have been inconsistent and not comprehensively synthesised.

What are the new findings

- This systematic review and meta-analysis of 25 RCTs shows that PBT reduces fall rate (by 23%), number of fallers (by 17%), and injurious falls (by 24%).

- PBT substantially improves reactive balance, reducing laboratory-induced falls by 58%.
- No significant effects were observed for other fall risk factors such as strength or general balance.
- PBT is a promising and task-specific fall prevention strategy, but more high-quality trials and scalable approaches are needed.

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.[1 2] Age-related functional declines may be manifested as poor static balance,[3] slow gait,[4] decreased mobility[5] and poor executive function[6] which have been the target of many conventional exercise interventions.[7] However, most falls in community-dwelling older people stem from unexpected perturbations such as tripping or slipping while walking.[8] 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.[9-11] This reactive balance control in response to a variety of perturbations plays an essential role in preventing falls in older people but cannot be sufficiently addressed by conventional exercises.[12]

Perturbation-based balance training (PBT), also called reactive balance training, is task-specific training that aims to improve reactive balance control via exposure to repeated postural perturbations.[13] Since the early 2000's, various forms of PBT have been trialed, including those using specialised treadmills,[14-16] simulated slips and/or trips[17 18] and manual perturbation techniques.[19] Our previous review in 2017 suggested that PBT can reduce laboratory falls by 91% and daily life falls by up to 50% in older people.[20] A recent systematic review in 2022 on reactive balance training also reported 39% falls reduction[21] but this review included disease-specific and younger populations which may limit its applicability to older people. As more trials on PBT have been reported with some inconsistencies[22-24], an updated systematic review is necessary to synthesise all the available evidence in this growing field of research. Moreover, several important questions on PBT are yet to be answered. First, while the mechanisms of PBT are thought to be highly task-specific (i.e. improving reactive balance), its impact on other factors such as gait, mobility, static balance and executive function should be clarified. Second, the methodologies of PBT are heterogeneous including a wide range of training dosage (e.g. as little as only one training

session, or as much as 48 sessions)[17 24], perturbation methods (e.g. perturbation walkways, treadmills, manual techniques) and target populations. Given these gaps, this systematic review and meta-analysis aims to not only confirm the efficacy of PBT in reducing falls among community-dwelling older adults but also to identify the optimal training doses, modalities, and population groups that may benefit the most from this intervention. These findings will directly 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) guidelines. The protocol of the review was prospectively at the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO: CRD42022343368).

Eligibility criteria

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) conducted in all settings were included. To be included in this review, studies had to include PBT in at least one intervention arm. The population of interest was community-dwelling adults aged 60 years or older. We excluded studies that specifically recruited people diagnosed with neurological diseases (e.g., Parkinson's, dementia, multiple sclerosis) or conditions (e.g., stroke). Regarding comparators, all types of comparators (e.g. usual treatment, other training, education, 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. The primary outcomes of this review were fall rates, proportion of fallers, injurious falls, and laboratory-based measures of reactive balance. These outcomes were selected due to their established clinical relevance for fall prevention and because they are commonly reported in the literature on perturbation-based training. Secondary outcomes, including measures of static balance, 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. No limitation on the duration of follow-up was imposed. Only articles published in English or Japanese were included.

Information sources and search strategy

Systematic searches were performed in four electronic databases (PubMed, CINAHL, EMBASE, and Cochrane) from inception to June 2023. An additional updated search was conducted in July 2024. The search string was constructed in collaboration with a research librarian with expertise in systematic reviews using search terms and keywords based on population (older adults), intervention (perturbation-based balance training) 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. The completed search strings are available in the 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 [25] and Covidence (for updated searches).

Data collection process

Data extraction was independently performed by two reviewers (ISZ, SS) with a data extraction template in Covidence using the following domains: study design and general information, participant characteristics, intervention characteristics, outcome measures and results. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion and by consulting additional reviewers (MGJ, YO).

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) [26]. All outcomes were separately assessed using ROB 2. Disagreements during consensus were mutually discussed among reviewers (YO, MGJ) when required, and a final decision was made after appropriate justification.

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, 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 (overground walkway vs treadmill vs standing perturbation), (iii) training dosage (≤10 hours vs >10 hours), and intervention type (PBT alone vs combined PBT, such as PBT plus resistance training). We chose these subgroup analyses because previous reviews and trials have indicated potential differences in effectiveness based on training dosage, perturbation type, and participant risk profiles.

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 2). [27] 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) [28 23 29-32], 16 used treadmills (e.g. belt accelerations/decelerations)[14 15 22 24 33-42] and four used standing perturbations (e.g. surface translation) [24 43-45] as their PBT modality. Training doses were >10 hours (mean=14 hours) in two studies,[23 36] and ≤10 hours (mean=2.5 hours) in the remaining studies. Six studies [34 35 41 43 45 46] 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 the Table 1.

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=43%). 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.

Insert figure 4

Subgroup analyses

Forest plots for each subgroup analysis are provided in the online supplementary appendices. A significant reduction in the number of falls was observed in both trials that included PBT as the sole intervention (rate ratio = 0.81; 95% CI: 0.62 to 1.06; p = 0.120; I^2 = 54%) and those that combined PBT with other interventions such as strength training (rate ratio = 0.26; 95% CI: 0.13 to 0.54; p = 0.0003). However, the effect size was significantly greater for multifactorial interventions (p-value for subgroup difference = 0.03). When stratified by training dosage (<10 hours vs >10 hours), no significant subgroup differences were found (p = 0.18). Similarly, no significant differences in effect size were observed based on intervention type (overground walkway, treadmill, or standing perturbation; p = 0.27; I^2 = 24.6%) or participant characteristics (healthy vs high-risk, p = 0.940; I^2 = 0%).

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 [14 16 17 23 41 46] 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)[15] was omitted (p = 0.050), suggesting this study may have contributed disproportionately to between-study variability.

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 (see supplementary file). However, the funnel plot for laboratory-assessed falls indicated potential publication bias. Upon removal of suspected outlier studies [32 44 47], 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

DISCUSSION

This systematic review and meta-analysis revealed PBT reduced fall rates in older adults by 23% compared to control groups receiving standard exercise or usual care. 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 consistently enhanced reactive balance responses to sudden perturbations. However, it did not significantly affect other fall-related risk factors such as static balance, gait speed, or fear of falling. These findings suggest that the observed reductions in falls are primarily driven by improvements in reactive balance, rather than broader changes in general balance or mobility.

Mechanisms and Dose of PBT

PBT differs fundamentally from traditional balance training. [24 48 49] 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. [13 50] PBT achieves this by exposing individuals to repeated, controlled perturbations, allowing them to develop predictive and reactive motor strategies to maintain balance.

Interestingly, most PBT programs included in this review involved relatively low training doses, averaging just 2.5 hours across 3–6 sessions. This suggests that PBT may operate through motor skill learning, where individuals rapidly adapt their gait and posture to avoid future balance loss. Studies show that older adults can adapt to simple perturbations within 3–24 trials in a single session, often through predictive strategies such as shifting the center of mass forward to counteract backward

balance loss. [17 18 51] Additionally, the subgroup analysis showed a dose-response with a 42% fall reduction compared to 16% when PBT dose was 10+ hours compared to <10 hours. This suggests Improving reactive responses to unpredictable perturbations likely requires higher training doses and multiple sessions [29 52], especially in frailer individuals who benefit from gradual progression and lower-intensity perturbations.

Improved Reactive Balance and Transfer to Daily Life

The review found that PBT reduced laboratory-induced falls by 58%, a strong indicator of improved reactive balance. However, the 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. [53 54] 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, but this benefit was lost at 12 months. [15] These findings highlight the potential value of booster sessions to maintain long-term benefits. [55]

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. [53] This underscores the need for more standardised outcome measures in future studies.

Different PBT Methods

Subgroup analyses did not reveal statistically significant differences between PBT delivery methods—such as treadmills, overground walkways, or manual perturbations. However, overground 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. [53 54 56] These mixed findings suggest that not all PBT modalities may be equally effective, and further research is needed to determine which methods best simulate real-world perturbations.

Complementing Conventional Exercise

Given that PBT did not significantly improve general balance, gait speed, or fear of falling, it should be viewed as a complementary intervention rather than a replacement for conventional exercise. Notably,

subgroup analysis 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. [23 57] Integrating PBT with traditional strength and balance exercises may therefore offer synergistic benefits, addressing multiple fall risk factors.

Clinical Implications

The findings of this review have important implications for clinical practice. Even brief PBT interventions—delivered over just a few hours—can yield meaningful improvements in reactive balance and fall risk. Clinicians should consider incorporating PBT into fall prevention programs, particularly for older adults with a history of falls or impaired reactive balance. However, many PBT protocols rely on specialised equipment (e.g., perturbation treadmills), which may not be feasible in all settings. [19 58 59] In such cases, manual perturbation techniques may offer a practical and low-cost alternative, though further research is needed to validate their effectiveness.

Limitations

Despite its strengths, this review has several limitations. First, it focused exclusively on community-dwelling older adults, limiting generalisability to frail or those living in residential aged care. Second, the possibility of publication bias and missed studies in including those not published in English or Japanese cannot be ruled out. Third, there was substantial heterogeneity in PBT protocols, including differences in training modality, dosage, and delivery, which may have influenced the pooled results. Finally, the certainty of evidence ranged from low to moderate due to concerns about risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision. 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 can reduce fall rates, the number of daily fallers, and injurious falls, while enhancing reactive balance capacity in community-dwelling older adults. PBT is a promising intervention that can be effectively integrated into conventional exercise programs to strengthen fall prevention efforts in clinical practice. However, further high-quality trials are needed to address unresolved aspects of PBT, including the optimisation of training protocols, identification of key components, and evaluation of long-term retention of benefits. Importantly, more accessible and

scalable delivery models are required, as many current PBT approaches are resource-intensive and difficult to implement in routine clinical and community settings.

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 YO and MGJ. 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.

REFERENCES

1. Shumway-Cook A, Ciol MA, Hoffman J, et al. Falls in the Medicare population: incidence, associated factors, and impact on health care. *Physical therapy* 2009;89(4):324-32. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20070107 [published Online First: 2009/02/21]
2. World Health Organization. Step Safely: Strategies for preventing and managing falls across the life-course 2021 [Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/978924002191-4.
3. Lord SR, Clark RD, Webster IW. Physiological factors associated with falls in an elderly population. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 1991;39(12):1194-200.
4. Quach L, Galica AM, Jones RN, et al. The nonlinear relationship between gait speed and falls: the Maintenance of Balance, Independent Living, Intellect, and Zest in the Elderly of Boston Study. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 2011;59(6):1069-73. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2011.03408.x
5. Beauchet O, Fantino B, Allali G, et al. Timed up and go test and risk of falls in older adults: A systematic review. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2011;15(10):933-38. doi: 10.1007/s12603-011-0062-0
6. Kearney FC, Harwood RH, Gladman JR, et al. The relationship between executive function and falls and gait abnormalities in older adults: a systematic review. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord* 2013;36(1-2):20-35. doi: 10.1159/000350031 [published Online First: 2013/05/29]
7. Di Lorito C, Long A, Byrne A, et al. Exercise interventions for older adults: A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Journal of Sport and Health Science* 2021;10(1):29-47. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2020.06.003
8. Berg WP, Alessio HM, Mills EM, et al. Circumstances and consequences of falls in independent community-dwelling older adults. *Age and ageing* 1997;26(4):261-8.
9. Patla AE. Strategies for dynamic stability during adaptive human locomotion. *IEEE Eng Med Biol Mag* 2003;22(2):48-52. doi: 10.1109/MEMB.2003.1195695 [published Online First: 2003/05/08]
10. Hof AL, Gazendam MG, Sinke WE. The condition for dynamic stability. *J Biomech* 2005;38(1):1-8. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2004.03.025
11. Okubo Y, Schoene D, Caetano MJ, et al. Stepping impairment and falls in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of volitional and reactive step tests. *Ageing research reviews* 2021;66:101238. doi: 10.1016/j.arr.2020.101238 [published Online First: 20201224]
12. Kim Y, Vakula MN, Bolton DAE, et al. Which Exercise Interventions Can Most Effectively Improve Reactive Balance in Older Adults? A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Front Aging Neurosci* 2021;13:764826. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2021.764826 [published Online First: 2022/02/05]
13. McCrum C, Bhatt TS, Gerards MHG, et al. Perturbation-based balance training: Principles, mechanisms and implementation in clinical practice. *Front Sports Act Living* 2022;4:1015394. doi: 10.3389/fspor.2022.1015394 [published Online First: 20221006]
14. Nørgaard JE, Andersen S, Ryg J, et al. Effect of Treadmill Perturbation-Based Balance Training on Fall Rates in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open* 2023;6(4):e238422. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.8422 [published Online First: 2023/04/20]
15. Lurie JD, Zagaria AB, Ellis L, et al. Surface Perturbation Training to Prevent Falls in Older Adults: A Highly Pragmatic, Randomized Controlled Trial. *Phys Ther* 2020;100(7):1153-62. doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzaa023
16. Lurie JD, Zagaria AB, Pidgeon DM, et al. Pilot comparative effectiveness study of surface perturbation treadmill training to prevent falls in older adults. *BMC Geriatrics* 2013;13(1):1-8.
17. Pai YC, Bhatt T, Yang F, et al. Perturbation training can reduce community-dwelling older adults' annual fall risk: a randomized controlled trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2014;69(12):1586-94. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glu087 [published Online First: 20140624]

18. Pai YC, Bhatt T, Wang E, et al. Inoculation against falls: rapid adaptation by young and older adults to slips during daily activities. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation* 2010;91(3):452-9. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2009.10.032
19. Mansfield A, Aqui A, Danells CJ, et al. Does perturbation-based balance training prevent falls among individuals with chronic stroke? A randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(8):e021510. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021510 [published Online First: 20180817]
20. Okubo Y, Schoene D, Lord SR. Step training improves reaction time, gait and balance and reduces falls in older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *British journal of sports medicine* 2017;51(7):586-93. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095452 [published Online First: 20160108]
21. Devasahayam AJ, Farwell K, Lim B, et al. The Effect of Reactive Balance Training on Falls in Daily Life: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Phys Ther* 2022;103(1) doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzac154
22. Aviles J, Allin LJ, Alexander NB, et al. 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. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences* 2019;74(9):1497-503. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glz018
23. Rogers MW, Creath RA, Gray V, et al. 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. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences* 2021;76(9):e194-e202. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glab017
24. Wang Y, Wang S, Liu X, et al. Can a single session of treadmill-based slip training reduce daily life falls in community-dwelling older adults? A randomized controlled trial. *Aging clinical and experimental research* 2022;34(7):1593-602. doi: 10.1007/s40520-022-02090-3 [published Online First: 2022/03/04]
25. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5(1):210. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4 [published Online First: 20161205]
26. Sterne JAC, Savovic J, Page MJ, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4898 [published Online First: 20190828]
27. McMaster University. GRADEpro GDT: GRADEpro guideline development tool [Software]: Evidence Prime, Inc.; 2023 [Available from: https://www.gradepro.org.
28. Allin LJ, Brolinson PG, Beach BM, et al. Perturbation-based balance training targeting both slip- and trip-induced falls among older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC geriatrics* 2020;20(1):205. doi: 10.1186/s12877-020-01605-9 [published Online First: 20200612]
29. Okubo Y, DL S, Brodie MA, et al. Effect of reactive balance training involving repeated slips and trips on balance recovery in older adults: A blinded randomized controlled trial. *The journals of gerontology Series A, Biological sciences and medical sciences* 2019 doi: 10.1093/gerona/glz021
30. Pai Y-C, Bhatt T, Yang F, et al. Perturbation training can reduce community-dwelling older adults' annual fall risk: a randomized controlled trial. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences & Medical Sciences* 2014;69(12):1586-94. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glu087
31. Bhatt T, Wang Y, Wang S, et al. Perturbation Training for Fall-Risk Reduction in Healthy Older Adults: Interference and Generalization to Opposing Novel Perturbations Post Intervention. *Front Sports Act Living* 2021;3:697169. doi: 10.3389/fspor.2021.697169 [published Online First: 20210816]
32. Liu X, Bhatt T, Wang Y, et al. The retention of fall-resisting behavior derived from treadmill slip-perturbation training in community-dwelling older adults. *Geroscience* 2021;43(2):913-26. doi: 10.1007/s11357-020-00270-5 [published Online First: 2020/09/27]
33. Bieryla KA, Madigan ML, Nussbaum MA. Practicing recovery from a simulated trip improves recovery kinematics after an actual trip. *Gait & posture* 2007;26(2):208-13. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.09.010 [published Online First: 2006/10/19]

34. Brull L, Hezel N, Arampatzis A, et al. Comparing the Effects of Two Perturbation-Based Balance Training Paradigms in Fall-Prone Older Adults: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Gerontology* 2023;69(7):910-22. doi: 10.1159/000530167 [published Online First: 2023/03/16]
35. Gerards M, Marcellis R, Senden R, et al. The effect of perturbation-based balance training on balance control and fear of falling in older adults: a single-blind randomised controlled trial. *BMC geriatrics* 2023;23(1):305. doi: 10.1186/s12877-023-03988-x [published Online First: 2023/05/18]
36. Gimmon Y, Riemer R, Kurz I, et al. Perturbation exercises during treadmill walking improve pelvic and trunk motion in older adults-A randomized control trial. *Archives of gerontology and geriatrics* 2018;75:132-38. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2017.12.004 [published Online First: 2018/01/06]
37. Kurz I, Gimmon Y, Shapiro A, et al. Unexpected perturbations training improves balance control and voluntary stepping times in older adults - a double blind randomized control trial. *BMC geriatrics* 2016;16:58. doi: 10.1186/s12877-016-0223-4 [published Online First: 2016/03/06]
38. Lurie JD, Zagaria AB, Pidgeon DM, et al. Pilot comparative effectiveness study of surface perturbation treadmill training to prevent falls in older adults. *BMC geriatrics* 2013;13:49. doi: 10.1186/1471-2318-13-49 [published Online First: 2013/05/18]
39. Obuchi S, Kojima M, Shiba Y, et al. [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* 2004;41(3):321-7. doi: 10.3143/geriatrics.41.321
40. Rieger MM, Papegaaij S, Pijnappels M, et al. Transfer and retention effects of gait training with anterior-posterior perturbations to postural responses after medio-lateral gait perturbations in older adults. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2020;75:104988. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2020.104988 [published Online First: 2020/03/17]
41. Shimada H, Obuchi S, Furuna T, et al. 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* 2004;83(7):493-9. doi: 10.1097/01.phm.0000130025.54168.91
42. Wang Y, Bhatt T, Liu X, et al. Can treadmill-slip perturbation training reduce immediate risk of over-ground-slip induced fall among community-dwelling older adults? *J Biomech* 2019;84:58-66. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2018.12.017 [published Online First: 2019/01/09]
43. Mansfield A, Peters AL, Liu BA, et al. Effect of a perturbation-based balance training program on compensatory stepping and grasping reactions in older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *Physical therapy* 2010;90(4):476-91. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20090070 [published Online First: 2010/02/20]
44. Parijat P, Lockhart TE. Effects of moveable platform training in preventing slip-induced falls in older adults. *Ann Biomed Eng* 2012;40(5):1111-21. doi: 10.1007/s10439-011-0477-0 [published Online First: 2011/12/03]
45. Maki BE, Cheng KC, Mansfield A, et al. Preventing falls in older adults: new interventions to promote more effective change-in-support balance reactions. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2008;18(2):243-54. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2007.06.005 [published Online First: 2007/09/04]
46. Rieger MM, Papegaaij S, Steenbrink F, et al. Effects of Perturbation-Based Treadmill Training on Balance Performance, Daily Life Gait, and Falls in Older Adults: REACT Randomized Controlled Trial. *Phys Ther* 2024;104(1) doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzad136 [published Online First: 2023/10/08]
47. Liu J, Lockhart TE, Parijat P, et al. Comparison of Slip Training in VR Environment And on Moveable Platform. *Biomed Sci Instrum* 2015;51:189-97.
48. Sherrington C, Fairhall NJ, Wallbank GK, et al. Exercise for preventing falls in older people living in the community. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2019;1(1):CD012424. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012424.pub2 [published Online First: 20190131]

49. Sherrington C, Michaleff ZA, Fairhall N, et al. Exercise to prevent falls in older adults: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med* 2017;51(24):1750-58. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2016-096547 [published Online First: 20161004]
50. Grabiner MD, Crenshaw JR, Hurt CP, et al. Exercise-based fall prevention: can you be a bit more specific? *Exercise and sport sciences reviews* 2014;42(4):161-8. doi: 10.1249/JES.0000000000000023
51. Bohm S, Mademli L, Mersmann F, et al. Predictive and Reactive Locomotor Adaptability in Healthy Elderly: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports medicine* 2015;45(12):1759-77. doi: 10.1007/s40279-015-0413-9
52. Okubo Y, Brodie MA, Sturnieks D, et al. Exposure to trips and slips with increasing unpredictability while walking can improve balance recovery responses with minimum predictive gait alterations. *PLoS One* 2018;13(9)
53. Phu S, Sturnieks DL, Song PYH, et al. 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* 2024;97:103273. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2024.103273 [published Online First: 20240831]
54. Song P, Sturnieks DL, Davis M, et al. 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* 2021;in press
55. Bhatt T, Yang F, Pai YC. Learning to resist gait-slip falls: long-term retention in community-dwelling older adults. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation* 2012;93(4):557-64. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2011.10.027
56. Lee A, Bhatt T, Liu X, et al. Can higher training practice dosage with treadmill slip-perturbation necessarily reduce risk of falls following overground slip? *Gait & posture* 2018;61:387-92. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.01.037 [published Online First: 2018/02/18]
57. Okubo Y, Duran L, Delbaere K, et al. 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. *J Geriatr Phys Ther* 2021 doi: 10.1519/JPT.0000000000000312 [published Online First: 2021/07/29]
58. Whitten J, O'Leary B, Graham D, et al. The Acceptability of a Community-Based Perturbation-Based Balance Training to Older Adults and Healthcare Professionals. *Gerontol Geriatr Med* 2024;10:23337214241246843. doi: 10.1177/23337214241246843 [published Online First: 20240415]
59. Ho C, Sharma S, Huang T, et al. Clinician acceptability of the ReacStep reactive balance training program for fall prevention. *Physiother Res Int* 2024;29(4):e2133. doi: 10.1002/pri.2133

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)

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)

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

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)

TABLES

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

Author, year	Sample and study characteristics					PBT			Control	
	N	Gender (% women)	Age mean ± SD/range	Participant characteristics	Intervention duration	Description (perturbation methods)	Progression	Dose (min)	Description	Dose (min)
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	Slips: from short, slow slips to fast long slips Trips: Increase belt accelerations	60-80 trials in 30 min/session 4 sessions	General balance exercise adapted from the Otago Exercise Program	4 sessions 30 min
Aviles 2019	35	RBT[a]: 68.4% TaiChi: 68.7%	RBT[a]: 80.9 ± 6.2 TaiChi: 82.6 ± 4.5	Healthy	4 weeks	Specialized treadmill: Treadmill perturbations (n=40) varying 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 progressively during each session as participant performance improves	40 perturbations/ session, 12 sessions 30 min/session	Tai-Chi training	12 sessions 30 min/session
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	None	1 session session duration N/A	Ctrl: Normal walking session	1 session session duration N/A
Bieryla 2007	12	50%	Range: 63 - 83 y	Healthy	1 day	Trip recovery training from a sudden obstacle on modified treadmill	Increasing/decreasin g speed as per participant performance and recovery	20 trials, 1 session 15 min/session	Normal treadmill walking	1 session 15 min/session
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	The progression in task challenges was adjusted individually based on a standardized procedure including the judgment of the trainer and the participant using 5-point scale of subjectively	1 session 30-40 min/session, 3 sessions/week	No treatment	N/A

							perceived difficulty and anxiety			
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 and walking speed. It was based on these NRS scores, and each participant's ability to manage	3 sessions 30 min/session	Usual care physiotherapy	Variable
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 and accelerations of the horizontal translations). The level of perturbation was adjusted to match each subject's ability and to be continuously challenging	48 sessions 20 min/session	Usual treatment - treadmill gait training w/o perturbations	48 sessions 20 min/session
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 difficulty 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/s2 acceleration at the first training session.	24 sessions 20 min/session	Treadmill walking	24 sessions 20 min/session
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 (simulated slip was induced by moving the platform 0.3 m at a speed of 1.2 m/s) VRT: Virtual reality (A sudden virtual slip was induced by tilting	None	24 trials of slips in 1 session	Normal walking session	1 session

						the environment 25 degrees in the pitch plane at 60o/s)				
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 middle of the 7-walk way)	Sub jects received progressively graded slip perturbations in the ascending phase. When subjects cannot tolerate a higher intensity level during this progression, it was kept at tolerable levels.	40 trials in 1 session, 30 min/session	Tc: Treadmill walking (usual treatment) Oc: No treatment	1 session 30 min/session Oc: no treatment
Lurie 2013	64	Overall: 59.3% SPTT: 50% Control: 67%	SPTT[o]: 81.1 ± 6.53 Ctrl[d]: 79.2 ± 7.65	Healthy	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 sessions progressed from less to more challenging	Variable sessions - determined clinically by therapist	Standard PT	Variable: determined clinically by therapist
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 less to more challenging	Variable session nr. determined clinically by therapist 15 min PBT/45min	Usual gait/balance intervention	Variable session nr. determined clinically by therapist 45 min/session
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 30-min/session	Voluntary step and reach-to-grasp training	3 sessions 30-min/session
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 30 min/session	Passive muscular relaxation and flexibility exercises	18 sessions 30 min/session
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 (Figure 2B). The trip perturbations were induced by a sudden	Intensity was adjusted after every 4th perturbation based on participants' preferred walking speed and was	4 sessions 20 min/session	Treadmill walking	4 sessions 20 min/session

						deacceleration followed by a greater backward acceleration at mid-swing	divided into 5 levels with progressively longer durations (slip) or greater accelerations (trip). Also perceived anxiety, avoided falls and comfort was measured.			
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	None	8 sessions 15 min/session	Treadmill walking	8 sessions 15 min/session
Okubo 2019	44	RBT: 59% Control: 55%	RBT[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 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, trip board height, slip distance or slip speed were adjusted	3 sessions 40 min/session	Target step training on walkway without perturbations	3 sessions 40 min/session
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)	None	1 session	Movable platform with one single slip	1 session
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	None	1 session, 15–20 min/session	Normal walking trials	1 session 15–20 min/session
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	None	1 session	8-min treadmill walking	1 session
Rieger 2023	70	REACT: 50% Ctrl: 50%	REACT: 75.5 (5.4) Ctrl: 73.9 (5.9)	High-risk	4 weeks		Training progression was in order of	2 sessions/ week, (total 4	Ctrl: Gait training under cognitive	2 sessions/ week, (total 4 weeks),

							priority of: Increase walking speed, increase the perturbation difficulty every week, by increasing the levels of acceleration/deceler-ation 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.	weeks), 30 minutes/session	dual-task conditions without perturbation. This	30 minutes/session
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	36 sessions 20 min/ duration N/A	Standard flexibility and relaxation exercises (SFR)	36 sessions 20 min/session
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 were progressively increased in magnitude and finally involved 100% reductions in speed	1-3 times/week (Total 10 hours in 6 months)	Physical therapy for pain (hot packs, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation), stretching exercises, resistance training, gait training over level surfaces, outdoor walking, balance training, ascending and descending of stairs, and group	Not mentioned

									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	As per patient ability	1 session 30 min	Treadmill walking	1 session 30 min
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	As per patient ability	1 session 30 min	Treadmill walking	1 session 30 min

[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;

534 **Table 2** Results of GRADE analysis

535

Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect		Certainty
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Perturbation-based balance training	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	
Number of falls (follow-up: range 3 months to 12 months; assessed with: Calendars)											
11	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** (1.4 to 56 fewer falls)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ Low[a,b]
Proportion of fallers (%) (follow-up: range 3 months to 12 months; assessed with: Calendars)											
11	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** (3 to 12 fewer fallers)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ Moderate[a]
Injurious falls (%) (follow-up: range 1 months to 12 months; assessed with: Medical record)											
4	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** (5 to 10	⊕⊕⊕⊕ Low[c,d]

										fewer fallers)	

Laboratory falls (assessed with: Video or harness load cell)

9	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** (21 to 34 fewer falls)	⊕⊕⊕⊘ Moderate[a,d,e]

536

Study or Subgroup	log[Risk Ratio]	SE	Weight	Risk Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
1.4.1 High risk					
Parijat 2012	-2.94	1.42	1.2%	0.05 [0.00, 0.85]	? + − + ? −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**1.2%**	**0.05 [0.00, 0.85]**	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.07 (P = 0.04)					
1.4.2 Some concern					
Allins, 2020a	-0.97	0.58	6.3%	0.38 [0.12, 1.18]	? + + ? ? ?
Bhatt, 2021	-0.57	0.09	33.0%	0.57 [0.47, 0.67]	? + + + ? ?
Liu 2015	-1.95	1.49	1.1%	0.14 [0.01, 2.64]	? + + ? ? ?
Liu 2020 a	-2.48	1.45	1.2%	0.08 [0.00, 1.44]	? + + + ? ?
Liu 2020 b	-0.82	0.37	12.3%	0.44 [0.21, 0.91]	? + + + ? ?
Wang, 2019	-1.47	0.37	12.3%	0.23 [0.11, 0.47]	+ + + + ? ?
Subtotal (95% CI)			**66.2%**	**0.40 [0.26, 0.62]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.11; Chi² = 8.57, df = 5 (P = 0.13); I² = 42%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.14 (P < 0.0001)					
1.4.3 Low risk					
Norgaard, 2023	-0.99	0.29	16.6%	0.37 [0.21, 0.66]	+ + + + + +
Okubo, 2019	-0.46	0.3	16.0%	0.63 [0.35, 1.14]	+ + + + + +
Subtotal (95% CI)			**32.6%**	**0.48 [0.29, 0.81]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.05; Chi² = 1.61, df = 1 (P = 0.20); I² = 38%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.76 (P = 0.006)					
Total (95% CI)			**100.0%**	**0.42 [0.31, 0.58]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.07; Chi² = 12.90, df = 8 (P = 0.12); I² = 38%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 5.37 (P < 0.00001)					
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 2.46, df = 2 (P = 0.29), I² = 18.6%					



Risk of bias legend

(**A**) Randomisation process

(**B**) Deviations from the intended interventions

(**C**) Missing outcome data: Laboratory falls

(**D**) Measurement of the outcome: Laboratory falls

(**E**) Selection of the reported result: Laboratory falls

(**F**) Overall: Laboratory falls

Study or Subgroup	log[Rate Ratio]	SE	Weight	Rate Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
1.1.1 High risk					
Lurie, 2013	-0.92	0.36	7.8%	0.40 [0.20, 0.81]	+ + + − ? −
Rogers, 2021b	-0.81	0.34	8.4%	0.44 [0.23, 0.87]	+ + − ? ? −
Rogers, 2021a	-0.16	0.38	7.3%	0.85 [0.40, 1.79]	+ + − ? ? −
Maki 2008	0	0.71	2.8%	1.00 [0.25, 4.02]	− − − − − −
Wang 2022	0.17	0.25	11.4%	1.19 [0.73, 1.93]	− + ? + + −
Mansfield, 2010	0.34	0.65	3.3%	1.40 [0.39, 5.02]	+ + − − − −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**41.1%**	**0.75 [0.47, 1.17]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.15; Chi² = 9.99, df = 5 (P = 0.08); I² = 50%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.27 (P = 0.20)					
1.1.2 Some concern					
Pai, 2014	-0.69	0.3	9.6%	0.50 [0.28, 0.90]	? + ? + ? ?
Shimada 2004	-0.63	0.46	5.7%	0.53 [0.22, 1.31]	? + ? ? ? ?
Aviles, 2019	-0.29	0.67	3.1%	0.75 [0.20, 2.78]	? + ? ? ? ?
Lurie, 2020	0.1	0.06	19.2%	1.11 [0.98, 1.24]	+ + ? + + ?
Subtotal (95% CI)			**37.6%**	**0.74 [0.43, 1.26]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.18; Chi² = 9.21, df = 3 (P = 0.03); I² = 67%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.12 (P = 0.26)					
1.1.3 Low risk					
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]	+ + + + + +
Subtotal (95% CI)			**21.3%**	**0.79 [0.58, 1.08]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.00, df = 1 (P = 1.00); I² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.46 (P = 0.14)					
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 = 0.09, df = 2 (P = 0.96), 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

Study or Subgroup	log[]	SE	Experimental Total	Control Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI
1.2.1 High risk						
Lurie, 2013	-0.55	0.47	26	33	1.5%	0.58 [0.23, 1.45]
Maki 2008	-0.34	0.52	4	4	1.2%	0.71 [0.26, 1.97]
Mansfield, 2010	0.16	0.57	16	15	1.0%	1.17 [0.38, 3.59]
Rogers, 2021a	-0.17	0.66	24	26	0.8%	0.84 [0.23, 3.08]
Rogers, 2021b	-0.69	0.35	25	26	2.7%	0.50 [0.25, 1.00]
Wang 2022	0.13	0.29	70	63	3.9%	1.14 [0.65, 2.01]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**165**	**167**	**11.1%**	**0.79 [0.57, 1.11]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 4.25, df = 5 (P = 0.51); I² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.33 (P = 0.18)						
1.2.2 Some concern						
Aviles, 2019	-0.26	0.54	16	15	1.1%	0.77 [0.27, 2.22]
Lurie, 2020	-0.15	0.07	218	212	67.6%	0.86 [0.75, 0.99]
Pai, 2014	-0.68	0.3	102	96	3.7%	0.51 [0.28, 0.91]
Shimada 2004	-0.47	0.44	15	11	1.7%	0.63 [0.26, 1.48]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**351**	**334**	**74.1%**	**0.79 [0.63, 0.98]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.01; Chi² = 3.41, df = 3 (P = 0.33); I² = 12%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.14 (P = 0.03)						
1.2.3 Low Risk						
Norgaard, 2023	-0.14	0.16	70	70	12.9%	0.87 [0.64, 1.19]
Rieger 2023	-0.21	0.43	35	34	1.8%	0.81 [0.35, 1.88]
Subtotal (95% CI)			**105**	**104**	**14.7%**	**0.86 [0.64, 1.16]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.02, df = 1 (P = 0.88); I² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.99 (P = 0.32)						
Total (95% CI)			**621**	**605**	**100.0%**	**0.83 [0.74, 0.93]**
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 7.81, df = 11 (P = 0.73); I² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.21 (P = 0.001)						
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.25, df = 2 (P = 0.88), 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

Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Experimental Total	Control Total	Weight	Hazard Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI	Risk of Bias A B C D E F
1.3.1 High risk							
Lurie, 2013	-0.86	0.77	26	33	2.9%	0.42 [0.09, 1.91]	+ + ? − ? −
Subtotal (95% CI)			**26**	**33**	**2.9%**	**0.42 [0.09, 1.91]**	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.12 (P = 0.26)							
1.3.2 Some concern							
Lurie, 2020	-0.2	0.16	218	212	66.6%	0.82 [0.60, 1.12]	+ + ? + + ?
Pai, 2014	-0.7	0.57	109	103	5.3%	0.50 [0.16, 1.52]	? + ? ? ? ?
Subtotal (95% CI)			**327**	**315**	**71.9%**	**0.79 [0.58, 1.07]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 0.71, df = 1 (P = 0.40); I² = 0%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.54 (P = 0.12)							
1.3.3 Low risk							
Norgaard, 2023	-0.34	0.26	70	70	25.2%	0.71 [0.43, 1.18]	+ + + + + +
Subtotal (95% CI)			**70**	**70**	**25.2%**	**0.71 [0.43, 1.18]**	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.31 (P = 0.19)							
Total (95% CI)			**423**	**418**	**100.0%**	**0.76 [0.58, 0.98]**	
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 1.41, df = 3 (P = 0.70); I² = 0%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.15 (P = 0.03)							
Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.70, df = 2 (P = 0.70), I² = 0%							



Risk of bias legend

(**A**) Randomisation process

(**B**) Deviations from the intended interventions

(**C**) Missing outcome data: Injurious falls

(**D**) Measurement of the outcome: Injurious falls

(**E**) Selection of the reported result: Injurious falls

(**F**) Overall: Injurious falls