



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

5 **Fabio La Porta¹ Serena Caselli²**

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

9 ¹IRCCS Istituto delle Scienze Neurologiche di Bologna

10 ² Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Modena

11 ³ Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia

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

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

16

17 *** Correspondence:**

18 Corresponding Author: Fabio La Porta
19 fabio.laporta@ausl.bologna.it

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

22 **Abstract**

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

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

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

30 Setting: Outpatients in two Italian centers.

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

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

43 Results: A total of 690 falls were reported at 12-month follow-up, 337 (48.8%) in the intervention
44 group and 353 (51.2%) in the control group with 1.66 (\pm 3.5) and 1.77 (\pm 3.2) mean falls per subject,
45 respectively. The number of subjects with at least one fall was 236 (58.6%), with 119 (58.6%) and
46 117 falls (58.5%) in the intervention and control groups, respectively. No statistically significant
47 differences were observed between groups regarding the number of falls, the fall probability, and the
48 time to the first fall at 12-month follow-up. Furthermore, according to the subgroup analysis, no
49 significant differences were reported between subgroups (i.e., the four etiological class categories of
50 interest for the study). Finally, considering the two groups at pre-test (T1) and post-test (T3)
51 evaluations, a statistically significant difference was found only for the Fullerton Advanced Balance
52 Scale ($p=0.006$) and the Mini-BESTest ($p=0.004$) in favor of the intervention group.

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

63 **1 Introduction**

64 Fall risk in the elderly is a major public health issue due to the immediate injury-related
65 consequences and the risk of associated long-term disability (1). One out of three older people over
66 65 years is estimated to fall each year, and this rate increases to 50% in the elderly over 80 years old
67 (2). Around 15% of older adults are multiple fallers, experiencing more than one fall each year, thus
68 increasing morbidity and mortality (1). In 2 to 10% of cases, falls can lead to hip fractures strictly
69 related to functional decline, death, and increase in hospitalization costs, even though falls alone are
70 known to limit social participation and increase the risk of institutionalization (3). Moreover, the
71 costs for the acute management of the 85,762 hospitalizations for hip fractures that occurred in Italy

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

79 A systematic literature review and meta-analysis analyzed fall risk factors in community-dwelling
80 older people (6), highlighting that falling results from an interaction between environmental hazards
81 and inadequate physiology to cope with them, such as gait problems, poor vision, impaired peripheral
82 sensation, lower limb strength, dizziness, and the use of psychotropic medications or polypharmacy
83 (6,7). In older adults presenting for medical attention after a fall or who have gait or balance
84 problems, guidelines recommend a multifactorial fall risk assessment (8). This strategy implies
85 identifying modifiable risk factors and implementing targeted interventions for fall prevention (3).
86 However, the delivery of effective treatments for fall prevention in usual clinical practice still
87 represents a challenge (9,10).

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

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

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

116 **2 Materials and methods**

117 ***2.1 Study design***

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

124 [Figure 1]

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

131 ***2.2 Participants***

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

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

140 ***2.3 Enrolment algorithm***

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

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

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

148 1. Anamnestic Assessment of Eligibility (AAE):

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

160 [Table 1]

- 161 • Those who resulted at 'low fall risk' or 'not satisfying study criteria' were excluded.
162 The study protocol allowed to contact these subjects after one year by the PUA's
163 nurse to record any eventual fall that occurred and, thus, provided helpful quantitative
164 information for the post-hoc validation of the screening algorithm;
- 165 • After combining the assessment results, people who resulted at 'moderate-to-high fall
166 risk' accessed the successive selection step (Objective Assessment of Eligibility -
167 OAE).

168 2. Objective Assessment of Eligibility (OAE):

- 169 • This assessment constituted the PRE.C.I.S.A. second selection step, and it was
170 administered during an outpatient visit by a trained physiotherapist to individuals
171 selected at 'moderate-to-high fall risk' during the previous selection step (AAE);
- 172 • The aim was to evaluate in detail all fall risk factors described in the literature and,
173 hence, to confirm the eligibility for the study (be at 'moderate-to-high fall risk' after
174 the combination of the assessment results). In particular, the prospective participant
175 was submitted to the Falls Risk for Older People in the Community Screen (FROP-
176 Com Screen) (21), to the Fall Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT, Stapleton, 2009) (22), to
177 several mobility and balance tests (10 Meters Walking Test, Timed Up&Go test,
178 Tandem stance from the 4 Stage Balance Test, 30-second Chair Standing test, Short
179 Physical Performance Battery, Functional Reach Test), to the Abbreviated Mental
180 Test Score, and the visual acuity assessment (Snellen Chart);

- 181
- Those who obtained an ‘eligible coefficient’ ≥ 1 , calculated from the FROP-Com Screen and the FRAT (Stapleton, 2009) total scores, was judged as ‘eligible’ to be enrolled in the study (Table 1);
- 182
- Any individual re-classified at ‘low risk’ following this second assessment step was excluded from the enrolment and contacted one year later by the PUA’s trained nurse to collect the number of falls (study outcome).
- 183
- 184
- 185
- 186

187 ***2.4 Randomization***

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

189

190

191

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

193

194

195

196

197

198

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

200

- a report on their individual risk factor profile;
 - an illustrated brochure on fall prevention;
 - personalized suggestions to minimize the fall risk addressed to their General Practitioner (GP).
- 201
- 202
- 203
- 204

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

206

207

208 ***2.5 Interventions***

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

210

211

212 ***2.5.1 Group exercise sessions***

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

214

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

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

221

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

224

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

232 2.5.2 Group education sessions on fall risk factors

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

- 236 i. a 10-minute frontal lesson on a specific theme held by a component of the interdisciplinary
237 team;
- 238 ii. a 20-minute group discussion on the lesson content (involving participants, caregivers, and
239 professionals). A handbook summarizing these topics was provided to each participant at the
240 beginning of the first education session.

241 2.5.3 Personalized plan for reducing domestic fall risk factors

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

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

- 249
- 250
- 251
- Verified the presence of the fall-physical activity report diary, delivered at the time of recruitment, in a position that facilitated the compilation in case of fall (e.g., hanging on the wall in the living room/ kitchen, etc.);
- 252
- During the subsequent three home visits, related to the personalized home exercise program, the PT checked the implementation of the recommended interventions proposed during the first home access and filled the ‘Check-list of correction of environmental risk factors at home’.
- 253
- 254
- 255

256 2.5.4 Personalized home exercise program

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

258

259

260

- 261
- The PT devised this program in the context of an initial home visit (on the 2nd week) and subsequently monitored within two further home visits (on the 4th and 6th weeks).
- 262
- During the initial home visit, an illustrated manual containing strength and balance exercises was provided and explained to each participant based on the first group exercise session. These exercises were chosen between those the subject performed with greater safety in the group session.
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- Besides, the PT gave indications about recommended training frequency and time and registration of the performed physical activity in his/her fall-physical activity report diary of the current month.
- 267
- During the subsequent two visits, the PT verified i) the setting adequacy, ii) the modality in which the participant performed the suggested exercises, and iii) the update of the fall-physical activity report diary.
- 268
- 269
- 270
- Finally, in all three home accesses linked to the home exercise program, the PT checked the implementation/maintenance of the recommendations on risk factors correction given in the first-week home visit.
- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275

276 2.5.5 Multifactorial personalized intervention

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

278

- 279
- Review of medications, including psychotropic medications (N and G), antiparkinsonian drugs (N), and cardiovascular medications (G);
- 280
- Management of unaddressed visual impairments (G): ophthalmologist referral, lens prescription, suggestions regarding the limitation of bifocal lenses;
- 281
- 282
- Management of unaddressed cardiovascular issues (G), such as postural hypotension, covert cardiac failure, and abnormalities of cardiac rhythm, eventual cardiology referral;
- 283
- 284

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

292 2.5.6 Interventions delivery

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

297 **2.6 Comparator**

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

301 **2.7 Outcome measures**

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

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

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

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

319 The blindness of the assessments was guaranteed with various strategies:

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

326 *2.8 Statistical Analyses*

327 *2.8.1 Sample size calculation*

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

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

337 *2.8.2 Descriptive statistics for all participants*

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

341 *2.8.3 Primary and secondary endpoint calculations*

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

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

354 2.8.4 Analysis of the differences between groups (IG and CG)

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

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

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

367 2.8.5 Analysis of the differences between sub-groups (four etiological risk class categories)

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

372 2.8.6 Analysis of the differences between groups (IG and CG) for T3 endpoints (post-test)

373 2.8.6.1 Rasch analysis

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

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

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

394 *2.8.6.2 Pre-test vs. post-test differences between groups (IG and CG)*

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

401 *2.8.7 Cases lost to follow-up*

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

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

412 *2.8.8 Statistical software*

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

418 **3 Results**

419 *3.1 Descriptive statistics for all participants (n=403)*

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

425 [Figure 2]

426 [Table II]

427

428 The mean age of enrolled participants was 76.2 years (SD: 6.3), and about two-thirds of them
429 (65.5%) were females. About two-thirds of the enrolled patients (65.2%) were elderly with an
430 estimated fall risk at one year comprised between 33% and 50%, as 43.7% and 21.6% were classified
431 within the 65 to 80 and >80 risk classes, respectively. The remaining 34.7% were elderly patients
432 with an associated neurological condition. Their estimated fall risk at one year was between 60% and
433 70%, as 19.4% and 15.4% of them had a diagnosis of Parkinson's Disease or stroke, respectively.
434 Considering the estimated fall risk of the enrollment patients, only 7.9% could be considered at 'low
435 risk' according to the FROP-Com, whereas the enrollment algorithm classified the remaining 92.1%
436 of patients correctly as being at moderate (36.2%) or high fall risk (55.8%) according to the FROP-
437 Com. There were no statistically significant differences between the subjects' baseline characteristics
438 of the two groups.

439

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

446 [Table III]

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

451

452 The median time of occurrence of the first fall was 11.1 months. A probability of absence of falls of
453 77.6% (CI95% [73.7, 81.8%]), 65.0% (CI95% [60.5, 69.8%]) and 47.3% (CI95% [42.6, 52.4%])
454 were recorded, respectively, at three, six and twelve months.

455

456 **3.2 Differences between groups (CG and IG)**

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

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

464

465 [Figure 3]

466 [Table III]

467

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

473

474 A probability of absence of falls of 76.5% (CI95% [70.8, 82.6%]) and 78.8% (CI95% [73.4, 84.6%])
475 in the first three months were recorded, respectively for CG and IG. No statistically significant
476 differences were observed between groups regarding the number of falls (Incidence Rate Ratio -
477 IRR=0.94, CI95% [0.69-1.29], p=0.693), and the fall probability (Risk Ratio - RR=0.94, CI95%
478 [0.79- 1.12], p=0.503) (table IV).

479

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

483

[Table IV]

484 ***3.3 Differences between sub-groups (four etiological risk class categories in the CG and IG)***

485 Regarding the number of falls (table V), the comparison between CG and IG showed a trend towards
486 a lower (although not significant) risk of falling for elderly aged 65-80 (IRR=0.79; CI95% [0.50,
487 1.25]), elderly aged >80 (IRR=0.85; CI95% [0.51, 1.40]), and elderly with associated Parkinson's
488 Disease (IRR=0.94; CI95% [0.52, 1.72]) in the IG. The risk appeared lower (although not significant)
489 for elderly with stroke sequelae (IRR=2.39; CI95% [0.88, 6.49]) in the CG.

490

[Table V]

491

492 Concerning the fall probability, elderly aged 65-80 and elderly with Parkinson in the IG had a lower
493 (although not significant) probability of falling than those randomized in the CG (RR=0.86, CI95%
494 [0.65, 1.13] and, respectively, RR=0.93; CI95% [0.70, 1.23]). On the other hand, elderly aged >80
495 and elderly with stroke in the IG had a higher (although not significant) probability of falling if
496 randomized in the IG (RR=1.03, CI95% [0.74, 1.47] and, respectively, RR=1.22, CI95% [0.63,
497 2.35]).

498

499 Considering the endpoint ‘time to the first fall’, elderly aged 65-80, elderly aged >80 and elderly with
500 Parkinson had a lower (although not significant) hazard ratio if randomized in the IG in comparison
501 to the CG (HR= 0.83, CI95% [0.56, 1.25]); HR=0.92, CI95% [0.54, 1.59]; HR=0.83, CI95% [0.49,
502 1.41], respectively). Instead, the hazard ratio was higher (HR=1.32; CI95% [0.58, 3.01]) for elderly
503 with stroke sequelae randomized in the IG.

504

505 **3.4 Rasch analysis**

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

510

[Table VI]

511 **3.5 Pre-test vs. post-test differences between groups (CG and IG)**

512 The ANCOVA analysis (table VII) showed no significant difference between the CG and the IG for
513 the post-test FROP-Com (MD=-0.03 logits; 95%CI [-0.13, 0.07]), BBS (+0.15 logits; CI95% [-0.13,
514 0.07]), and POMA measures (+0.12 logits (CI95% [-0.14, 0.37]) after controlling for the pre-test
515 values.

516

[Table VII]

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

520

521 **4 Discussion**

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

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

548

549 According to our results, the total number of recorded falls was substantial (690), with a fall
550 incidence of 58.6%, and a mean of 1.71 (SD: 3.36) falls accounted for each included subject. These
551 data are in contrast with those reported in the literature, where the overall fall incidence in elderly
552 over 65 years was around 28 to 35% and about 32 to 42% in those over 75 years (49), with 0.2-1.6
553 fall for each included subject (2). Furthermore, the prevalence of ‘multiple fallers’ observed in our
554 trial (22.1%) was higher than that reported by previous studies (15%) in older adults (45). Indeed,
555 several subjects reported more than ten falls in our sample while participating in the trial, with a
556 subject reporting up to thirty-three falls (2.8 falls per month). The observed discrepancies between
557 our results and literature data may be explained considering the inclusion of participants affected by
558 neurological conditions who are well known to be multiple fallers and present, according to previous
559 studies, a fall risk around 50% in Parkinson’s Disease (50) and 43 to 70% in stroke (51). Indeed, the
560 reported incidence of multiple fallers within persons with neurological conditions in literature is
561 around 15% in stroke subjects (51) and over 50% incidence in PD, where up to 13% of patients fall
562 more than once a week (45). The prevalence of severe injuries in our sample (6.8% in the CG and
563 5.9% in the IG; 6.4% for the whole sample) was instead similar to the value (10%) reported for the
564 elderly population (49).

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

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

573 (all $p > 0.05$) across all the four considered subgroups (older adults 65 to 79 years; older adults ≥ 80
574 years; older adults with PD; older adults with stroke). As per the general group, there was a general,
575 although not significant, trend of better outcomes for the IG group. The stroke subgroup made an
576 exception, as the risk of falling was apparently higher (although not significant) for patients enrolled
577 in the IG. The fall risk for persons with stroke is notoriously high, being reported to be around 43 to
578 70% in the previous trials (51). Although intravenous thrombolysis (52) and endovascular treatments
579 for large vessel occlusions have significantly improved the long term prognosis of ischemic stroke
580 both in terms of survival and functional outcome (53), it is not clear what is their impact on balance
581 and other fall risk factors. Our results could also be explained in light of the literature data which
582 report an increase of the exposure to circumstances leading to falls (and, thus, an increase in the
583 number of falls) brought about by an increase in physical activity (54).

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

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

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

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

624 ***4.1 Study limitations***

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

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

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

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

652

653 **4.2 Conclusions**

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

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

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

674

675 **Acknowledgments**

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

677 **Authors' contributions**

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

680 **Funding**

681 This study was financed by the Agenzia Socio-Sanitaria Regionale della Regione Emilia-Romagna
682 (Italy) in the context of the Programma di Ricerca Regione-Università 2013 (PRUA2-2013-
683 00002056)

684 **Conflicts of interest statement**

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

687

688

689 **References**

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

693 2. Rubenstein LZ, Josephson KR. The epidemiology of falls and syncope. *Clin Geriatr Med*
694 (2002) **18**:141–158. doi: 10.1016/s0749-0690(02)00002-2

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

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

701 5. Golinelli D, Boetto E, Mazzotti A, Rosa S, Rucci P, Berti E, Ugolini C, Fantini MP. Cost
702 Determinants of Continuum-Care Episodes for Hip Fracture. *Health Serv Insights* (2021)
703 **14**:1178632921991122. doi: 10.1177/1178632921991122

704 6. Deandrea S, Lucenteforte E, Bravi F, Foschi R, La Vecchia C, Negri E. Risk factors for falls
705 in community-dwelling older people: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiol Camb Mass*
706 (2010) **21**:658–668. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181e89905

707 7. Moreland J, Richardson J, Chan DH, O’Neill J, Bellissimo A, Grum RM, Shanks L.
708 Evidence-based guidelines for the secondary prevention of falls in older adults. *Gerontology* (2003)
709 **49**:93–116. doi: 10.1159/000067948

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

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

- 715 prevention of falls and mobility problems in vulnerable elders. *Ann Intern Med* (2001) **135**:686–693.
716 doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-135-8_part_2-200110161-00007
- 717 10. Nevitt MC, Cummings SR, Hudes ES. Risk factors for injurious falls: a prospective study. *J*
718 *Gerontol* (1991) **46**:M164-170. doi: 10.1093/geronj/46.5.m164
- 719 11. Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Gillespie WJ, Lamb SE, Gates S, Cumming RG, Rowe BH.
720 Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the community. *Cochrane Database Syst*
721 *Rev* (2009)CD007146. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007146.pub2
- 722 12. de Negreiros Cabral K, Perracini MR, Soares AT, de Cristo Stein F, Sera CTN, Tiedemann A,
723 Sherrington C, Filho WJ, Paschoal SMP. Effectiveness of a multifactorial falls prevention program in
724 community-dwelling older people when compared to usual care: study protocol for a randomised
725 controlled trial (Prevquedas Brazil). *BMC Geriatr* (2013) **13**:27. doi: 10.1186/1471-2318-13-27
- 726 13. Lamb SE, Bruce J, Hossain A, Ji C, Longo R, Lall R, Bojke C, Hulme C, Withers E,
727 Finnegan S, et al. Screening and Intervention to Prevent Falls and Fractures in Older People. *N Engl*
728 *J Med* (2020) **383**:1848–1859. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001500
- 729 14. Ellis TD, Cavanaugh JT, Earhart GM, Ford MP, Foreman KB, Thackeray A, These MS,
730 Dibble LE. Identifying clinical measures that most accurately reflect the progression of disability in
731 Parkinson disease. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord* (2016) **25**:65–71. doi:
732 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2016.02.006
- 733 15. Viscogliosi C, Belleville S, Desrosiers J, Caron CD, Ska B, BRAD Group. Participation after
734 a stroke: changes over time as a function of cognitive deficits. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* (2011) **52**:336–
735 343. doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2010.04.020
- 736 16. Goodwin VA, Richards SH, Henley W, Ewings P, Taylor AH, Campbell JL. An exercise
737 intervention to prevent falls in people with Parkinson’s disease: a pragmatic randomised controlled
738 trial. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* (2011) **82**:1232–1238. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2011-300919
- 739 17. Allen NE, Sherrington C, Paul SS, Canning CG. Balance and falls in Parkinson’s disease: a
740 meta-analysis of the effect of exercise and motor training. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* (2011)
741 **26**:1605–1615. doi: 10.1002/mds.23790
- 742 18. Tomlinson CL, Patel S, Meek C, Herd CP, Clarke CE, Stowe R, Shah L, Sackley CM, Deane
743 KHO, Wheatley K, et al. Physiotherapy versus placebo or no intervention in Parkinson’s disease.
744 *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (2013)CD002817. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002817.pub4
- 745 19. World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical
746 principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA* (2013) **310**:2191–2194. doi:
747 10.1001/jama.2013.281053
- 748 20. Nandy S, Parsons S, Cryer C, Underwood M, Rashbrook E, Carter Y, Eldridge S, Close J,
749 Skelton D, Taylor S, et al. Development and preliminary examination of the predictive validity of the
750 Falls Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT) for use in primary care. *J Public Health Oxf Engl* (2004)
751 **26**:138–143. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdh132
- 752 21. Russell MA, Hill KD, Day LM, Blackberry I, Gurrin LC, Dharmage SC. Development of the

- 753 Falls Risk for Older People in the Community (FROP-Com) screening tool. *Age Ageing* (2009)
754 **38**:40–46. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afn196
- 755 22. Stapleton C, Hough P, Oldmeadow L, Bull K, Hill K, Greenwood K. Four-item fall risk
756 screening tool for subacute and residential aged care: The first step in fall prevention. *Australas J*
757 *Ageing* (2009) **28**:139–143. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-6612.2009.00375.x
- 758 23. Reece AC, Simpson JM. Preparing Older People to Cope after a Fall. *Physiotherapy* (1996)
759 **82**:227–235. doi: 10.1016/S0031-9406(05)66877-0
- 760 24. Organization WH. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health*. World
761 Health Organization (2001). 352 p.
- 762 25. Lamb SE, Jørstad-Stein EC, Hauer K, Becker C, Prevention of Falls Network Europe and
763 Outcomes Consensus Group. Development of a common outcome data set for fall injury prevention
764 trials: the Prevention of Falls Network Europe consensus. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2005) **53**:1618–1622.
765 doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53455.x
- 766 26. World Health Organization. WHO Global Report on Falls Prevention in Older Age. (2007)
- 767 27. Christensen K, Kreiner S, Mesbah M. *Rasch Models in Health*. Hoboken NJ: ISTE Ltd and
768 John Wiley&Sons. London UK (2013).
- 769 28. Russell MA, Hill KD, Blackberry I, Day LM, Dharmage SC. The reliability and predictive
770 accuracy of the falls risk for older people in the community assessment (FROP-Com) tool. *Age*
771 *Ageing* (2008) **37**:634–639. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afn129
- 772 29. Berg KO, Wood-Dauphinee SL, Williams JI, Maki B. Measuring balance in the elderly:
773 validation of an instrument. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique* (1992) **83 Suppl 2**:S7-11.
- 774 30. La Porta F, Franceschini M, Caselli S, Cavallini P, Susassi S, Tennant A. Unified Balance
775 Scale: an activity-based, bed to community, and aetiology-independent measure of balance calibrated
776 with Rasch analysis. *J Rehabil Med* (2011) **43**:435–444. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0797
- 777 31. Tinetti ME. Performance-oriented assessment of mobility problems in elderly patients. *J Am*
778 *Geriatr Soc* (1986) **34**:119–126. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.1986.tb05480.x
- 779 32. Rose DJ, Lucchese N, Wiersma LD. Development of a multidimensional balance scale for
780 use with functionally independent older adults. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2006) **87**:1478–1485. doi:
781 10.1016/j.apmr.2006.07.263
- 782 33. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric techniques
783 to improve the Balance Evaluation Systems Test: the mini-BESTest. *J Rehabil Med* (2010) **42**:323–
784 331. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0537
- 785 34. Prodinge B, O'Connor RJ, Stucki G, Tennant A. Establishing score equivalence of the
786 Functional Independence Measure motor scale and the Barthel Index, utilising the International
787 Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health and Rasch measurement theory. *J Rehabil Med*
788 (2017) **49**:416–422. doi: 10.2340/16501977-2225

- 789 35. La Porta F, Caselli S, Susassi S, Cavallini P, Tennant A, Franceschini M. Is the Berg Balance
790 Scale an Internally Valid and Reliable Measure of Balance Across Different Etiologies in
791 Neurorehabilitation? A Revisited Rasch Analysis Study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2012) **93**:1209–
792 1216. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2012.02.020
- 793 36. La Porta F, Giordano A, Caselli S, Foti C, Franchignoni F. Is the Berg Balance Scale an
794 effective tool for the measurement of early postural control impairments in patients with Parkinson’s
795 disease? Evidence from Rasch analysis. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* (2015) **51**:705–716.
- 796 37. Cattaneo D, Gervasoni E, Pupillo E, Bianchi E, Aprile I, Imbimbo I, Russo R, Cruciani A,
797 Turolla A, Jonsdottir J, et al. Educational and Exercise Intervention to Prevent Falls and Improve
798 Participation in Subjects With Neurological Conditions: The NEUROFALL Randomized Controlled
799 Trial. *Front Neurol* (2019) **10**:865. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2019.00865
- 800 38. Oakley A, Dawson MF, Holland J, Arnold S, Cryer C, Doyle Y, Rice J, Hodgson CR,
801 Sowden A, Sheldon T, et al. Preventing falls and subsequent injury in older people. *Qual Health*
802 *Care QHC* (1996) **5**:243–249. doi: 10.1136/qshc.5.4.243
- 803 39. Lamb SE, Jørstad-Stein EC, Hauer K, Becker C, Prevention of Falls Network Europe and
804 Outcomes Consensus Group. Development of a common outcome data set for fall injury prevention
805 trials: the Prevention of Falls Network Europe consensus. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2005) **53**:1618–1622.
806 doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53455.x
- 807 40. Snijders AH, Nonnekes J, Bloem BR. Recent advances in the assessment and treatment of
808 falls in Parkinson’s disease. *F1000 Med Rep* (2010) **2**:76. doi: 10.3410/M2-76
- 809 41. Beghi E, Gervasoni E, Pupillo E, Bianchi E, Montesano A, Aprile I, Agostini M, Rovaris M,
810 Cattaneo D, NEUROFALL Group. Prediction of Falls in Subjects Suffering From Parkinson Disease,
811 Multiple Sclerosis, and Stroke. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2018) **99**:641–651. doi:
812 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.10.009
- 813 42. Xu T, Clemson L, O’Loughlin K, Lannin NA, Dean C, Koh G. Risk Factors for Falls in
814 Community Stroke Survivors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*
815 (2018) **99**:563-573.e5. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2017.06.032
- 816 43. Fereshtehnejad S-M. Strategies to maintain quality of life among people with Parkinson’s
817 disease: what works? *Neurodegener Dis Manag* (2016) **6**:399–415. doi: 10.2217/nmt-2016-0020
- 818 44. Walsh ME, Horgan NF, Walsh CD, Galvin R. Systematic review of risk prediction models for
819 falls after stroke. *J Epidemiol Community Health* (2016) **70**:513–519. doi: 10.1136/jech-2015-206475
- 820 45. Allen NE, Schwarzel AK, Canning CG. Recurrent falls in Parkinson’s disease: a systematic
821 review. *Park Dis* (2013) **2013**:906274. doi: 10.1155/2013/906274
- 822 46. Batchelor FA, Mackintosh SF, Said CM, Hill KD. Falls after stroke. *Int J Stroke Off J Int*
823 *Stroke Soc* (2012) **7**:482–490. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-4949.2012.00796.x
- 824 47. Fasano A, Canning CG, Hausdorff JM, Lord S, Rochester L. Falls in Parkinson’s disease: A
825 complex and evolving picture. *Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc* (2017) **32**:1524–1536. doi:
826 10.1002/mds.27195

- 827 48. Denissen S, Staring W, Kunkel D, Pickering RM, Lennon S, Geurts AC, Weerdesteyn V,
828 Verheyden GS. Interventions for preventing falls in people after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
829 (2019) **10**:CD008728. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008728.pub3
- 830 49. Masud T, Morris RO. Epidemiology of falls. *Age Ageing* (2001) **30 Suppl 4**:3–7. doi:
831 10.1093/ageing/30.suppl_4.3
- 832 50. Morris ME, Menz HB, McGinley JL, Huxham FE, Murphy AT, Ianssek R, Danoudis M, Soh
833 S-E, Kelly D, Watts JJ. Falls and mobility in Parkinson’s disease: protocol for a randomised
834 controlled clinical trial. *BMC Neurol* (2011) **11**:93. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-11-93
- 835 51. Weerdesteyn V, de Niet M, van Duijnhoven HJR, Geurts ACH. Falls in individuals with
836 stroke. *J Rehabil Res Dev* (2008) **45**:1195–1213.
- 837 52. Muruet W, Rudd A, Wolfe CDA, Douiri A. Long-Term Survival After Intravenous
838 Thrombolysis for Ischemic Stroke: A Propensity Score-Matched Cohort With up to 10-Year Follow-
839 Up. *Stroke* (2018) **49**:607–613. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.019889
- 840 53. Yang W, Zhang L, Yao Q, Chen W, Yang W, Zhang S, He L, Li H, Zhang Y. Endovascular
841 treatment or general treatment: how should acute ischemic stroke patients choose to benefit from
842 them the most?: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* (2020) **99**:e20187.
843 doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000000020187
- 844 54. Klenk J, Kerse N, Rapp K, Nikolaus T, Becker C, Rothenbacher D, Peter R, Denking MD,
845 ActiFE Study Group. Physical Activity and Different Concepts of Fall Risk Estimation in Older
846 People—Results of the ActiFE-Ulm Study. *PLoS One* (2015) **10**:e0129098. doi:
847 10.1371/journal.pone.0129098
- 848 55. Küçükdeveci A, Tennant A, Grimby G, Franchignoni F. Strategies for assessment and
849 outcome measurement in Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine: An educational review. *J Rehabil*
850 *Med* (2011) **43**:661–672. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0844
- 851 56. Grimby G, Tennant A, Tesio L. The use of raw scores from ordinal scales: Time to end
852 malpractice? *J Rehabil Med* (2012) **44**:97–98. doi: 10.2340/16501977-0938
- 853 57. Kahler E, Rogausch A, Brunner E, Himmel W. A parametric analysis of ordinal quality-of-
854 life data can lead to erroneous results. *J Clin Epidemiol* (2008) **61**:475–480. doi:
855 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.05.019
- 856 58. Perline R, Wright BD, Wainer H. The Rasch Model as Additive Conjoint Measurement. *Appl*
857 *Psychol Meas* (1979) **3**:237–255. doi: 10.1177/014662167900300213
- 858 59. Pellicciari L, Piscitelli D, Basagni B, De Tanti A, Algeri L, Caselli S, Ciurli MP, Conforti J,
859 Estraneo A, Moretta P, et al. ‘Less is more’: validation with Rasch analysis of five short-forms for
860 the Brain Injury Rehabilitation Trust Personality Questionnaires (BIRT-PQs). *Brain Inj* (2020)
861 **34**:1741–1755. doi: 10.1080/02699052.2020.1836402
- 862 60. Vogler CM, Menant JC, Sherrington C, Ogle SJ, Lord SR. Evidence of detraining after 12-
863 week home-based exercise programs designed to reduce fall-risk factors in older people recently

- 864 discharged from hospital. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* (2012) **93**:1685–1691. doi:
865 10.1016/j.apmr.2012.03.033
- 866 61. Godi M, Franchignoni F, Caligari M, Giordano A, Turcato AM, Nardone A. Comparison of
867 reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the mini-BESTest and Berg Balance Scale in patients with
868 balance disorders. *Phys Ther* (2013) **93**:158–167. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20120171
- 869 62. Burr J, Quach L. SOCIAL ISOLATION AND FALLS RISK AMONG COMMUNITY
870 DWELLING OLDER ADULTS: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF DEPRESSION. *Innov Aging* (2019)
871 **3**:S293–S293. doi: 10.1093/geroni/igz038.1078
- 872 63. Nicholson NR. A Review of Social Isolation: An Important but Underassessed Condition in
873 Older Adults. *J Prim Prev* (2012) **33**:137–152. doi: 10.1007/s10935-012-0271-2
- 874 64. Casamassima F, Ferrari A, Milosevic B, Ginis P, Farella E, Rocchi L. A wearable system for
875 gait training in subjects with Parkinson’s disease. *Sensors* (2014) **14**:6229–6246. doi:
876 10.3390/s140406229
- 877 65. Optimizing the tracking of falls in studies of older participants: comparison of quarterly
878 telephone recall with monthly falls calendars in the MOBILIZE Boston Study - PubMed.
879 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20360242/> [Accessed August 8, 2020]
- 880 66. Cameron ID, Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Murray GR, Hill KD, Cumming RG, Kerse N.
881 Interventions for preventing falls in older people in care facilities and hospitals. *Cochrane Database*
882 *Syst Rev* (2012) **12**:CD005465. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD005465.pub3
- 883 67. Perry L, Kendrick D, Morris R, Dinan S, Masud T, Skelton D, Iliffe S, ProAct65+ Study
884 Team. Completion and return of fall diaries varies with participants’ level of education, first
885 language, and baseline fall risk. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* (2012) **67**:210–214. doi:
886 10.1093/gerona/qlr175
- 887 68. Ganz DA, Higashi T, Rubenstein LZ. Monitoring falls in cohort studies of community-
888 dwelling older people: effect of the recall interval. *J Am Geriatr Soc* (2005) **53**:2190–2194. doi:
889 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.00509.x
- 890 69. Stark SL, Silianoff TJ, Kim HL, Conte JW, Morris JC. Tailored Calendar Journals to
891 Ascertain Falls Among Older Adults. *OTJR Occup Particip Health* (2015) **35**:53–59. doi:
892 10.1177/1539449214561764
- 893 70. Bhasin S, Gill TM, Reuben DB, Latham NK, Ganz DA, Greene EJ, Dziura J, Basaria S,
894 Gurwitz JH, Dykes PC, et al. A Randomized Trial of a Multifactorial Strategy to Prevent Serious Fall
895 Injuries. *N Engl J Med* (2020) **383**:129–140. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2002183
- 896 71. Becker C. Shake, rattle and get moving again. *Age Ageing* (2021) **50**:1889–1890. doi:
897 10.1093/ageing/afab187
- 898
- 899

1 **Table I – AAE and OAE enrolment algorithms**

Anamnestic assessment of eligibility (AAE) algorithm	Objective assessment of eligibility (OAE) algorithm
<p><i>Not eligible and/or at low risk</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the absence of at least one inclusion criteria OR • the presence of at least one exclusion criteria OR the inability to walk 10 meters without assistance OR • the ability to walk 10 meters without assistance AND a FRAT (Nandy, 2004) total score equal to 0 AND the absence of fear of falling. 	<p><i>FROP-Com Screen</i></p> <p>Total score 0-1: low risk (eligible coefficient = 0) Total score 2-4: medium risk (eligible coefficient = 1) Total score 5-9: high risk (eligible coefficient = 2)</p>
<p><i>Moderate risk</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the ability to walk 10 meters without assistance AND the absence of previous fall(s) AND • a FRAT (Nandy, 2004) total score ≤ 2 OR • the presence of fear of falling. 	<p><i>FRAT (Stapleton, 2009)</i></p> <p>Total score 5-11: low risk (eligible coefficient = 0) Total score 12-15: medium risk (eligible coefficient = 1) Total score 16-20: high risk (eligible coefficient = 2).</p>
<p><i>High risk</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the ability to walk 10 meters without assistance AND • the presence of previous fall(s) OR • a FRAT (Nandy, 2004) total score ≥ 3. 	

3 Table II - Clinical and demographic sample characteristics

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

4 *Abbreviations: sd = standard deviation.*

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

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

(*) = the information is reported only for subjects with at least one fall, for whom only the most severe fall is considered.

Abbreviations: sd = standard deviation; CI95% = confidence interval at 95% level.



1 **Table IV - Analysis of observed differences between IG and CG**

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

2
3 *Abbreviations: CI95% = Confidence Interval at 95% level; IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio; RR = Relative Risk; HR =*
4 *Hazard Ratio.*
5 *Notes: the association measures are expressed as a comparison between the intervention group and the control group.*
6
7
8

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

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

11
 12 *Abbreviations: CI95% = Confidence Interval at 95% level; IRR = Incidence Rate Ratio; RR = Relative Risk; HR =*
 13 *Hazard Ratio.*
 14 *Notes: the association measures are expressed as a comparison between the four subgroups in the IG and CG.*
 15

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

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

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

19


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

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

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

25 **Figure 1 Study summary flow chart**

26




27

28


29

30

31 **Figure 2 CONSORT 2010 flow diagram**



32 **Figure 3 Fall number distribution by group**
33



34 *The intervention group is represented by the red bars, the control group by the blue bars.*
35
36

Supplementary Material

37 **Appendix 1 – Group intervention protocol details**

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

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

- 43 i. Warming (5 minutes): head, neck, trunk, and ankle movements, back and knee
44 extensions, walking on the spot;
- 45 ii. Circuit training (35 minutes):
- 46 ○ Station 1 – Muscular strength exercises: ankle plantarflexion, squat, chair
47 standing, and frontal step (all these exercised were realized with hand support
48 and, when possible, wearing a weight vest).
 - 49 ○ Station 2 – Balance exercises: reaching in standing position, tandem standing,
50 and single-leg standing (1-6 weeks); sidewalk, tandem walk, and toe walk (7-
51 11 weeks).
 - 52 ○ Station 3 – Recovery techniques from falling: seven steps with ‘backward-
53 chaining method’, starting from the sitting or standing position(23).
- 54 iii. Dynamic balance and walking, considering the base pathology (10 minutes):
- 55 ○ Obstacle courses (walking with motor and dual cognitive tasks);
 - 56 ○ Walking exercises (direction and speed changes, associated activities with
57 arms, in crowded contexts; in PD use of visual and auditory cues);
 - 58 ○ Climbing stairs.

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

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

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

71 ○ Third-Fifth-Seventh-Ninth session: for each exercise and side, the
72 Physiotherapist checked the possible progression (starting from the current
73 working weight, increasing progressively 500 grams to recalculate the 65% of
74 1RM as described) and noted it in the participant’s group treatment chart.

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

78 ● Station 2 – Balance exercises:

79 ○ First session: for each exercise, the Physiotherapist defined the initial difficulty
80 level (4 levels A-B-C-D of increasing difficulty). He started from medium-
81 high C level, then receded or advanced according to the subject’s condition
82 verified during pre-test evaluations.

83 ○ Third-Fifth-Seventh-Ninth session: for each exercise, the Physiotherapist
84 checked the possible progression to the next level, which could occur if the
85 participant realized the exercise in safety condition.

86 ● Station 3 – Recovery techniques from falling:

87 ○ In the first session, the Physiotherapist proposed performing steps 1 and 2,
88 then further 5 steps (to 7), one for each session.

89 ○ It was recommended that the Physiotherapist review the steps of the previous
90 weeks and set the next step for every session.

91 ○ The subject passed to the next step only when he/she could safely perform the
92 previous steps.

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

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

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

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

109 ii. The importance of regular physical exercise (P)

- 110 iii. Behaviors at risk of falling (PT)
- 111 iv. Drugs and falls (G)
- 112 v. Home safety (PT)
- 113 vi. Postural hygiene of feet and footwear (PT)
- 114 vii. The benefits of a healthy and proper diet and the adoption of healthy lifestyles in fall
- 115 prevention (G)
- 116 viii. Attention and falls (N)
- 117 ix. Vision impairment and falls (G)
- 118 x. Osteoporosis and falls (G)
- 119 xi. Why is it important to continue exercising? (PT)

120 A handbook summarizing these topics was provided to each participant at the beginning of

121 the first education session.

122 **3. A personalized plan of reducing domestic fall risk factors following a home visit**

123 **performed by the Physiotherapist within the first week of treatment.** During this visit,

124 lasting 60-90 minutes, the Physiotherapist filled the ‘Home environmental risks

125 questionnaire’ and compared it with the same questionnaire compiled by the participant at the

126 pre-test assessment. This questionnaire investigated the following macro-areas related to

127 modifiable risk factors:

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

137 Then, the Physiotherapist gave specific recommendations with proposals for correcting the

138 detected modifiable risk factors by delivering the ‘Suggestions for the reduction of

139 environmental risks at home’ sheet in which the actual present hazards were highlighted.

140 He/she also verified the presence of the fall-physical activity report diary, delivered at the time

141 of recruitment, in a position that facilitated the compilation in case of fall (e.g., hanging on the

142 wall in the living room/ kitchen, etc.).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

194

Supplementary Material

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

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

The PRE.C.I.S.A. Randomized Controlled Trial

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

Supplementary Material

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