



LJMU Research Online

Ackermans, TMA, Francksen, NC, Casaña-Eslava, RV, Lees, C, Baltzopoulos, V, Lisboa, PJG, Hollands, MA, O'Brien, TD and Maganaris, CN

Stair negotiation behaviour of older individuals: Do step dimensions matter?

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/12169/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Ackermans, TMA, Francksen, NC, Casaña-Eslava, RV, Lees, C, Baltzopoulos, V, Lisboa, PJG, Hollands, MA, O'Brien, TD and Maganaris, CN (2020) Stair negotiation behaviour of older individuals: Do step dimensions matter? Journal of Biomechanics. ISSN 1873-2380

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Stair negotiation behaviour of older individuals: Do step dimensions matter?

Thijs M.A. Ackermans^{a,*}, Natasha C. Francksen^a, Raul V. Casana-Eslava^b, Carolyn Lees^c,
Vasilios Baltzopoulos^a, Paulo J.G. Lisboa^b, Mark A. Hollands^a, Thomas D. O'Brien^a,
Constantinos N. Maganaris^a

^a Research to Improve Stair Climbing Safety (RISCS), Faculty of Science, School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street, Liverpool L3 3AF, United Kingdom;

^b Faculty of Engineering and Technology, School of Applied Mathematics, Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street, Liverpool L3 3AF, United Kingdom;

^c Faculty of Education, Health and Community, School of Nursing and Allied Health, Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street, Liverpool L3 3AF, United Kingdom;

*Corresponding author at: Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Tom Reilly Building, Byrom Street, Liverpool L3 3AF, United Kingdom. T: +31623017957; Email: tma.ackermans@gmail.com.

Article type: Original Article (Word count: 3496)

Keywords: stair negotiation; ageing; fall risk; step dimensions; multivariate stepping behaviour.

1 **Abstract**

2 Stair falls are a major health problem for older people. Most studies on identification of stair
3 fall risk factors are limited to staircases set in given step dimensions. However, it remains
4 unknown whether the conclusions drawn would still apply if the dimensions had been changed
5 to represent more challenging or easier step dimensions encountered in domestic and public
6 buildings. The purpose was to investigate whether the self-selected biomechanical stepping
7 behaviours are maintained when the dimensions of a staircase are altered. Sixty-eight older
8 adults (>65 years) negotiated a seven-step staircase set in two step dimensions (*shallow*
9 staircase: rise 15cm, going 28cm; *steep* staircase: rise 20cm, going 25cm). Six biomechanical
10 outcome measures indicative of stair fall risk were measured. K-means clustering profiled the
11 overall stair-negotiating behaviour and cluster profiles were calculated. A Cramer's V
12 measured the degree of association in membership between clusters. The cluster profiles
13 revealed that the biomechanically risky and conservative factors that characterized the overall
14 behaviour in the clusters did not differ for the majority of older adults between staircases for
15 ascent and descent. A strong association of membership between the clusters on the *shallow*
16 staircase and the *steep* staircase was found for stair ascent (Cramer's V: 0.412, p<0.001) and
17 descent (Cramer's V: 0.380, p=0.003). The findings indicate that manipulating the demand of
18 the task would not affect the underpinning mechanism of a potential stair fall. Therefore, for
19 most individuals, detection of stair fall risk might not require testing using a staircase with
20 challenging step dimensions.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

1 **Introduction**

2 Stair negotiation is one of the most hazardous daily tasks for older adults, often resulting in
3 falls (M. S. Roys, 2001). Indeed, falls on stairs have been identified as the leading cause of
4 accidental death and place a substantial financial burden on the National Health Service
5 (Scuffham, Chaplin, & Legood, 2003; Soriano, DeCherrie, & Thomas, 2007; Startzell, Owens,
6 Mulfinger, & Cavanagh, 2000). The literature has identified tripping during the swing phase
7 and slipping during push-off as the main underlying mechanisms for a fall during stair ascent
8 (Templer, 1995). During stair descent, the underlying mechanisms include tripping and
9 slipping during the loading phase, or a loss of centre of mass (CoM) control during the lowering
10 phase (Templer, 1995).

11 A compromised safety on stairs has been primarily linked with deficiencies in physical
12 capabilities, behaviour and stair design (Jacobs, 2016; M. S. Roys, 2001). In terms of stair
13 design, staircases with a large step riser create additional demands for joint moment generation
14 during stair ascent (Stacoff, Diezi, Luder, Stüssi, & Kramers-de Quervain, 2005) and control
15 of the CoM during descent (Novak, Komisar, Maki, & Fernie, 2016). Staircases with a small
16 going are thought to increase the risk for a slip during descent by reducing the available area
17 to safely land the leading limb (M. S. Roys, 2001). Although, stair design affects safety, the
18 majority of studies on identification of risk factors for a stair fall are limited to a staircase set
19 in given step dimensions (Buckley, Cooper, Maganaris, & Reeves, 2013; Christina &
20 Cavanagh, 2002; Hamel, Okita, Higginson, & Cavanagh, 2005; Mian, Narici, Minetti, &
21 Baltzopoulos, 2007; Mian, Thom, Narici, & Baltzopoulos, 2007). Thus, it remains unknown
22 whether the conclusions drawn regarding stair fall risk would still apply if the demand of the
23 task had been changed by implementing more or less challenging step dimensions, within the
24 range of step dimensions that could be encountered in various domestic and public buildings.

25 The few studies that have compared risk factors between staircases with different step
26 dimensions are limited to comparisons of single biomechanical factors, such as foot positioning
27 or dynamic balance (Johnson & Pauls, 2010; Nemire, Johnson, & Vidal, 2016; Novak et al.,
28 2016; Riener, Rabuffetti, & Frigo, 2002; M. Roys & Wright, 2005; M. S. Roys, 2001; Wright
29 & Roys, 2005, 2008). However, it has been shown that risky stepping strategies may be adopted
30 at the same time with more conservative strategies (Ackermans et al., 2019). For example,
31 older adults descending stairs have been reported to display not only a decreased clearance,
32 which increases fall risk, but also a decreased required coefficient of friction, which indicates
33 a more conservative strategy that could reduce fall risk (Ackermans et al., 2019). Therefore,
34 multiple parameters, reflecting both more risky or more conservative strategies on stairs,

1 should be used to understand the effect of different step dimensions on safety. Furthermore,
2 the studies that compared different step dimensions used mean values, either for a single group
3 (Riener et al., 2002; Wright & Roys, 2005), or between predetermined groups, typically,
4 younger vs older individuals (Novak et al., 2016; Stacoff et al., 2005). This approach would
5 not allow establishing whether a particular individual would maintain the stepping behaviour
6 selected or would adopt a different stepping strategy when exposed to a staircase with different
7 step dimensions. To circumvent this limitation, a recently developed multivariate approach for
8 profiling individual stepping behaviour should be used (Ackermans et al., 2019).

9 The purpose of the present study was to apply a multivariate approach to investigate
10 whether the selected biomechanical stepping behaviours of older individuals are maintained
11 when negotiating staircases with two different step dimension configurations.

13 **Methods**

14 *Participants*

15 Sixty-eight older adults (age: 71.2 ± 4.0 y; body height: 1.68 ± 0.08 m; body mass: 70.2 ± 13.4 kg;
16 males: 24) participated in the study. All participants lived independently and were recruited
17 from the local community of Liverpool, UK. Participants were excluded if they could not
18 negotiate both staircases in a step-over-step manner, or were using handrails or any other aid
19 to negotiate the stairs. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants after the
20 procedures and possible risks of the study were explained. The study was approved by the NHS
21 research ethics committee in the UK (IRAS ID: 216671) and was conducted in accordance with
22 the Declaration of Helsinki.

24 *Staircase configuration*

25 The measurements were conducted on a custom-built instrumented seven-step staircase
26 (Ackermans et al., 2019). The kinematics were obtained using a 24 infrared camera-system
27 (120Hz, Vicon, Oxford Metrics, UK) and kinetics were obtained through four force platforms
28 (1080Hz, 9260AA, Kistler AG, CH) embedded in the lower four steps. The staircase was set
29 in two different step dimension configurations. The “*shallow*” staircase was set at a rise of
30 15cm and going of 28cm resulting in a pitch of 28.2 degrees and the “*steep*” staircase was set
31 at a rise of 20cm and going of 25cm resulting in a pitch of 38.7 degrees. The step dimensions
32 of both staircases conformed to relevant building regulations in the UK (British-Standards-
33 Institute, 1984; Department-of-the-Environment-and-The-Welsh-Office, 1992), with the

1 *shallow* staircase representing an ‘easier’ public staircase and the *steep* staircase a more
2 ‘challenging’ private staircase (M. S. Roys, 2001).

3 4 *Procedures*

5 Participants visited the lab on two occasions. During the first visit, they ascended and
6 descended the *shallow* staircase at their self-selected pace in a step-over-step manner without
7 using the handrails. Only the older adults who were confident to negotiate the *shallow* staircase
8 in this manner were invited for the second visit, in which they ascended and descended the
9 *steep* staircase in a similar manner. All trials were performed with the volunteers clothed in
10 tight fitting clothes and wearing their own comfortable shoes. They were fitted in a five-point
11 safety harness, which was attached to the overhead belay safety system. A trained member of
12 the research team operated the belay system, ensuring that there was no tension in the rope
13 during the measurements. To allow familiarisation, the older adults performed up to five
14 practice trials on each staircase. Afterwards, they performed five more trials with the final three
15 trials used for analysis. There was a break after the familiarization and the older adults tested
16 were allowed to take as many breaks during the following trials to avoid fatigue. In all trials,
17 the staircase was approached with the left leg, before landing on the first step with the right leg
18 during both ascent and descent.

19 20 *Data analysis*

21 Full body kinematics were obtained using a 15 segment (head, thorax, pelvis, upper arms, lower
22 arms, hands, thighs, shanks, feet) full-body six-degree of freedom kinematic model defined by
23 76 reflective markers (diameter 14 mm). The segmental data were based on Dempster’s
24 regression equations (Dempster, 1955) and used geometrical volumes to represent each
25 segment (Hanavan, 1964). The position of the whole body CoM was estimated as the weighted
26 sum of the various body segments using Visual3D (C-Motion, Germantown, USA). For further
27 analysis kinetic and kinematic data were filtered using a low-pass fourth order Butterworth
28 filter with a cut-off frequency of 6Hz. The gait events on the steps were determined using force
29 plate data.

30 Kinetic and kinematic data were analysed to determine the following outcome measures,
31 which have been described in detail previously (Ackermans et al., 2019):

32 1) *Foot clearance*. The foot clearance was calculated by projecting a virtual outline of the
33 participant’s shoe in the movement trials (Ackermans et al., 2019). The foot clearance was
34 obtained during the swing phase when the virtual shoe outline of the leading limb passed the

1 vertical position of the step edge up until the outline passed the horizontal position of the step
2 edge. The minimal clearance was determined within this time frame for steps 2-6 for stair
3 ascent and descent.

4 2) *Proportion of foot length in contact with stair (PFLCS)*. PFLCS was calculated using
5 the virtual shoe outline at touch-down on steps 2-4 for stair ascent and steps 1-4 for stair
6 descent. The parameter was calculated using the distance of the horizontal projection of the
7 most posterior aspect (distance x) and the most anterior aspect (distance y) of the virtual shoe
8 outline to the step edge. The PFLCS was calculated as a percentage using the following
9 equation: $PFLCS = (\text{distance } x / (\text{distance } x + \text{distance } y)) * 100\%$.

10 3) *Required coefficient of friction (RCOF)*. This parameter was calculated by dividing the
11 resultant shear force (vector sum of the mediolateral and antero-posterior force) by the vertical
12 force at each sample in time (Christina & Cavanagh, 2002). The peak RCOF was determined
13 using Visual3d (C-Motion, Germantown, USA) after a threshold of 50 N for the vertical force
14 was exceeded. For stair ascent, this parameter was calculated in late stance before push-off for
15 steps 2-4 and for stair descent, the parameter was calculated during the loading phase in early
16 stance for steps 1-4.

17 4) *Cadence*. Cadence was taken as the average duration of two gait cycles (one of the left
18 limb and one of the right limb) for stair ascent and stair descent.

19 5) *Maximal CoM angular acceleration (only during stair descent)*. The angular
20 acceleration was calculated for the angle between the CoM and centre of pressure (CoP)
21 position of the trailing leg. The maximal angular acceleration of the CoM was obtained as the
22 peak value during the swing phase for steps 1-4 only for stair descent.

23 6) In addition to the five parameters listed (1-5), *the trial-to-trial variances of these*
24 *parameters* were also calculated as the average of the variance across the three trials for each
25 of the analysed steps. Variance in itself is a risk factor for falls, as more variance can indicate
26 a person's inability to maintain a steady/safe movement pattern (Hausdorff, Rios, & Edelberg,
27 2001).

28 29 *Statistics*

30 To examine differences in biomechanical stepping strategies between staircases a multivariate
31 method was applied for stair ascent and descent (Ackermans et al., 2019). The multivariate
32 method profiled the individual stepping strategies of older adults based on the mean values of
33 outcome measures (1-6) using k-means clustering. The optimal number of clusters was
34 determined through a Separation – Concordance (SeCo) map (Casana-Eslava, Jarman, Lisboa,

1 & Martin-Guerrero, 2017; Chambers, Jarman, Etechells, & Lisboa, 2013; Lisboa, Etechells,
2 Jarman, & Chambers, 2013). The SeCo map details the stability and separation of the solutions
3 found for the dataset and the specified values of K. Producing a plot of the SeCo map of the
4 proportion of solutions with a given consistency allows the user to gauge the relative
5 performance of the solutions for a value of K, in the present study between 2-10. The optimal
6 number of K was decided based on the guidelines that this solution is stable (concordance of
7 close to 1) together with adequate separation (Lisboa et al., 2013). To examine differences in
8 cluster composition, the cluster profiles ($CP = \text{Mean}_{\text{cluster}} - \text{Mean}_{\text{overall}} / \text{SD}_{\text{overall}}$) were calculated
9 for all outcome measures with a threshold subjectively set at 0.5 after examining the data. In
10 order to measure the degree of association between clusters obtained on the *shallow* staircase
11 and clusters obtained on the *steep* staircase, a Cramer's V index was calculated (with a value
12 of greater than 0.35 indicating a strong association (Akoglu, 2018)) and cross-tabulations were
13 obtained for stair ascent and descent (Cramér, 2016). Statistical analyses were performed using
14 SPSS (version 24, SPSS Inc., California, USA) and Matlab (R2018a, Mathworks, Natick,
15 USA). The significance level was set at $\alpha=0.05$.

16

17 **Results**

18 *Number of clusters*

19 The SeCo map revealed that during stair ascent the optimal number of clusters for both
20 staircases was three (Figure 1A, C). For stair descent the SeCo map revealed that the optimal
21 number of clusters for the *shallow* staircase was three and for the *steep* staircase was four
22 (Figure 1B, D).

23

24 *Cluster profiles in stair ascent*

25 For the *shallow* staircase during ascent, the CP revealed that cluster 1 differed from the overall
26 mean by showing higher PFLCS (CP=0.61) (Table 1). Cluster 2 differed from the overall mean
27 by showing higher foot clearance (CP=0.53), more variance in PFLCS (CP = 1.53), higher
28 RCOF (CP = 0.84), more variance in RCOF (CP=0.81) and more variance in cadence
29 (CP=1.48) (Table 1). Cluster 3 differed from the overall mean by showing lower foot clearance
30 (CP=-0.62), less PFLCS (CP=-1.19) and higher cadence (CP=0.67) (Table 1).

31 For the *steep* staircase during ascent, cluster 1 differed from the overall mean by
32 showing less PFLCS (CP=-0.67), more RCOF (CP=0.54) and higher cadence (CP=0.74) (Table
33 1). Cluster 2 differed from the overall mean by showing higher PFLCS (CP=0.66) and lower

1 cadence (CP=-0.59) (Table 1). Cluster 3 differed from the overall mean by showing more
2 variance in foot clearance (CP=1.42), less PFLCS (CP=-0.64), more variance in PFLCS
3 (CP=0.62), more variance in RCOF (CP=1.07) and more variance in cadence (CP=1.65) (Table
4 1).

6 *Cluster profiles in stair descent*

7 The CP of the *shallow* staircase during descent revealed that cluster 1 differed from the overall
8 mean by showing higher foot clearance (CP=0.56), less CoM angular acceleration (CP = -0.63),
9 less variance in CoM angular acceleration (CP=-0.64), more RCOF (CP = 1.26), more variance
10 in RCOF (CP = 1.20) and lower cadence (CP=-1.14) (Table 2). Cluster 2 differed from the
11 overall mean by showing less RCOF (CP=-0.56) (Table 2). Cluster 3 differed from the overall
12 mean by showing higher CoM angular acceleration (CP=0.95), more variance in CoM angular
13 acceleration (CP=0.98) and higher cadence (CP=0.50) (Table 2).

14 For the *steep* staircase during descent, the CP revealed that cluster 1 differed from the
15 overall mean by showing less foot clearance (CP=-0.77) and less variance in RCOF (CP=-0.51)
16 (Table 2). Cluster 2 differed from the overall mean by showing higher CoM angular
17 acceleration (CP=1.20) and more variance in CoM angular acceleration (CP=1.35) (Table 2).
18 Cluster 3 differed from the overall mean by showing a higher foot clearance (CP=0.80), less
19 CoM angular acceleration (CP=-0.50), less variance in CoM angular acceleration (CP=-0.55)
20 and lower cadence (CP=-0.73) (Table 2). Cluster 4 differed from the overall mean by showing
21 more variance in foot clearance (CP=0.52), less PFLCS (CP=-0.61), more variance in PFLCS
22 (CP=1.90), less RCOF (CP=-0.90), higher cadence (CP=1.03) and more variance in cadence
23 (CP=1.59) (Table 2).

25 *Cluster association*

26 For stair ascent, the Cramer's V (0.412, $p < 0.001$) revealed a strong association (Akoglu, 2018)
27 of membership of individuals clustered on the *shallow* staircase with those clustered on the
28 *steep* staircase (Table 3). Cluster 1 for the *steep* staircase contained predominantly individuals
29 from cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase (56.5%) (Table 3). Cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase
30 contained predominantly individuals from cluster 1 for the *shallow* staircase (82.4%) (Table
31 3). Similar to cluster 1, cluster 3 contained predominantly individuals from cluster 3 for the
32 *shallow* staircase (45.5%) (Table 3).

1 For stair descent, the Cramer's V (0.380, p=0.003) revealed a strong association
2 (Akoglu, 2018) of membership of the individuals clustered for the *shallow* staircase with those
3 clustered for the *steep* staircase (Table 4). Cluster 1 for the *steep* staircase contained
4 predominantly individuals from cluster 2 for the *shallow* staircase (63.2%) (Table 4). Cluster
5 2 for the *steep* staircase contained predominantly individuals from cluster 3 for the *shallow*
6 staircase (52.9%) (Table 4). Cluster 3 for the *steep* staircase contained predominantly
7 individuals from cluster 1 for the *shallow* staircase (45.8%) (Table 4). Similar to cluster 2,
8 cluster 4 contained predominantly individuals from cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase (62.5%)
9 (Table 4).

11 Discussion

12 In the present study, we used a multivariate approach to characterise the stair negotiation
13 behaviour of older adults on two staircases with steps of different dimensions. For stair ascent,
14 three clusters were identified for both staircases. For stair descent, three clusters were identified
15 on the *shallow* staircase and four clusters on the *steep* staircase. The clusters differed from the
16 overall mean by 1) showing only risky strategies, 2) only conservative strategies, or 3) a
17 combination of risky and conservative strategies. The majority of the older adults maintained
18 their individual stair-negotiating behaviour irrespective of step dimensions.

20 Cluster association

21 A strong association of membership between clusters on the *shallow* staircase and the *steep*
22 staircase was found for stair ascent (Cramer's V: 0.412, p<0.001) and descent (Cramer's V:
23 0.380, p=0.003). This indicates that the staircase with more challenging step dimensions had
24 no effect on the clustering of the individuals tested, i.e. individuals who were clustered together
25 on the *shallow* staircase were also clustered together on the *steep* staircase.

27 Stair ascent

28 For stair ascent, cluster 1 for the *steep* staircase consisted of 56.5% of the individuals of cluster
29 3 for the *shallow* staircase. Similar to cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase, cluster 1 for the *steep*
30 staircase displayed less PFLCS and higher cadence, which are risky strategies that could
31 increase the risk for a slip or trip (M. S. Roys, 2001). Additionally, cluster 1 for the *steep*
32 staircase displayed higher RCOF and did not display a reduced foot clearance. Although, the
33 increase in RCOF indicates an additional risky strategy (Hamel, Okita, Bus, & Cavanagh,

2005), the individuals could have compensated for this by increasing their foot clearance (M. S. Roys, 2001; Templer, 1995). Furthermore, the few individuals of cluster 1 for the *steep* staircase who originated from cluster 1 and cluster 2 for the *shallow* staircase altered slightly their stepping behaviour by adopting a more risky strategy.

Cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase consisted of 82.4% of the individuals of cluster 1 for the *shallow* staircase. Similar to cluster 1 for the *shallow* staircase, cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase displayed higher PFLCS, which is a more conservative strategy (M. S. Roys, 2001). Additionally, cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase displayed a reduced cadence. Although the difference in the CP of cadence between the two staircases is small (*shallow* CP=-0.44; *steep* CP=-0.59), this could indicate that individuals used a slightly more conservative strategy when the demand increased. Furthermore, the few individuals of cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase who originated from cluster 2 and cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase altered slightly their stepping behaviour by adopting a more conservative strategy.

Cluster 3 for the *steep* staircase consisted of 11 individuals who were spread over the three clusters for the *shallow* staircase (cluster 1: 27.3%; cluster 2: 27.3 %; cluster 3: 45.5%). The individuals displayed no conservative strategies, but risky behaviours for five out of the eight parameters, such as less PFLCS and more variance in foot clearance, PFLCS, RCOF and cadence, increasing trip and slip risk (Hamel, Okita, Bus, et al., 2005; Hausdorff et al., 2001; M. S. Roys, 2001). This indicates that the increased demand resulted in a change to a more risky stepping behaviour for the 11 individuals of cluster 3 who could not be associated to a specific cluster on the *shallow* staircase.

The findings in stair ascent indicate that the majority of the individuals of cluster 1 and cluster 2 maintained their stepping behaviour and that especially, the individuals of cluster 3 changed their stepping behaviour when the task demand increased.

Stair descent

For stair descent, cluster 1 for *steep* staircase consisted of 63.2% of the individuals of cluster 2 for *shallow* staircase. In contrast to cluster 2 for the *shallow* staircase, cluster 1 for the *steep* staircase did not display less RCOF, which is a conservative strategy (Christina & Cavanagh, 2002), but displayed less foot clearance and less variance in RCOF. The reduced foot clearance could increase trip risk and the reduced variance could indicate a more conservative strategy (Hamel, Okita, Higginson, et al., 2005; Hausdorff et al., 2001). The more challenging step dimensions resulted in small changes in the stepping strategies (indicated by the CP that ranged from 0.51-0.77) to a slightly more risky strategy. Furthermore, cluster 1 included a few

1 individuals who originated from cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase and slightly altered their
2 stepping behaviour.

3 Cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase consisted of 52.9% of individuals of cluster 3 for the
4 *shallow* staircase. Similar to cluster 3 for *shallow* staircase, cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase
5 displayed higher mean and variance values in CoM angular acceleration, increasing the risk for
6 a loss of CoM control (Buckley et al., 2013; Mian, Narici, et al., 2007). However, the
7 individuals of cluster 2 for the *steep* staircase did not display higher cadence, which could
8 indicate that the individuals used a slightly more conservative strategy when the demand
9 increased. Furthermore, cluster 2 included a few individuals who originated from cluster 1 and
10 cluster 2 for the *shallow* staircase and slightly altered their stepping behaviour.

11 Cluster 3 for the *steep* staircase consisted of 45.8% of the individuals of cluster 1 for
12 the *shallow* staircase. Similar to cluster 1 for the *shallow* staircase, cluster 3 for the *steep*
13 staircase displayed larger foot clearance, reduced cadence and lower mean and variance values
14 for CoM angular acceleration, which are conservative strategies that could reduce trip or slip
15 risk (Buckley et al., 2013; Hamel, Okita, Higginson, et al., 2005; Mian, Narici, et al., 2007). In
16 contrast, cluster 3 for the *steep* staircase did not display larger average and variance values of
17 RCOF, which could indicate that individuals used a slightly more conservative strategy when
18 the demand increased by decreasing the risk for a slip (Christina & Cavanagh, 2002).
19 Furthermore, cluster 3 included a few individuals who originated from cluster 2 and cluster 3
20 for the *shallow* staircase and slightly altered their stepping behaviour.

21 Cluster 4 for the *steep* staircase consisted of 8 individuals, with the majority of these
22 individuals originating from cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase (5/8). Cluster 4 for the *steep*
23 staircase showed a more risky stepping behaviour compared to cluster 3 for the *shallow*
24 staircase, by showing less PFLCS, a higher cadence and more variance in foot clearance,
25 PFLCS and cadence, which could increase the risk for a trip or slip (Hausdorff et al., 2001; M.
26 S. Roys, 2001). Only one of these risky behaviours was similar to the behaviours adopted by
27 cluster 3 for the *shallow* staircase, namely a higher cadence. This could indicate that the
28 individuals of cluster 4 for *steep* staircase who originated from cluster 2 and 3 of the *shallow*
29 staircase altered their stepping behaviour to a more risky behaviour when the demand
30 increased.

31 The findings in stair descent indicate that the majority of the individuals of cluster 1-3
32 maintained their stepping behaviour and that all the individuals of cluster 4 changed their
33 stepping behaviour when the task demand increased.

34

1 **Conclusion**

2 In conclusion, older adults adopted a range of stair negotiation behaviours, including the
3 display of solely biomechanically risky strategies, solely biomechanically conservative
4 strategies or a mix of biomechanically risky and conservative strategies. The comparison
5 between staircases revealed that the majority of older adults maintained their overall
6 biomechanical stepping profile, with only slight changes in terms of risk and safety
7 characteristics when exposed to a more challenging staircase. This indicates that most of the
8 older adults tested were identifiable based on their stepping behaviour irrespective of the step
9 dimensions implemented. Importantly, the present findings also indicate that the underlying
10 mechanism of a stair fall may remain the same irrespective of step dimensions. In terms of
11 safety, this could imply that when the stepping behaviour of an individual at risk for a stair fall
12 is improved through targeted interventions, this individual would be safer on multiple step
13 dimension configurations. At present, it is not possible to establish which of the behaviours for
14 stair ascent and descent is truly safer or riskier, as it is imperative to link each cluster with a
15 relevant metric of stair falls sustained over a follow-up period.

17 **Acknowledgements**

18 This work was supported by a Liverpool John Moores University studentship. We would like
19 to express our gratitude to Denis Holzer for his help with the calculations of foot clearance and
20 proportion of foot length in contact with stair and to the members of the RISCs (Research to
21 Improve Stair Climbing Safety) group of Liverpool John Moores University for their help
22 during the data collection.

24 **Conflict of interest statement**

25 The authors have no conflicts of interests to declare.

27 **References**

- 28 Ackermans, T. M., Francksen, N. C., Casana-Eslava, R. V., Lees, C., Baltzopoulos, V., Lisboa,
29 P. J., . . . Maganaris, C. N. (2019). A novel multivariate approach for biomechanical
30 profiling of stair negotiation. *Experimental gerontology*, 110646.
31 Akoglu, H. (2018). User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turkish journal of emergency*
32 *medicine*, 18(3), 91-93.
33 British-Standards-Institute. (1984). *BS5395: Part 1: 1977: Stairs, Ladders and Walkways:*
34 *Code for the Design of Straight Stairs*. BSI.
35 Buckley, J. G., Cooper, G., Maganaris, C. N., & Reeves, N. D. (2013). Is stair descent in the
36 elderly associated with periods of high centre of mass downward accelerations?
37 *Experimental gerontology*, 48(2), 283-289.

- 1 Casana-Eslava, R. V., Jarman, I. H., Lisboa, P. J., & Martin-Guerrero, J. D. (2017). Quantum
2 clustering in non-spherical data distributions. *Neurocomputing*, 268(C), 127-141.
- 3 Chambers, S. J., Jarman, I. H., Etchells, T. A., & Lisboa, P. J. (2013). Inference of number of
4 prototypes with a framework approach to K-means clustering. *International Journal of*
5 *Biomedical Engineering and Technology* 5, 13(4), 323-340.
- 6 Christina, K. A., & Cavanagh, P. R. (2002). Ground reaction forces and frictional demands
7 during stair descent: effects of age and illumination. *Gait & posture*, 15(2), 153-158.
- 8 Cramér, H. (2016). *Mathematical methods of statistics (PMS-9)* (Vol. 9): Princeton university
9 press.
- 10 Dempster, W. (1955). *Space requirements of the seated operator. Geometrical, kinematic, and*
11 *mechanical aspects of the body with special reference to the limbs.* Dayton, OH:
12 *Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.* Retrieved from
- 13 Department-of-the-Environment-and-The-Welsh-Office. (1992). *The Building Regulations*
14 *1991 Approved Document K: Stairs, Ramps and Guards.* London: HMSO Publications
- 15 Hamel, K. A., Okita, N., Bus, S. A., & Cavanagh, P. R. (2005). A comparison of foot/ground
16 interaction during stair negotiation and level walking in young and older women.
17 *Ergonomics*, 48(8), 1047-1056.
- 18 Hamel, K. A., Okita, N., Higginson, J. S., & Cavanagh, P. R. (2005). Foot clearance during
19 stair descent: effects of age and illumination. *Gait & posture*, 21(2), 135-140.
- 20 Hanavan, E. (1964). A Mathematical Model of the Human Body (Technical report AMRL-
21 TDR-64-102) Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. *OJ: Wright Air Development Center.*
- 22 Hausdorff, J. M., Rios, D. A., & Edelberg, H. K. (2001). Gait variability and fall risk in
23 community-living older adults: a 1-year prospective study. *Archives of physical*
24 *medicine and rehabilitation*, 82(8), 1050-1056.
- 25 Jacobs, J. V. (2016). A review of stairway falls and stair negotiation: Lessons learned and future
26 needs to reduce injury. *Gait & posture*, 49, 159-167.
- 27 Johnson, D. A., & Pauls, J. (2010). Systemic stair step geometry defects, increased injuries,
28 and public health plus regulatory responses. In (pp. 453-461): CRC Press.
- 29 Lisboa, P. J., Etchells, T. A., Jarman, I. H., & Chambers, S. J. (2013). Finding reproducible
30 cluster partitions for the k-means algorithm. *BMC bioinformatics*, 14(1), S8.
- 31 Mian, O. S., Narici, M. V., Minetti, A. E., & Baltzopoulos, V. (2007). Centre of mass motion
32 during stair negotiation in young and older men. *Gait & posture*, 26(3), 463-469.
- 33 Mian, O. S., Thom, J. M., Narici, M. V., & Baltzopoulos, V. (2007). Kinematics of stair descent
34 in young and older adults and the impact of exercise training. *Gait & posture*, 25(1), 9-
35 17.
- 36 Nemire, K., Johnson, D. A., & Vidal, K. (2016). The science behind codes and standards for
37 safe walkways: changes in level, stairways, stair handrails and slip resistance. *Applied*
38 *ergonomics*, 52, 309-316.
- 39 Novak, A., Komisar, V., Maki, B., & Fernie, G. R. (2016). Age-related differences in dynamic
40 balance control during stair descent and effect of varying step geometry. *Applied*
41 *ergonomics*, 52, 275-284.
- 42 Riener, R., Rabuffetti, M., & Frigo, C. (2002). Stair ascent and descent at different inclinations.
43 *Gait & posture*, 15(1), 32-44.
- 44 Roys, M., & Wright, M. (2005). Minor variations in gait and their effect on stair safety.
45 *Contemporary Ergonomics*, 427-431.
- 46 Roys, M. S. (2001). Serious stair injuries can be prevented by improved stair design. *Applied*
47 *ergonomics*, 32(2), 135-139.
- 48 Scuffham, P., Chaplin, S., & Legood, R. (2003). Incidence and costs of unintentional falls in
49 older people in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*,
50 57(9), 740-744.

1 Soriano, T. A., DeCherrie, L. V., & Thomas, D. C. (2007). Falls in the community-dwelling
2 older adult: a review for primary-care providers. *Clinical interventions in aging*, 2(4),
3 545.

4 Stacoff, A., Diezi, C., Luder, G., Stüssi, E., & Kramers-de Quervain, I. A. (2005). Ground
5 reaction forces on stairs: effects of stair inclination and age. *Gait & posture*, 21(1), 24-
6 38.

7 Startzell, J. K., Owens, D. A., Mulfinger, L. M., & Cavanagh, P. R. (2000). Stair negotiation
8 in older people: a review. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 48(5), 567-580.

9 Templer, J. (1995). *The staircase: studies of hazards, falls, and safer design*: MIT press.

10 Wright, M., & Roys, M. (2005). Effect of changing stair dimensions on safety. *Contemporary*
11 *Ergonomics*, 469-474.

12 Wright, M., & Roys, M. (2008). Accidents on English dwelling stairs are directly related to
13 going size. *Contemporary Ergonomics*, 2008, 632.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

1 **Tables**

2 **Table 1.**

3 Cluster profiles (CP) for stair ascent of the biomechanical outcome measures assessed for the
 4 two staircases. Those exceeding the threshold of ± 0.5 are highlighted bold and coloured in
 5 terms of risk (red = more risky strategy; green = more conservative strategy).

	Foot clearance	Var. Foot clearance	PFLCS	Var. PFLCS	RCOF	Var. RCOF	Cadence	Var. ⁶ Cadence
Shallow staircase								
Cluster 1	0.19	-0.07	0.61	-0.29	-0.12	-0.15	-0.44	-0.31 ⁸
Cluster 2	0.53	0.42	0.07	1.53	0.84	0.81	0.33	1.48
Cluster 3	-0.62	-0.07	-1.19	-0.20	-0.19	-0.12	0.67	-0.15 ¹⁰
Steep staircase								
Cluster 1	-0.05	-0.32	-0.67	0.17	0.54	-0.31	0.74	-0.33 ¹
Cluster 2	0.06	-0.24	0.66	-0.31	-0.37	-0.14	-0.59	-0.31 ²
Cluster 3	-0.10	1.42	-0.64	0.62	0.02	1.07	0.28	1.65

14 Note 4 Var: variance; PFLCS: proportion of foot length in contact with stair; RCOF: required coefficient of friction.

15
16
17

18 **Table 2.**

19 Cluster profiles (CP) for stair descent of the biomechanical outcome measures assessed for the
 20 two staircases. Those exceeding the threshold of ± 0.5 are highlighted bold and coloured in
 21 terms of risk (red = more risky strategy; green = more conservative strategy).

	Foot clearance	Var. Foot clearance	PFLCS	Var. PFLCS	CoM ang. acc.	Var. CoM ang. acc.	RCOF	Var. RCOF	Cadence	Var. Cadence
Shallow staircase										
Cluster 1	0.56	0.02	0.25	-0.05	-0.63	-0.64	1.26	1.20	-1.14	-0.41
Cluster 2	0.09	0.31	0.16	-0.13	-0.47	-0.49	-0.56	-0.35	0.13	0.18
Cluster 3	-0.43	-0.40	-0.35	0.19	0.95	0.98	-0.04	-0.26	0.50	0.01
Steep staircase										
Cluster 1	-0.77	-0.43	-0.05	-0.17	-0.48	-0.31	0.02	-0.51	0.31	-0.23
Cluster 2	-0.07	-0.24	0.02	-0.30	1.20	1.35	0.03	0.00	0.20	0.05
Cluster 3	0.80	0.34	0.23	-0.29	-0.50	-0.55	0.26	0.49	-0.73	-0.39
Cluster 4	-0.41	0.52	-0.61	1.90	0.10	-0.48	-0.90	-0.25	1.03	1.59

22 Note 2 Var: variance; PFLCS: proportion of foot length in contact with stair; ang: angular; acc: acceleration; RCOF: required coefficient of friction.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1 **Table 3**

2 Cross-tabulations of the clusters identified on *shallow* staircase with the clusters identified on
 3 *steep* staircase during stair ascent. A Cramer’s V is calculated to measure the degree of
 4 association between the clusters.

Ascent	Shallow staircase			Total
	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	
Steep staircase				
Cluster 1	7 ^a	3	13	23
	30.4% ^b	13.0%	56.5%	100.0%
Cluster 2	28	4	2	34
	82.4%	11.8%	5.9%	100.0%
Cluster 3	3	3	5	11
	27.3%	27.3%	45.5%	100.0%
Total	38	10	20	68
	55.9%	14.7%	29.4%	100.0%

Cramer’s V = 0.412, p = <0.001

5 ^a = frequency, ^b = row percentage

7 **Table 4**

8 Cross-tabulations of the clusters identified on *shallow* staircase with the clusters identified on
 9 *steep* staircase during stair descent. A Cramer’s V is calculated to measure the degree of
 10 association between the clusters.

Descent	Shallow staircase			Total
	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	
Steep staircase				
Cluster 1	1 ^a	12	6	19
	5.3% ^b	63.2%	31.6%	100.0%
Cluster 2	2	6	9	17
	11.8%	35.3%	52.9%	100.0%
Cluster 3	11	9	4	24
	45.8%	37.5%	16.7%	100.0%
Cluster 4	0	3	5	8
	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
Total	14	30	24	68
	20.6%	44.1%	35.3%	100.0%

Cramer’s V = 0.380, p = 0.003

11 ^a = frequency, ^b = row percentage

12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20

1 **Figures**

2 **Figure 1.** Separation-Concordance (SeCo) maps for the biomechanical outcome measures for
3 both staircases for ascent and descent, highlighting the top 10% (of 500 initialisations of the k-
4 means algorithm) with Δ Sum of Squares (SSQ) on the y-axis and the internal median Cramer's
5 V on the x-axis for each value of k (2-10). (A: *shallow* staircase ascent; B: *shallow* staircase
6 descent; C: *steep* staircase ascent; D: *steep* staircase descent).

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15