

Prediction of balance perturbations and falls on stairs in older people using a biomechanical profiling approach: A 12-month longitudinal study

Journal:	<i>Journal of Gerontology: Medical Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	JGMS-2019-RES-682.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Ackermans, Thijs; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Sport and Exercise Sciences Francksen, Natasha; Liverpool John Moores University Lees, Carolyn; Liverpool John Moores University Papatzika, Fyllis; HU Berlin Arampatzis, Adamantios; Humboldt-University Berlin, Training and Movement Sciences Baltzopoulos, Vasilios; Liverpool John Moores University Lisboa, Paulo; Liverpool John Moores University Hollands, Mark; Liverpool John Moores University, Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences O'Brien, Thomas; Liverpool John Moores University Maganaris, Costis; Liverpool John Moores University, Research Institute for Sport and Exercise Sciences
Keywords:	Gait-Biomechanics, Physical Activity, Risk Factors, Falls
Alternate Keyword:	Stair negotiation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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
32
33
34
35
36

Prediction of balance perturbations and falls on stairs in older people using a biomechanical profiling approach: A 12-month longitudinal study

Thijs Ackermans, PhD (thijs.ackermans@kuleuven.be)^{a,*}; Natasha Francksen, MSc^a; Carolyn Lees, PhD^b; Fyllis Papatzika, MSc^c; Adamantios Arampatzis, PhD^{c, d}; Vasilios Baltzopoulos, PhD^a; Paulo Lisboa, PhD^e; Mark Hollands, PhD^a; Thomas O’Brien, PhD^a; Constantinos Maganaris, PhD^a

^aResearch to Improve Stair Climbing Safety (RISCS), Liverpool John Moores University, United Kingdom;
^bFaculty of Education, Liverpool John Moores University, UK;
^cDepartment of Training and Movement Sciences, Humboldt-Universitat zu Berlin, Germany;
^dBerlin School of Movement Science, Humboldt-Universitat zu Berlin, Germany;
^eFaculty of Engineering and Technology, Liverpool John Moores University, UK;
*Corresponding author

Word count original article: 5716
Word count revised article: 6314
Number of data elements: 5

1. Abstract

Background: Stair falls are a major health problem for older people, but presently there are no specific screening tools for stair fall prediction. The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether stair fallers could be differentiated from non-fallers by biomechanical risk factors or physical/psychological parameters and to establish the biomechanical stepping profile posing the greatest risk for a stair fall.

Methods: Eighty-seven older adults (age: 72.1 ± 5.2 y) negotiated an instrumented seven-step staircase and performed a range of physical/psychological tasks. K-means clustering was used to profile the overall stair negotiation behaviour with biomechanical parameters indicative of fall risk as input. Falls and events of balance perturbation (combined “hazardous events”) were then monitored during a 12-month follow-up. Cox-regression analysis was performed to examine if physical/psychological parameters or biomechanical outcome measures could predict future hazardous events. Kaplan-Meier survival curves were obtained to identify the stepping strategy posing a risk for a hazardous event.

Results: Physical/psychological parameters did not predict hazardous events and the commonly used Fall Risk Assessment Tool (FRAT) classified only 1/17 stair fallers at risk for a fall. Single biomechanical risk factors could not predict hazardous events on stairs either. On the contrary, two particular clusters identified by the stepping profiling method in stair ascent were linked with hazardous events.

Conclusion: This highlights the potential of the stepping profiling method to predict stair fall risk in older adults against the limited predictability of single parameter approaches currently used as screening tools.

Keywords: fall risk, stair negotiation, clustering, stepping behaviour.

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 2. Introduction

2 A significant number of older people get injured or die every year following a fall, with stair
3 falls accounting for 60% of all fall-related deaths (1). Identifying the individuals at risk for a
4 fall is necessary to deliver effective fall prevention interventions. At community level, there
5 are various fall risk screening tools available. In the UK, the Fall Risk Assessment Tool
6 (FRAT) is most commonly used (2). Although the existing fall risk screening tests, including
7 the FRAT, are not stair-specific, they encompass physical and psychological parameters that
8 are associated with stair negotiation performance, such as parameters related to vision, vitality,
9 dynamic balance, strength, fear of falling and balance confidence levels (1, 3, 4). Thus, the
10 general fall risk screening tools assume that a person identified to be at risk for a general fall
11 will also be at risk for a fall on stairs. However, it should be noted that stair negotiation is a
12 complex and specific skill, and can be executed using different techniques that can be adjusted
13 to the capabilities and deficits of the individual. For example, older adults with balance deficits
14 could minimize stair fall risk by relying more on the handrails and/or negotiating the stairs in
15 a step-by-step manner, as both strategies allow more effective balance control (5, 6). However,
16 generic fall screening methods do not encompass this individual ability to adjust stepping
17 technique and, thus, it is questionable whether they can identify older people at risk specifically
18 for stair falls.

19 Fall risk detection using stair-specific biomechanical testing requires access to a lab
20 and typically quantifies mean differences between subject groups for single biomechanical
21 parameters indicative of risk for example, a reduced foot clearance to the stair edge, which
22 increases the chances of a trip (7). However, this grouping approach overlooks the fact that
23 certain individuals within a group may also display more conservative stepping strategies,
24 which could potentially compensate for the risky strategies. For example, it has been reported
25 that older adults displaying increased variability in foot clearance, which is a risky strategy for

1 a trip, also displayed an increased foot clearance, which minimises trip risk (8). We recently
2 established a novel multivariate approach that circumvents this limitation by profiling
3 individual stepping strategies based on multiple parameters reflecting both risk and safety on
4 stairs (8). The profiling approach showed that older adults display various stair negotiation
5 behaviours that consist of both risky and conservative strategies. However, an overall
6 biomechanical stepping profile at greatest risk for a stair fall has not been established yet. In
7 addition, access to specialised lab facilities and instrumented staircases is a practical issue that
8 would preclude the implementation of the biomechanical profiling method as a fall predictive
9 tool at community level. Therefore, easily quantifiable physical/psychological parameters that
10 underpin the overall stepping profile of an individual should be identified for stair fall risk
11 detection in large-scale populations. A study of Tiedemann et al. (2007) identified a range of
12 easily quantifiable physical/psychological parameters that are associated with stair negotiation
13 performance (e.g. knee extension strength, contrast sensitivity, leaning balance, fear of falling
14 and vitality scores) (4). However, at present we do not know which of these parameters are
15 linked with a given biomechanical stepping profile.

16 Here we have, therefore, adopted a prospective study design to: 1) investigate whether
17 participants who would go on to experience stair falls or balance perturbations on stairs over a
18 12-month follow up period could be differentiated by a biomechanical risk factor or
19 physical/psychological parameters, 2) establish the overall stepping profile linked with the
20 greatest number of falls and balance perturbations sustained and identify easily measurable
21 physical/psychological parameters underpinning this stepping profile.

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 3. Methods

2 3.1 Participants

3 Eighty-seven older adults (28 Males; age: 72.1±5.2 y; body height: 1.66±0.20 m; body mass:
4 71.4±14.6 kg) participated in the study. All participants lived independently and were recruited
5 from the local community of Liverpool, UK. Participants who were younger than 65 years of
6 age, did not use stairs in daily life or used any other aid apart from the handrail to negotiate
7 stairs were excluded. Written informed consent was obtained after the procedures and possible
8 risks of the study were explained. The study was approved by the NHS research ethics
9 committee in the UK (IRAS ID: 216671) and was conducted in accordance with the
10 Declaration of Helsinki.

12 3.2 Staircase measurements

13 The measurements were taken on a custom-built instrumented seven-step staircase. This
14 measurement set-up has been described in detail previously (8). Briefly, kinematics were
15 obtained using a 24 infrared camera-system (16 MX T-series and 8 Bonita cameras, 120Hz,
16 Vicon, Oxford Metrics, UK) and ground reaction forces were obtained through four force
17 platforms (1080Hz, 9260AA, Kistler AG, CH) embedded in the lower four steps. The staircase
18 configuration was set in accordance with the UK building regulations and represented a
19 staircase in a typical private home (9, 10), with the rise set at 20 cm and run at 25 cm, resulting
20 in a pitch of 38.7°.

21 Trials were performed with participants clothed in tight fitting shorts and shirt and
22 wearing their own comfortable shoes (no boots, heels or sandals). Participants were fitted in a
23 five-point safety harness, which was attached to the overhead belay safety system. To allow
24 familiarisation with the experimental setup and safety harness, participants performed up to
25 five practice trials. Afterwards, participants ascended and descended the staircase five times at

their self-selected pace and manner. Participants who used the handrails either with one hand or both hands were asked, only if they were confident to do so, to negotiate the stairs five more times without using the handrails. The final three trials were used for analysis.

3.3 Data analysis staircase measurements

Full-body kinematics were obtained using a 15 segment (head, thorax, pelvis, upper arms, lower arms, hands, thighs, shanks, feet) full-body six-degree of freedom kinematic model defined by 76 reflective markers (diameter 14mm). The segmental data were based on Dempster's regression equations (11) and used geometrical volumes to represent each segment (12). The position of the whole body CoM was estimated as the weighted sum of the various body segments using Visual3D (C-Motion, Germantown, USA). For further analysis the ground reaction forces and kinematic data were filtered using a low-pass fourth order Butterworth filter with a cut-off frequency of 6 Hz. In each of the four force platforms, heel strike was determined in the first frame in which the vertical GRF was greater than 20 N and toe-off was determined in the first frame in which the vertical GRF was less than 20 N.

The methods used to obtain the biomechanical outcome measures of the present study have been presented in detail (8), therefore only a brief description of the relevant outcome measures will be presented here. The outcome measures included: 1) *Foot clearance*. The foot clearance was calculated for both ascent and descent during the swing phase over steps 1-5 as the minimal clearance between the leading limb and the step edge (8). 2) *Proportion of foot length in contact with stair (PFLCS)*. PFLCS was calculated at touch-down on steps 2-4 for ascent and 1-4 for descent. The parameter was calculated using the distance of the horizontal projection of the most posterior aspect (distance x) and the most anterior aspect (distance y) of the shoe outline to the step edge ($PFLCS = (\text{distance } x / (\text{distance } x + \text{distance } y)) * 100\%$). 3) *Required coefficient of friction (RCOF)*. The RCOF was calculated by dividing the resultant

1 shear force (vector sum of the mediolateral and antero-posterior force) by the vertical force at
2
3 each sample in time (13). The peak RCOF was determined during the push-of phase for stair
4
5 ascent on steps 2-4 and during the loading phase of stance for stair descent on steps 1-4 using
6
7 Visual3d (C-Motion, Germantown, USA) after a threshold of 50 N for the vertical force was
8
9 exceeded. 4) *Cadence*. The mean cadence of two gait cycles (one for the left limb and one for
10
11 the right limb) across the three trials was considered for further analysis. 5) *Maximal CoM*
12
13 *angular acceleration (only for stair descent)*. The angular acceleration was calculated for the
14
15 angle between the CoM and CoP position of the trailing leg. The maximal angular acceleration
16
17 of the CoM was obtained as the peak value during the swing phase for steps 1-4 during stair
18
19 descent. 6) In addition to the parameters listed (1-5), *the trial-to-trial variability of these*
20
21 *parameters* were calculated as the mean of the variability across the three trials for each of the
22
23 analysed steps separately. Variability in itself is a risk factor for falls, as higher variability can
24
25 indicate a person's inability to maintain a steady/safe movement pattern (14).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 3.4 Physical/psychological parameters

36
37 A range of physical/psychological parameters were measured following the stair
38
39 measurements. These measurements were selected due to their relevance regarding stair
40
41 negotiation performance and feasibility at community level (4). Relevant person-related factors
42
43 such as age, body height, body mass, number of medications and number of falls in the previous
44
45 12-months were self-reported.
46
47
48

49 The following questionnaires were completed: the Activities-specific Balance
50
51 Confidence Scale (ABC), to assess self-perceived balance confidence while performing daily
52
53 activities (15), the Falls Efficacy Scale-International (FES-I), to assess concern about falling
54
55 while completing activities of daily living (16), the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA)
56
57 to assess the cognitive functioning (17) and the Nottingham extended Activities of Daily Living
58
59
60

(NADL) index to assess the functional status (18). The FRAT was completed to determine fall risk (2).

Measures of vision included visual acuity and contrast sensitivity and these were obtained using the Freiburg Vision Test (FRACT) (19).

Balance measures included the Berg Balance Scale (BBS), which addresses anticipatory balance control with and without a change in base of support during 14 different functional tasks (20), and the Functional reach test, which provides information related to anticipatory balance control without a change in base of support while reaching forward (21). In addition, the single leg stance test, which is included in the BBS, was also included as a separate measure and performed for a prolonged period of 30 seconds while the number of times the participant had to regain their balance was recorded.

The Range of Motion (RoM) was assessed actively and passively for the hip flexion, knee flexion and ankle plantar and dorsal flexion in the supine position using a goniometer (22).

Handgrip strength and lower body strength were measured. Handgrip strength was obtained using a handgrip dynamometer (TKK 5401, Takei Scientific Instruments, Tokyo, Japan). Isometric muscle forces of hip flexion, hip abduction, knee flexion and knee extension were obtained using a handheld myometer (M500 MyoMeter, Biometrics Ltd, UK). The participants performed a 'make' test with participant's position and dynamometer placement as described by Andrews et al. (1996) (23). The maximal torque was calculated and normalized for body mass (N·m/kg).

The six tests of the Fullerton Functional Fitness Test were included as single independent outcome measures (24): 1) The amount of chair stands performed in 30 sec., to measure functional lower body strength; 2) The amount of arm curls performed in 30 sec., to measure functional upper body strength; 3) The amount of steps performed within a 2-min step

1
2
3 1 test, to measure physical stamina; 4) Chair sit and reach, to measure lower body flexibility; 5)
4
5 2 Back scratch test, to measure upper body flexibility and 6) Timed up and go, to measure speed,
6
7 3 agility and balance (24).
8
9

10 4
11
12 5 3.5 Recording of stair falls and balance perturbations
13

14 6 Subsequent to the baseline assessments, a 12-month follow-up with monthly contact via phone
15
16 7 calls or email was made to register the occurrence, circumstances and self-perceived causes of
17
18 8 falls and balance perturbations during both ascent and descent within this period. The
19
20 9 participants were provided with a diary to record falls and balance perturbations daily and
21
22 10 encouraged to contact the research team as soon as an incident had occurred. A fall was defined
23
24 11 as the outcome of the person losing their balance, causing them to hit the stairs with their body
25
26 12 (including hands) during ascent or descent. Instances of instability, including trips and slips,
27
28 13 where balance was regained following the perturbation, were also recorded. Furthermore, any
29
30 14 changes in living conditions (e.g. admission to a care home or installing a stair lift) and life
31
32 15 events (e.g. a heavy accident that would prevent them from negotiating stairs) that could
33
34 16 potentially result in dropping out of the follow-up were recorded.
35
36
37
38
39

40 17
41
42 18 3.6 Statistical analysis
43

44 19 A multivariate method (8) was applied to the data of the older adults that were confident enough
45
46 20 to not use handrails (N=72) during the stair test. The older adults who were dependent on the
47
48 21 handrails were excluded and clustered together as a separate group, as they already adopt a
49
50 22 distinct overall stair-negotiating strategy. The multivariate method profiled the individual
51
52 23 stepping strategies of the older adults based on the biomechanical outcome measures (1-6)
53
54 24 using k-means clustering. The optimal number of clusters was determined through the SeCo
55
56 25 framework, this method has previously been described in detail (25-27). To examine
57
58
59
60

1 differences in the composition of each cluster, the cluster profiles ($CP = (\text{Mean}_{\text{cluster}} -$
 2 $\text{Mean}_{\text{overall}}) / \text{SD}_{\text{overall}}$) were calculated for all outcome measures with a threshold set at 0.5. To
 3 determine the underlying physical/psychological capabilities of each cluster, including the
 4 handrail dependent cluster, we carried out a logistic regression analysis using a forward
 5 stepwise procedure for each cluster separately with the physical/psychological parameters as
 6 input. Presence in the specific cluster was used as the dependent variable for each cluster
 7 separately (0 = present within one of the other clusters, 1 = present in the analysed cluster).
 8 The potentially low sample size does not affect the outcome of the logistic regression, as the
 9 goal was to elucidate which variables explain the specific clusters, rather than to make
 10 decisions using predictions about individual subjects. In addition, no adjustments (e.g.
 11 Bonferroni correction) were deemed necessary for the logistic regression, as these apply to
 12 multivariate models. The predictive power of each logistic model was evaluated by the area
 13 under the receiver operator characteristic curve (AUC) (28).

14 Stair falls and events of balance perturbation were combined and referred to as
 15 “hazardous events”. Kaplan-Meier survival curves and log-rank tests were performed to
 16 identify the stepping strategy with the greater risk of falling. The time to, and occurrence of,
 17 the first hazardous event within 12 months of follow-up were used as factors. Subsequently,
 18 the hazard function was plotted to investigate how the hazard rate for obtaining a hazardous
 19 event amongst the ‘survivors’ changed over time (29). Furthermore, a forward stepwise Cox-
 20 regression analysis was executed to examine if the physical/psychological parameters could
 21 predict hazardous events on stairs. In addition, a Cox-regression analysis was performed to
 22 examine if the single biomechanical outcome measures (1-6) identified as risk factors in the
 23 literature could predict hazardous events during stair ascent and descent. Statistical analyses
 24 were performed using SPSS (version 24, SPSS Inc., California, USA) and Matlab (R2018a,
 25 Mathworks, Natick, USA). The significance level was set at $\alpha=0.05$.

1
2
3 1
4
5 2 4. Results
6
7
8 3 4.1 Participants
9
10 4 Eighty-seven older adults (free from cognitive impairments; MoCa: 27.6±2.3) were recruited
11
12 5 and completed the baseline assessments. Approximately 40% of the participants used the
13
14 6 handrails the first time they negotiated the staircase, and 60% of these participants were
15
16 7 confident enough to negotiate the staircase without handrails afterwards. The strategies of
17
18 8 handrail use varied between participants, with some participants using one side and others both
19
20 9 sides. Nonetheless, there were no significant differences in vertical GRF and CoM acceleration
21
22 10 when the trials with handrail usage were compared to the trials without handrail usage.
23
24
25

26 11 Five participants dropped out, leaving 82 older adults who completed the 12-month
27
28 12 follow up period. Reported reasons for dropping were: installing a stair lift at home (1 older
29
30 13 adult), car accident that made them physically unable to negotiate stairs (2 independent older
31
32 14 adults), unspecified reasons for losing contact (2 older adults). Stair fall and balance
33
34 15 perturbation data up until participants dropped out were included in the analysis.
35
36
37
38
39

40 17 4.2 Hazardous events
41
42 18 During the 12-month follow-up period, 40 out of the 87 older adults reported at least one
43
44 19 generic fall and 17 out of these 40 fallers reported at least one fall specifically on stairs. In
45
46 20 addition, 12 older adults had an event of balance perturbation on the stairs. For stair ascent, 13
47
48 21 older adults (14.9%) reported at least one fall and 8 older adults (9.2%) had an event of balance
49
50 22 perturbation (Table 1). These combined were predominantly caused by a trip (90.4%) and
51
52 23 approximately 20% resulted in minor injuries, such as cuts and bruises. For stair descent, 4
53
54 24 older adults (4.6%) reported at least one fall and 4 other older adults (4.6%) had an event of
55
56 25 balance perturbation (Table 2). These combined varied in terms of their cause between a trip
57
58
59
60

(37.5%), loss of CoM control (25.0%), missing a step (25.0%) and a slip (12.5%). Four hazardous events resulted in injuries (50.0%), with one stair fall resulting in two fractures in the foot, requiring hospital admission.

4.3 Stair ascent stepping strategies

The SeCo framework revealed that 3 was the optimal number of clusters for stair ascent (cluster 1: 37; cluster 2: 24; cluster 3: 11 older adults). The CP revealed that cluster 1 differed from the overall mean by displaying higher PFLCS (CP=0.66) and lower cadence (CP=-0.60) (Table 3). Cluster 2 differed from the overall mean by displaying less PFLCS (CP=-0.71), higher RCOF (CP=0.57) and higher cadence (CP=0.78) (Table 3). Cluster 3 differed from the overall mean by displaying a higher variability in foot clearance (CP=1.44), less PFLCS (CP=-0.67), a higher variability in PFLCS (CP=0.66), a higher variability in RCOF (CP=1.10) and a higher variability in cadence (CP=1.72) (Table 3). Cluster 4 included the participants (N=15) which differed from the other clusters in their overall stepping strategy by depending fully on the handrails.

The logistic model for cluster 1 during stair ascent ($\chi^2=34.01$; $p<0.001$) revealed that membership of this cluster could be predicted by a lower score on the visual acuity test (OR=0.128, CI=0.016–0.991, $p=0.049$), lower hip flexion strength (OR=0.002, CI=0.000–0.107, $p=0.002$), greater passive knee flexion RoM (OR=1.116, CI=1.021–1.219, $p=0.015$), higher score on the BBS (OR=2.387, CI=1.466–3.886, $p<0.001$) and greater number of medications (OR=1.515, CI=1.087–2.110, $p=0.014$), resulting in a high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.822, $p < 0.001$). The logistic model for cluster 2 ($\chi^2=14.86$; $p<0.001$) revealed that membership of this cluster could be predicted by a smaller number of medications (OR=0.551; CI=0.379–0.803; $p=0.002$), resulting in a high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.748, $p<0.001$). The logistic model for cluster 3 ($\chi^2=18.51$; $p<0.001$) revealed that membership of this cluster

could be predicted by a greater hip flexion strength (OR=239.874; CI=4.503–12777.112; p=0.007), higher score on the functional reach test (OR=1.145; CI=1.008–1.302; p=0.037) and lower score on the back scratch test (OR=0.920; CI=0.852–0.992; p=0.031), resulting in a high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.853, p < 0.001). The logistic model for the handrail-dependent cluster 4 ($\chi^2=71.71$; p<0.001) revealed that membership of this cluster could be predicted with 100% accuracy (Nagelkerke R²=1.0) by a smaller passive knee flexion RoM, smaller active hip flexion RoM and lower score on the BBS, resulting in a very high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.990, p<0.001).

4.4 Stair descent stepping strategies

For stair descent, 4 was the optimal number of clusters (cluster 1: 8; cluster 2: 21; cluster 3: 17; cluster 4: 26 older adults). The CP revealed that cluster 1 differed from the overall mean by displaying a higher variability in foot clearance (CP=0.52), less PFLCS (CP=-0.62), a higher variability in PFLCS (CP=1.95), less RCOF (CP=-0.91), higher cadence (CP=1.03) and a higher variability in cadence (CP=1.66) (Table 3). Cluster 2 differed from the overall mean by displaying less foot clearance (CP=-0.73) (Table 3). Cluster 3 differed from the overall mean by displaying a higher CoM angular acceleration (CP=1.25) and a higher variability in CoM angular acceleration (CP=1.41) (Table 3). Cluster 4 differed from the overall mean by displaying a higher foot clearance (CP=0.78), lower CoM angular acceleration (CP=-0.54), a lower variability in CoM angular acceleration (CP=-0.54) and lower cadence (CP=-0.79) (Table 3). Cluster 5 included the participants (N=15) which differed from the other clusters in their overall stepping strategy by depending fully on the handrails.

The logistic model for cluster 1 ($\chi^2=10.50$; p=0.001) revealed that the presence of an older adult in this cluster could be predicted by a greater hip flexion strength (OR=330.320, CI=6.896–15822.421, p=0.003), resulting in a high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.854,

p=0.001). The logistic model for cluster 2 ($\chi^2=17.56$; $p<0.001$) revealed that membership of this cluster could be predicted by a higher score on the visual acuity test (OR=6.648; CI=0.976–45.298; $p=0.053$) and a higher number of steps on the 2 min step test (OR=1.026; CI=1.010–1.042; $p=0.002$), resulting in a high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.801, $p<0.001$). The logistic model for cluster 3 ($\chi^2=20.06$; $p<0.001$) revealed that membership of this cluster could be predicted by a greater active dorsi-flexion RoM (OR=1.202; CI=1.034–1.397; $p=0.017$), a lower score on the back scratch test (OR=0.935; CI=0.881–0.992; $p=0.026$) and a higher score on the ABC scale (OR=1.275; CI=0.998–1.630; $p=0.052$), resulting in a high prediction accuracy (AUC=0.830, $p<0.001$). None of the physical/psychological parameters could predict the presence of an older adult in cluster 4. Since the handrail-dependent individuals were grouped separately the logistic model for cluster 5 during stair descent was the same as the logistic model of cluster 4 during stair ascent.

4.5 Prediction of hazardous events

Overall, there was a constant risk for a hazardous event during stair ascent and descent (Figure 1A, B). For stair ascent, hazardous events could not be predicted by any of the physical/psychological parameters as no significant Cox-regression model could be obtained. Similar to stair ascent, none of the physical/psychological parameters on their own could predict hazardous events in stair descent, as the obtained Cox-regression model ($\chi^2=22.922$; $p=0.003$) included eight non-significant physical tests (contrast sensitivity, hip abduction strength, passive plantar flexion RoM, active knee flexion RoM, timed up and go, single leg stance test, 2-minute step test and handgrip strength; $p=0.360$ – 0.479). The single biomechanical outcome measures could also not predict hazardous events, as the obtained cox-regression models were non-significant for stair ascent ($\chi^2=7.925$; $p=0.441$) and descent ($\chi^2=10.070$; $p=0.434$).

1
2
3
4 1 For both stair ascent and descent, hazardous events were spread over the clusters
5
6 2 identified (Table 1, 2). The stepping strategy at a greater risk for a hazardous event could not
7
8 3 be identified using the Kaplan-Meier survival analysis for either stair ascent (log rank test:
9
10 4 $\chi^2=2.324$; $p=0.508$) or descent (log rank test: $\chi^2=1.100$; $p=0.894$) (Figure 1C, D). However, it
11
12 5 is evident that clusters 1 and 2 during stair ascent (Figure 1C) display an exponential
13
14 6 distribution, indicating that the hazard rate, which is the probability of a hazardous event (30),
15
16 7 does not change with time ($h(t)=\lambda$). This is confirmed by plotting the hazard function over time
17
18 8 for these clusters (Figure 2A), which indicates that the hazardous events are directly related to
19
20 9 the stair-negating strategy of these clusters (29). For stair descent, cluster 2 appeared to display
21
22 10 an exponential distribution, indicating a constant hazard (Figure 1D). However, the hazard rate
23
24 11 of this cluster was low compared to the rate of the cluster 1 and 2 in stair ascent (Figure 2A)
25
26 12 and did not differ from cluster 4 and 5 in descent, which also showed a tendency for an
27
28 13 exponential distribution (Figure 2B). Therefore, it is not possible to relate the hazardous events
29
30 14 directly to the stair-negating strategy of cluster 2 (29).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 16 5 Discussion

41
42 17 In the present study, we adopted a 12-month prospective design and sought to establish 1) the
43
44 18 predictability of stair fall risk from easily quantifiable physical/psychological parameters and
45
46 19 2) the overall stepping profile that predisposes to a risk for a hazardous event on stairs.
47
48 20 Hazardous events in ascent or descent could not be predicted using the physical/psychological
49
50 21 parameters, or the FRAT. In contrast, the multivariate method revealed that two out of the four
51
52 22 overall stair ascent strategies were predictive of hazardous events. For stair descent, the
53
54 23 hazardous events were not directly associated with the identified stepping behaviours.
55
56 24 Although not all the hazardous events could be related to a specific stepping strategy, the
57
58
59
60

underlying physical/psychological parameters of most of the specific stepping strategies were identified for both stair ascent and descent.

5.1 Biomechanical stepping strategies and underlying physical/psychological capabilities

The multivariate biomechanical approach identified three clusters for stair ascent. Cluster 1 displayed a higher PFLCS, which reduces the risk for a slip, and a lower cadence, which reduces the risk for both a slip and trip (31). This more conservative strategy was linked with a lower visual acuity, lower hip flexion strength, higher passive knee flexion RoM, higher score on the BBS and polypharmacy. The reduced visual acuity and strength, and polypharmacy could possibly outweigh the improved balance and knee RoM and, therefore, explain why individuals in cluster 1 adopted a more conservative stepping strategy (1, 4, 32, 33). Cluster 2 adopted a more risky strategy by displaying a lower PFLCS, a higher RCOF and higher cadence, which increase the risk for both a slip and a trip (31, 34). This more risky strategy is linked to a reduced medication intake, which indicates a better overall fitness that could potentially offset some of the risky strategies adopted (33). Cluster 3 displayed a lower PFLCS and a higher variability in foot clearance, PFLCS, RCOF and cadence; the risk for a slip combined with greater variability can indicate a person's inability to maintain a steady/safe movement pattern (14). This overall riskier strategy was linked to higher hip flexion strength, increased functional reach and reduced back scratch performance. The greater strength and improved balance could outweigh the reduced upper body flexibility and allow the individuals to adopt a riskier overall strategy (1, 4). Cluster 4 depended fully on the handrails and therefore displayed an overall conservative strategy, which was linked with a reduced active hip RoM, a reduced passive knee RoM and poorer performance on the BBS. This suggests that for cluster 4, the handrails were necessary to improve stability and mitigate the negative effect of reduced RoM on stair ascending ability (4, 32).

1 For stair descent, the multivariate approach identified four clusters. Cluster 1 displayed
2 a higher variability for foot clearance, PFLCS and cadence, indicating that the individual has a
3 limited ability to maintain a steady movement pattern (14) increasing the risk for a trip and
4 slip. Furthermore, cluster 1 displayed less PFLCS, increasing the risk for a slip (31), and a
5 greater mean cadence, increasing the risk for a trip, slip or loss of CoM control (35). These
6 riskier strategies were accompanied by a smaller RCOF that could mitigate the risk for a slip
7 (13). This overall riskier strategy was linked to a greater hip flexion strength, which could
8 potentially offset some of the risky strategies adopted by the individuals in cluster 1 (4). Cluster
9 2 was at an increased risk for a trip due to a smaller foot clearance (34). This more risky
10 stepping strategy was linked to an improved visual acuity and more steps performed on the 2-
11 minute stepping task. The improved visual functioning and higher fitness levels could
12 potentially offset the risky strategies adopted by the individuals in cluster 2 (4). Cluster 3
13 displayed a greater peak and variability in CoM angular acceleration, which both increase the
14 risk for a loss of CoM control when stepping down (36-39). This riskier stepping strategy was
15 linked to a greater active dorsiflexion RoM, higher values on the ABC-scale and a reduced
16 performance on the back-scratch test. The increased RoM and higher confidence levels could
17 offset the increased risk for a stair fall (1, 40). Cluster 4 displayed solely conservative strategies,
18 such as a higher foot clearance, a lower cadence, and a lower peak and variability in CoM
19 angular acceleration (34, 36, 37). This stepping strategy could not be linked to any of the
20 physical/psychological parameters. Therefore, the selection of this conservative overall
21 stepping strategy of these individuals could potentially reflect a deficit in
22 physical/psychological capabilities that were not assessed in the present study or a general pre-
23 disposition to stepping strategies deemed to be “safer” biomechanically. Cluster 5 displayed an
24 overall conservative stepping strategy, as handrails were used throughout. Similar to the

1 handrail dependent group for stair ascent, use of the handrails was necessary to improve
2 stability and mitigate the negative effect of reduced RoM on stair descending ability (4, 40).

3 The above findings indicate that the physical/psychological capabilities of an older
4 adult play a role in determining the stepping strategy adopted, with better
5 physical/psychological scores “affording” an older adult to adopt a riskier overall behaviour.

6 7 5.2 Prediction of hazardous events

8 A total of 40 older adults (46%) sustained at least one generic fall within the 12-month follow-
9 up period, with 17 out of the 40 fallers (43%) sustaining a fall specifically on stairs. This large
10 proportion of stair fallers together with the resulting high injury rate (46% of stair falls resulted
11 in injuries) reinforces the need for establishing specific screening tools for stair fall risk in older
12 people.

13 For both stair ascent and descent, hazardous events could not be predicted based on the
14 individual physical/psychological parameters or the existing FRAT, as shown by the Cox-
15 regression models. This could be explained by adjustments that the older individuals made to
16 their overall behaviour based on their physical/psychological capacities. For example, the
17 participants with the poorest performance in the physical/psychological tests adopted the most
18 conservative strategy by depending fully on the handrails. This is supported by the FRAT, as
19 five out of the six older adults who were identified at risk for a fall by the FRAT adopted the
20 most conservative overall stepping behaviour by depending fully on the handrail. As a result,
21 only one of the six older adults at risk for a fall went on to actually experience a stair fall,
22 resulting in a very low sensitivity (0.17) of the FRAT to predict stair fall risk. From the 17
23 older adults who sustained a stair fall, 16 were classified as not being at risk for a fall by the
24 FRAT. This highlights that the current screening approaches are not specific enough to detect
25 older adults at risk for a stair fall, as they cannot account for adjustments in the stair negotiation

1
2
3 1 technique that an individual can make to minimise the risk for a fall. Equally important,
4
5 2 individual biomechanical parameters specific to the stair negotiation task were not able predict
6
7 3 hazardous events for either stair ascent or descent, which supports the use of a multivariate
8
9 4 profiling approach.

10
11
12 5 An overall stepping profile with a higher risk for a hazardous event during stair ascent
13
14 6 could not be identified. However, in the survival curves it is evident that cluster 1 and 2 display
15
16 7 an exponential distribution for fall risk (Figure 1C), resulting in a constant hazard rate (Figure
17
18 8 2A) indicating that the stepping strategy of cluster 1 and 2 can be directly linked to the
19
20 9 hazardous event sustained. This suggests that the conservative strategy of cluster 1 does not
21
22 10 outweigh the reduced physical/psychological capabilities, which include reduced visual acuity,
23
24 11 less hip flexion strength, and polypharmacy. For cluster 2, the findings suggest that having a
25
26 12 lower medication intake compared to the other clusters, does not lead to them adopting a riskier
27
28 13 overall stepping strategy. Similar to stair ascent, an overall stepping strategy that was
29
30 14 particularly at risk for a hazardous event during stair descent could not be identified. Although,
31
32 15 cluster 2 shows a tendency for an exponential distribution for fall risk (Figure 1D), the hazard
33
34 16 rate of cluster 2 (Figure 2B) was low compared to the hazard rate of the clusters in stair ascent
35
36 17 (Figure 2A) and did not differ from clusters 4 and 5 in descent (Figure 2B).

37
38
39 18 The above findings suggest that, for stair ascent, the multivariate profiling approach has
40
41 19 the ability to link the hazardous events of cluster 1 and 2 to their overall stepping behaviour.
42
43 20 Individuals in cluster 1 would reduce their risk for a stair fall by improving visual acuity (e.g.
44
45 21 by wearing corrective glasses) and hip flexor muscle strength (4). To offset the negative effect
46
47 22 of polypharmacy, adopting conservative strategies such as reducing the cadence might also
48
49 23 reduce the stair fall risk. Participants in cluster 2 had no physical/psychological deficits present
50
51 24 compared to the other older adults in this study, hence a reduction in stair fall risk would require
52
53 25 adopting a more conservative stepping behaviour, for example, by using the handrails, which
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

allows a more effective balance control (6). Adequate physical/psychological capabilities were also evident in clusters 1-4 for stair descent, which might explain the low number of hazardous events sustained. Adopting more conservative stepping behaviours might further reduce the risk for a fall during stair descent. Participants in cluster 5, who already display an overall conservative strategy by depending on the handrails, might further reduce their risk for a stair fall by improving their balance and ROM through targeted exercise training (41) and by a step-by-step manner, which decreases the demand of the task in terms of joint loading (5).

The implicit assumption in the present analysis is that the stepping strategies of the older adults profiled in controlled lab conditions is representative of their stepping behaviour in real life. Clearly, however, these constraints do not apply when negotiating stairs daily. It has been shown that the overall stepping profile is not modified when negotiating stairs with different step dimensions than those examined here (42), but there are other factors that could have an influence, such as environmental factors (e.g. lighting and stair surface (7, 43)), individual factors (e.g. less attention for the task due to dual tasking (44)), or other factors (e.g. number of people on the stairs (45)). Simulating in the lab all the external conditions that may modify the biomechanical stepping profile of an individual is challenging. One more pragmatic approach could be to apply the stepping profiling method in real life staircases. Advancements in marker-less motion capture and wearable sensors could allow recording of various input parameters for the identification of the stepping profile, for example, foot clearance, foot placement, cadence and CoM trajectories (46-48). Using stair-specific biomechanical parameters measured in real life conditions together with a higher sample size (i.e. increasing the number of hazardous events) could improve the predictive power of the multivariate approach. Once the stepping profile linked to the highest risk is identified in real life conditions, the underlying easily quantifiable physical/psychological parameters should be identified and implemented in screening tools to identify people at risk for a fall on stairs.

Falls and balance perturbations throughout the follow-up period were self-recorded. In order to minimize inaccuracies with self-recording, we provided the participants with a diary on which they were asked to record falls and balance perturbations daily. The participants were encouraged to contact by phone the lead researcher as soon as possible after they suffered a fall or balance perturbation.

In conclusion, for the first time, the individual stepping strategies of older adults were profiled and linked with fall risk in a prospective longitudinal study. Single physical/psychological parameters did not predict hazardous events on stairs sustained in the 12-month follow up period, and the FRAT classified only 1 out of the 17 stair fallers as being at risk for a fall. In addition, single biomechanical risk factors could not predict hazardous events on stairs sustained in the follow up period, most likely due to their multifactorial nature. However, the multivariate method used in this study, revealed that two out of the four overall stair ascent strategies were predictive of hazardous events.

Funding

This work was supported by a Liverpool John Moores University studentship.

Acknowledgements

All authors contributed to the design, interpretation, and manuscript preparation. The measurements were conducted by TA and NF, and analyses were conducted by TA. We would like to express our gratitude to the members of the RISCS group of LJMU for their support during the data collection.

Conflict of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interests to declare.

References

1. Startzell JK, Owens DA, Mulfinger LM, Cavanagh PR. Stair negotiation in older people: a review. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*. 2000;48(5):567-80 DOI: doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2000.tb05006.x.
2. NHS-UK. Are you at risk of falling? 2018. Available from: <https://http://www.nhs.uk/live-well/healthy-body/are-you-at-risk-of-falling/>.
3. Jacobs JV. A review of stairway falls and stair negotiation: Lessons learned and future needs to reduce injury. *Gait & posture*. 2016;49:159-67 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2016.06.030>.
4. Tiedemann AC, Sherrington C, Lord SR. Physical and psychological factors associated with stair negotiation performance in older people. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*. 2007;62(11):1259-65 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/62.11.1259>.
5. King SL, Underdown T, Reeves ND, Baltzopoulos V, Maganaris CN. Alternate stair descent strategies for reducing joint moment demands in older individuals. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2018;78:126-33.
6. Reeves ND, Spanjaard M, Mohagheghi AA, Baltzopoulos V, Maganaris CN. Influence of light handrail use on the biomechanics of stair negotiation in old age. *Gait & posture*. 2008;28(2):327-36.
7. Hamel KA, Okita N, Higginson JS, Cavanagh PR. Foot clearance during stair descent: effects of age and illumination. *Gait & Posture*. 2005;21(2):135-40 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2004.01.006>.
8. Ackermans TM, Francksen NC, Casana-Eslava RV, Lees C, Baltzopoulos V, Lisboa PJ, et al. A novel multivariate approach for biomechanical profiling of stair negotiation. *Experimental gerontology*. 2019:110646.

- 1 9. British-Standards-Institute. BS5395: Part 1: 1977: Stairs, Ladders and Walkways:
2 Code for the Design of Straight Stairs. BSI.; 1984.
- 3 10. Department-of-the-Environment-and-The-Welsh-Office. The Building Regulations
4 1991 Approved Document K: Stairs, Ramps and Guards. London: HMSO Publications; 1992.
- 5 11. Dempster W. Space requirements of the seated operator. Geometrical, kinematic, and
6 mechanical aspects of the body with special reference to the limbs. Dayton, OH: Wright-
7 Patterson Air Force Base. Technical Report WADC-TR-55-159 Technical Report WADC-
8 TR-55-159, 1955.
- 9 12. Hanavan E. A Mathematical Model of the Human Body (Technical report AMRL-
10 TDR-64-102) Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. OJ: Wright Air Development Center. 1964.
- 11 13. Christina KA, Cavanagh PR. Ground reaction forces and frictional demands during
12 stair descent: effects of age and illumination. *Gait & posture*. 2002;15(2):153-8 DOI:
13 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362\(01\)00164-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0966-6362(01)00164-3).
- 14 14. Hausdorff JM, Rios DA, Edelberg HK. Gait variability and fall risk in community-
15 living older adults: a 1-year prospective study. *Archives of physical medicine and*
16 *rehabilitation*. 2001;82(8):1050-6 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1053/apmr.2001.24893>.
- 17 15. Powell LE, Myers AM. The activities-specific balance confidence (ABC) scale. *The*
18 *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*.
19 1995;50(1):M28-M34 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/50A.1.M28>.
- 20 16. Yardley L, Beyer N, Hauer K, Kempen G, Piot-Ziegler C, Todd C. Development and
21 initial validation of the Falls Efficacy Scale-International (FES-I). *Age and ageing*.
22 2005;34(6):614-9 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afi196>.
- 23 17. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, Charbonneau S, Whitehead V, Collin I, et al.
24 The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive

- 1 impairment. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society. 2005;53(4):695-9 DOI:
2 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53221.x>.
- 3 18. Nouri F, Lincoln N. An extended activities of daily living scale for stroke patients.
4 Clinical rehabilitation. 1987;1(4):301-5 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/026921558700100409>.
- 5 19. Bach M. The Freiburg Visual Acuity Test-automatic measurement of visual acuity.
6 Optometry and vision science. 1996;73(1):49-53.
- 7 20. Berg KO, Wood-Dauphinee SL, Williams JI, Maki B. Measuring balance in the
8 elderly: validation of an instrument. Canadian journal of public health= Revue canadienne de
9 sante publique. 1992;83:S7-11.
- 10 21. Duncan PW, Studenski S, Chandler J, Prescott B. Functional reach: predictive validity
11 in a sample of elderly male veterans. Journal of gerontology. 1992;47(3):M93-M98 DOI:
12 <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/47.3.M93>.
- 13 22. Norkin CC, White DJ. Measurement of joint motion: a guide to goniometry: FA
14 Davis; 2016.
- 15 23. Andrews AW, Thomas MW, Bohannon RW. Normative values for isometric muscle
16 force measurements obtained with hand-held dynamometers. Physical therapy.
17 1996;76(3):248-59 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/76.3.248>.
- 18 24. Rikli RE, Jones CJ. Development and validation of a functional fitness test for
19 community-residing older adults. Journal of aging and physical activity. 1999;7(2):129-61
20 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.7.2.129>.
- 21 25. Casana-Eslava RV, Jarman IH, Lisboa PJ, Martin-Guerrero JD. Quantum clustering in
22 non-spherical data distributions. Neurocomputing. 2017;268(C):127-41.
- 23 26. Chambers SJ, Jarman IH, Etchells TA, Lisboa PJ. Inference of number of prototypes
24 with a framework approach to K-means clustering. International Journal of Biomedical
25 Engineering and Technology 5. 2013;13(4):323-40.

- 1
2
3 1 27. Lisboa PJ, Etchells TA, Jarman IH, Chambers SJ. Finding reproducible cluster
4
5 2 partitions for the k-means algorithm. BMC bioinformatics. 2013;14(1):S8 DOI:
6
7 3 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-14-S1-S8>.
8
9
10 4 28. Hanley JA, McNeil BJ. The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating
11
12 5 characteristic (ROC) curve. Radiology. 1982;143(1):29-36 DOI:
13
14 6 <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiology.143.1.7063747>.
15
16
17 7 29. Hess KR, Levin VA. Getting more out of survival data by using the hazard function.
18
19 8 Clinical Cancer Research. 2014;20(6):1404-9.
20
21
22 9 30. Bewick V, Cheek L, Ball J. Statistics review 12: survival analysis. Critical care.
23
24 10 2004;8(5):389.
25
26 11 31. Roys MS. Serious stair injuries can be prevented by improved stair design. Applied
27
28 12 ergonomics. 2001;32(2):135-9 DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-6870\(00\)00049-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-6870(00)00049-1).
29
30
31 13 32. Reeves ND, Spanjaard M, Mohagheghi AA, Baltzopoulos V, Maganaris CN. Older
32
33 14 adults employ alternative strategies to operate within their maximum capabilities when
34
35 15 ascending stairs. Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology. 2009;19(2):e57-e68 DOI:
36
37 16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2007.09.009>.
38
39
40 17 33. Campbell AJ, Borrie MJ, Spears GF. Risk factors for falls in a community-based
41
42 18 prospective study of people 70 years and older. Journal of gerontology. 1989;44(4):M112-
43
44 19 M7.
45
46
47 20 34. Hamel KA, Okita N, Bus SA, Cavanagh PR. A comparison of foot/ground interaction
48
49 21 during stair negotiation and level walking in young and older women. Ergonomics.
50
51 22 2005;48(8):1047-56 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140130500193665>.
52
53
54 23 35. Simoneau GG, Cavanagh PR, Ulbrecht JS, Leibowitz HW, Tyrrell RA. The influence
55
56 24 of visual factors on fall-related kinematic variables during stair descent by older women.
57
58
59
60

- 1 Journal of gerontology. 1991;46(6):M188-M95 DOI:
- 2 <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronj/46.6.M188>.
- 3 36. Buckley JG, Cooper G, Maganaris CN, Reeves ND. Is stair descent in the elderly
- 4 associated with periods of high centre of mass downward accelerations? Experimental
- 5 gerontology. 2013;48(2):283-9 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2012.11.003>.
- 6 37. Mian OS, Narici MV, Minetti AE, Baltzopoulos V. Centre of mass motion during
- 7 stair negotiation in young and older men. Gait & Posture. 2007;26(3):463-9 DOI:
- 8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2006.11.202>.
- 9 38. Mian OS, Thom JM, Narici MV, Baltzopoulos V. Kinematics of stair descent in
- 10 young and older adults and the impact of exercise training. Gait & posture. 2007;25(1):9-17
- 11 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2005.12.014>.
- 12 39. Templer J. The staircase: studies of hazards, falls, and safer design: MIT press; 1995.
- 13 40. Reeves ND, Spanjaard M, Mohagheghi AA, Baltzopoulos V, Maganaris CN. The
- 14 demands of stair descent relative to maximum capacities in elderly and young adults. Journal
- 15 of Electromyography and Kinesiology. 2008;18(2):218-27 DOI:
- 16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jelekin.2007.06.003>.
- 17 41. Gavin JP, Reeves ND, Jones DA, Roys M, Buckley JG, BALTZOPOULOS VB, et al.
- 18 Combined resistance and stretching exercise training benefits stair descent biomechanics in
- 19 older adults. Frontiers in Physiology. 2019;10:873.
- 20 42. Ackermans TMA, Francksen NC, Casana-Eslava RV, Lees C, Baltzopoulos V, Lisboa
- 21 PJG, et al. Stair negotiation behaviour of older individuals: Do step dimensions matter?
- 22 Journal of Biomechanics. 2020:109616 DOI:
- 23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiomech.2020.109616>.
- 24 43. Tisserand M. Progress in the prevention of falls caused by slipping. Ergonomics.
- 25 1985;28(7):1027-42.

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

44. Vallabhajosula S, Tan CW, Mukherjee M, Davidson AJ, Stergiou N. Biomechanical analyses of stair-climbing while dual-tasking. *Journal of biomechanics*. 2015;48(6):921-9.

45. Lam WH, Cheung C-y. Pedestrian speed/flow relationships for walking facilities in Hong Kong. *Journal of transportation engineering*. 2000;126(4):343-9.

46. Selvaraj M, Baltzopoulos V, Shaw A, Maganaris C, Cullen J, O'Brien T, et al., editors. *Stair Fall Risk Detection Using Wearable Sensors*. 2018 11th International Conference on Developments in eSystems Engineering (DeSE); 2018: IEEE.

47. González A, Hayashibe M, Fraisse P, editors. *Estimation of the Center of Mass with Kinect and Wii balance board*. 2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems; 2012: IEEE.

48. Shany T, Redmond SJ, Narayanan MR, Lovell NH. Sensors-based wearable systems for monitoring of human movement and falls. *IEEE Sensors journal*. 2011;12(3):658-70.

Tables

Table 1. The number, circumstances and self-perceived causes of the hazardous events for the four clusters during stair ascent, with cluster 4 representing the handrail dependent cluster (HR dep.).

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4 (HR dep.)	Total
Number of ascent fallers	5	5	2	1	13
Balance perturbations	2	3	2	1	8
Cause					
- Trip	6	8	3	2	19
- Loss of CoM control	0	0	1	0	1
- Missed step	1	0	0	0	1
Location					
- Home	5	5	1	2	13
- Public building	2	3	3	0	8
- Outside	2	2	0	1	5
- Inside	5	6	4	1	16
Injuries					
- Yes (hospital admission)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0	1 (0)	4 (0)
- No	6	6	4	1	17

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Table 2. The number, circumstances and self-perceived causes of the hazardous events for the
2 five clusters during stair descent, with cluster 5 representing the handrail dependent cluster
3 (HR dep.).

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5 (HR dep.)	Total
Number of descent fallers	0	2	0	2	0	4
Balance perturbations	1	1	1	0	1	4
Cause						
- Trip	1	0	1	1	0	3
- Loss of CoM	0	0	0	1	1	2
- control	0	2	0	0	0	2
- Missed step	0	1	0	0	0	1
- Slip						
Location						
- Home	0	1	1	2	0	4
- Public building	1	2	0	0	1	4
- Outside	1	0	0	1	1	4
- Inside	0	3	1	1	0	4
Injuries						
- Yes (hospital admission)	1 (0)	2 (0)	0	1 (1)	0	4 (1)
- No	0	1	1	1	1	4

Table 3. Cluster profiles (CP) of the biomechanical outcome measures assessed for the three clusters for stair ascent and four clusters for stair descent. Those exceeding the threshold of 0.5 are highlighted bold and highlighted in terms of risk (red = riskier 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
<i>Stair ascent</i>										
Cluster 1	0.06	-0.21	0.66	-0.29	-	-	-0.38	-0.11	-0.60	-0.30
Cluster 2	-0.06	-0.34	-0.71	0.15	-	-	0.57	-0.33	0.78	-0.32
Cluster 3	-0.08	1.44	-0.67	0.66	-	-	0.04	1.10	0.31	1.72
<i>Stair descent</i>										
Cluster 1	-0.44	0.52	-0.62	1.95	0.13	-0.44	-0.91	-0.28	1.03	1.66
Cluster 2	-0.73	-0.47	-0.10	-0.18	-0.39	-0.30	-0.08	-0.40	0.40	-0.22
Cluster 3	-0.09	-0.25	0.02	-0.30	1.25	1.41	0.00	-0.05	0.23	0.07
Cluster 4	0.78	0.38	0.26	-0.25	-0.54	-0.54	0.35	0.44	-0.79	-0.38

Notes: *Var*: variability; *PFLCS*: proportion of foot contact length in contact with stairs; *CoM*: centre of mass; *ang*: angular; *acc*: acceleration; *RCOF*: required coefficient of friction.

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
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figures

Figure 1. Kaplan–Meier survival curves for sustaining a hazardous event during the 12-month follow-up for stair ascent (A), stair descent (B), the clusters identified for stair ascent (C) and the clusters identified for stair descent (D).

Figure 2. The hazard rate for a hazardous event of cluster 1 and 2 for stair ascent (A) and cluster 2, 4 and 5 for stair descent (B).

For Peer Review




Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier survival curves for sustaining a hazardous event during the 12-month follow-up for stair ascent (A), stair descent (B), the clusters identified for stair ascent (C) and the clusters identified for stair descent (D).

150x106mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2. The hazard rate for a hazardous event of cluster 1 and 2 for stair ascent (A) and cluster 2, 4 and 5 for stair descent (B).

149x62mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Table 1. Correlation matrix (r) between all biomechanical parameters studied for stair ascent.

	FC	FC_v	PFLCS	PFLCS_v	RCOF	RCOF_v	Cad	Cad_v
FC		0.14	0.16	-0.21	0.09	-0.08	-0.10	-0.02
FC_v	-		-0.15	0.13	-0.00	0.47	-0.09	0.27
PFLCS	-	-		-0.05	-0.24	-0.12	-0.56	-0.18
PFLCS_v	-	-	-		0.08	0.04	0.05	0.36
RCOF	-	-	-	-		0.16	0.41	-0.06
RCOF_v	-	-	-	-	-		-0.09	0.14
Cad	-	-	-	-	-	-		0.14
Cad_v	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

var: variability; FC: foot clearance; PFLCS: proportion of foot length in contact with stairs; RCOF: required coefficient of friction; Cad: cadence.
 Light grey shading indicates moderate correlations $r = 0.4-0.7$ $p < .05$, and dark grey shading indicates strong correlations $r = 0.7-1.0$ $p < .05$.

Table 2. Correlation matrix (r) between all biomechanical parameters studied for stair descent.

	FC	FC_v	PFLCS	PFLCS_v	COM	COM_v	RCOF	RCOF_v	Cad	Cad_v
FC		0.26	0.04	-0.15	-0.07	-0.01	-0.04	0.13	-0.32	-0.22
FC_v	-		0.05	0.20	-0.05	-0.09	-0.04	-0.00	-0.02	0.03
PFLCS	-	-		-0.22	-0.12	-0.06	0.13	0.12	-0.16	-0.22
PFLCS_v	-	-	-		0.02	-0.14	-0.10	-0.13	0.25	0.29
COM	-	-	-	-		0.62	-0.15	-0.11	0.27	0.11
COM_v	-	-	-	-	-		0.05	-0.08	0.08	0.16
RCOF	-	-	-	-	-	-		0.38	-0.51	-0.19
RCOF_v	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-0.25	-0.05
Cad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		0.36
Cad_v	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

var: variability; FC: foot clearance; PFLCS: proportion of foot length in contact with stairs; COM: Centre of mass angular acceleration; RCOF: required coefficient of friction; Cad: cadence.

Light grey shading indicates moderate correlations $r = 0.4-0.7$ $p < .05$, and dark grey shading indicates strong correlations $r = 0.7-1.0$ $p < .05$.