

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Portegijs, Erja; Edgren, Johanna; Salpakoski, Anu; Kallinen, Mauri; Rantanen, Taina; Alen, Markku; Kiviranta, Ilkka; Sihvonen, Sanna; Sipilä, Sarianna

Title: Balance confidence was associated with mobility and balance performance in older people with fall-related hip fracture: a cross-sectional study.

Year: 2012

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Portegijs, E., Edgren, J., Salpakoski, A., Kallinen, M., Rantanen, T., Alen, M., Kiviranta, I., Sihvonen, S., & Sipilä, S. (2012). Balance confidence was associated with mobility and balance performance in older people with fall-related hip fracture: a cross-sectional study.. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 93(12), 2340-6.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2012.05.022>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

1 **Running head:** Balance confidence or performance

2

3 **Balance confidence was associated with mobility and balance performance in**
4 **older people with fall-related hip fracture: a cross-sectional study**

5

6 Erja Portegijs¹ PhD, Johanna Edgren¹ MSc, Anu Salpakoski¹ MSc, Mauri Kallinen^{2,3} MD
7 PhD, Taina Rantanen¹ PhD, Markku Alen^{1*} MD PhD, Ilkka Kiviranta^{3†} MD PhD, Sanna
8 Sihvonen^{1‡} MD PhD, Sarianna Sipilä¹ MD PhD

9

10 ¹ Gerontology Research Center and Department of Health Sciences, University of
11 Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä,

12 ² Department of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine, Central Finland Central Hospital,
13 Jyväskylä

14 ³ Central Finland Health Care District, Jyväskylä

15

16 Present affiliation:

17 * Department of Medical Rehabilitation, Oulu University Hospital and Institute of Health
18 Sciences, University of Oulu, Oulu

19 † Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki
20 University Central Hospital, Helsinki

21 ‡ JAMK University of Applied Sciences, School of Health and Social Studies, Jyväskylä,
22 Finland

23

1 For correspondence and reprints, contact:

2 Corresponding author: Erja Portegijs

3 Address: Gerontology Research Centre

4 Department of Health Sciences

5 P.O. Box 35 (Viv)

6 FIN-40014 University of Jyväskylä, FINLAND

7 Email: erja.portegijs@jyu.fi

8 Phone: +358 40 481 4347

9

10 **Conflict of interest**

11

12 We certify that no party having a direct interest in the results of the research supporting
13 this article has or will confer a benefit on us or on any organization with which we are
14 associated AND, if applicable, we certify that all financial and material support for this
15 research (eg, NIH or NHS grants) and work are clearly identified in the title page of the
16 manuscript.

17

18 **Acknowledgements**

19

20 These studies were supported by Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, Kela–The
21 Social Insurance Institution of Finland, Juho Vainio Foundation, and Finnish Cultural
22 Foundation. The funders had no further interest or involvement in the design, methods,
23 subject recruitment, data collection, analysis and preparation of the manuscript.

1 Gerontology Research Center is a joint effort between the University of Jyväskylä and
2 the University of Tampere.

3

4 **Presentations**

5

6 Part of the data will be presented on the Nordic Congress on Gerontology, in June 2012
7 (Copenhagen, Denmark) by the corresponding author Erja Portegijs.

8

9 **Trial number**

10

11 This study is a joint analysis of two randomized controlled trials investigating health,
12 functional capacity, and rehabilitation of people with a hip fracture history (study
13 identifiers ISRCTN34271567, ISRCTN53680197).

1 **Balance confidence was associated with mobility and balance performance in**
2 **older people with fall-related hip fracture: a cross-sectional study**

3

4 **Objective.** To study the relationship between balance confidence, a concept closely
5 related to fear of falling, mobility and balance performance and perceived mobility
6 limitation in older people following a fall-related hip fracture.

7

8 **Design.** Cross-sectional analyses of pre-trial data of two randomized controlled trials of
9 physical rehabilitation (ISRCTN34271567; ISRCTN53680197).

10

11 **Setting.** University research center

12

13 **Participants.** Community-dwelling people aged over 60 years, 6 weeks to 7.5 years
14 after a fall-related hip fracture (N=130).

15

16 **Interventions.** Not applicable.

17

18 **Main Outcome Measures.** The main outcome was the self-reported Activity-specific
19 Balance Confidence (ABC) scale. Assessments also included perceived ability to walk
20 outdoors or climb one flight of stairs, and assessments of self-preferred walking speed,
21 modified Timed Up-and-Go, and Berg Balance Scale.

22

1 **Results.** Higher ABC scores were related to better mobility and balance performance
2 ($R>0.47$) and perceived mobility function ($R>0.54$). In univariate general linear models,
3 all associations remained significant also after adjustment for age, gender, time since
4 fracture, number of chronic diseases, and in addition either level of physical activity or
5 muscle strength of the fractured leg. An ABC score <85 points identified those with
6 mobility and balance limitation across measures.

7

8 **Conclusion.** In people who have had a fall-related hip fracture, an independent
9 relationship exists between balance confidence and mobility and balance performance
10 as well as perceived mobility function. Since lack of balance confidence may
11 compromise rehabilitation and recovery, the ABC scale may help to identify older hip
12 fracture patients with mobility and balance limitation.

13

14 **Keywords.** Femoral fracture, falls efficacy, balance confidence, mobility limitation,
15 postural balance

16

17

1 **List of abbreviations**

2

3	95%CI	95% Confidence Interval
4	ABC	Activity-specific Balance Confidence
5	BBS	Berg Balance Scale
6	CV	Coefficient of Variation
7	ICC	Intra-Class Coefficient
8	TUG	Timed-Up-and-Go
9	RS	Spearman correlation coefficient

1 Fear of falls and lack of balance confidence, two closely related concepts^{1,2}, may exist
2 among older people with or without a history of falls. However, those with experience of
3 a fall or fall-related trauma are likely to adopt their behavior due to fear for a new fall.
4 After hip fracture, older people often experience lack of balance confidence, which may
5 be a correct appraisal of their increased risk for falls.³ Older people who have suffered a
6 hip fracture have a markedly increased risk for future falls and new fractures in
7 comparison with healthy older people.⁴ Partly this increased risk is due to impairments
8 in lower-limb muscle strength, mobility and balance performance that persist even years
9 after the fracture.⁴⁻⁹ Recovery to pre-fracture levels of functioning occurs in about one-
10 third of persons surviving hip fracture.^{4,8,10}

11
12 Balance confidence may contribute to the lack of functional recovery after hip fracture.
13 Lack of balance confidence and fear of falling are reported to have a debilitating effect
14 on mobility and functioning in geriatric rehabilitation patients¹¹ and residents¹², and
15 accelerate the decline in mobility function in relatively healthy older people.^{13,14} Lack of
16 balance confidence may cause a vicious circle of further deterioration of function
17 through avoidance of activities in which a person observes an increased fall risk.³
18 Avoidance of physical activities causes muscle strength to decrease, which further
19 increases the risk for mobility and balance limitation and even disability.^{8,15} On the other
20 hand, engaging in physical activities, even through ordinary daily activities only, or
21 physical rehabilitation has a training effect in more frail older people.^{16,17}

22

1 Balance confidence is task-specific. The Activity-specific Balance Confidence (ABC)
2 scale assesses a person's confidence to perform different tasks without losing balance
3 or falling.² Assessing the ABC scale takes only few minutes and may be thus be
4 feasible in the clinical practice as well.² The ABC scale is related to different mobility
5 and balance performance measures in relatively healthy samples of older people.¹⁸⁻²⁰
6 Its use in more frail older populations, such as hip fracture patients, has been
7 questioned due to its large range of activities.²¹ In hip fracture patients other measures
8 of fear of falling and balance confidence have been associated with both mobility
9 performance and perceived mobility function.²¹ A previous study of our group suggested
10 that the ABC scale was feasible in people with a history of hip fracture.⁷ The relationship
11 between ABC scale and functional balance was stronger among those with a history of
12 hip fracture than among age- and sex-matched healthy controls.⁷
13
14 Our aim was to examine the relationship between performance-based and self-reported
15 measures of mobility and balance function in older people with a previous fall-related
16 hip fracture. In addition, the study aimed to determine whether this relationship
17 remained after adjustment, including potential underlying mechanisms, such as reduced
18 physical activity level and poor muscle strength. Finally, we searched for a cut-off value
19 for the ABC scale to identify those with mobility and balance limitation across the
20 different measures.

21

22

1 **METHODS**

2

3

4 **Study Design**

5

6 This study is a joint analysis of two randomized controlled trials investigating health,
7 functional capacity, and rehabilitation of people with a hip fracture history (study
8 identifiers ISRCTN34271567, ISRCTN53680197).^{22,23} Both studies were performed at
9 the same research center, using the same equipment and participants were recruited
10 from the same Health Care District with identical inclusion and exclusion criteria. Data of
11 these studies were pooled to increase sample size. Only the pre-trial data are used in
12 this cross-sectional study.

13

14 **Participants**

15

16 The methods of both trials have been described before.^{22,23} Patient records at the
17 Central Finland Central Hospital were reviewed (in the fall of the years 2004-2005 and
18 throughout the years 2008-2010) to recruit community-dwelling people over 60-years-
19 old, who had been operated for femoral neck or trochanteric fracture. All potential
20 patients were informed about the study (N=748). Those willing to participate were
21 interviewed over the telephone or met during the inpatient period at the health care
22 center to ensure suitability (N=268). Exclusion criteria were inability to move outdoors
23 without assistance from another person, amputation of a lower limb, severe progressive

1 or neurological diseases, alcoholism and severe memory problems (Mini Mental State
2 Examination, MMSE<19).²⁴ Of the 149 eligible patients, 130 were included in the
3 present analyses based on an additional criterion of having experienced a hip fracture
4 due to a low impact fall, which may exacerbate the perception of lack of balance
5 confidence. The ethical committee of the local Health Care District approved both of the
6 study protocols. Participants gave their written informed consent prior to the
7 assessments. The assessments were performed 6 weeks to 7.5 years after the fracture.

8

9 **Assessment**

10

11 A physician and research nurse performed a thorough clinical examination to assess
12 general health status. Details of the fracture and repair (internal fixation vs. arthroplasty)
13 and the number of chronic conditions (present for at least three months) were confirmed
14 according to a questionnaire and medical records. Time since fracture was calculated
15 as the number of days between date of fracture and date of the assessments.

16

17 Data collection of the following measures was performed by trained research assistants.

18 Balance confidence in carrying out activities without becoming unsteady was assessed
19 by interview using a modified Finnish version of the Activities-specific Balance

20 Confidence (ABC) scale.^{2,25} In this modified version, item 14 and 15 regarding

21 escalators in the original scale were replaced with two items on “riding on a bicycle in a
22 street with light traffic / in a heavily trafficked street with no bike path”. Bicycling was a
23 more relevant activity for Finnish older people as large malls with escalators were very

1 uncommon until recently. Subjects are asked to report their confidence levels when
2 carrying out 16 different activities, including those performed outdoors. Each activity
3 was rated from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (total confidence); total score ranges from 16 to
4 160. The ABC scale was reported valid and reliable in older populations.² In addition, a
5 close relationship between fear of falls and lack of balance confidence has been
6 shown.³

7
8 Functional balance was measured using the Finnish translation of the Berg Balance
9 Scale (BBS),²⁶ which evaluates the ability to perform 14 different tasks related to the
10 subject's skills such as to sit down, stand up, reach forward, turn 360 degrees, and
11 stand on one leg. Each task is rated from 0 (incapable) to 4 (safe and independent);
12 total score ranges from 0 to 56. BBS has high intra- and inter-rater reliability.²⁷
13 Participants were categorized as having good and poorer balance performance based
14 on a cut-off point of 45 points, which has been used to predict falls.²⁶

15
16 Participants were allowed to use their assistive device commonly used for walking
17 indoors during mobility tests. Self-preferred walking speed (m/s) was calculated from
18 the shortest time to walk 10 meters, assessed using photocells.^a Three meter was
19 allowed for acceleration and deceleration. This test has been shown valid and reliable.²⁸
20 Participants were grouped into good, fair and poorer mobility based on cut-off points of
21 1.0 and 0.8 m/s that have been used to predict falls.^{29,30}

22

1 The modified Timed Up-and-Go (TUG) measures the time it takes to rise from a chair,
2 walk 2.44m as fast as possible, turn around a cone and return to the chair.³¹⁻³³ The
3 shortest time of two trials, measured using a stopwatch, was used for analyses. The
4 TUG test is valid and reliable for assessing mobility.³³ Participants were grouped into
5 good, fair and poorer mobility based on cut-off points of 8.5³² and 15³⁴ seconds that
6 have been used to predict falls.

7

8 Self-reported mobility was assessed using a questionnaire. Participants were asked
9 about perceived difficulty to walk outdoors and to climb one flight of stairs. The
10 response categories were: (1) no difficulty, (2) some difficulty, (3) major difficulty, (4)
11 unable without help from another person, (5) unable even with help. Due to low
12 frequency in category 3 to 5, they were joined for the analyses ('major difficulty or
13 unable').³⁵

14

15 Present level of physical activity was assessed with a self-report scale by Grimby³⁶ with
16 slight modifications. The highest category of the initial scale was divided into two
17 categories, separating those participating in regular exercise fitness activities from those
18 active in competitive sports. The 7-point scale ranged from 1 (mostly sitting) to 7
19 (participation in competitive sports). Categories 4-7 were combined due to low
20 frequencies, thus leaving four groups: (1) mostly sitting, (2) light physical activity; such
21 as light house hold tasks, (3) moderate physical activity for less than three hours a week,
22 such as walking longer distance, domestic work, and (4) moderate activity for more than
23 4 hours a week and/or more strenuous activity multiple times a week.

1
2 Maximal voluntary isometric knee extension strength of the fractured leg was assessed
3 using an adjustable dynamometer chair.^b The ankle was attached to a strain-gauge
4 system with the knee angle fixed at 60 degrees from full extension. Participants were
5 encouraged to extend the leg as forcefully as possible. After 2-3 practice trials, the
6 highest force of at least three measurements was used for analysis. Each contraction
7 was maintained for 2-3 seconds. The test has been shown valid and reliable.³⁷

8

9 **Statistical Analysis**

10

11 Participants with missing variables in knee extension strength (n=15), walking (n=8),
12 TUG (n=13) and BBS (n=6) tests were dropped from the respective analysis only. BBS,
13 walking speed, and TUG were analyzed as continuous as well as categorical variables
14 based on the cut-off points used to predict falls.

15

16 Variable distribution was tested with Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. Group differences were
17 tested with independent T-tests and χ^2 -tests. Spearman (rs) and Pearson (r) correlation
18 coefficients were calculated for relationships between ABC score, measures of mobility
19 and balance performance and perceived mobility limitation as well as confounders.

20 Fracture repair type was not significantly ($p < 0.05$) associated with any mobility or
21 balance measure and was therefore not included in multivariable analyses. Univariate
22 general linear models were used to compare groups based on the categorized mobility
23 and balance performance measures and perceived mobility limitation. Each model

1 included ABC score (crude model), and was adjusted for (1) age, gender, time since hip
2 fracture, and number of chronic diseases, and in addition either (2) level of physical
3 activity or (3) knee extension strength of the fractured limb. Separate ROC-curves were
4 drawn for ABC score to identify those with poorer mobility and balance performance, or
5 major difficulty in perceived mobility measures. For each measure the optimal cut-off
6 point(s) (highest sensitivity and specificity) was determined. These cut-off points were
7 then used in sensitivity and specificity analyses to choose the cut-off point most suitable
8 to identify those with mobility and balance limitation across outcomes. Finally, the cut-off
9 score identified was used to predict mobility and balance limitation in logistic regression
10 analyses. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) of crude (unadjusted)
11 models are reported. PASW Statistics 18^c was used for the statistical analyses and
12 statistical significance was set at $P \leq 0.050$.

13

14

15 **RESULTS**

16

17

18 Table 1 shows the participants characteristics. They were on average $77.6 \pm$ standard
19 deviation 7.2 years old and the majority was female. On average 1.5 ± 1.9 years had
20 passed since the hip fracture.

21

22 **Correlation analyses**

23

1 Correlation coefficients between ABC score and continuous mobility and balance
2 performance measures indicated that better performance (higher score; for TUG lower
3 score) was associated with higher balance confidence (higher ABC score; Table 1).
4 Similar correlations were found between ABC score and categorized performance-
5 based measures; $r_s=0.60$ ($p<0.001$) for BBS, $r_s=0.48$ ($p<0.001$) for TUG, and $r_s=-0.47$
6 ($p<0.001$) for walking speed, respectively. For the self-reported measures, less difficulty
7 was related to higher balance confidence, the correlation coefficients with ABC score
8 were $r_s=-0.54$ ($p<0.001$) for ability to walk outdoors and $r_s=-0.57$ ($p<0.001$) for stair
9 climb ability, respectively.

10

11 Group differences were calculated for all confounding variables (data not shown). Those
12 with poorer walking speed, TUG and BBS and those with perceived mobility limitation
13 were significantly older ($p\leq 0.014$), they had lower levels of physical activity ($p<0.001$)
14 and muscle strength ($p\leq 0.005$) than those with better functioning. For those with poorer
15 walking speed, TUG and those with perceived limitation to walk outdoors significantly
16 less time had passed since the hip fracture ($p\leq 0.041$). Those with poorer TUG and BBS
17 and those with perceived mobility limitation had a higher number of chronic diseases
18 ($p\leq 0.029$) than those with better functioning. Lower ABC score correlated significantly
19 with higher age ($r=0.37$, $p<0.001$) and number of diseases ($r_s=-0.29$, $p=0.001$), and
20 lower level of physical activity ($r_s=0.47$, $p<0.001$) and muscle strength ($r_s=0.40$,
21 $p<0.001$; Table 1).

22

1 **Multivariable analyses**

2

3 Figure 1 shows a clear gradient of decreasing ABC scores in groups with poorer
4 mobility and balance performance and perceived mobility limitation. Group differences
5 remained significant ($p < 0.026$) also after adjustment for age, gender, time since hip
6 fracture, and the number of chronic diseases, as well as after additional adjustment for
7 level of physical activity or knee extension strength in the fractured limb (Table 2). Level
8 of physical activity and knee extension strength attenuated the relationship between
9 ABC score and all mobility and balance measures, however, the relationships remained
10 significant.

11

12 **Sensitivity analysis**

13

14 ROC curves of each mobility and balance performance or perceived mobility limitation
15 measure with ABC score suggested several potential cut-off points: 68.5 (ability to walk
16 outdoors and walking speed), 76.5 (walking speed and TUG), 78 (ability to walk
17 outdoors and climb stairs), 80.5 (walking speed), 84.5 (ability to climb stairs and TUG),
18 and 85.5 points (BBS). All were used in the following sensitivity and specificity analyses
19 to identify those with poorer mobility and balance performance and perceived mobility
20 limitation for each measure. Using 84.5 points for cut-off rendered good sensitivity
21 (≥ 0.73) and specificity (≥ 0.70) across all measures (Table 3). In logistic regression
22 analyses, those with an ABC sum score < 85 points had an odds ratio (OR) of 18.7
23 (95%CI:6.0-58.0) for having major outdoors walking difficulty and 11.7 (4.6-29.9) for

1 major stair climb difficulty. For the performance-based tests, the OR's were 12.6 (5.3-
2 29.8) for BBS, 7.3 (3.0-17.8) for TUG, and 6.3 (2.6-15.0) for walking speed, respectively.

3

4

5 **DISCUSSION**

6

7

8 Our study shows that balance confidence was associated with a range of measures of
9 mobility and balance performance and perceived mobility limitation in older people
10 following a fall-related hip fracture. The relationships found remained significant also
11 after considerable adjustment. An ABC score <85 points identified most participants
12 with mobility and balance limitation across the different measures. The ABC scale may
13 be useful for clinicians to identify hip fracture patients with or at risk for mobility and
14 balance limitation. Addressing lack of balance confidence together with improving
15 mobility and balance performance by physical rehabilitation may positively affect the
16 potential for functional recovery of hip fracture patients.

17

18 In relatively healthy populations of older people, a reduced ABC score, indicating lack of
19 confidence to perform mobility tasks without loss of balance, has been associated with
20 reduced performance as measured in walking speed^{18,20}, TUG^{18,19}, and BBS.¹⁸ The
21 mean ABC score in our study, when converted to a scale from 0-100% (being 55), was
22 similar as the means in two studies of patients about 4 months after hip fracture (being
23 59 and 61, respectively).^{38,39} In addition, the associations with BBS ($r=0.77$)³⁸ and gait

1 speed ($r > 0.6$;) ^{38,39} were very similar. Previous studies using other measures of fear of
2 falling or balance confidence have shown relationships with TUG ⁴⁰ and self-reported
3 mobility measures in hip fracture patients. ^{40,41} Our results showed that the association
4 between ABC score and mobility and postural balance occurred across different self-
5 reported and performance-based measures.

6
7 Lajoie et al. ⁴² has previously determined a cut-off score for the ABC scale. In their study
8 a score of less than 67% (that is 107 points) on the ABC scale increased the risk for
9 falls in relatively healthy older people. Our population with a previous fall-related hip
10 fracture had lower balance confidence (two-third scored below 107p). Therefore, we
11 determined a new cut-off point to identify persons with mobility and balance limitation
12 after a fall-related hip fracture. Those with an ABC score < 85 points had a 6-18 times
13 increased risk of having poor mobility and balance performance or perceived mobility
14 limitation than those with higher ABC scores. The association between balance
15 confidence, mobility and balance performance or perceived mobility limitation was
16 independent of time since fracture. This may support the hypothesis that poor balance
17 confidence may implicate poorer recovery potential from an acute event ¹¹ such as hip
18 fracture.

19
20 The ABC scale is a relatively quick and easy tool to administer. ² Identifying older hip
21 fracture patients with low balance confidence and at risk for mobility and balance
22 limitation may be clinically relevant. In our study, the ABC scale had an independent
23 association with all measures of mobility and balance performance and perceived

1 mobility limitation. Early identification of hip fracture patients at risk may also impact on
2 other health outcomes, such as new falls, disability and loss of independence. The ABC
3 scale may be suitable also in the time-pressured clinical practice.

4
5 Early physical rehabilitation, including progressive resistance training or other physical
6 exercises, may prevent or reduce the major functional decline associated with hip
7 fracture.^{16,17} In addition, mobility and balance performance can be improved by different
8 physical interventions in healthy older people (for review⁴³) as well as in clinical
9 populations (for review⁴⁴). Based on the close relationship between physical
10 performance and balance confidence, and the risk appraisal theory^{3,45}, intervention
11 aiming to improve physical function may also improve balance confidence. In hip
12 fracture patients attending inpatient rehabilitation no relationship between change in
13 ABC score and change in physical function was observed⁴⁶ and a weak association was
14 found with change in dynamic balance following exercise training in older people
15 residing in retirement villages.⁴⁷ There is some evidence that fear of falling may be
16 reduced by different interventions in community-dwelling older populations.⁴⁸ However,
17 systematic reviews in older hip fracture patients of multidisciplinary interventions and
18 interventions aiming to improve both physical and psychological function were not able
19 to demonstrate better outcomes when compared to regular care after hip fracture.^{49,50}

20

21 **Study limitations**

22

1 Due to our inclusion criteria (community-dwelling, being able to come to our research
2 center for measurements, being able to walk outdoors independently) participants were
3 relatively well-functioning older people, compared to hip fracture patients in general.
4 Generalization of the results should be done with caution. We included older people
5 with a large time range since the fall-related hip fracture (6 weeks to 7.5 years). The
6 time since fracture was related to performance-based mobility and balance measures,
7 however, it did not affect the relationship between ABC score, mobility and balance
8 performance or perceived mobility limitation. This may suggest that lack of balance
9 confidence persistently affects mobility and balance performance in older people with a
10 history of fall-related hip fracture. The sample size in this study allowed for considerable
11 adjustment. We are therefore confident that the relationship between balance
12 confidence and the different measures of mobility and balance performance and
13 perceived mobility limitation was independent. Due to the cross-sectional study design,
14 the chronological order of lack of balance confidence and limitations in mobility and
15 balance performance and their relationship with the hip fracture event remain unclear.
16 Longitudinal studies are needed to confirm associations and determine cause-effect
17 relationships.

18

19

20 **CONCLUSIONS**

21

22

23 In older people with a fall-related hip fracture an independent relationship exists
24 between balance confidence and a range of performance-based and self-reported

1 mobility and balance performance measures. In this group of older people, a score of
2 <85 points on the ABC scale identified those with mobility and balance limitation.
3 Identification of persons with lack of balance confidence seems clinically relevant as it
4 may compromise functional recovery from the hip fracture. Potentially, rehabilitation
5 may be more effective, when lack of balance confidence is taken into account or
6 targeted. However, further study is needed to develop effective strategies to improve
7 balance confidence and reduce the functional decline associated with hip fracture.

8

9

10 **References**

11

12

- 13 1. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychol*
14 *Rev* 1977;84:191-215.
- 15 2. Powell LE, Myers AM. The activities-specific balance confidence (ABC) scale. *J*
16 *Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 1995;50A:M28-34.
- 17 3. Hadjistavropoulos T, Delbaere K, Fitzgerald TD. Reconceptualizing the role of fear
18 of falling and balance confidence in fall risk. *J Aging Health* 2011;23:3-23.
- 19 4. Lloyd BD, Williamson DA, Singh NA, Hansen RD, Diamond TH, Finnegan TP, Allen
20 BJ, Grady JN, Stavrinou TM, Smith EU, et al. Recurrent and injurious falls in the
21 year following hip fracture: A prospective study of incidence and risk factors from
22 the sarcopenia and hip fracture study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2009;64:599-
23 609.

- 1 5. Madsen OR, Lauridsen UB, Sorensen OH. Quadriceps strength in women with a
2 previous hip fracture: Relationships to physical ability and bone mass. *Scand J*
3 *Rehabil Med* 2000;32:37-40.
- 4 6. Portegijs E, Kallinen M, Rantanen T, Heinonen A, Sihvonen S, Alen M, Kiviranta I,
5 Sipila S. Effects of resistance training on lower-extremity impairments in older
6 people with hip fracture. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2008;89:1667-74.
- 7 7. Sihvonen S, Kulmala J, Kallinen M, Alen M, Kiviranta I, Sipila S. Postural balance
8 and self-reported balance confidence in older adults with a hip fracture history.
9 *Gerontology* 2009;55:630-6.
- 10 8. Visser M, Harris TB, Fox KM, Hawkes W, Hebel JR, Yahiro JY, Michael R,
11 Zimmerman SI, Magaziner J. Change in muscle mass and muscle strength after a
12 hip fracture: Relationship to mobility recovery. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*
13 2000;55:M434-40.
- 14 9. Sherrington C, Lord SR. Increased prevalence of fall risk factors in older people
15 following hip fracture. *Gerontology* 1998;44:340-4.
- 16 10. Marottoli RA, Berkman LF, Cooney LM, Jr. Decline in physical function following hip
17 fracture. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1992;40:861-6.
- 18 11. Denkinger MD, Igl W, Lukas A, Bader A, Bailer S, Franke S, Denkinger CM,
19 Nikolaus T, Jamour M. Relationship between fear of falling and outcomes of an
20 inpatient geriatric rehabilitation population-fear of the fear of falling. *J Am Geriatr*
21 *Soc* 2010;58:664-73.

- 1 12. Myers AM, Fletcher PC, Myers AH, Sherk W. Discriminative and evaluative
2 properties of the activities-specific balance confidence (ABC) scale. *J Gerontol A*
3 *Biol Sci Med Sci* 1998;53:M287-94.
- 4 13. Deshpande N, Metter EJ, Lauretani F, Bandinelli S, Guralnik J, Ferrucci L. Activity
5 restriction induced by fear of falling and objective and subjective measures of
6 physical function: A prospective cohort study. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2008;56:615-20.
- 7 14. Cumming RG, Salkeld G, Thomas M, Szonyi G. Prospective study of the impact of
8 fear of falling on activities of daily living, SF-36 scores, and nursing home admission.
9 *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2000;55:M299-305.
- 10 15. Rantanen T, Avlund K, Suominen H, Schroll M, Frandin K, Pertti E. Muscle strength
11 as a predictor of onset of ADL dependence in people aged 75 years. *Aging Clin Exp*
12 *Res* 2002;14(3 Suppl):10-5.
- 13 16. Sylliaas H, Brovold T, Wyller TB, Bergland A. Progressive strength training in older
14 patients after hip fracture: A randomised controlled trial. *Age Ageing* 2011;40:221-7.
- 15 17. Binder EF, Brown M, Sinacore DR, Steger-May K, Yarasheski KE, Schechtman KB.
16 Effects of extended outpatient rehabilitation after hip fracture: A randomized
17 controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004;292:837-46.
- 18 18. Talley KM, Wyman JF, Gross CR. Psychometric properties of the activities-specific
19 balance confidence scale and the survey of activities and fear of falling in older
20 women. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2008;56:328-33.
- 21 19. Schepens S, Goldberg A, Wallace M. The short version of the activities-specific
22 balance confidence (ABC) scale: Its validity, reliability, and relationship to balance
23 impairment and falls in older adults. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2010;51:9-12.

- 1 20. Reelick MF, van Iersel MB, Kessels RP, Rikkert MG. The influence of fear of falling
2 on gait and balance in older people. *Age Ageing* 2009;38:435-40.
- 3 21. Visschedijk J, Achterberg W, Van Balen R, Hertogh C. Fear of falling after hip
4 fracture: A systematic review of measurement instruments, prevalence,
5 interventions, and related factors. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010;58:1739-48.
- 6 22. Portegijs E, Rantanen T, Kallinen M, Heinonen A, Alen M, Kiviranta I, Sipila S.
7 Lower-limb pain, disease, and injury burden as determinants of muscle strength
8 deficit after hip fracture. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2009;91:1720-8.
- 9 23. Sipila S, Salpakoski A, Edgren J, Heinonen A, Kauppinen MA, Arkela-Kautiainen M,
10 Sihvonen SE, Pesola M, Rantanen T, Kallinen M. Promoting mobility after hip
11 fracture (ProMo): Study protocol and selected baseline results of a year-long
12 randomized controlled trial among community-dwelling older people. *BMC*
13 *Musculoskelet Disord* 2011;12:277.
- 14 24. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for
15 grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res*
16 1975;12:189-98.
- 17 25. Mänty M, Sihvonen S, Hulkko T, Lounamaa A, editors. Iäkkäiden henkilöiden
18 kaatumistapaturmat. Opas kaatumisten ja murtumien ehkäisyyn. 2nd ed.
19 Kansanterveyslaitoksen julkaisuja; 2007. URL:
20 www.ktl.fi/attachments/suomi/julkaisut/julkaisusarja_b/2007/2007b29.pdf
- 21 26. Berg KO, Wood-Dauphinee SL, Williams JI, Maki B. Measuring balance in the
22 elderly: Validation of an instrument. *Can J Public Health* 1992;83 Suppl 2:S7-11.

- 1 27. Steffen TM, Hacker TA, Mollinger L. Age- and gender-related test performance in
2 community-dwelling elderly people: Six-minute walk test, berg balance scale, timed
3 up & go test, and gait speeds. *Phys Ther* 2002;82:128-37.
- 4 28. Sipila S, Multanen J, Kallinen M, Era P, Suominen H. Effects of strength and
5 endurance training on isometric muscle strength and walking speed in elderly
6 women. *Acta Physiol Scand* 1996;156:457-64.
- 7 29. Studenski S, Perera S, Patel K, Rosano C, Faulkner K, Inzitari M, Brach J, Chandler
8 J, Cawthon P, Connor EB, et al. Gait speed and survival in older adults. *JAMA*
9 2011;305:50-8.
- 10 30. Bohannon RW, Williams Andrews A. Normal walking speed: A descriptive meta-
11 analysis. *Physiotherapy* 2011;97:182-9.
- 12 31. Podsiadlo D, Richardson S. The timed "up & go": A test of basic functional mobility
13 for frail elderly persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1991;39:142-8.
- 14 32. Rose DJ, Jones CJ, Lucchese N. Predicting the probability of falls in community-
15 residing older adults using the 8-foot up-and-go: A new measure of functional
16 mobility. *J Aging Phys Act* 2002;10:466-475.
- 17 33. Rikli RE, Jones CJ. Development and validation of a functional fitness test for
18 community-residing older adults. *J Aging Phys Act* 1999;7:129-161.
- 19 34. Nordin E, Lindelof N, Rosendahl E, Jensen J, Lundin-Olsson L. Prognostic validity
20 of the timed up-and-go test, a modified get-up-and-go test, staff's global judgement
21 and fall history in evaluating fall risk in residential care facilities. *Age Ageing*
22 2008;37:442-8.

- 1 35. Laukkanen P, Heikkinen E, Kauppinen M. Muscle strength and mobility as
2 predictors of survival in 75-84-year-old people. *Age Ageing* 1995;24:468-73.
- 3 36. Grimby G. Physical activity and muscle training in the elderly. *Acta Med Scand*
4 *Suppl* 1986;711:233-7.
- 5 37. Rantanen T, Era P, Heikkinen E. Physical activity and the changes in maximal
6 isometric strength in men and women from the age of 75 to 80 years. *J Am Geriatr*
7 *Soc* 1997;45:1439-45.
- 8 38. Whitehead C, Miller M, Crotty M. Falls in community-dwelling older persons
9 following hip fracture: Impact on self-efficacy, balance and handicap. *Clin Rehabil*
10 2003;17:899-906.
- 11 39. Kline Mangione K, Craik RL, Lopopolo R, Tomlinson JD, Brenneman SK. Predictors
12 of gait speed in patients after hip fracture. *Physiother Can* 2008;60:10-8.
- 13 40. Oude Voshaar RC, Banerjee S, Horan M, Baldwin R, Pendleton N, Proctor R,
14 Tarrier N, Woodward Y, Burns A. Fear of falling more important than pain and
15 depression for functional recovery after surgery for hip fracture in older people.
16 *Psychol Med* 2006;36:1635-45.
- 17 41. McKee KJ, Orbell S, Austin CA, Bettridge R, Liddle BJ, Morgan K, Radley K. Fear of
18 falling, falls efficacy, and health outcomes in older people following hip fracture.
19 *Disabil Rehabil* 2002;24:327-33.
- 20 42. Lajoie Y, Gallagher SP. Predicting falls within the elderly community: Comparison of
21 postural sway, reaction time, the berg balance scale and the activities-specific
22 balance confidence (ABC) scale for comparing fallers and non-fallers. *Arch*
23 *Gerontol Geriatr* 2004;38:11-26.

- 1 43. American College of Sports Medicine, Chodzko-Zajko WJ, Proctor DN, Fiatarone
2 Singh MA, Minson CT, Nigg CR, Salem GJ, Skinner JS. American college of sports
3 medicine position stand. exercise and physical activity for older adults. *Med Sci*
4 *Sports Exerc* 2009;41:1510-30.
- 5 44. Rydwik E, Frandin K, Akner G. Effects of physical training on physical performance
6 in institutionalised elderly patients (70+) with multiple diagnoses. *Age Ageing*
7 2004;33:13-23.
- 8 45. Martin RR, Hadjistavropoulos T, McCreary DR. Fear of pain and fear of falling
9 among younger and older adults with musculoskeletal pain conditions. *Pain Res*
10 *Manag* 2005;10:211-9.
- 11 46. Petrella RJ, Payne M, Myers A, Overend T, Chesworth B. Physical function and fear
12 of falling after hip fracture rehabilitation in the elderly. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*
13 2000;79:154-60.
- 14 47. Cyarto EV, Brown WJ, Marshall AL, Trost SG. Comparative effects of home- and
15 group-based exercise on balance confidence and balance ability in older adults:
16 Cluster randomized trial. *Gerontology* 2008;54:272-80.
- 17 48. Zijlstra GA, van Haastregt JC, van Rossum E, van Eijk JT, Yardley L, Kempen GI.
18 Interventions to reduce fear of falling in community-living older people: A systematic
19 review. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007;55:603-15.
- 20 49. Crotty M, Unroe K, Cameron ID, Miller M, Ramirez G, Couzner L. Rehabilitation
21 interventions for improving physical and psychosocial functioning after hip fracture
22 in older people. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010;(1):CD007624.

1 50. Handoll HH, Cameron ID, Mak JC, Finnegan TP. Multidisciplinary rehabilitation for
2 older people with hip fractures. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2009;(4):CD007125.

3

4

5 **Suppliers**

6

7

8 ^a Research Laboratory, Department of Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä,
9 Jyväskylä, Finland.

10 ^b Good Strength, Metitur Oy, Jyväskylä, Finland

11 ^c SPSS software, Illinois, USA

12

13

14 **Table and Figure legends**

15

16

17 **Table 1.** Means (standard deviations; SD) or prevalence of the participant
18 characteristics and Spearman correlation coefficients of each measure with the Activity-
19 specific Balance Confidence scale (N=130).

20

21 **Table 2.** Differences in mean Activity-specific Balance Confidence scale tested with
22 adjusted univariate models for the mobility and balance performance groups based on
23 previously reported cut-off values and the groups with perceived mobility limitation.

1

2 **Table 3.** Sensitivity and specificity analyses using 85 points as cut-off value for the
3 Activity-specific Balance Confidence scale (to identify those with poorer mobility and
4 balance performance or perceived mobility limitation).

5

6 **Figure 1.** Marginal means and 95% confidence intervals of the Activity-specific Balance
7 Confidence scale in the mobility and balance groups derived from crude univariate
8 models.




Table 1. Means (standard deviations; SD) or prevalence of the participant characteristics and Spearman correlation coefficients of each measure with the Activity-specific Balance Confidence scale (N=130).

	Mean	SD	rs	P
Age (yrs)	77.6	7.2	0.37*	<0.001
Time since fracture (yrs)	1.5	2.0	0.07	0.437
Number of chronic diseases (n)	3.4	1.9	-0.29	0.001
Knee extension strength fractured leg (N)	202.3	91.2	0.40*	<0.001
BBS (p)	43.3	9.7	0.72	<0.001
TUG time (s)	15.0	10.3	-0.56	<0.001
Walking speed (m/s)	0.9	0.2	0.51*	<0.001
ABC score (p)	89.2	32.5	1.00	
	N	%	rs	P
Gender (female)	98	75.4	-0.05	0.613
Fracture repair				
(Internal fixation)	60	46.2	-0.03	0.668
(Hemi arthroplasty)	57	43.8		
(Total arthroplasty)	13	10.0		
Physical activity				
(Mostly sitting)	32	24.6	0.47	<0.001
(Low / moderate physical activity)	67	51.5		
(Moderate physical activity ≤3 hrs/week)	23	17.7		

(Moderate activity \geq 4hrs/week or more strenuous)	7	5.4
--	---	-----

*Pearson correlation coefficients

Table 2. Differences in mean Activity-specific Balance Confidence scale tested with adjusted univariate models for the mobility and balance performance groups based on previously reported cut-off values and the groups with self-reported mobility limitation.

		ABC	Physical activity	KE
Walk outdoors	Model 1	<0.001		
	Model 2	<0.001	0.001	
	Model 3	<0.001		0.007
Climb stairs	Model 1	<0.001		
	Model 2	<0.001	0.004	
	Model 3	<0.001		0.025
BBS	Model 1	<0.001		
	Model 2	<0.001	0.001	
	Model 3	<0.001		0.014
TUG	Model 1	0.001		
	Model 2	0.026	0.008	
	Model 3	0.014		0.042
Walking speed	Model 1	<0.001		
	Model 2	0.002	0.011	
	Model 3	0.002		0.096

*KE=knee extension strength of the fractured leg

Table 3. Sensitivity and specificity analyses using 85 points as cut-off value for the Activity-specific Balance Confidence scale (to identify those with poorer mobility and balance performance or self-reported mobility limitation).

		ABC		ABC<85	
		<85	≥85	sensitivity	specificity
Walk outdoors	No difficulty	6	24	0.89	0.71
	Some difficulty	21	41		
	Major difficulty/ unable	31	4		
Climb stairs	No difficulty	8	36	0.83	0.71
	Some difficulty	17	26		
	Major difficulty/ unable	33	7		
BBS	Good balance	15	54	0.78	0.78
	Poorer balance	42	12		
TUG	Good mobility	6	25	0.73	0.70
	Fair mobility	18	31		
	Poorer mobility	27	10		
Walking speed	Good mobility	11	36	0.76	0.70
	Fair mobility	14	23		
	Poorer mobility	28	9		