Fall Risk Assessment in Elderly with and without history of falls. Kinematic Gait Analysis. A comparative study

scola Superior de Saúde

Dr. Lopes Dias

Coutinho, A.(1); Fragata, C.(2); Maio, D.(2); Vivas, I.(2); Gonçalves, M.(2)(1) MSc Physical Therapy. Professor at Superior Helth School Dr. Lopes Dias. Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco. Portu- acoutinho@ipcb.pt gal (2) Physical Therapist

INTRODUCTION

Problems : declining functional status, quality of life, independence and increased risk of accidents, among which is to highlight the increased risk of falls. In Portugal, the falls are about 70 % of accidents in the elderly.

Public concern both in terms of morbidity and mortality, and in terms of

WHF group:

- Having \geq 65 years;
- Having suffered 1 or more falls during the last year;
- Sign the informed consent.
- **WOHF group:**

costs to health and social services.

As such, it becomes extremely important to know the possible causes and risk factors of the occurrence of falls, so they can be created and implemented effective strategies for prevention and recovery in physical therapy. A very common mechanism of falls is tripping, the cause of 53 % of falls in the elderly.

The specific point of the gait cycle that causes most frequently stumble is the mid-swing phase because this is the stage where there is less distance between the foot and the ground - MFC (Minimum foot clearance). The MFC is therefore a variable gait which is defined as the vertical distance between the lowest point of the foot, the leg that is in the swing phase, and the floor.

OBJECTIVES

Change in value of MFC among seniors with and without a history of falls;

- What is the Lower Limb joint responsible for this variation;
- **Relationship between the risk of falling, obtained through the TUG (Timed Up** and Go test) and the value of MFC.

- Having \geq 65 years;

- Have not suffered falls over the past year;

- Sign the informed consent.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA

- Products need to perform gait support; - Possess a condition affecting the lower limbs and/or the gait.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

KINOVEA

- One camcorder and focus light, placed perpendicular to the route to be made;

- Subjects in shorts and bare;

- Reflective spherical markers in dominant LL;
- Considered one gait cycle of each individual, from a pre-determined site.

SAMPLE

Non-probability, convenience, consisted of 30 elderly volunteers

- WHF Group: 15 individuals with a history of falls;

- WOHF Group: 15 individuals with no history of falls.

TUG

- The subject stands up from a chair, walks 3 meters, turns, walks up to the chair and sits down again.

- No physical assistance was provided to the subject;
- The evaluator used a stopwatch to record the activity

RESULTS

 \mathbf{M}

Correlations between joint amplitudes and TUG with MFC					
	MFC (cm)	р			
Hip range (°)	-0,171	0,542			
Knee range (°)	-0,135	0,631			
Ankle range (°)	-0,21	0,453			
Hip range (°)	0,22	0,431			
Knee range (°)	0,51	0,052			
Ankle range (°)	-0,143	0,611			
TUG (s)	-0,269	0,15			
CORRELATION TUG /MFC					
	s between joint ampli Hip range (°) Knee range (°) Ankle range (°) Hip range (°) Knee range (°) Knee range (°) TUG (s) CORRELATION T	s between joint amplitudes and TUG MFC (cm) Hip range (°) -0,171 Knee range (°) -0,135 Ankle range (°) -0,21 Hip range (°) 0,22 Knee range (°) 0,51 Ankle range (°) -0,143 TUG (s) -0,269			

WOHF n=15 WHQ n=15 p FC (cm) $2,11\pm0,4$ $1,93\pm0,41$ $0,145$ UG (s) $8,48\pm1,11$ $9,58\pm1,55$ $0,056$ MFC between groups WHF $1,93\pm0,41$ p WHF $1,93\pm0,41$ $0,145$ VOHF $2,11\pm0,4$ $0,145$	Comparison between the MFC and TUG WHF					
FC (cm) $2,11\pm0,4$ $1,93\pm0,41$ $0,145$ UG (s) $8,48\pm1,11$ $9,58\pm1,55$ $0,056$ Comparison of MFC between groups MFC p WHF $1,93\pm0,41$ $0,145$ VOHF $2,11\pm0,4$ $0,145$		WOHF n=15	WHQ n=15	p		
UG (s) $8,48\pm1,11$ $9,58\pm1,55$ $0,056$ Comparison of MFC between groups MFC p WHF $1,93\pm0,41$ $0,145$ VOHF $2,11\pm0,4$ $0,145$	FC (cm)	2,11±0,4	1,93±0,41	0,145		
Comparison of MFC between groupsMFC <i>p</i> WHF1,93±0,41VOHF2,11±0,4	UG (s)	8,48±1,11	9,58±1,55	0,056		
MFC p WHF 1,93±0,41 VOHF 2,11±0,4	Comparison of MFC between groups					
WHF 1,93±0,41 VOHF 2,11±0,4 0,145		MFC		p		
VOHF 2,11±0,4 0,145	WHF	1,93±0,41		0 145		
	VOHF	2,11±0,4		0,145		

2010;32(4):429-35.

Joints with more influence on variation of MFC:

- WOHF: Ankle(21%) \rightarrow Hip (17,1%) \rightarrow Knee (13,5%); - WHF: Knee (51%) \rightarrow $Hip(22\%) \rightarrow Ankle$

(14,3%).

Dtsch Arztebl Int. 2010;107(46):809-16.

- No significant differences (p = 0,150);

- But, negative correlation (r = -0, 269).

CONCLUSION

In our sample no significant differences in the value of MFC were obtained between the WHF group and the WOHF.

Even without significant value for MFC differences was determined that the LL joint

responsible for its variation (p> 0,05):

- WOHF: ankle;

- WHF: knee.

The correlation between the risk of falling, obtained by the TUG and the variation of the

MFC was also not significant.

The use of the TUG is more sensitive and effective in predicting the risk of falling when

compared to the kinematic analysis to obtain the value of the MFC and range of motion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American College of Sports Medicine Position Stand. Exer- Maki BE, McIlroy WE. Control of rapid limb movements cise and physical activity for older adults. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 1998;30(6):992-1008.

for balance recovery: age-related changes and implications for fall prevention. Age Ageing. 2006;35(2):ii12-ii8.

Barrett RS, Mills PM, Begg RK. A systematic review of the Masud T, Morris RO. Epidemiology of falls. Age Ageing. effect of ageing and falls history on minimum foot clea-2001;4:3-7. rance characteristics during level walking. Gait Posture.

Pighills AC, Torgerson DJ, Sheldon TA, Drummond AE, Bland JM. Environmental assessment and modification to

DGS. Promoção da saúde » Educação para a saúde » Áreas prevent falls in older people. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2011;59 de intervenção » Acidentes e sua prevenção 2007; Availa-(1):26-33. ble from: http://www.dgs.pt/.

Rubenstein LZ. Falls in older people: epidemiology, risk Fuller GF. Falls in the elderly. Am Fam Physician. 2000;61 factors and strategies for prevention. Age Ageing. 2006;35 (2):ii37-ii41 (7):2159-68.

demográfica e socio-económica recente das pessoas idosas. Revista de Estudos Demográficos. 2002.

Khandoker AH, Lynch K, Karmakar CK, Begg RK, Palaniswami M. Toe clearance and velocity profiles of young and elderly during walking on sloped surfaces. J Neuroeng Rehabil. 2010;7:18.

Lai DT, Shilton A, Begg R. On the feasibility of learning to predict minimum toe clearance under different walking speeds. Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2010;3:4890-3.

Leyk D, Ruther T, Wunderlich M, Sievert A, Essfeld D, Witzki A, et al. Physical performance in middle age and old age: good news for our sedentary and aging society.

INE DdECedPd. O Envelhecimento em Portugal : Situação Ruthazer R, Lipsitz LA. Antidepressants and falls among elderly people in long-term care. Am J Public Health. 1993;83(5):746-9.

> Schulz BW. Minimum toe clearance adaptations to floor surface irregularity and gait speed. J Biomech. 2011;44 (7):1277-84.

> WHO. Health statistics and health information systems -**Definition of an older or elderly person. 2011; Available** from: http://www.who.int/healthinfo/survey/ ageingdefnolder/en/index.html#.

> WHO. WHO Global Report on Falls Prevention in Older Age. 2007.