1 Preclinical mobility limitation outcomes in rehabilitation interventions for middle-aged and

2 older adults population: a scoping review protocol

3

4 **Author information:**

- The names of the authors: Aiping Lai, PhD. (Kin)¹, Ashley Morgan, PT¹, Julie Richardson
- 6 PT, PhD^{1,2*}, Lauren Griffith, PhD², Ayse Kuspinar PT, PhD¹, Jenna Smith-Turchyn PT, PhD¹
- 7 The affiliations of the authors:
- ⁸ ¹School of Rehabilitation Science, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada
- 9 ²Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada

10	•	* Corresponding author: Julie Richardson PT, PhD, Email: jrichard@mcmaster.ca
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		

20 Abstract

21 **Objectives:** This scoping review aims to understand the extent of evidence regarding preclinical

22 mobility limitation (PCML) intervention studies that have been implemented or planned in

23 middle-aged and older adult populations.

24 Introduction: Individuals with PCML are at a high risk of future functional loss and progression

to disability. An overview of studies undertaken on this emerging topic is now due.

26 Inclusion criteria: Rehabilitation intervention studies that measured PCML outcomes or

assessed individuals at the PCML stage will be included. Studies will be considered if the

participants are middle-aged (45-64yrs) or older adults (≥ 65yrs) in any setting, including

29 community-dwelling, hospital discharges, or institutional settings.

30 Methods: Seven databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, AMED, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Web of Science and

31 Cochrane CENTRAL) were searched to locate relevant published and unpublished intervention

32 studies (English evidence from inception onwards). The search strategy will be generated using

33 the PCC framework (population, concept, and context) and refined after consulting with a

34 McMaster research librarian. In addition, a manual search from the reference list of retrieved

35 papers and review articles will also be performed. Two reviewers will use predefined

36 inclusion/exclusion criteria to independently review titles, abstracts, and full texts of potential

37 articles. Any disagreements on study selection will be resolved by discussion or consensus

involving a third reviewer. Data will be collected and reported using a predefined data

39 extraction chart and described using qualitative content analysis.

40 **Keywords:** preclinical mobility limitation; middle-aged; older adults; intervention

41 Introduction

42 Mobility is defined as the ability to move oneself (independently or by using assistive devices or 43 transportation) around their environment¹⁻². Mobility is a key physical ability that influences the 44 quality of life as a strong prognostic indicator of disability³. A mobility limitation is usually the 45 first area in which disability occurs. Twenty-four percent of older Canadians aged 65 to 74 46 experienced mobility disability, and this percentage increases as they grow older. Forty-one

percent of older adults aged 75 to 84 years and 61 percent of those aged 85 years and over 47 experience mobility disability⁴. The trajectory of mobility loss with aging is commonly described 48 as a descending curve with a steeper decline shown late in life³. However, age-related 49 impairments in mobility-associated physiological systems can be compensated by changing the 50 manner or the frequency of doing a mobility task⁵. An overt mobility limitation only manifests 51 when the severity of mobility loss becomes too high to be compensated³. The intermediate 52 stage, which occurs with progressive loss of function and precedes the onset of disability, was 53 referred to as "preclinical disability"⁶, "preclinical mobility disability"⁷, or "preclinical mobility 54 limitation" (PCML)⁸. The concept of preclinical disability was first introduced by Fried and 55 colleagues⁶. They defined it as a functional stage where people can still complete certain tasks 56 57 but change the frequency or modify the way of doing the tasks. They linked the progressive disability to an iceberg and described the stage of PCML as a submerged portion of the iceberg. 58 Only the tip of the iceberg is visible, representing individuals can no longer compensate 59 successfully for their loss of physical function. 60

Before significant mobility and functional independence losses, there may be 61 interventions that can improve recovery likelihood and functional levels⁹. Individuals in the 62 63 PCML stage may represent an optimal group to receive disability prevention interventions, as they are likely to be responsive to altered risk factors¹⁰. In the primary prevention of disability 64 among older adults, intervening at the PCML stage might be the most effective strategy to 65 66 reduce the burden of disability in this population. However, studies have provided inconclusive 67 results. For example, an RCT study compared older adults with preclinical gait dysfunction in a motor learning program incorporating goal-oriented stepping and walking with those in a 68 standard program employing endurance training by treadmill walking¹¹. Both groups improved 69 70 walking endurance, but older adults in the motor learning group demonstrated more improvements in mobility performance parameters (such as gait speed and motor skill)¹¹. Yet, 71 Day and colleagues investigated a group of community-dwelling older adults with PCML in a Tai 72 Chi group and seated flexibility exercise group for 24 weeks and found little change in 73 impairments or functional limitations ¹². Many factors may contribute to these conflicting 74 findings, such as tools used to identify the stage of PCML, eligibility criteria for participants, and 75

interventions selected. A preliminary search also showed that the outcomes measuring changes 76 of PCML vary among studies¹²⁻¹⁴. Some used self-reported measures, such as the preclinical 77 disability screening tool by Fried et al.¹⁵ or the Preclinical mobility disability scale by Manty et 78 al.⁸, while others debate whether performance-based measures can identify more limitations in 79 physical function than self-report measures¹¹. In addition, the characteristics of the sample 80 recruited (e.g. age, gender, cognitive level, etc.) and the variation in intervention used (e.g. 81 type, frequency, length, intensity and delivery professions, etc.) may also contribute to the 82 variation in results. 83

However, there was a lack of resource mapping evidence in relation to these concepts, which leads to the uncertainty of whether or not it would be helpful to conduct a systematic review. In addition, determination of the key items required when undertaking a systematic review, such as identifying precise research questions and defining suitable inclusion criteria.

Therefore, synthesizing the evidence currently available in PCML interventions will help 88 determine what these interventions are, what type of interventions are associated with various 89 outcomes and future directions for interventional research. A preliminary search in MEDLINE, 90 the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Evidence Synthesis, 91 92 and PROSPERO was conducted. No current or ongoing systematic or scoping reviews on this 93 topic were identified. The purpose of this scoping review is to provide a comprehensive 94 understanding of PCML intervention studies in middle-aged and older adults that have been tested or planned, map how they have been conducted and reported, identify the knowledge 95 gaps in current literature and make recommendations about future research direction in the 96 interventional study in PCML. 97

98

99 **Review questions:**

100 101 • What outcomes are used to measure PCML changes in the intervention studies? What other outcomes are reported in association with PCML outcomes?

4

What types of rehabilitation interventions are used to change PCML outcomes in
 middle-aged and older adults?

- What are the characteristics of the baseline samples included in the PCML intervention
 studies (e.g., participants' baseline characteristics, eligibility criteria, PCML stage
 assessment)?
- 107

108 Eligibility criteria

109 Participants

110 Studies will be considered for inclusion in this review if there are PCML outcomes reported or if

participants are identified as at the PCML stage. All the participants in the included studies will

112 be middle-aged (45-64yrs) or older adults (65yrs or over).

113 Concept

The concepts of the current review are rehabilitation intervention studies where PCML 114 outcomes were reported or people who reported functional changes consistent with the PCML 115 stage received a rehabilitation intervention. A rehabilitation intervention was defined as any 116 non-surgical or non-pharmacological intervention¹⁶. Studies using a rehabilitation intervention 117 118 as a single-component intervention or as a part of a multifaceted intervention regardless of 119 frequency, intensity, length, and who delivered them will be included. Measurements of PCML 120 stage and outcomes could be either self-reported (e.g. Fried task modification and disability scale, Manty scale, etc.) or physical performance measures (e.g. CS-PFP10, gait speed, etc.) as 121 long as the term of PCML or synonym (e.g. preclinical disability, subclinical disability, etc.) as 122 indicated explicitly in the studies. 123

124 Context

125 The present review will consider the studies conducted in any setting, including community-

dwelling, hospital settings (e.g. emergency room, hospital admission, rehab center, etc.), or

127 institutional settings (e.g. long-term care, supported housing, etc.).

5

128 Types of study to be included

129 This scoping review will consider experimental and quasi-experimental study designs, including

- 130 randomized controlled trials (RCTs), non-randomized controlled trials (NRS), controlled clinical
- 131 trials, pre-post studies, and interrupted time series studies. In addition, uncontrolled
- 132 longitudinal studies, case studies, registered trials, and protocols will also be considered for
- inclusion. Review papers will also be used to identify original studies. Two reviewers will
- 134 scrutinize the reference lists of eligible review papers to determine additional studies for review.
- 135 Abstract-only publications will not be considered for inclusion.
- 136

137 Method

- 138 The first methodological framework for scoping reviews was developed by Arksey and
- 139 O'Malley¹⁷. It then further developed over the years and was extended by Levac et al.¹⁸. The
- 140 proposed scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping
- 141 reviews which a working group developed from JBI and the JBI Collaboration (JBIC)¹⁹⁻²⁰.

142 Search strategy

A search will be conducted in seven databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, AMED, PsycINFO, CINAHL, 143 Web of Science and Cochrane CENTRAL) to locate relevant intervention studies (English 144 evidence from inception to March 19, 2022). The search strategy will be generated using the 145 PCC framework (Population, Concept, Context) and refined after consulting with a McMaster 146 147 research librarian. The text words included in the titles and abstracts of relevant papers and the index terms used to describe the papers were used to develop a complete search strategy 148 149 for Ovid MEDLINE (see Appendix I). The search strategy will be adapted for each database, including all identified keywords and index terms. In addition, a manual search from the 150 reference list of retrieved papers and review articles will also be performed for additional 151 studies. 152

153 Study selection

After the search is completed, all identified citations will be collated and uploaded into 154 155 Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). Duplicate records will be removed 156 in Covidence. Before screening all retrieved articles, two reviewers will conduct a pilot test of the eligibility criteria on the first 20 articles in alphabetical order of the author's last name. The 157 eligibility criteria will be modified as necessary for clarity based on the experience with the pilot 158 test. After the pilot test, two reviewers will independently review titles, abstracts, and full texts 159 of potential articles. Reasons for excluding sources of evidence in full text that do not meet the 160 inclusion criteria will be recorded and reported in the scoping review. Any disagreements about 161 study selection will be resolved by discussion or consensus involving a third reviewer. The 162 163 research results will be reported in full in the final scoping review in JBI Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR) flow 164 diagram²¹. 165

166 Data extraction

Two reviewers will conduct the data extraction to reduce errors and bias. A data extraction table 167 will be developed, pilot-tested, revised and finalized to ensure all records are extracted with the 168 same criteria. The data extracted will include the author's last name, publication year, types of 169 study, sample size, participants' characteristics (age, gender, setting) by groups (intervention vs. 170 171 comparator), and specific details about the interventions (e.g. content, length and frequency, 172 single or multifaceted, outcomes reported). A draft extraction form is provided (see Appendix II). Any modifications to the data extraction form will be detailed in the review. If appropriate, 173 authors of articles will be contacted to request missing or additional data. 174

175 Data analysis and presentation

The extracted data will be presented in tabular form that aligns with the research questions of this scoping review. Interventions will be presented by listing type, content, length, intensity, frequency, and whether it is delivered as a single method or part of a multifaceted approach. Participants' characteristics will be presented by listing age, gender (% of female and % of male), % of participants identified as at the stage of PCML and the measurements used. Selfreported or physical performance measured PCML outcomes and other outcomes reported in

- 182 the studies will also be presented. A narrative summary will accompany the tabulated results
- and describe how the results relate to the review questions.
- 184

185 References

- 186 1. Webber SC, Porter MM, Menec VH. Mobility in older adults: a comprehensive
- 187 framework. Gerontologist. 2010; 50(4):443-50.
- World Health Organization. International classification of functioning, disability and
 health: ICF. World Health Organization. 2001.
- 190 https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/42407
- Ferrucci L, Cooper R, Shardell M, Simonsick EM, Schrack JA, Kuh D. Age-Related Change
 in Mobility: Perspectives From Life Course Epidemiology and Geroscience. J Gerontol A
 Biol Sci Med Sci. 2016;71(9):1184-94.
- 4. Government of Canada. Federal Disability Report 2011. Retrieved on May 13 2022 from
 https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-
- 196 development/programs/disability/arc/federal-report2011/section1.html#s1a1
- 197 5. Weiss CO, Hoenig HM, Fried LP. Compensatory strategies used by older adults facing
 198 mobility disability. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2007;88(9):1217-20.
- Fried LP, Herdman SJ, Kuhn KE, Rubin G, Turano K. Preclinical Disability: Hypotheses
 About the Bottom of the Iceberg. Journal of Aging and Health. 1991;3(2):285-300.
- Fried LP, Bandeen-Roche K, Williamson JD, Prasada-Rao P, Chee E, Tepper S, Rubin GS.
 Functional decline in older adults: expanding methods of ascertainment. J Gerontol A
 Biol Sci Med Sci. 1996 Sep;51(5):M206-14.
- 8. Mänty M, Heinonen A, Leinonen R, Törmäkangas T, Sakari-Rantala R, Hirvensalo M et
 al.,. Construct and predictive validity of a self-reported measure of preclinical mobility
 limitation. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2007;88(9):1108-13.
- Lorenz RA. Coping with preclinical disability: older women's experiences of everyday
 activities. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2010;42(4):439-47.

209	10. Fried LP, Bandeen-Roche K, Chaves PH, Johnson BA. Preclinical mobility disability
210	predicts incident mobility disability in older women. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.
211	2000;55(1):M43-52.
212	11. Brach JS, Van Swearingen JM, Perera S, Wert DM, Studenski S. Motor learning versus
213	standard walking exercise in older adults with subclinical gait dysfunction: a randomized
214	clinical trial. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2013;61(11):1879-86.
215	12. Day L, Hill KD, Jolley D, Cicuttini F, Flicker L, Segal L. Impact of tai chi on impairment,
216	functional limitation, and disability among preclinically disabled older people: a
217	randomized controlled trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2012;93(8):1400-7.
218	13. Neil-Sztramko S, Smith-Turchyn J, Richardson J, Dobbins M. Impact of a Knowledge
219	Translation Intervention on Physical Activity and Mobility in Older Adults (the Move4Age
220	Study): Randomized Controlled Trial. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(2):e15125.
221	14. Richardson J, Chan D, Risdon K, Giles C, Mulveney S, Cripps D. Does monitoring change
222	in function in community-dwelling older adults alter outcome? A randomized controlled
223	trial. Clin Rehabil. 2008;22(12):1061-70.
224	15. Fried LP, Young Y, Rubin G, Bandeen-Roche K; WHAS II Collaborative Research Group.
225	Self-reported preclinical disability identifies older women with early declines in
226	performance and early disease. J Clin Epidemiol. 2001;54(9):889-901.
227	16. McGlinchey MP, James J, McKevitt C, Douiri A, McLachlan S, Sackley CM. The effect of
228	rehabilitation interventions on physical function and immobility-related complications in
229	severe stroke-protocol for a systematic review. Syst Rev. 2018;7(1):197.
230	17. Hilary Arksey & Lisa O'Malley. Scoping studies: towards a methodological
231	framework, International Journal of Social Research Methodology. 2005;8(1):19-32.
232	18. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the
233	methodology. Implement Sci. 2010;5:69. Published 2010 Sep 20.
234	19. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Munn Z, Tricco AC, Khalil, H. Chapter 11: Scoping
235	Reviews (2020 version). In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). JBI Manual for Evidence
236	Synthesis, JBI, 2020. Available from https://synthesismanual.jbi.global .
237	https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-12

238	20. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Baldini Soares C, Khalil H, Parker D. Chapter 11:
239	Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's
240	Manual, JBI, 2017
241	21. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D et al.,. PRISMA Extension
242	for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med.
243	2018;169(7):467-473.
244	
245	
246	
247	
248	
249	
250	
251	
252	
253	
254	
255	
256	
257	
258	
259	
260	

261 Appendices

262 Appendix I: Search strategy

263

OVID MEDLINE (Search conducted on March 19, 2022)

1	exp Middle Aged/	4669400
2	exp Aged/ or exp "Aged, 80 and over"/	1532743
	((old* or elder* or geriatric*) adj5 (adult* or patient* or person* or people* or men or	
	man or woman or women)).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance	
	word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word,	
	organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare	
3	disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]	888364
4	middle aged.mp.	4684594
5	1 or 2 or 3 or 4	5491201
	((preclinical* or pre-clinical or subclinical* or sub-clinical or incipient* or perceived or	
	early) adj3 (mobility or function* or physical) adj3 (disab* or declin* or limit* or deficit*	
	or dysfunction* or impair* or difficult* or deteriorat* or modif*)).mp. [mp=title,	
	abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-	
	heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol	
	supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique	
6	identifier, synonyms]	2008
	((preclinical* or pre-clinical or subclinical* or sub-clinical) adj (disab* or declin* or limit*	
	or deficit* or dysfunction* or impair* or difficult* or deteriorat* or modif*)).mp.	
	[mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word,	
	floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept	
	word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept	
7	word, unique identifier, synonyms]	622
8	6 or 10	2592
9	5 and 11	1247
10	limit 12 to the English language	1191

264

266 Appendix II: Data extraction instrument

Study identifiers							
Title:							
First Author's last name:	Year:						
Study country:	Funding:						
Study design							
I randomized controlled trial (RCT)		🛛 non-rand	omized controlled trial (NRS)				
I controlled clinical trials		🛛 pre-post	study				
Interrupted time series study		🛾 uncontro	lled longitudinal study				
2 case study	egistered trial		Protocol				
Research purpose/objectives/question	IS						
Participants' characteristics (baseline)							
Inclusion/exclusion criteria:							
Recruitment methods:							
settings: 🛛 community-dwelling	🛛 hospit	al discharges					
Institutional	Others	I others:					
Identified as PCML:	Yes 🛛 R	10	🛙 Not clear				
If Yes, which assessment was used:							
Chronic condition indicated:	Yes 🛛 🕅	10	Not clear				
If Yes, which condition was indicated:							
For RCTs or NRS							
Sample size:	Intervention group:						
	Control/comparator group:						
Age (Mean, SD):	Intervention group:						
	Control/compa	arator group:					
Gender (F %, M %):	Intervention group:						
	Control/comp	arator group:					

For pre-post or other studies					
Sample size:	Drop out % and reasons:				
Age (Mean, SD):	Gender (F %, M %):				
Interventions					
Types: 🛛 🛛 educational	exercise Image: Others:				
Approach: I single-component	Imultifaceted				
content	Intervention group:				
	Control/comparator group:				
Length/Frequency/duration	Intervention group:				
	Control/comparator group:				
Mode of delivery	Intervention group:				
	Control/comparator group:				
Characteristics of the deliverers	Intervention group:				
	Control/comparator group:				
Outcomes					
PCML outcomes reported: 2 Y	es 🛛 No 🖓 Not clear				
If Yes, what outcomes were used to measure PCML changes:					
outcomes reported in association with P	CML outcomes: 2 Yes 2 No 2 Not clear				
If Yes, what outcomes were reported:					
Results					
Conclusions					
Strength and limitations					

267 Reviewer's name:

Data extraction date: