

TITLE: Effects of a clinical decision support system and patient portal for preventing medication-related falls in older fallers: Protocol of a cluster randomized controlled trial with embedded process and economic evaluations (ADFICE_IT)

FULL NAMES AND INSTITUTIONAL ADDRESSES FOR ALL AUTHORS:

Kelly K. de Wildt* (2, 4)

Bob van de Loo* (2, 3, 4)

Annemiek J. Linn (1)

Stephanie K. Medlock (2, 5)

Sara S. Groos (1)

Kim J. Ploegmakers (2, 4)

Lotta J. Seppala (2, 4)

Judith E. Bosmans (6)

Ameen Abu-Hanna (2, 5)

Julia C.M. van Weert (1)

Natasja M. van Schoor (2, 3)

Nathalie van der Velde (2, 4)

on behalf of the ADFICE_IT study team

* Kelly de Wildt and Bob van de Loo are shared first co-authors

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: n.vandervelde@amsterdamumc.nl

Affiliations

1 Amsterdam School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

2 Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

3 Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data Science, De Boelelaan 1117, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

4 Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Internal Medicine, Section of Geriatric
Medicine, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

5 Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Department of Medical Informatics,
Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

6 Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam
Public Health Research Institute, Van der Boechorststraat 7, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT:

Background: Falls are the leading cause of injury-related mortality and hospitalization among adults aged ≥ 65 years. An important modifiable fall-risk factor is use of fall-risk increasing drugs (FRIDs). However, deprescribing is not always attempted or performed successfully. The ADFICE_IT trial evaluates the combined use of a clinical decision support system (CDSS) and a patient portal for optimizing the deprescribing of FRIDs in older fallers. The intervention aims to optimize and enhance shared decision making (SDM) and consequently prevent injurious falls and reduce healthcare-related costs.

Methods: A multicenter, cluster-randomized controlled trial with process evaluation will be conducted among hospitals in the Netherlands. We aim to include 856 individuals aged ≥ 65 years that visit the falls clinic due to a fall. The intervention comprises the combined use of a CDSS and a patient portal. The CDSS provides guideline-based advice with regard to deprescribing and an individual fall-risk estimation, as calculated by an embedded prediction model. The patient portal provides educational information and a summary of the patient's consultation. Hospitals in the control arm will provide care-as-usual. Fall-calendars will be used for measuring the time to first injurious fall (primary outcome) and secondary fall outcomes during one year. Other measurements will be conducted at baseline, 3, 6, and 12 months and include quality of life, cost-effectiveness, feasibility, and shared decision-making measures. Data will be analyzed according to the intention-to-treat principle. Difference in time to injurious fall between the intervention and control group will be analyzed using multilevel Cox regression.

Discussion: The findings of this study will add valuable insights about how digital health informatics tools that target physicians and older adults can optimize deprescribing and support SDM. We expect the CDSS and patient portal to aid in deprescribing of FRIDs, resulting in a reduction in falls and related injuries.

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT05449470 (7-7-2022)

Keywords: fall prevention, fall-risk increasing drugs (FRIDs), older patients, outpatient clinic, prediction model, Clinical decision support system, patient portal, Shared Decision Making (SDM), randomized controlled trial (RCT), study protocol

Participant recruitment: 7 July 2022-ongoing *

* Results of this study have not yet been published or submitted to any journal.

Protocol version: 1

Trial sponsor: Amsterdam UMC, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam

Background

Falling among adults aged 65 years and older represents a serious public health problem. Approximately 30% of adults aged 65 or older falls each year. Moreover, falls are the leading cause of injury-related mortality and hospitalization, with one out of five falls resulting in severe injury (1). In the Western European region, 8.4 million adults aged 70 and older sought medical attention due to a fall-related injury, and 54 504 older adults died due to falls in 2017 alone (2). The incidence rate of fall-related injuries increases substantially with age (2).

Besides physical injuries such as head wounds and fractures (3,4), falls can also lead to the development of fear of falling (5,6), reduced perceived quality of life (7), reduced physical activity (8), physical decline (9), social isolation (10), increased healthcare utilization, and institutionalization (9,11,12). Furthermore, falls pose a substantial economic burden as fall-related costs are estimated to amount to 0.85 to 1.5 percent of the total healthcare expenditures in Western countries (13).

Falls have a complex etiology and are associated with several risk factors, such as history of falls (14), impaired mobility (14), frailty (15), chronic health conditions (16), fear of falling (17), depression (18), cognitive impairment (19), increasing age (18), and female gender (18). In addition, a

large body of research has linked the use of certain medications to falls (20–22). Medications recognized as fall-risk increasing drugs (FRIDs) include antipsychotics, antidepressants, diuretics, and opioids (23). Studies have reported that 65 to 93 percent of older adults admitted with fall-related injuries use at least one FRID (24). Antidepressants were the most commonly used FRID at the time of the fall-related injury, with a prevalence between 15 and 40 percent (24).

Despite the growing evidence on medication as an important modifiable risk factor, deprescribing in older adults is often not attempted or performed unsuccessfully. Physicians generally find deprescribing challenging since it requires complex decision-making in the context of polypharmacy and multi-morbidity (25). To be precise, physicians find it difficult to identify which patients are at risk of a medication-related fall and it is not always clear which medications should be considered for withdrawal and whether safer alternatives are available. Moreover, patients' beliefs regarding their medication use may further hinder effective FRIDs deprescribing. Research indicates patients are generally not concerned about possible adverse effects from their regular medication and not aware of medication management as an effective fall-prevention strategy (26,27). More effective communication may help raise awareness and consequently prompt patients to adopt to and comply with deprescribing as a treatment option. Moreover, communication is a two-way process and research suggests that interventions targeting both physicians and patients may be more effective than interventions that only target either one (28). Given these multifaceted complications, a multicomponent intervention is expected to improve FRIDs deprescribing in older adults and thereby help prevent medication-related falls.

There is growing attention for the role of SDM in deprescribing (29–31). SDM can be defined as an approach where clinicians and patients share the best available evidence when making decisions. In doing so, patients are supported to consider options and to achieve informed preferences (32). In complex patient cases with multiple treatment options, as is often the case in deprescribing in older adults, SDM has been found to lead to more informed decision-making, better participation in decision-making, more self-efficacy, increased knowledge, and reduced decisional conflict of patients in disadvantaged groups, such as older patients (33–35). Therefore, it is expected that enhanced SDM would support the FRIDs deprescribing process as well as improve patient compliance and adherence

to the new treatment plan. This, in turn, may lead to a decrease in medication-related falls among older adults.

Clinical decision support systems (CDSS) may help physicians in the deprescribing process of FRIDs and may stimulate SDM. A CDSS is a computerized system that aims to support clinical-decision making by generating assessments or recommendations based on the characteristics of an individual patient. CDSSs generate patient-specific output based on an existing knowledge base or based on predictive modelling methods. CDSSs are increasingly used for improving adherence to clinical guidelines as well as for preventing prescription errors and checking for drug interactions (36). Use of CDSSs in the prevention of falls has been studied in in- and outpatient settings (37–40). However, these studies were all limited in scope as they focused on a select number of FRIDs, did not use utilize predictive modelling methods for generating patient-specific output, or did not address risk communication or shared decision-making (SDM) (37–40).

A tool that could stimulate patients to participate in SDM is a patient portal, which allows patients to access their clinical data through a secure website (41). A recent systematic literature review on the impact of patient portals on health outcomes found that patient portals can enhance preventive behaviors and adherence to therapy (42). Furthermore, a qualitative study revealed that patients thought that a portal would facilitate them in seeking medical advice in between visits (e.g., on medication side effects) and that this would stimulate patient-driven communication (43).

Given this backdrop, the ADFICE_IT project (Alerting on adverse Drug reactions: Falls prevention Improvement through developing a Computerized clinical support system: Effectiveness of Individualized medicaTion withdrawal) was initiated to develop and evaluate a multicomponent intervention for optimizing FRIDs deprescribing and consequently improve patient outcomes. The intervention comprises the combined use of a CDSS and a patient portal. The CDSS includes a personalized fall risk prediction, which is used to estimate and visualizes a patient's fall risk. Furthermore, the CDSS gives insight in which of the patient's medications can contribute to this fall-risk, provides suggestions with safer medication alternatives, provides guideline-based medication advice, and provides an overview of the possible treatment actions. The patient portal provides general fall-related educational information (e.g. information about falls prevention, FRIDs, and FRIDs

deprescribing) and information to help patients prepare for their visit to the falls clinic. After the falls clinic visit, the patient portal will show a summary of the patient's treatment plan as discussed during the consultation. These features of the CDSS and patient portal may help to optimize and enhance (shared) decision making during the consultation. Consequently, it is expected that this will lead to less injurious falls among older adults and reduce healthcare-related costs.

The primary aim of the ADFICE_IT cluster randomized controlled trial is to assess the effectiveness of the multicomponent intervention, comprised of a CDSS and patient portal, compared with usual care. Effectiveness will be assessed in terms of time to first injurious fall (primary outcome). In addition, as secondary aims we will study the cost-effectiveness and feasibility of the intervention.

Methods

The SPIRIT criteria were used as guideline for the reporting of this protocol paper (44) (Supplementary File 1). The *CONSORT 2010 Statement: extension to cluster randomised controlled trials* will be used to further guide the reporting of the results of the trial (45).

The design and the development of the ADFICE_IT intervention was guided by the Medical Research Council (MRC) Framework for Complex Interventions (46). In the preparation phase of the MRC framework, we developed a prediction model for estimating a patient's risk of falling (47). The prediction model is currently being externally validated. In the development phase, we identified evidence and theory regarding CDSS and patient portal end users' preferences and needs, and extended these with empirical research (i.e. survey (48)), interviews) to inform our decisions regarding the design of the intervention. Furthermore, we incorporated guideline- and expert consensus-based medication advices (e.g. deprescribing advice or use of safer alternative medication) in the CDSS (23). In the feasibility/piloting phase of the MRC framework, we tested the usability of the user interface of our intervention through usability studies. The present paper describes the protocol for the final phase of the project in which we will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention.

Study design and settings

To evaluate the effectiveness of our multicomponent (CDSS and patient portal) intervention in preventing injurious falls among older adults, a multicenter cluster-randomized controlled trial will be conducted among new falls clinic patients of ten Dutch hospitals. These patients have been referred for a multifactorial falls assessment to the geriatrics departments by their general practitioner, the emergency department, or other specialists because of a history of falling or an increased risk of falling.

Ethical considerations

The ADFICE_IT study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Medical Ethics review board of the Amsterdam University Medical Centres (METC AMC 2021_061). All study participants will be asked to sign an informed consent prior to data collection. The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (DATE; 7-7-2022, identifier: NCT05449470).

Eligibility criteria

The study population consists of older adults visiting a falls clinic. Falls clinics typically perform detailed multidisciplinary fall risk assessments and make recommendations or implement a range of targeted falls and falls injury-prevention strategies based on the assessment findings (49). Falls clinics at Dutch hospitals that use Epic software (Epic Systems Corporation; Verona, Wisconsin, United States) as their electronic patient record system were eligible to be included as a study center. Patients meeting the following criteria are eligible for inclusion:

- Aged 65 years and older;
- History of at least one fall in the past year;
- A Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score of 21 points or higher or equivalently a Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA) Dutch score of 16 points or higher (50);
- Use of at least one FRID (as defined by the Dutch Federation of Medical Specialists (51));
- Sufficient command of the Dutch language in speech and writing; and
- Willingness to sign informed consent.

Potential subjects will be excluded if they:

- Already participate in another (intervention) study;
- Have a life expectancy of less than one year; or
- Suffer from severe mobility impairment (i.e. bedridden, e.g. inability to walk short distances with assistance of a walking aid).

Participant recruitment has started in July 2022 and is ongoing.

Randomization and blinding

Since the intervention needs to be integrated into the physician's workflow, randomization will be performed at hospital level prior to the start of inclusion. We evaluated use of the CDSS in usability studies among physicians of one of the locations of the Amsterdam UMC, i.e. location AMC. To avoid possible contamination of the intervention, the Amsterdam UMC: location AMC will be exempted from randomization and included in the intervention group by default. To assure the control and intervention hospitals remain similar with respect to their patient population, the other location of Amsterdam UMC, i.e. location VUmc, will be included in the control group by default.

Randomization of the remaining hospitals will be done based on a 1:1 allocation ratio and stratified based on whether the hospital is academic or non-academic. The randomization procedure will be done by an independent statistician using computer-generated random numbers. Blinding of the intervention allocation is not possible since both physicians and patients will have to interact with the CDSS and patient portal. Researchers will be blinded to group allocation during the statistical analyses.

Intervention

The multicomponent intervention comprises the combined use of a CDSS and a patient portal. Furthermore, patients in the intervention arm will receive a Question Prompt List (QPL) prior to their consultation. Physicians in the intervention arm will be trained to work with the CDSS. The control

hospitals will only receive a general overview of the study, including the procedures. Patients in the control arm will receive care-as-usual.

CDSS

Relevant FRIDs were identified based on the Dutch fall guideline (51) and STOPPFall (Screening Tool of Older Persons Prescriptions in older adults with high fall risk) tool (23). These two sources form the foundation for the CDSS' clinical knowledge base. For each class of identified FRIDs, relevant recommendations about deprescribing from more than 30 different Dutch clinical guidelines have been extracted and formalized using the Logical Elements Rule Method (52). Thus, the CDSS provides point-of-care guideline and expert consensus based medication withdrawal advice (23) as well as a personalized fall-risk estimation based on a prediction model (47).

The CDSS will be integrated in the electronic patient record system and workflow of physicians. On the CDSS start page, the physician can check the data that was pulled from the electronic patient record system, and see the patient's estimated risk of falling. On the next screen, the physician can see the advice of the CDSS for each of the patient's prescribed current medications. Based on the given advice, the physician can decide to propose a change in treatment for a specific medication. The physician can discuss those proposed treatment changes with the patient using the consultation screen. The final screen will allow the physician to copy-paste all treatment decisions to the patient's electronic health record, print a patient-friendly summary of the individual treatment plan, and send it to the patient portal.

Patient portal

Patients in the intervention arm will receive access to the patient portal prior to their visit to the falls clinic. At that time, the patient portal provides general fall-related educational information (e.g. information about falls prevention, FRIDs, and FRIDs deprescribing) and information to help patients prepare for the falls clinic visit. After their consultation with the physician during their fall clinic visit, the patients will also receive access to the additional patient portal pages with the personalized fall-risk estimate and the treatment plan as discussed with the physician.

250

251 *Question Prompt List (QPL)*

252 Patients in the intervention arm will receive a printed QPL prior to their visit to the falls clinic. A QPL
 253 is a structured list of questions designed to encourage information gathering, which patients can use as
 254 example questions to ask during the consultation (53). A QPL stimulates agenda setting and helps
 255 patients to remember important questions. In other contexts (e.g. oncology), QPLs have been found to
 256 improve communication and stimulate participation in older patients (53). Our QPL will consist of
 257 preparatory questions and concerns that need to be completed by the patient preceding the consultation
 258 (e.g. ‘Which of the medications that I am currently taking are truly crucial for my health?’). Patients
 259 will be asked to bring it with them to consultation.

260

261 *Training*

262 Physicians will be trained in small groups (i.e., the geriatric staff of a specific intervention hospital) on
 263 how to use the system during a one-hour training session. The training addresses four components: 1)
 264 general overview of the study and its aim, 2) (issues in) FRIDs deprescribing, 3) employing SDM and
 265 the QPL during a consultation, and 4) practical instructions on how to use the CDSS. ADFICE_IT
 266 project team members (i.e., an experienced geriatrician and two communication scholars) will provide
 267 the training. Afterwards, an online version of the training will be available to the physicians.

268

269 **Comparator**

270 Patients treated at the control hospitals will receive care-as-usual, e.g. a multifactorial fall assessment
 271 at a falls clinic. Usually such an assessment takes up around 3-4 hours, distributed over 1 or 2 days,
 272 and is concluded by a consultation between the patient and the physician.

273

274 **Procedures**

275 Patients who schedule an appointment at any of the participating falls clinics (i.e., intervention and
 276 control hospitals) will receive a letter containing information on the objectives and procedures of the

study and an invitation to participate. For patients in the intervention arm, the invitation letter will also include a printed QPL and a link to the patient portal.

At the falls clinic, eligibility will be determined according to the in- and exclusion criteria by the hospitals' staff members. The researcher will then provide oral and written information about the study to eligible patients. Patients who are interested in participating in the study will be asked to sign an informed consent form. Next, the falls clinic assessments will be carried out as usual. In the intervention group, the physician will use the CDSS prior to the consultation to understand a patient's fall risk and medical background as well as during the consultation with the patient. Consultations in the control group are carried out according to care as usual. After the consultation, the research assistants will ask the included patients and their caregivers (if applicable) to fill out a set of questionnaires (see "Data Collection"). After the visit to the falls clinic, patients in the intervention group will be able to review information about their consultation with the physician (i.e., their treatment plan) and their estimated fall risk in the patient portal.

Data collection

We will collect a wide range of quantitative and qualitative data to assess the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness and to evaluate the implementation of the intervention (see Figure 1 for complete overview of measurements). Questionnaires will be administered at baseline and 3, 6, and 12 months after baseline (Figure 1).

Estimating the effectiveness of the intervention on trial outcomes

The primary outcome is time to first injurious fall. An injurious fall is defined as a fall resulting in wounds, bruises, sprains, cuts, medically recorded fractures, head or internal injury, requiring medical/health professional examination, accident and emergency treatment, or inpatient treatment (54). This definition is consistent with moderate and serious injuries, as proposed by Schwenk (2012). Secondary outcomes include number of injurious falls, total number of falls, time to first fall resulting in any injuries (i.e., fall that results in minor, moderate, or severe injuries), total number of falls resulting in any injuries, time to first fall and (health-related) quality of life. Falls are defined as an

unexpected event in which the participants come to rest on the ground, floor, or lower level (55). At baseline, patients in both groups receive a falls calendar to keep track of falls, fall-related injuries, and fall-related healthcare use on a weekly basis for 12 months. The falls calendars will be returned every month by mail. Incomplete, missing or unclear data will be further inquired by telephone. Health-related quality of life is assessed using the EuroQol-5D-5L (EQ-5D-5L) index value, EQ-5D visual analogue scale and the Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Survey Short Form (TOPICS-SF) summary score (56,57). EQ-5D-5L is a standardized instrument for measuring health-related quality of life (58). The health states based on the five EQ-5D-5L domains will be converted to utility scores using the Dutch EQ-5D-5L tariff (56). The TOPICS-SF is a 22-item questionnaire for measuring health-related quality of life, which was developed to evaluate patient-reported outcomes in the context of multidimensional geriatric care (57).

Estimating the cost-effectiveness of the intervention

Societal costs related to the intervention and care as usual will be assessed using the institute for Medical Technology Assessment Medical Consumption Questionnaire (iMCQ) (59) and the institute for Medical Technology Assessment Productivity Cost Questionnaire (iPCQ; Figure 1) (60). The iMCQ is a non-disease specific questionnaire for measuring health care use (59). The iPCQ is a questionnaire for measuring productivity losses of paid work due to absenteeism, presenteeism and productivity losses related to unpaid work (60). Costs will be calculated by multiplying the volumes of healthcare use with the corresponding unit prices. Lost productivity costs will be calculated using the friction cost approach.

Process evaluation

The process evaluation will consist of two parts: a) assessing the feasibility of the intervention and b) evaluating how the intervention facilitates SDM.

Process evaluation: Feasibility

To assess the feasibility of the intervention, we will collect the following: 1) data logged by the CDSS and patient portal, 2) participation data of the CDSS training, 3) physician satisfaction regarding the CDSS, 4) the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM; (61)) questionnaire; 5) the Website Satisfaction Scale questionnaire (WSS (62)), 6) videotaped consultations, 7) pharmacy records, and 8) falls calendar entries.

Usage data of the CDSS and patient portal will be measured throughout the study period. The extent to which the intervention was implemented as intended (fidelity/dose delivered) and the extent to which the participants actively engage with the intervention (dose received/exposure) will be assessed through data logged by the CDSS and patient portal, and the videotaped consultations. Dose received/exposure will also be assessed through participation data of the CDSS training. Reach/participation rate will be assessed through data logged by the CDSS to analyze the extent to which physicians propose changes in FRID prescriptions. Patients will be asked to self-report changes in medication use on the fall calendar on a weekly basis. These falls calendar entries and pharmacy records will be used to analyze the extent to which patients adhere to the physicians' advice and changes in the treatment plan. Satisfaction with the intervention (dose received/exposure) will be measured through physician evaluations of the CDSS and the WSS questionnaire (patients). The TAM questionnaire assesses the perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and intended usage of the CDSS, and the WSS measures the comprehensibility, satisfaction and Emotional Support of the patient portal (62). Finally, barriers and facilitators (context) will be assessed through the videotaped consultations, and physician evaluations of the CDSS by means of a survey.

Process evaluation: Shared Decision Making

SDM will be measured through self-reported questionnaires in the full sample (i.e. perceived SDM; the iSHAREpatient and iSHAREphysician (63). In addition, we aim to measure observed SDM in a subsample (n=50) through videos of consultations (i.e. the Observer OPTION^{MCC} Multiple Chronic Conditions coding scheme (64)). SDM will be assessed in relation to two affective-cognitive outcomes: preparation for decision-making through the Preparation for Decision-making scale (PrepDM; (65)) and decisional conflict through the Decisional Conflict Scale (DCS; low literacy

version; (66)). The ‘Question Format DCS – 10 item 3 response categories’ version of the DCS is recommended to be used for low literacy groups (67). In addition, recall of information will be assessed in the subsample through the Netherlands Patient Information Recall Questionnaire (NPIRQ; (68)). The iSHARE questionnaire will be used to measure perceived SDM from both the patient and physician perspective. The NPIRQ consists of multiple-choice questions, completion items, and open-ended questions related to information about treatment and recommendations on how to handle side effects (68). Patient responses on the questionnaire will be checked against the actual communication in video recordings of the consultations. In addition, the PrepDM will be used to assess how patients evaluate the usefulness of the patient portal and QPL for preparing themselves for communicating with their physician during the consultation. Finally, we will code observed shared (triadic) decision-making between the physician, the patient, and if relevant, the informal caregiver, in the videotaped consultations by using the Observer OPTION^{MCC} Multiple Chronic Conditions coding scheme (64).

SDM will be assessed using questionnaires in the full sample and video observations in a subsample. The subsample of 50 consultations in both intervention and control group will be video recorded to assess the level of SDM. After working with the CDSS for a couple of months, intervention-group physicians will be asked to fill out an online questionnaire about their satisfaction with the CDSS, to indicate whether they thought the advice provided by the CDSS was (sufficiently) accurate, if they perceived any barriers in using the CDSS system, and if they thought the patient perceived barriers in using the patient portal. Pharmacy records will be used to make an inventory of the prescribed medicines for individual patients at baseline and 12 months after baseline to assess adherence.

Data management

Data will be handled confidentially and only a limited number of members of the study team will have access to the complete datasets. The collected and pseudonymized questionnaire data for each local center will be transferred to the Amsterdam UMC, where it will be entered, stored and processed in Castor. In addition, the digital CDSS and patient portal data will be stored locally at each hospital. Every 3-6 months, study data will be extracted to .csv text files and stored in a secured folder.

Furthermore, administrative data will be stored in a secured SQL database. Finally, data from both control and intervention patients will be extracted from Epic every 3-6 months to .csv text files (e.g. medication data, problem lists, relevant lab values, and the prediction model variables). Data from individual patients will be pseudonymized, and the different datasets can only be linked through a participant identification number, which is stored in a separate data system. These data management systems all comply in accordance with the European Union General Data Protection Regulation.

Statistical analysis

Data of the RCT will be analyzed according to the intention-to-treat principle. P-values of < 0.05 will be considered statistically significant.

Estimating the effectiveness of the intervention on trial outcomes

For every participant, we will assess fall incidents during a fixed follow-up period of 12 months, which will start after a set 1 month, during which the dose of FRIDs will be stopped or decreased. Difference in time to injurious fall between the intervention and control group in the follow-up period will be analyzed by means of a multilevel Cox regression model based on hospital level (69). Model fit will be assessed using standard approaches (e.g., the proportional hazards assumption with Schoenfeld residuals). We will adjust all models for age, sex and type of hospital, i.e. academic versus non-academic. In a sensitivity analysis, we will additionally adjust for significant baseline differences. Difference in total number of (injurious) falls in the follow-up period between the control and intervention groups will be analyzed by means of multilevel Poisson regression models based on hospital level. In the case of overdispersion, we will apply either quasi-Poisson regression or negative binomial regression depending on the observed distribution of the data. Difference between the intervention and control group with respect to time to any fall and time to fall that results in any injuries will be analyzed by means of survival analyses, similarly to the primary outcome.

Differences in EQ-5D-5L index score, EQ-5D visual analogue scale, and TOPICS-SF summary score between the intervention and control group after 12 months will be analyzed by means of linear mixed models. These models will be adjusted for the baseline value of the outcome (70).

416

417 *Estimating the cost-effectiveness of the intervention*

418 Differences in costs and effects between intervention and usual care will be estimated using seemingly
 419 unrelated regression to retain the correlation between costs and effects. Incremental cost-effectiveness
 420 ratios will be calculated by dividing the difference in costs between CDSS and usual care due to
 421 differences in incidence in injurious falls as well as gained quality-adjusted life years (QALYs).
 422 Bootstrapping techniques will be used to estimate the uncertainty surrounding the incremental cost-
 423 effectiveness ratios. Uncertainty will be shown in cost-effectiveness planes and cost-effectiveness
 424 acceptability curves.

425

426 *Process evaluation: Feasibility*

427 In the first part of the process evaluation we will evaluate the feasibility of the intervention, and
 428 describe 1) user data, 2) participation in and evaluation of the training, 3) physician and patient
 429 satisfaction and acceptance of the CDSS and patient portal. These descriptive statistics will be
 430 presented as percentages or means with standard deviations.

431

432 *Process evaluation: Shared Decision Making*

433 Differences in mean change between arms will be analyzed with the use of multi-level modelling and
 434 will be expressed as mean differences with 95% CIs. We will analyze differences in perceived SDM
 435 and observed SDM for both patients and physicians in the intervention and control groups. Finally, we
 436 will assess the differences between the intervention and control groups on recall (NPIRQ), adherence
 437 (pharmacy records), and quality of life (EQ-5D-5L).

438

439 **Per protocol analysis**

440 Logged data by the CDSS and patient portal will be used to select participants for a per protocol
 441 analysis for the primary outcome. In this analysis, we will only include patients from the experimental
 442 group that meet the following two criteria 1) physicians used the CDSS in the consult with the patients

and 2) physician used the ‘print’ button in the CDSS or the patient visited the patient portal at least once after the consultation.

Sample size

Sample sizes of $n = 385$ in the intervention and $n = 385$ in the control group (10 clusters with 77 patients in each cluster) are needed to detect a difference in proportion of injurious falls of 0.10 with 80% power. We inferred the proportion of patients who will experience an injurious fall to be 0.22 in the control and 0.12 in the intervention group. In these calculations, we assumed the two-sided significance level of 5% and an intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.01 to account for clustering (71). Presupposing a drop-out rate of 10%, 856 patients will need to be included.

Monitoring

A data monitoring committee will not be established since the overall risk associated with the trial is considered negligible.

Harms

All adverse events and serious adverse events reported by the subject or observed by the researchers or his staff will be recorded in an electronic database. Serious adverse events will also be reported to the medical ethics committee of the Amsterdam UMC.

Discussion

The multicenter RCT described in this paper will assess: a) the effectiveness of the multicomponent intervention (i.e., use of CDSS and patient portal) compared with usual care. Effectiveness will be assessed in terms of time to first injurious fall (primary outcome). As secondary aims, cost-effectiveness and the feasibility of the intervention will be assessed.

The deprescribing of FRIDs requires complex decision making. We expect that the implementation of our CDSS and patient portal, supported by a prediction model and guideline-based

advice, will aid in optimizing deprescribing decisions for both the physician and patient, consequently reducing fall risk. In line with the expectation that the intervention will aid in the prevention of injurious falls, it is hypothesized that the intervention will be more cost-effective compared to care-as-usual regarding fall-related health care costs. The direct healthcare and follow-up care resulting from injurious falls among older adults potentially involve 0.85 to 1.5 percent of the total healthcare expenditures in Western countries (13).

The process evaluation will evaluate a) the implementation of the intervention and b) how this intervention leads to enhanced SDM and patient outcomes. A systematic review has suggested that SDM can lead to better affective-cognitive outcomes, e.g. improved satisfaction and less decisional conflict (72). Thus, we hypothesize that physicians and geriatric patients as well as their caregivers will evaluate the intervention workflow more positively compared to the care-as-usual workflow and will engage in more SDM regarding the patient's treatment plan. Recent studies have illustrated that compliance to FRID-deprescribing is often poor. In a study by Boyé et al. (73), researchers found that compliance to their intervention of FRIDs-withdrawal was limited among patients. The researchers found that 35 percent of all deprescribing attempts were unsuccessful, either due to non-compliance, recurrence of the initial indication for prescribing, or additional medication being described for newly diagnosed conditions. Moreover, the STRIDE trial, a multicenter randomized controlled trial by Basin et al. (74) evaluated a multifactorial intervention that included the use of motivational interviewing to encourage patients to choose recommendations they were willing to address. Among the patients for which medication use was identified as a risk factor, only 29 percent of patients agreed to address this risk. We expect that a higher degree of SDM will lead to more recall and knowledge among patients, leading to more treatment and medication adherence among patients. This in turn, could also lead to less medication-related injurious falls among patients.

An important strength of our study is that we developed the intervention following the MRC guidelines. The aim of the framework is to ensure that feasible interventions are empirically and theoretically founded and that considerations are given both to the effectiveness of the intervention and how it works. The intervention's end-users are included in each phase of the project. This way, we

will be able to optimally personalize the intervention's design to the heterogeneous needs of the end-users.

Another asset of our study is that it includes both an effect evaluation and a process evaluation. This will help us to not only assess whether the intervention was effective, but the process evaluation will also make it possible to assess whether the intervention was implemented correctly, and which implementation factors were facilitating or impeding. Gaining more insight into the context will deepen our understanding of why the intervention was (not) successful.

The findings of this study will add valuable insights about how digital health informatics tools, based on prediction models, can support SDM between physicians and older adults. This new knowledge will be especially insightful in the case of FRIDs withdrawal among older adults. Furthermore, this study will also contribute to the literature on risk communication, since it investigates how physicians will use a visualized fall-risk estimate in their consultations with the patient.

Outlook

If the ADFICE_IT intervention will prove to be effective, it could be implemented in routine healthcare practices. The hospitals in the intervention group can continue using the CDSS and patient portal as they have done during the RCT, as the intervention will already be implemented in their electronic patient record systems. The hospitals in the control group could also implement the CDSS and patient portal software at the end of the study. Furthermore, the software will be available as open source to facilitate national and international implementation. We expect that once implemented at the falls clinic of the geriatric departments, the ADFICE_IT intervention will contribute to individualized and cost-effective prevention of (medication-related) injurious falls among older adults.

Abbreviations

ADVICE_IT: Alerting on adverse Drug reactions: Falls prevention Improvement through developing a Computerized clinical support system: Effectiveness of Individualized medication withdrawal;

CDSS: Clinical decision support system; CI: confidence interval; DCS: Decisional Conflict Scale; EQ-5D-5L: EuroQol-5D-5L; FRID: Fall-Risk Increasing Drug; IMCQ: institute for Medical Technology Assessment Productivity Cost Questionnaire Medical Consumption Questionnaire; IPCQ: institute for Medical Technology Assessment Productivity Cost Questionnaire Productivity Cost Questionnaire; MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination; MOCA: Montreal Cognitive Assessment; MRC: Medical Research Council; NPIRQ: Netherlands Patient Information Recall Questionnaire; PrepDM: Preparation for Decision-making scale; QALY: quality-adjusted life years QPL: Question Prompt List; RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; SDM: Shared Decision Making; TAM: Technology Acceptance Model; TOPICS-SF: The Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Survey – Short Form; UI: User Interface; WSS: Website Satisfaction Scale

Dissemination policy

The results of the ADFICE_IT study will be published in international, peer-reviewed, scientific journals. In addition, results will be presented at (inter)national scientific conferences, seminars, public events, and on the project website.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All project data will be stored in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation. Data from the trial will be made available for other researchers after the study is completed for replication purposes and for original research questions. To obtain data, researchers will need to submit an analysis proposal, which will be evaluated by the ADFICE_IT Steering Group. More information on the ADFICE_IT study can be found at <http://www.onderzoeknaarvallen.nl> (website information is also available in English).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

The ADFICE_IT study is supported by funding from the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development (ZonMw, Grant 848017004), The Hague and the Amsterdams Universiteitsfonds: Gepersonaliseerde Medicatieaanpassing bij Oudere Vallers. The study protocol was reviewed by ZonMW.

Authors' contributions

NvdV, NMvS, AA-H, SM, JCMvW contributed in the conception of the study. All authors have made substantial contributions to the design of the study. BvdL and KKdW wrote the manuscript. All the authors read the draft, made contributions and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable

Authors' information (optional)

Not applicable

References

1. Bergen G, Stevens MR, Burns ER. Falls and Fall Injuries Among Adults Aged ≥ 65 Years — United States, 2014. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2016;65:993–8. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6537a2>
2. Haagsma JA, Olij BF, Majdan M, van Beeck EF, Vos T, Castle CD, et al. Falls in older aged adults in 22 European countries: incidence, mortality and burden of disease from 1990 to 2017. Inj Prev. 2020 Oct;26(Supp 1):i67–74. Available from: <https://injuryprevention.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/injuryprev-2019-043347>

- 579 3. Alexander BH, Rivara FP, Wolf ME. The cost and frequency of hospitalization for fall-related
580 injuries in older adults. Am J Public Health. 1992 Jul;82(7):1020–3. Available from:
581 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1609903>
- 582 4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Home and Recreational Safety Important Facts
583 about Falls [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Apr 15]. p. 10–2. Available from:
584 <https://www.cdc.gov/homeandrecreationalsafety/falls/adultfalls.html>
- 585 5. Jung D. Fear of Falling in Older Adults: Comprehensive Review. Asian Nurs Res (Korean Soc
586 Nurs Sci). 2008;2(4):214–22. Available from:
587 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1976131709600037>
- 588 6. Peeters G, Bennett M, Donoghue OA, Kennelly S, Kenny RA. Understanding the aetiology of
589 fear of falling from the perspective of a fear-avoidance model – A narrative review. Clin
590 Psychol Rev. 2020;79(October 2019):101862. Available from:
591 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101862>
- 592 7. Hartholt KA, Van Beeck EF, Polinder S, Van Der Velde N, Van Lieshout EMM, Panneman
593 MJM, et al. Societal consequences of falls in the older population: Injuries, healthcare costs,
594 and long-term reduced quality of life. J Trauma - Inj Infect Crit Care. 2011;71(3):748–53.
- 595 8. Jefferis BJ, Iliffe S, Kendrick D, Kerse N, Trost S, Lennon LT, et al. How are falls and fear of
596 falling associated with objectively measured physical activity in a cohort of community-
597 dwelling older men? BMC Geriatr. 2014;14(1):114. Available from:
598 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2318-14-114>
- 599 9. Tinetti ME, Williams CS. The Effect of Falls and Fall Injuries on Functioning in Community-
600 Dwelling Older Persons. Journals Gerontol Ser A Biol Sci Med Sci. 1998 Mar
601 1;53A(2):M112–9. Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/biomedgerontology/article-
602 lookup/doi/10.1093/gerona/53A.2.M112](https://academic.oup.com/biomedgerontology/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/gerona/53A.2.M112)
- 603 10. Petersen N, König HH, Hajek A. The link between falls, social isolation and loneliness: A

- systematic review. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2020 May;88:104020. Available from:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167494320300145>
11. Stel VS, Smit JH, Pluijm SMF, Lips P. Consequences of falling in older men and women and risk factors for health service use and functional decline. Age Ageing. 2004 Jan 1;33(1):58–65. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ageing/afh028>
12. Tinetti ME, Williams CS. Falls, Injuries Due to Falls, and the Risk of Admission to a Nursing Home. N Engl J Med. 1997 Oct 30;337(18):1279–84. Available from: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/abs/10.1056/NEJM199710303371806>
13. Heinrich S, Rapp K, Rissmann U, Becker C, König HH. Cost of falls in old age: a systematic review. Osteoporos Int. 2010 Jun 19;21(6):891–902. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00198-009-1100-1>
14. Deandrea S, Lucenteforte E, Bravi F, Foschi R, La Vecchia C, Negri E. Risk Factors for Falls in Community-dwelling Older People. Epidemiology. 2010 Sep;21(5):658–68. Available from: <https://journals.lww.com/00001648-201009000-00020>
15. Cheng MH, Chang SF. Frailty as a Risk Factor for Falls Among Community Dwelling People: Evidence From a Meta-Analysis. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2017 Sep;49(5):529–36. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jnu.12322>
16. Paliwal Y, Slattum PW, Ratliff SM. Chronic Health Conditions as a Risk Factor for Falls among the Community-Dwelling US Older Adults: A Zero-Inflated Regression Modeling Approach. Biomed Res Int. 2017;2017:1–9. Available from: <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/bmri/2017/5146378/>
17. Hadjistavropoulos T, Delbaere K, Fitzgerald TD. Reconceptualizing the Role of Fear of Falling and Balance Confidence in Fall Risk. J Aging Health. 2011 Feb 17;23(1):3–23. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0898264310378039>
18. Ambrose AF, Paul G, Hausdorff JM. Risk factors for falls among older adults: A review of the

literature. *Maturitas*. 2013 May;75(1):51–61. Available from:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.02.009>

19. Muir SW, Gopaul K, Montero Odasso MM. The role of cognitive impairment in fall risk among older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age Ageing*. 2012 May;41(3):299–308. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ageing/afs012>

20. de Vries M, Seppala LJ, Daams JG, van de Glind EMM, Masud T, van der Velde N, et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: I. Cardiovascular Drugs. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2018 Apr 1;19(4):371.e1-371.e9. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1525861017306989>

21. Seppala LJ, Wermelink AMAT, de Vries M, Ploegmakers KJ, van de Glind EMM, Daams JG, et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: II. Psychotropics. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2018 Apr 1;19(4):371.e11-371.e17. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1525861017307843>

22. Seppala LJ, van de Glind EMM, Daams JG, Ploegmakers KJ, de Vries M, Wermelink AMAT, et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: III. Others. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2018 Apr 1;19(4):372.e1-372.e8.

23. Seppala LJ, Petrovic M, Ryg J, Bahat G, Topinkova E, Szczerbińska K, et al. STOPPFall (Screening Tool of Older Persons Prescriptions in older adults with high fall risk): a Delphi study by the EuGMS Task and Finish Group on Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs. *Age Ageing*. 2021 Jun 28;50(4):1189–99. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article/50/4/1189/6043386>

24. Hart LA, Phelan EA, Yi JY, Marcum ZA, Gray SL. Use of Fall Risk-Increasing Drugs Around a Fall-Related Injury in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2020 Jun 17;68(6):1334–43. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jgs.16369>

25. Tinetti ME, Gordon C, Sogolow E, Lapin P, Bradley EH. Fall-Risk Evaluation and Management: Challenges in Adopting Geriatric Care Practices. *Gerontologist*. 2006 Dec 1;46(6):717–25. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/gerontologist/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/geront/46.6.717>
26. Bagge M, Tordoff J, Norris P, Heydon S. Older people’s attitudes towards their regular medicines. *J Prim Health Care*. 2013;5(3):234. Available from: <http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=HC13234>
27. Laing SS, Silver IF, York S, Phelan EA. Fall Prevention Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices of Community Stakeholders and Older Adults. *J Aging Res*. 2011;2011(2):1–9. Available from: <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jar/2011/395357/>
28. Légaré F, Ratté S, Stacey D, Kryworuchko J, Gravel K, Graham ID, et al. Interventions for improving the adoption of shared decision making by healthcare professionals. In: Légaré F, editor. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2010. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006732.pub2>
29. Jansen J, Naganathan V, Carter SM, McLachlan AJ, Nickel B, Irwig L, et al. Too much medicine in older people? Deprescribing through shared decision making. *BMJ*. 2016 Jun 3;353(June):i2893. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.i2893>
30. Weir K, Nickel B, Naganathan V, Bonner C, McCaffery K, Carter SM, et al. Decision-Making Preferences and Deprescribing: Perspectives of Older Adults and Companions About Their Medicines. *Journals Gerontol Ser B*. 2018 Sep 20;73(7):e98–107. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article/73/7/e98/4668532>
31. Thompson W, Reeve E, Moriarty F, Maclure M, Turner J, Steinman MA, et al. Deprescribing: Future directions for research. *Res Soc Adm Pharm*. 2019 Jun;15(6):801–5. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1551741118307757>
32. Elwyn G, Laitner S, Coulter A, Walker E, Watson P, Thomson R. Implementing shared

- decision making in the NHS. BMJ. 2010 Oct 14;341(oct14 2):c5146–c5146. Available from:
<http://www.bmj.com/content/341/bmj.c5146.abstract>
33. Simmons M, Hetrick S, Jorm A. Shared Decision-Making: Benefits, Barriers and Current Opportunities for Application. Australas Psychiatry. 2010 Oct 1;18(5):394–7. Available from:
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3109/10398562.2010.499944>
34. O'Connor AM, Rostom A, Fiset V, Tetroe J, Entwistle V, Llewellyn-Thomas H, et al. Decision aids for patients facing health treatment or screening decisions: systematic review. BMJ. 1999 Sep 18;319(7212):731–4. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10487995>
35. Durand MA, Carpenter L, Dolan H, Bravo P, Mann M, Bunn F, et al. Do Interventions Designed to Support Shared Decision-Making Reduce Health Inequalities? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Malaga G, editor. PLoS One. 2014 Apr 15;9(4):e94670. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094670>
36. Sutton RT, Pincock D, Baumgart DC, Sadowski DC, Fedorak RN, Kroeker KI. An overview of clinical decision support systems: benefits, risks, and strategies for success. npj Digit Med. 2020 Dec 6;3(1):17. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0221-y>
37. Tamblyn R, Egale T, Buckeridge DL, Huang A, Hanley J, Reidel K, et al. The effectiveness of a new generation of computerized drug alerts in reducing the risk of injury from drug side effects: a cluster randomized trial. J Am Med Informatics Assoc. 2012 Jul 1;19(4):635–43. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-lookup/doi/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000609>
38. Kouladjian O'Donnell L, Gnjdjic D, Sawan M, Reeve E, Kelly PJ, Chen TF, et al. Impact of the Goal-directed Medication Review Electronic Decision Support System on Drug Burden Index: A cluster-randomised clinical trial in primary care. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2021 Mar 2;87(3):1499–511. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/bcp.14557>
39. Rieckert A, Reeves D, Altiner A, Drewelow E, Esmail A, Flamm M, et al. Use of an electronic

decision support tool to reduce polypharmacy in elderly people with chronic diseases: cluster randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 2020 Jun 18;369:m1822. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.m1822>

40. Damoiseaux-Volman BA, van der Velde N, Ruige SG, Romijn JA, Abu-Hanna A, Medlock S. Effect of Interventions With a Clinical Decision Support System for Hospitalized Older Patients: Systematic Review Mapping Implementation and Design Factors. JMIR Med Informatics. 2021 Jul 16;9(7):e28023. Available from: <https://medinform.jmir.org/2021/7/e28023>

41. Turner AM, Osterhage K, Hartzler A, Joe J, Lin L, Kanagat N, et al. Use of Patient Portals for Personal Health Information Management: The Older Adult Perspective. AMIA . Annu Symp proceedings AMIA Symp. 2015;2015:1234–41. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26958263>

42. Carini E, Villani L, Pezzullo AM, Gentili A, Barbara A, Ricciardi W, et al. The Impact of Digital Patient Portals on Health Outcomes, System Efficiency, and Patient Attitudes: Updated Systematic Literature Review. J Med Internet Res. 2021 Sep 8;23(9):e26189. Available from: <https://www.jmir.org/2021/9/e26189>

43. Tieu L, Sarkar U, Schillinger D, Ralston JD, Ratanawongsa N, Pasick R, et al. Barriers and Facilitators to Online Portal Use Among Patients and Caregivers in a Safety Net Health Care System: A Qualitative Study. J Med Internet Res. 2015 Dec 3;17(12):e275. Available from: <http://www.jmir.org/2015/12/e275/>

44. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gotzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. BMJ. 2013 Jan 9;346(jan08 15):e7586–e7586. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.e7586>

45. Campbell MK, Piaggio G, Elbourne DR, Altman DG. Consort 2010 statement: extension to cluster randomised trials. BMJ. 2012 Sep 4;345(sep04 1):e5661–e5661. Available from:

<https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.e5661>

46. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2008 Sep 29;337(7676):a1655. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.a1655>
47. van de Loo B, Seppala LJ, van der Velde N, Medlock S, Denkinger M, de Groot LC, et al. Development of the ADF ICE_IT Models for Predicting Falls and Recurrent Falls in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: Pooled Analyses of European Cohorts With Special Attention to Medication. Lipsitz LA, editor. *Journals Gerontol Ser A*. 2022 Jul 5;77(7):1446–54. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/biomedgerontology/advance-article/doi/10.1093/gerona/glac080/6563350>
48. Ploegmakers KJ, Medlock S, Linn AJ, Lin Y, Seppälä LJ, Petrovic M, et al. Barriers and facilitators in using a Clinical Decision Support System for fall risk management for older people: a European survey. *Eur Geriatr Med*. 2022 Apr 15;13(2):395–405. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00599-w>
49. Hill KD, Moore KJ, Dorevitch MI, Day LM. Effectiveness of Falls Clinics: An Evaluation of Outcomes and Client Adherence to Recommended Interventions. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2008 Apr;56(4):600–8. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01626.x>
50. Trzepacz PT, Hochstetler H, Wang S, Walker B, Saykin AJ. Relationship between the Montreal Cognitive Assessment and Mini-mental State Examination for assessment of mild cognitive impairment in older adults. *BMC Geriatr*. 2015 Dec 7;15(1):107. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12877-015-0103-3>
51. Federation of Medical Specialists. Effect of medication on fall risk in older adults [In Dutch: Effect medicijnen op valrisico ouderen] [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Jul 6]. Available from: https://richtlijnendatabase.nl/richtlijn/preventie_van_valincidenten_bij_ouderen/effect_medicijnen_op_valrisico_ouderen.html

52. Medlock S, Opondo D, Eslami S, Askari M, Wierenga P, de Rooij SE, et al. LERM (Logical Elements Rule Method): A method for assessing and formalizing clinical rules for decision support. *Int J Med Inform.* 2011 Apr;80(4):286–95. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2011.01.014>
53. Brandes K, Linn AJ, Butow PN, van Weert JCM. The characteristics and effectiveness of Question Prompt List interventions in oncology: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychooncology.* 2015 Mar;24(3):245–52. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pon.3637>
54. Schwenk M, Lauenroth A, Stock C, Moreno RR, Oster P, McHugh G, et al. Definitions and methods of measuring and reporting on injurious falls in randomised controlled fall prevention trials: a systematic review. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2012 Dec 17;12(1):50. Available from: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/12/50>
55. Lamb SE, J  rstad-Stein EC, Hauer K, Becker C. Development of a Common Outcome Data Set for Fall Injury Prevention Trials: The Prevention of Falls Network Europe Consensus. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2005 Sep;53(9):1618–22. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2005.53455.x>
56. M. Versteegh M, M. Vermeulen K, M. A. A. Evers S, de Wit GA, Prenger R, A. Stolk E. Dutch Tariff for the Five-Level Version of EQ-5D. *Value Heal.* 2016 Jun;19(4):343–52. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.01.003>
57. Santoso AMM, Lutomski JE, Hofman CS, Metzelthin SF, Blom JW, van der Wees PJ, et al. Development of a Patient-Reported Outcome Measure for Geriatric Care: The Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Survey Short Form. *Value Heal.* 2018 Oct;21(10):1198–204. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2018.02.011>
58. Group TE. EuroQol - a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy (New York).* 1990 Dec;16(3):199–208. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0168851090904219>

59. Bouwmans C, Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Koopmanschap M, Krol M, Severens H BW. Manual iMTA medical cost questionnaire (iMCQ) [in Dutch: Handleiding iMTA medical cost questionnaire (iMCQ)]. 2013.
60. Bouwmans C, Krol M, Severens H, Koopmanschap M, Brouwer W, Hakkaart-van Roijen L. The iMTA Productivity Cost Questionnaire: A Standardized Instrument for Measuring and Valuing Health-Related Productivity Losses. *Value Health*. 2015 Sep;18(6):753–8. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2015.05.009>
61. Davis FD. Technology Acceptance Model: TAM. Al-Suqri, MN, Al-Aufi, AS *Inf Seek Behav Technol Adopt S*. 1989;205–19.
62. Bol N, van Weert JCM, de Haes HCJM, Loos EF, de Heer S, Sikkels D, et al. Using Cognitive and Affective Illustrations to Enhance Older Adults' Website Satisfaction and Recall of Online Cancer-Related Information. *Health Commun*. 2014 Aug 9;29(7):678–88. Available from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10410236.2013.771560>
63. Bomhof-Roordink H, Stiggelbout AM, Gärtner FR, Portielje JEA, de Kroon CD, Peeters KCMJ, et al. Patient and physician shared decision-making behaviors in oncology: Evidence on adequate measurement properties of the iSHARE questionnaires. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2022 May;105(5):1089–100. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.08.034>
64. Pel-Littel RE, Buurman BM, van de Pol MH, Yilmaz NG, Tulner LR, Minkman MM, et al. Measuring triadic decision making in older patients with multiple chronic conditions: Observer OPTIONMCC. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2019 Nov;102(11):1969–76. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0738399119302538>
65. Bennett C, Graham ID, Kristjansson E, Kearing SA, Clay KF, O'Connor AM. Validation of a Preparation for Decision Making scale. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2010 Jan;78(1):130–3. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0738399109002328>
66. O'Connor AM. Validation of a Decisional Conflict Scale. *Med Decis Mak*. 1995 Feb

2;15(1):25–30. Available from:

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X9501500105>

67. O'Connor AM. User Manual – Decisional Conflict Scale.

https://DecisionaidOhriCa/Eval_DcsHtml. 1993;1–16.

68. Jansen J, van Weert J, van der Meulen N, van Dulmen S, Heeren T, Bensing J. Recall in Older Cancer Patients: Measuring Memory for Medical Information. *Gerontologist*. 2008 Apr

1;48(2):149–57. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/48.2.149>

69. Austin PC. A Tutorial on Multilevel Survival Analysis: Methods, Models and Applications. *Int Stat Rev*. 2017 Aug;85(2):185–203. Available from:

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/insr.12214>

70. Twisk J, Bosman L, Hoekstra T, Rijnhart J, Welten M, Heymans M. Different ways to estimate treatment effects in randomised controlled trials. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun*. 2018

Jun;10(March):80–5. Available from:

<https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2451865417301849>

71. Adams G, Gulliford MC, Ukoumunne OC, Eldridge S, Chinn S, Campbell MJ. Patterns of intra-cluster correlation from primary care research to inform study design and analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2004 Aug;57(8):785–94. Available from:

<https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0895435604000459>

72. Shay LA, Lafata JE. Where Is the Evidence? A Systematic Review of Shared Decision Making and Patient Outcomes. *Med Decis Mak*. 2015 Jan 28;35(1):114–31. Available from:

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X14551638>

73. Boyé N. Effectiveness of medication withdrawal in older fallers : results from the Improving Medication Prescribing to reduce Risk Of FALLs (IMPROveFALL) trial. 2016;142–6.

74. Bhasin S, Gill TM, Reuben DB, Latham NK, Ganz DA, Greene EJ, et al. A Randomized Trial of a Multifactorial Strategy to Prevent Serious Fall Injuries. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jul

832 9;383(2):129–40. Available from: <http://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2002183>

Items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set

1. Primary Registry and Trial Identifying Number

Name of Primary Registry, and the unique ID number assigned by the Primary Registry to this trial.

Name of Primary Registry: ClinicalTrials.gov

ID number assigned by the Primary Registry to this trial: NCT05449470

2. Date of Registration in Primary Registry

Date when trial was officially registered in the Primary Registry.

7-7-2022

3. Secondary Identifying Numbers

Other identifiers besides the Trial Identifying Number allocated by the Primary Registry, if any. These include:

- The Universal Trial Number (UTN)
- Identifiers assigned by the sponsor (record Sponsor name and Sponsor-issued trial number (e.g. protocol number))
- Other trial registration numbers issued by other Registries (both Primary and Partner Registries in the WHO Registry Network, and other registries)
- Identifiers issued by funding bodies, collaborative research groups, regulatory authorities, ethics committees / institutional review boards, etc.

All secondary identifiers will have 2 elements: an identifier for the issuing authority (e.g. NCT, ISRCTN, ACTRN) plus a number.

There is no limit to the number of secondary identifiers that can be provided.

Identifier as given by the Dutch Central Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (<https://english.ccmo.nl/>): NL76386.018.21

Identifier as given by the Medical Ethics review board of the Amsterdam University Medical Centres: METC AMC 2021_061

4. Source(s) of Monetary or Material Support

Major source(s) of monetary or material support for the trial (e.g. funding agency, foundation, company, institution).

The ADFICE_IT study is supported by funding from the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development (ZonMw, Grant 848017004), The Hague and the Amsterdams Universiteitsfonds: Gepersonaliseerde Medicatieaanpassing bij Oudere Vallers.

5. Primary Sponsor

The individual, organization, group or other legal entity which takes responsibility for initiating, managing and/or financing a study. The Primary Sponsor is responsible for ensuring that the trial is properly registered. The Primary Sponsor may or may not be the main funder.

The sponsor of this study is the Amsterdam UMC.

6. **Secondary Sponsor(s)**

Additional individuals, organizations or other legal persons, if any, that have agreed with the primary sponsor to take on responsibilities of sponsorship.

A secondary sponsor may have agreed to:

- take on all the responsibilities of sponsorship jointly with the primary sponsor; or
- form a group with the Primary Sponsor in which the responsibilities of sponsorship are allocated among the members of the group; or
- act as the Primary Sponsor's legal representative in relation to some or all of the trial sites.

There are no secondary sponsors.

7. **Contact for Public Queries**

Email address, telephone number and postal address of the contact who will respond to general queries, including information about current recruitment status.

“Note: The information provided in here is functional and not personal, it is recommended to provide institutional and not personal information. By providing this information the registrant consents that the information provided can or may be published on a public website. Once provided the information cannot be redacted or anonymized as a result of new privacy legislation such as the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)”.

Contact: N. van der Velde

Telephone number: +3120 566 9111

Address: Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Internal Medicine, Section of Geriatric Medicine, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, Netherlands

8. **Contact for Scientific Queries**

There must be clearly assigned responsibility for scientific leadership to a named Principal Investigator. The PI may delegate responsibility for dealing with scientific enquiries to a scientific contact for the trial. This scientific contact will be listed in addition to the PI.

“Note: The information provided in here is functional and not personal, it is recommended to provide institutional and not personal information. By providing this information the registrant consents that the information provided can or may be published on a public website. Once provided the information cannot be redacted or anonymized as a result of new privacy legislation such as the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)”.

The contact for scientific queries must include:

- Name and title, email address, telephone number, postal address and affiliation of the Principal Investigator, and;

- Email address, telephone number, postal address and affiliation of the contact for scientific queries about the trial (if applicable). The details for the scientific contact may be generic (that is, there does not need to be a named individual): e.g. a generic email address for research team members qualified to answer scientific queries.

Contact: Prof. Dr. Nathalie van der Velde

Telephone number: +3120 566 9111

Address: Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Internal Medicine, Section of Geriatric Medicine, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, Netherlands

9. Public Title

Title intended for the lay public in easily understood language.

A Clinical Decision Support System and Patient Portal for Preventing Medication-related Falls in Older Patients

10. Scientific Title

Scientific title of the study as it appears in the protocol submitted for funding and ethical review. Include trial acronym if available.

A Clinical Decision Support System and Patient Portal for Preventing Medication-related Falls in Older Patients (ADFICE_IT)

11. Countries of Recruitment

The countries from which participants will be, are intended to be, or have been recruited at the time of registration.

Netherlands

12. Health Condition(s) or Problem(s) Studied

Primary health condition(s) or problem(s) studied (e.g., depression, breast cancer, medication error).

If the study is conducted in healthy human volunteers belonging to the target population of the intervention (e.g. preventive or screening interventions), enter the particular health condition(s) or problem(s) being prevented.

Prevention of medication-related injurious falls.

13. Intervention(s)

For each arm of the trial record a brief intervention name plus an intervention description.

Intervention Name: For drugs use generic name; for other types of interventions provide a brief descriptive name.

- For investigational new drugs that do not yet have a generic name, a chemical name, company code or serial number may be used on a temporary basis. As

soon as the generic name has been established, update the associated registered records accordingly.

- For non-drug intervention types, provide an intervention name with sufficient detail so that it can be distinguished from other similar interventions.

Intervention Description: Must be sufficiently detailed for it to be possible to distinguish between the arms of a study (e.g. comparison of different dosages of drug) and/or among similar interventions (e.g. comparison of multiple implantable cardiac defibrillators). For example, interventions involving drugs may include dosage form, dosage, frequency and duration.

If the intervention is one or more drugs then use the International Non-Proprietary Name for each drug if possible (not brand/trade names). For an unregistered drug, the generic name, chemical name, or company serial number is acceptable.

If the intervention consists of several separate treatments, list them all in one line separated by commas (e.g. "low-fat diet, exercise").

For controlled trials, the identity of the control arm should be clear. The control intervention(s) is/are the interventions against which the study intervention is evaluated (e.g. placebo, no treatment, active control). If an active control is used, be sure to enter in the name(s) of that intervention, or enter "placebo" or "no treatment" as applicable. For each intervention, describe other intervention details as applicable (dose, duration, mode of administration, etc).

Intervention Name: ADFICE_IT CDSS and Patient Portal for optimizing deprescribing of fall-risk-increasing drugs

In this study we will evaluate the effect of an intervention comprised of the combined use of a clinical decision support system and a patient portal for optimizing the deprescribing of FRIDs in older fallers. Patients in the control arm will receive care-as-usual.

14. Key Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participant selection, including age and sex. Other selection criteria may relate to clinical diagnosis and co-morbid conditions; exclusion criteria are often used to ensure patient safety.

If the study is conducted in healthy human volunteers not belonging to the target population (e.g. a preliminary safety study), enter "healthy human volunteer".

Patients meeting the following criteria are eligible for inclusion:

- Aged 65 years and older;
- History of at least one fall in the past year;

- A Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) score of 21 points or higher or equivalently a Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MOCA) Dutch score of 16 points or higher (50);
- Use of at least one FRID (as defined by the Dutch Federation of Medical Specialists (51));
- Sufficient command of the Dutch language in speech and writing; and
- Willingness to sign informed consent.

Potential subjects will be excluded if they:

- Already participate in another (intervention) study;
- Have a life expectancy of less than one year; or
- Suffer from severe mobility impairment (i.e. bedridden, e.g. inability to walk short distances with assistance of a walking aid).

15. Study Type

Study type consists of:

- Type of study (interventional or observational)
- Study design including:
 - Method of allocation (randomized/non-randomized)
 - Masking (is masking used and, if so, who is masked)
 - Assignment (single arm, parallel, crossover or factorial)
 - Purpose
- Phase (if applicable)

For randomized trials: the allocation concealment mechanism and sequence generation will be documented.

This study is a a multicenter, cluster-randomized controlled trial. Masking will not be used. Assignment will be at random and at the level of the cluster.

16. Date of First Enrollment

Anticipated or actual date of enrolment of the first participant.

The first patient was enrolled on 7 July 2022.

17. Sample Size

Sample Size consists of:

- Number of participants that the trial plans to enrol in total.
- Number of participants that the trial has enrolled.

The trial plans on enrolling 856 participants. A total of 8 participants have currently been enrolled at the point of this submission.

18. Recruitment Status

Recruitment status of this trial:

- Pending: participants are not yet being recruited or enrolled at any site
- Recruiting: participants are currently being recruited and enrolled
- Suspended: there is a temporary halt in recruitment and enrolment
- Complete: participants are no longer being recruited or enrolled
- Other

The status of this trial is: recruiting (participants are currently being recruited and enrolled).

19. Primary Outcome(s)

Outcomes are events, variables, or experiences that are measured because it is believed that they may be influenced by the intervention.

The Primary Outcome should be the outcome used in sample size calculations, or the main outcome(s) used to determine the effects of the intervention(s). Most trials should have only one primary outcome.

For each primary outcome provide:

- The name of the outcome (do not use abbreviations)
- The metric or method of measurement used (be as specific as possible)
- The timepoint(s) of primary interest

Example:

Outcome Name: Depression

Metric/method of measurement: Beck Depression Score

Timepoint: 18 weeks following end of treatment

The primary outcome is time to first injurious fall. Injurious falls will be recorded prospectively over a period of one year, using weekly fall calendars.

20. Key Secondary Outcomes

Secondary outcomes are outcomes which are of secondary interest or that are measured at timepoints of secondary interest. A secondary outcome may involve the same event, variable, or experience as the primary outcome, but measured at timepoints other than those of primary interest.

As for primary outcomes, for each secondary outcome provide:

- The name of the outcome (do not use abbreviations)
- The metric or method of measurement used (be as specific as possible)
- The timepoint(s) of interest

Number of injurious falls [Time Frame: 12 months]

This concerns the total number of injurious falls over the course of 12 months. An injurious fall is defined as a fall resulting in wounds, bruises, sprains, cuts, medically

recorded fractures, head or internal injury, requiring medical/health professional examination, accident and emergency treatment, or inpatient treatment.

Total number of falls [Time Frame: 12 months]

Total number of any fall (I.e. a fall that results in no injuries, or minor, moderate, or severe injuries)

Time to first fall resulting in any injuries [Time Frame: 12 months]

I.e. a fall that results in minor, moderate, or severe injuries

Total number of falls resulting in any injuries [Time Frame: 12 months]

I.e. a fall that results in minor, moderate, or severe injuries

Time to first non-injurious fall [Time Frame: 12 months]

I.e. a fall that results in no injuries

EuroQol-5D-5L (EQ-5D-5L) [Time Frame: at baseline, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months]

The descriptive system comprises five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression. Each dimension in the EQ-5D-5L has five response levels: no problems (Level 1); slight; moderate; severe; and extreme problems (Level 5). Furthermore, it includes a visual analogue scale (EQ-VAS) which provides a single global rating of self-perceived health and is scored on a 0 (worst health imaginable) to 100 (best health imaginable) scale.

The Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Minimum Data Set-Short Form (TOPICS-SF) [Time Frame: at baseline and 12 months]

Data as measured by the The Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Minimum Data Set-Short Form (TOPICS-SF) will be analysed based on the preference-weighted score, ranging from 1.90 to 9.78, with higher scores reflecting a better health status, as perceived by the respondent. The TOPICS - Short Form 2017 including Casemix forms were developed in collaboration with the Nederlandse Vereniging voor Klinische Geriatrie (NvKG - Dutch Association for Clinical Geriatrics) to use as a Patient Reported Outcome Measure (PROM) in the Dutch outpatient and clinical daily practice.

iMTA Productivity Cost Questionnaire (iPCQ) [Time Frame: at baseline, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months]

Direct and indirect costs related to the intervention and care as usual will be assessed using the iMTA Productivity Cost Questionnaire (iPCQ).

iMTA Medical Consumption Questionnaire (iMCQ) [Time Frame: at baseline, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months]

The iMTA Medical Consumption Questionnaire (iMCQ) is an instrument for measuring medical consumption. The iMCQ includes questions related to frequently occurring contacts with health care providers.

Feasibility assessed by number of CDSS and patient portal use [Time Frame: 12 months]

To assess the feasibility of the intervention, the investigators will use data logged by the CDSS and patient portal to understand how (often) the CDSS and patient portal are used

Percentage of physicians attending the CDSS training via a questionnaire [Time Frame: 12 months]

To assess the feasibility of the intervention, the investigators will look at the percentage of physicians who attended the CDSS training. More specifically, this will be measured by asking physicians whether they attended the CDSS training online, offline or not at all as part of the CDSS user satisfaction questionnaire.

Correlation of percentage of physicians attending the CDSS training and CDSS user satisfaction [Time Frame: 12 months]

The correlation between the proportion of a department's staff members who did/did not participate in the CDSS training and user satisfaction regarding the CDSS will be assessed.

CDSS user satisfaction [Time Frame: 12 months]

To assess the feasibility of the intervention, the investigators will study the satisfaction regarding the CDSS (i.e. physician evaluations of the CDSS). Agreement

with satisfaction statements will be scored on a 7-point Likert scale (1= totally disagree; 7 = totally agree).

Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) [Time Frame: at baseline]

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is designed to measure the adoption of a new technology/system based on user attitudes. 6 items aim to measure Perceived Usefulness on a 7-point Likert scale (1=totally disagree; 7 = totally agree), and 6 items aim to measure Perceived Ease of Use on a 7-point Likert scale (1=totally disagree; 7 = totally agree). Intention to use is measured through 1 item on a 7-point Likert scale (1=totally disagree; 7 = totally agree)

Website Satisfaction Scale (WSS) [Time Frame: at 3 months]

The Website Satisfaction Scale (WSS) measures satisfaction with comprehensibility, satisfaction with attractiveness, and satisfaction with emotional support through 12 items, for each sub scale using a 7-point Likert response scale, ranging from 1 'totally disagree' to 7 'totally agree'.

Observer OPTION Multiple Chronic Conditions (OPTION-MCC) [Time Frame: 12 months]

Videotaped consultations will be coded on triadic decision making in older patients with multiple chronic conditions by using the Observer OPTION Multiple Chronic Conditions (OPTION-MCC) coding scheme. Six types of physicians', patients', and caregivers' behaviors are coded. Physicians' behavior is coded on a 5-point scale (0= The behavior is not observed; 4=The behavior is executed to a very high standard), patients' behavior is coded on a 3-point scale (0=No or minimal participation, e.g. only yes or no; 2=Active participation, answers questions and asks questions, brings in own ideas and shares perceptions), and informal caregivers' behavior is coded on a 3-point scale (0=No or minimal participation, e.g. only yes or no; 2=Active participation, answers questions and asks questions, brings in own ideas and shares perceptions)

Rate of adherence to new medication plan using pharmacy records [Time Frame: 12 months]

To assess adherence to the medication advice, the investigators will compare a patient's new medication advice with their pharmacy records to determine whether a patient adheres to the new medication advice or whether they (eventually) change back to their old medication

Number of falls calendar entries [Time Frame: 12 months]

To assess adherence to the medication advice, the investigators will compare the new medication advice with falls calendar entries on medication use to determine whether a patient adheres to the new medication advice or whether they (eventually) change back to their old medication

iSHARE [Time Frame: 12 months]

To evaluate how the intervention facilitates SDM, the investigators will use the iSHAREpatient and iSHAREphysician questionnaires. The iSHAREphysician consists of 16 items scored on a 6-point Likert scale (1= did not do this at all; 6 = completely did this). The iSHAREpatient consists of 16 items scored on a 6-point Likert scale (1= did not do this at all; 6 = completely did this). Dimension scores (range, 0-5) and a total score (the sum of the dimension scores; range, 0-30) for both iSHARE questionnaires will be calculated. The investigators will then apply a linear transformation to obtain a 0 to 100 total score $((\text{score}/30)*100)$. Higher dimension and total scores indicate higher levels of SDM.

Decisional Conflict Scale (DCS; low literacy scale) [Time Frame: at baseline]

To evaluate how the intervention facilitates SDM, the investigators will use the Decisional Conflict Scale (DCS; low literacy scale). This scale consists of 10 questions, scored on 3 response categories (yes, do not know, no).

Preparation for Decision-making scale (PrepDM) [Time Frame: at baseline]

To evaluate how the intervention facilitates SDM, the investigators will use the Preparation for Decision-making scale (PrepDM). This scale consists of 10 items, scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1= not at all; 5 = a great deal)

Netherlands Patient Information Recall Questionnaire (NPIRQ) [Time Frame: 12 months]

To evaluate how the intervention facilitates SDM, the investigators will use the Netherlands Patient Information Recall Questionnaire (NPIRQ). This questionnaire consists of open questions.

21. Ethics Review

The ethics review process information of the trial record in the primary register database. It consists of:

- Status (possible values: Not approved, Approved, Not Available)
- Date of approval
- Name and contact details of Ethics committee(s)

Our study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Medical Ethics review board of the Amsterdam University Medical Centres. The date of approval was: 28/09/2021. The committee can be contacted by mail: mecamc@amsterdamumc.nl

22. Completion date

Date of study completion: The date on which the final data for a clinical study were collected (commonly referred to as, "last subject, last visit").

N/A: data collection is still ongoing.

23. Summary Results

It consists of:

- Date of posting of results summaries

- Date of the first journal publication of results
- URL hyperlink(s) related to results and publications
- Baseline Characteristics: Data collected at the beginning of a clinical study for all participants and for each arm or comparison group. These data include demographics, such as age and sex, and study-specific measures.
- Participant flow: Information to document the progress and numbers of research participants through each stage of a study in a flow diagram or tabular format.
- Adverse events: An unfavorable change in the health of a participant, including abnormal laboratory findings, and all serious adverse events and deaths that happen during a clinical study or within a certain time period after the study has ended. This change may or may not be caused by the intervention being studied.
- Outcome measures: A table of data for each primary and secondary outcome measure and their respective measurement of precision (eg a 95% confidence interval) by arm (that is, initial assignment of participants to arms or groups) or comparison group (that is, analysis groups), including the result(s) of scientifically appropriate statistical analyses that were performed on the outcome measure data, if any.
- URL link to protocol file(s) with version and date
- Brief summary

Data collection is still ongoing. Results of this study have not yet been published or submitted to any journal.

24. IPD sharing statement

Statement regarding the intended sharing of deidentified individual clinical trial participant-level data (IPD). Should indicate whether or not IPD will be shared, what IPD will be shared, when, by what mechanism, with whom and for what types of analyses. It consists of:

- Plan to share IPD (Yes, No)
- Plan description

We plan on sharing the IPD after the trial has been completed, all research data will be made available for other researchers for replication purposes and for original research questions. To obtain data, researchers will need to submit an analysis proposal, which will be evaluated by the steering group.

SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents*

Section/item	ItemN	Description	Page
Administrative information			
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	1
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry	3
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set	32
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier	3
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	Funding, page 21
Roles and responsibilities	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	Authors' contributions, page 21
	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	3
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	Funding, page 21
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	N/A

Introduction

Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	Background, page 3
	6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	Comparator, page 10
Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses	Background, page 6
Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)	Study design and settings, page 7

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23291969>; this version posted July 28, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes

Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	Eligibility criteria, page 7
Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	Eligibility criteria, page 7
Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	Intervention, page 8
	11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)	N/A
	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)	N/A
	11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	N/A

Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	Data collection, page 11
Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	Data collection, page 11
Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	Sample size, page 16
Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	N/A

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions	Randomization and blinding, page 8
Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned	N/A

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292666>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions	Randomization and blinding, page 8
Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	Randomization and blinding, page 8
	17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial	N/A

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.16.23292886>; this version posted July 28, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	Data collection, page 11
	18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols	N/A
Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	Data management, page 14
Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	Statistical analysis, page 15
	20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)	Per protocol analysis, page 16

20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	Per protocol analysis, page 16
-----	---	--------------------------------

Methods: Monitoring

Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed	Monitoring, page 17
-----------------	-----	---	---------------------

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292866>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	N/A
-----	---	-----

Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	Harms, page 17
-------	----	---	----------------

Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	N/A
----------	----	---	-----

Ethics and dissemination

Research ethics approval	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval	Ethics approval and consent to participate, page 20
Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	N/A
Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	Procedures, page 10

	26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	N/A
Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	Data management, page 14
Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	Competing interests, page 20
Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	Data management, page 14
Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	N/A
Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	Dissemination policy, page 20
	31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	N/A
	31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	N/A
Appendices			
Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	*provided in separate document.
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	N/A

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292635>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "[Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported](#)" license.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292866>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Figure 1. Schedule of study procedures and assessments

	STUDY PERIOD				
	Before and during enrolment	Post-enrolment			Close-out
TIMEPOINT	$-t_1$	T_0 (baseline)	t_1 (3 months)	t_2 (6 months)	t_3 (12 months)
ENROLMENT:					
Eligibility screen	X				
Informed consent	X				
Cluster allocation	X				
INTERVENTIONS:					
Training sessions for physicians in intervention hospitals	X				
Use of CDSS and patient portal		X			
ASSESSMENTS:					
Questionnaires					
EuroQol-5D-5L (EQ-5D-5L)		X	X	X	X
Institute for Medical Technology Assessment Medical Consumption Questionnaire (iMCQ)		X	X	X	X
Institute for Medical Technology Assessment Productivity Cost Questionnaire (IPCQ)		X	X	X	X
The Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Survey Short Form (TOPICS-SF)		X			X
iSHARE patient		X			

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292866>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292866>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

iSHARE physician				
Preparation for Decision-making scale (PrepDM)	X			
Netherlands Patient Information Recall Questionnaire (NPIRQ)		X		
Decisional Conflict Scale (DCS)	X			
Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)	X			
Website Satisfaction Scale questionnaire (WSS)		X		
Physicians' Satisfaction with the CDSS				
Other assessments				
Attendance training physicians	X			
Patient portal logs				
CDSS logs				
Videotaped consultations				
Falls calendar				
Pharmacy records		X		X

CDSS, clinical decision support system.