TITLE: Are age-related impairments in change-in-support balance reactions dependent on the method of balance perturbation?

AUTHORS: Avril Mansfield^{a, b}, Brian E. Maki^{a, b, c, d, e}

^aInstitute of Medical Science, University of Toronto, Canada

^bCentre for Studies in Aging, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, Toronto, Canada

^cDepartment of Surgery, University of Toronto, Canada

^dInstitute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering, University of Toronto, Canada

^eToronto Rehabilitation Institute, Toronto, Canada

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Brian E. Maki, PEng, PhD

Centre for Studies in Aging, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre,

2075 Bayview Ave, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4N 3M5

tel: +1-416-480-6100 ext. 3513

fax: +1-416-480-5856

email: brian.maki@sri.utoronto.ca

ARTICLE TYPE: Full paper

KEYWORDS: aging, balance reactions, falls, postural perturbation, stepping, grasping

RUNNING HEAD: Age-related Impairments in Balance Reactions

Word count: 3135

ABSTRACT (word count = 249)

Rapid “change-in-support” (stepping or grasping) balance-recovery reactions play a critical role in preventing falls. Studies investigating age-related impairments in these reactions using differing perturbation methods have shown contradictory results. The discrepancies could be due to the different mechanical and sensory stimuli provided by the different perturbation methods, but could also be due to other confounding factors (e.g. differences in perturbation predictability). This study compared two commonly-used perturbation methods: weight-drop cable-pulls (CPs) and motor-driven surface-translations (STs). For each perturbation-method, effects of aging on the change-in-support reactions were established by comparing 10 young (22-28 years) and 30 older (64-79 years) adults, using large unpredictable multi-directional perturbations similar to those used in previous studies showing age-related differences. Age-related differences in the pattern and spatio-temporal features of the limb movements were examined for stepping and grasping reactions evoked by antero-posterior perturbation of stance, as well as stepping reactions evoked by lateral perturbations delivered while subjects walked “in-place”. Although age-group effects were almost always more pronounced for ST perturbations, the direction of the effect was always the same for both perturbation methods; hence, the perturbation-dependent differences in mechanical and sensory stimuli did not seem to be a critical factor. Perturbation waveform appeared to be a more important factor. For the perturbation methods used here, the ST perturbations were more destabilising than the CP perturbations (leading to a more rapid rise in perturbatory ankle-torque and greater centre-of-mass motion prior to the onset of the postural reaction), and were consequently more effective in revealing age-related deficiencies.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 The ability to react to sudden perturbations is critical to balance control. Of particular
3 importance in preventing falls are change-in-support reactions, involving rapid stepping and
4 grasping movements (Maki and McIlroy, 2006). These reactions are the only defence against
5 large postural perturbations (Shumway-Cook and Wollacott, 1995), but are frequently recruited
6 following smaller perturbations when subjects are allowed to react naturally (McIlroy and Maki,
7 1993b; Jensen *et al.*, 2001).

8 Age-related differences in change-in-support reactions have been studied using cable-pull
9 (CP, e.g. Luchies *et al.*, 1994; Rogers *et al.*, 2001), surface-translation (ST, e.g. McIlroy and
10 Maki, 1996; Brauer *et al.*, 2002), and release-from-lean perturbations (e.g. Thelen *et al.*, 1997;
11 Hsiao-Wecksler and Robinovitch, 2007). Contradictory age-related effects have emerged from
12 these studies. For example, some studies showed that foot-off times were slower in older adults
13 (OA), some showed that young adults (YA) were slower, and some showed no age-related
14 difference (Table 1).

15 The cause of the contradictory findings is unclear. One possibility pertains to differences
16 in perturbation method, which result in differing mechanical and sensory stimuli. For example,
17 CPs apply pressure at the pelvis whereas STs induce shear forces at the foot-sole; therefore, there
18 are differences in cutaneous stimuli. Furthermore, differences in the point-of-application of
19 perturbatory force could affect induced patterns of motion as well as associated proprioceptive,
20 visual and vestibular stimuli (Liu *et al.*, 2003). Differing mechanical and sensory stimuli, and
21 age-related differences in the ability to respond to specific types of stimuli, may influence
22 characteristics of balance-recovery reactions and the degree to which age-related differences are
23 observed. It is also possible that differences in the time-history and amplitude of the
24 perturbatory force affect the degree to which age-related differences emerge; however, few

1 studies have provided details regarding the perturbation waveform and reported amplitude
2 variables can be difficult to compare (e.g. cable-pull force versus support-surface acceleration).

3 The contradictory findings could also be due to differences in the predictability of
4 perturbation characteristics, which could affect the ability to adopt predictive control strategies
5 (Horak *et al.*, 1989; Maki and Whitelaw, 1993). During release-from-lean perturbations,
6 perturbation direction and magnitude are entirely predictable. Unpredictable multi-directional
7 CP and ST perturbations are possible (Henry *et al.*, 1998; Luchies *et al.*, 1999; Maki *et al.*, 2000;
8 Mille *et al.*, 2005; Schulz *et al.*, 2005); however, CP and ST studies have varied in the degree of
9 unpredictability used. Additionally, there are often differing instructions given to subjects,
10 which can have a strong influence on certain features of postural reactions (Maki and McIlroy,
11 1997).

12 This study aimed to determine if previously-reported age-related differences in change-
13 in-support reactions are dependent on perturbation method, under conditions where other
14 confounding factors are controlled. We compared CPs delivered by a weight-drop apparatus and
15 STs delivered by a motor-driven motion-platform, using perturbation parameters (weight-drop
16 magnitude/distance, platform-acceleration profile) similar to previous studies (e.g. Luchies *et al.*,
17 1994; McIlroy and Maki, 1996). In each case, we gave the same instructions to subjects and
18 varied the perturbation features in an unpredictable manner. We hypothesised that both
19 perturbation methods would reveal the same fundamental age-related deficiencies. However, we
20 also suspected that the two methods would exhibit differences in perturbation waveform that
21 could influence the degree to which these deficiencies are revealed. To explore this possibility,
22 we developed a simple model to compare the time-history of the perturbatory torque and also
23 analysed differences in evoked center-of-mass (COM) motion.

METHODS

We recruited 10 YA (22-28 years; five men; height 1.63-1.83m; weight 57-104kg) and 30 community-dwelling OA with a history of falls or instability (64-79 years; 15 men; height 1.51-1.82m; weight 52-118kg). Subjects were right-handed with no neuromusculoskeletal conditions adversely affecting daily activities. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board and subjects provided written informed consent. The OA were participants in a balance-training study; the pre-training data presented here are also reported as part of that study (Mansfield *et al.*, 2008).

As detailed previously (Mansfield *et al.*, 2007), subjects either stood or walked in-place on a large (2x2m) multi-axis motion platform that delivered ST perturbations (Figure 1). Multi-axis CP perturbations were delivered using a weight-drop system connected to a belt (worn at the height of the anterior-superior iliac spines) via cables and pulleys. The CP system was mounted on the motion platform, allowing perturbation method, direction and timing to be varied unpredictably from trial-to-trial. After 12 initial familiarisation trials, subjects completed three trial blocks focussing on: 1) stepping evoked by antero-posterior (AP) perturbation of stance; 2) stepping evoked by medio-lateral (ML) perturbation while walking in-place; and 3) grasping reactions evoked by backward perturbation of stance (Table 2). The walk-in-place task was used in ML-step trials because previous work has shown that this task exacerbates age-related problems in avoiding collision between the swing and stance limbs (Maki *et al.*, 2000).

Three force-plates recorded ground-reaction forces (Figure 1), a three-dimensional motion-capture system recorded coordinates of markers on the feet and arms, and four video cameras recorded gross motor behaviours. Force-sensing resisters recorded handrail-contact and load cells recorded the CP force and safety-harness loading. Accelerometers and a linear potentiometer measured motion-platform acceleration and displacement. The accelerometer

1 signals were used to correct force-plate measures for inertial artifacts arising from platform
2 motion (Maki, 1987). Surface electromyographic (EMG) activity was recorded bilaterally from
3 tibialis anterior, medial gastrocnemius, medial deltoid, and biceps brachii. All signals were low-
4 pass filtered (10Hz) and sampled at 200Hz, except the video (sampled at 60Hz) and EMG (band-
5 pass filtered 10-500Hz, sampled at 1000Hz).

6 To compare the destabilising effect of CP and ST perturbations, COM displacement and
7 velocity were calculated for AP-perturbation trials (trial-block #1), by integrating the net AP-
8 force acting on the body (Figure 2). An inverted-pendulum model estimated the perturbatory
9 ankle-torque resulting from each perturbation-method (Figure 3).

10 Outcome measures were those used in previous studies examining age-related differences
11 in change-in-support reactions. AP- and ML-step reactions (trial-blocks #1 and #2, respectively)
12 were characterised by: frequency of multi-step reactions, stepping pattern, and frequency of arm
13 reactions (despite instructions not to move arms). We also determined the frequency of “extra”
14 lateral steps (AP perturbations, trial-block #1) and frequency of collisions between the swing-
15 and stance-limb (ML perturbations, trial-block #2). All of the above were detected from the
16 kinematic data and confirmed by inspection of the videos. For the initial step in each trial (AP
17 perturbations, trial-block #1), we also analysed: 1) onset of preceding ankle-muscle activation
18 (the “automatic postural response”; (Nashner and Cordo, 1981)); 2) foot-off and foot-contact
19 times; 3) occurrence of “anticipatory postural adjustments” (APAs, defined by an initial lateral
20 centre-of-pressure excursion $>4\text{mm}$ toward the swing limb prior to unloading; (McIlroy and
21 Maki, 1999)); and 4) step length and width. For grasping trials (trial-block #3), we analysed
22 biceps and medial-deltoid latencies, and handrail-contact time. Harness-assisted recoveries
23 (harness-loading $>20\%$ body weight) were analysed for all trials. Timing measures were
24 determined relative to perturbation-onset (surface acceleration $>0.1\text{m/s}^2$; cable force $>5\text{N}$).

1 EMG onset latencies were determined by a computer algorithm (McIlroy and Maki, 1993a) and
2 confirmed by visual inspection.

3 Data from each perturbation-method were first examined separately, using a one-way
4 repeated-measures ANOVA to determine if there were significant age-group effects. The
5 strength of the age-effect was quantified by calculating the “effect size” (i.e. difference in OA
6 and YA means divided by pooled standard deviation). Two-way repeated-measures ANOVA,
7 with age-group and perturbation-method as factors, was then used to examine the age-by-method
8 interaction to determine if the age-effect was dependent on perturbation-method. Data were rank-
9 transformed prior to analysis, to avoid errors arising from violation of assumptions underlying
10 the ANOVA (Conover and Iman, 1981).

12 RESULTS

13 The model revealed a more rapid rise in the initial perturbatory ankle-torque generated by
14 STs, compared to CPs, although the peak torque amplitude was similar (Figure 3). Later phases
15 of the perturbations also differed. For STs, the initial perturbatory torque resulting from the
16 support-surface acceleration was followed by a perturbation in the opposite direction due to
17 surface deceleration. Conversely, each CP provided a unidirectional perturbation.

18 Analysis of COM motion (AP-perturbation trials) confirmed the more rapid rise in
19 destabilizing effect of STs; COM displacement and velocity 100ms after perturbation-onset
20 (before the postural reaction) were higher for STs than CPs (p-values<0.0001; Table 3).
21 Conversely, COM displacement at foot-off and foot-contact time was larger in CP-trials (p-
22 values<0.0001). CP-trials also showed higher COM velocity at foot-contact (p-values<0.0001);
23 however, at foot-off, this trend was only seen in YA “backward-fall” trials (p=0.026), and CPs
24 showed lower COM velocity in OA “forward-fall” trials (p<0.0001).

Age-related differences in change-in-support responses were commonly observed, but were more pronounced in ST-trials (Table 4; Figure 4). A small number of variables failed to show any significant age-effects, in either ST- or CP-trials (frequency of harness-assisted recoveries, swing duration and step width in AP-step trials, frequency of crossover steps in ML-step trials). With one exception (AP step-length), STs revealed statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) age-effects for all remaining variables. CP-trials invariably demonstrated the same age-related trends in these variables; however, the age-effect sizes were smaller and often failed to attain statistical significance. AP step-length was the only variable to show a stronger, statistically-significant age-effect in CP-trials (the age-effect in ST-trials was in the same direction but smaller; Figure 4e).

STs appeared more likely than CPs to cause problems for older adults, evidenced by the higher frequency of: 1) arm reactions (despite constraints on arm movement) during stepping responses (17% ST, 2% CP); 2) “extra” lateral steps in AP-perturbation trials (19% ST, 1% CP); and 3) collisions between the swing and stance limbs in ML-perturbation trials (56% ST, 6% CP). “Floor effects” in these CP data likely contributed to small age-effect sizes (0.09-0.14) and the failure to attain statistical significance.

The dependence of age-effect on perturbation-method was confirmed by two-way ANOVA. These analyses showed a significant age-by-method interaction ($p < 0.05$) for: frequency of multi-step reactions; frequency of arm reactions during stepping trials; and tibialis-anterior latency, step length, step width and frequency of “extra” lateral steps in AP-perturbation trials. In all but one case (AP step-length), the interaction indicated a stronger effect in the ST-trials (Figure 4).

DISCUSSION

Although age-effects were almost always more pronounced in ST-trials, the direction of the age-effect (i.e. whether the variable increased or decreased in OA) was invariably the same for both perturbation methods, as hypothesised. The similar nature of age-effects across two distinctly-different perturbation methods suggests that the specific nature of the mechanical stimulus and associated sensory drive were not critical factors.

The more pronounced age-related differences observed in ST-trials suggest that STs were more destabilising than CPs. Supporting this, our inverted-pendulum model predicted a more rapid rise in perturbatory ankle-torque in ST-trials. Although this was a very simple model, COM data were consistent with the model predictions, showing larger COM displacement/velocity 100ms after perturbation-onset in ST-trials. These COM data primarily reflect the destabilising effect of the perturbation, as the earliest component of the perturbation-evoked reaction occurred ~100ms or more after perturbation-onset.

Interpretation of COM motion at later points is more complicated as this also reflects the influence of the perturbation-evoked reaction. Although there were mixed results at foot-off, COM displacement and velocity at foot-contact were consistently higher for CPs. This could reflect the stabilizing influence of platform deceleration in ST-trials (McIlroy and Maki, 1994). The platform deceleration-pulse began 300ms after perturbation-onset, and hence was likely too late to substantively affect COM motion prior to foot-off (~350-400ms after perturbation-onset) but could have reduced COM motion prior to foot-contact (~500-550ms after perturbation-onset). This may, in turn, have reduced the step-length required to recover equilibrium, thereby decreasing the likelihood of exposing age-related limitations in ability to rapidly generate large steps (Hsiao-Wecksler and Robinovitch, 2007). Such effects could explain the finding that age-related differences in AP step-length were less pronounced in ST-trials; however, this cannot be

determined conclusively from the present data.

The modelling and COM results suggest that perturbation time-course (waveform) was a more important factor than the nature of mechanical and sensory stimuli. Thus, for example, the slower rise in perturbatory ankle-torque generated by CPs allowed OA more time to plan and execute change-in-support reactions, whereas the more urgent need to respond rapidly to ST perturbations would be more likely expose limitations arising from age-related speed-of-processing decrements (Schulz *et al.*, 2006). This is supported by the fact that foot-off, foot-contact, grasping-reaction latency and rail-contact were all delayed in CP-trials (Table 4). The more rapid onset of STs, compared to CPs, may have also contributed to the higher frequency of limb collisions during ML-step trials. In these trials, subjects walked in-place with the perturbation triggered to occur shortly after one foot was lifted. The very rapid initial ML support-surface movement caused the stance leg to move rapidly toward the lifted foot, making it difficult to avoid a collision between the limbs.

The unpredictable trial-to-trial variation in perturbation-method (CP or ST) is unique to this study. Potentially, this higher level of unpredictability could be responsible for some discrepancies between this and previous studies. For example, previous studies have shown very small age-related delays (e.g. <10ms, Woollacott *et al.*, 1986) in onset of early “automatic postural responses” in ankle musculature, whereas the present study showed much larger age-effects (~40-50ms). Conceivably, the higher degree of unpredictability may have impeded the ability of OA to detect onset of instability, compared with other studies.

To facilitate comparison with previous studies, the present findings are included in Table 1. Our findings agree with previous ST studies, with one exception: the present analysis of foot-off times showed more rapid initiation of AP steps in OA, whereas the previous work indicated no significant age-effect for foot-off time (McIlroy and Maki, 1996). The YA foot-off times were

1 quite similar in both studies, whereas our OA initiated more rapid responses than the previously-
2 studied OA. The discrepancy could be due to differences in perturbation unpredictability
3 (greater in the present study) and/or differences in OA cohort (history of instability/falls, no such
4 history in the previous study).

5 For CPs, the present results are supported by previous studies in some cases but not in
6 others. There was mixed support for our findings that AP-step foot-off times were faster in OA
7 and that swing duration was unaffected by age; however, there was agreement with our finding
8 that OA took shorter steps. For ML-step reactions, a previous CP study found that OA favoured
9 crossover steps and that crossovers were associated with a high rate of limb collisions (Mille *et*
10 *al.*, 2005), whereas we found no significant age-effect on frequency of crossover steps and limb
11 collisions occurred rarely in our CP-trials. The ML-step discrepancies could be due to the fact
12 that our ML perturbations were delivered during in-place walking (rather than bipedal stance). It
13 is more difficult to pinpoint the cause of discrepancies in AP-step findings. Possible
14 explanations include differences in: cohort characteristics, perturbation unpredictability,
15 perturbation waveform, instructions, measurement/analysis methods and/or statistical power.

16 Regarding grasping reactions, only one previous study has examined age-related
17 differences; that study used AP ST-perturbations (Maki *et al.*, 2001). The present ST-results
18 agree with these findings, indicating age-related delays in initiation and completion of grasping
19 reactions. The present CP data show trends in this same direction; however, these findings were
20 not statistically significant. The present results also agree with previous ST step-reaction studies
21 showing more frequent arm reactions in OA (Maki *et al.*, 2001), but showed that such arm
22 reactions were very infrequent in CP-trials. This could be due to the less destabilizing nature of
23 the CP waveform, but could also possibly reflect a reluctance, in ST-trials, to rely on stepping to
24 recover balance when standing on an “unreliable” moving surface.

Although we did not include release-from-lean (RFL) perturbations in this initial study, it is evident, from Table 1, that previous RFL studies have yielded substantially different findings. The predictability of the RFL perturbations is likely to be a major contributing factor. Results may also differ because the pre-perturbation ankle dorsiflexion required in RFL tests (up to 40 degrees) may limit the degree to which ankle rotation can occur during the balance-recovery reaction. Furthermore, the forward COM displacement associated with the initial lean posture necessitates either a more rapid step or a larger step distance, in comparison to step reactions evoked when subjects are not leaning (Maki and McIlroy, 1999a). The extreme level of challenge associated with large lean angles may thus explain why RFL studies (Thelen *et al.*, 1997; Wojcik *et al.*, 1999) have been successful in exposing age-related limits on step-initiation speed (not seen in CP and ST studies). Conversely, the age-related increase in step length seen in RFL studies may represent preplanned efforts to compensate for delayed step initiation. Future studies could potentially disentangle confounding effects of perturbation predictability by incorporating more unpredictability into the RFL protocol (e.g. by mounting the RFL apparatus on a motion platform, so that ST perturbations can also be delivered).

The present study is the first to directly compare age-related differences in change-in-support reactions evoked using different perturbation methods. The results are directly applicable to studies using the specific perturbation methods tested (weight-drop CPs and motor-driven STs), but cannot definitively isolate effects due to differences in perturbation waveform versus the nature of the perturbation *per se*. Future studies may take advantage of more sophisticated electromechanical actuators (Pidcoe and Rogers, 1998) to create CP waveforms that more closely match the ST waveforms, allowing the influences due to perturbation type and waveform to be de-coupled.

Another potential limitation of the present study pertains to the single-joint inverted-

pendulum model. This model is a simplification of the multi-segmental motion that can occur during balance-recovery reactions, but has nonetheless been shown to predict stepping behaviour evoked by both CPs and STs (Pai *et al.*, 1998; Pai *et al.*, 2000). We would also emphasize that this model was intended only to provide a means of identifying major differences in perturbation time-course, and was not intended to provide precise predictions of joint kinematics and kinetics. A third limitation is that the comparison of COM motion was restricted to AP-perturbations. We elected not to analyze COM motion evoked by ML perturbation, in this study, because the interpretation of these data is complicated by variation in: 1) pattern of stepping (crossover versus side-step); 2) occurrence of collisions between the swing and stance limb; and 3) ML COM velocity at time of perturbation-onset (due to variability in the “walk-in-place” pattern). The degree to which the two perturbation methods induce different patterns of ML COM motion remains to be addressed in future studies.

In conclusion, the present results indicate that age-related differences in the control of perturbation-evoked change-in-support reactions were not critically dependent on the nature or point-of-application of the perturbatory force, as both of the tested perturbation-methods consistently yielded the same direction of age-effect. The strength of the effect, however, appeared to be highly dependent on the perturbation waveform, i.e. features such as rise-time and phase-reversal (e.g. due to support-surface deceleration). For the specific ST and CP waveforms tested here, the ST perturbations were more effective in revealing age-related differences.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (grant #NET-54025) and the Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation (summer internship #ONF2007-PREV-INT-452). The authors wish to acknowledge Tracy Lee, Adam Sobchak and James Tung (who designed and built the cable-pull perturbation system) and Areeba Adnan, Kenneth Cheng, Emily King, Aaron Marquis and Amy Peters (who assisted with data collection and processing).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Brauer, S. G., Wollacott, M., Shumway-Cook, A., 2002. The influence of a concurrent task on the compensatory stepping response to a perturbation in balance-impaired healthy elders. *Gait and Posture* 15, 83-93.
- Conover, W. J., Iman, R. L., 1981. Rank transformations as a bridge between parametric and nonparametric statistics. *The American Statistician* 35, 124-129.
- Drillis, R., Contini, R., 1966. Body segment parameters. New York, New York, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.
- Henry, S. M., Fung, J., Horak, F. B., 1998. EMG responses to maintain stance during multidirectional surface translations. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 80, 1939-1950.
- Horak, F. B., Diener, H. C., Nashner, L. M., 1989. Influence of central set on human postural responses. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 62, 841-853.
- Hsiao-Wecksler, E. T., Robinovitch, S. N., 2007. The effect of step length on young and elderly women's ability to recover balance. *Clinical Biomechanics* 22, 574-580.
- Jensen, J. J., Brown, L. A., Woollacott, M. H., 2001. Compensatory stepping: the biomechanics of a preferred response among older adults. *Experimental Aging Research* 27, 361-376.
- Liu, W., Kim, S. H., Long, J. T., Pohl, P. S., Duncan, P. A., 2003. Anticipatory postural adjustments and the latency of compensatory stepping reactions in humans. *Neuroscience Letters* 336, 1-4.
- Luchies, C. W., Alexander, N. B., Schultz, A. B., Ashton-Miller, J., 1994. Stepping responses of young and old adults to postural disturbances: kinematics. *Journal of the American Geriatric Society* 42, 506-512.
- Luchies, C. W., Wallace, D., Pazdur, R., Young, S., DeYoung, A. J., 1999. Effects of age on balance assessment using voluntary and involuntary step tasks. *Journals of Gerontology* 54A, M140-144.
- Maki, B. E., 1987. A posture control model and balance test for the prediction of relative postural stability with special consideration to the problem of falling in the elderly. PhD thesis, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow
- Maki, B. E., Edmondstone, M. A., McIlroy, W. E., 2000. Age-related differences in laterally directed compensatory stepping behavior. *Journals of Gerontology* 55A, M270-277.

1 Maki, B. E., Edmondstone, M. A., Perry, S. D., Heung, E., Quant, S., McIlroy, W. E.,
2 2001. Control of rapid limb movements for balance recovery: do age-related changes predict
3 falling risk? In: J. Duysens, B. C. M. Smits-Engelsman and H. Kingma.(Eds.), Control of Posture
4 and Gait. International Society for Postural and Gait Research, Maastricht, Netherlands. pp. 126-
5 129.

6 Maki, B. E., McIlroy, W. E., 1997. The role of limb movements in maintaining upright
7 stance: the "change-in-support" strategy. *Physical Therapy* 77, 488-507.

8 Maki, B. E., McIlroy, W. E., 1999a. Control of compensatory stepping reactions: age-
9 related impairment and the potential for remedial intervention. 15, 69-90.

10 Maki, B. E., McIlroy, W. E., 1999b. The control of foot placement during compensatory
11 stepping reactions: does speed of response take precedence over stability? *IEEE Transactions on*
12 *Rehabilitation Engineering* 7, 80-90.

13 Maki, B. E., McIlroy, W. E., 2006. Control of rapid limb movements for balance
14 recovery: age-related changes and implications for fall prevention. *Age and Ageing* 35-S2, ii12-
15 ii18.

16 Maki, B. E., Whitelaw, R. S., 1993. Influence of expectation and arousal on center-of-
17 pressure responses to transient postural perturbations. *Journal of Vestibular Research* 3, 25-39.

18 Mansfield, A., Peters, A. L., Liu, B. A., Maki, B. E., 2007. A perturbation-based balance
19 training program for older adults: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *BMC*
20 *Geriatrics* 7, 12.

21 Mansfield, A., Peters, A. L., Liu, B. A., Maki, B. E., 2008. Evaluation of a perturbation-
22 based balance-training program for older adults: a randomized controlled trial. (in preparation).

23 McIlroy, W. E., Maki, B. E., 1993a. Changes in early 'automatic' postural responses
24 associated with the prior-planning and execution of a compensatory step. *Brain Research* 631,
25 203-211.

26 McIlroy, W. E., Maki, B. E., 1993b. Task constraints on foot movement and the
27 incidence of compensatory stepping following perturbation of upright stance. *Brain Research*
28 616, 30-38.

29 McIlroy, W. E., Maki, B. E., 1994. The 'deceleration response' to transient perturbation of
30 upright stance. *Neuroscience Letters* 175, 13-16.

1 McIlroy, W. E., Maki, B. E., 1996. Age-related changes in compensatory stepping in
2 response to unpredictable perturbations. *Journals of Gerontology* 51A, M289-296.

3 McIlroy, W. E., Maki, B. E., 1997. Preferred placement of the feet during quiet stance:
4 development of a standardized foot placement for balance testing. *Clinical Biomechanics* 12, 66-
5 70.

6 McIlroy, W. E., Maki, B. E., 1999. The control of lateral stability during rapid stepping
7 reactions evoked by antero-posterior perturbation: does anticipatory control play a role? *Gait and*
8 *Posture* 9, 190-198.

9 Mille, M.-L., Johnson, M. E., Martinez, K. M., Rogers, M. W., 2005. Age-dependent
10 differences in lateral balance recovery through protective stepping. *Clinical Biomechanics* 20,
11 607-616.

12 Nashner, L. M., Cordo, P. J., 1981. Relation of automatic postural responses and
13 reaction-time voluntary movements of human leg muscles. *Experimental Brain Research* 43,
14 395-405.

15 Pai, Y.-C., Maki, B. E., Iqbal, K., McIlroy, W. E., Perry, S. D., 2000. Thresholds for step
16 initiation induced by support-surface translation: a dynamic center-of-mass model provides much
17 better prediction than a static model. *Journal of Biomechanics* 33, 387-392.

18 Pai, Y.-C., Rogers, M. W., Patton, J., Cain, T. S., Hanke, T. A., 1998. Static versus
19 dynamic predictions of protective stepping following waist-pull perturbations in young and older
20 adults. *Journal of Biomechanics* 31, 1111-1118.

21 Pidcoe, P. E., Rogers, M. W., 1998. A closed-loop stepper motor waist-pull system for
22 inducing protective stepping in humans. *Journal of Biomechanics* 31, 377-381.

23 Rogers, M. W., Hedman, L. D., Johnson, M. E., Cain, T. D., Hanke, T. A., 2001. Lateral
24 stability during forward-induced stepping for dynamic balance recovery in young and older
25 adults. *Journals of Gerontology* 56A, M589-594.

26 Schulz, B. W., Ashton-Miller, J. A., Alexander, N. B., 2005. Compensatory stepping in
27 response to waist pulls in balance-impaired and unimpaired women. *Gait and Posture* 22, 198-
28 209.

29 Schulz, B. W., Ashton-Miller, J. A., Alexander, N. B., 2006. Can initial and additional
30 compensatory steps be predicted in young, older, and balance-impaired older females in response
31 to anterior and posterior waist pulls while standing. *Journal of Biomechanics* 39, 1444-1453.

1 Shumway-Cook, A., Wollacott, M., 1995. Motor control: theory and practical
2 applications. Baltimore, Williams & Wilkins.

3 Thelen, D. G., Wojcik, L. A., Schultz, A. B., Ashton-Miller, J. A., Alexander, N. B.,
4 1997. Age differences in using a rapid step to regain balance during a forward fall. Journals of
5 Gerontology 52A, M8-13.

6 Wojcik, L. A., Thelen, D. G., Schultz, A. B., Ashton-Miller, J. A., Alexander, N. B.,
7 1999. Age and gender differences in single-step recovery from a forward fall. Journals of
8 Gerontology 54A, M44-50.

9 Woollacott, M. H., Shumway-Cook, A., Nashner, L. M., 1986. Aging and posture
10 control: changes in sensory organization and muscular coordination. International Journal of
11 Aging and Human Development 23, 81-97.

12

13

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: Experimental set-up for delivering the surface-translation (ST) and cable-pull (CP) perturbations. Unpredictable multi-directional (forward, backward, left or right) STs were delivered via rapid horizontal translation of the computer-controlled motor-driven motion platform. Unpredictable multi-directional CPs were applied by dropping a weight attached to a pelvic belt (worn at the level of the anterior-superior iliac spines) via a cable and pulley system, using a computer and electromagnet to control the timing of the weight drop. Four cables were attached to the belt and the experimenter connected the carabiner for one of these cables to the weight-drop mechanism, prior to each CP-trial, in order to vary the CP direction unpredictably (in ST-trials, none of the cables were attached to the weight). A locking mechanism provided an equal amount of slack (~2-4cm) in each of the four cables and thereby ensured that subjects could not detect which (if any) of the cables were attached to the weight, prior to the release of the locking mechanism, which occurred immediately prior to the onset of the CP or ST perturbation. In grasping trials, a cylindrical handrail (height: 55% subject height, diameter: 38mm, length: 1.63m) was mounted on the platform, to the right of the subject (25% subject height from the midline of the subject's body), and foam blocks (40cm high) were placed around the feet in order to deter stepping. To deter arm reactions in stepping trials, subjects held a lightweight rod behind their back (Maki *et al.*, 2000), and were instructed not to move their arms or release the rod. At the start of each trial, subjects either stood or walked "in-place" at the centre of the platform, with the feet in a comfortable standardized position (McIlroy and Maki, 1997).

Figure 2: Centre-of-mass (COM) displacement and velocity for typical trials (young-adult subject), for the two perturbation methods: **A.** surface-translation (ST) and **B.** cable-pull

(CP). The plots at the bottom of each panel show the time history of the surface acceleration and CP force. The equations that were integrated to determine the COM motion are included on the graphs. In these equations, $x_{COM,ST}$ and $x_{COM,CP}$ are the antero-posterior (AP) COM displacements (relative to the motion platform) for ST and CP perturbations, S is the total AP shear force recorded from the force plates, m is the body mass, x_{ST} is the AP motion-platform displacement recorded during ST perturbations, and F_c is the AP cable force recorded during CP perturbations. Numerical integration of the equations began at time zero, which corresponds to perturbation-onset (i.e. platform acceleration $>0.1\text{m/s}^2$ or cable force $>5\text{N}$). Previous studies using this same equipment have shown that this method of estimating COM velocity and displacement is reliable provided that the duration of the integration is limited to $\sim 800\text{ms}$; however, significant propagation of errors due to signal drift can occur when integrating force-plate signals over longer time periods (Maki and McIlroy, 1999b; McIlroy and Maki, 1999). To avoid this problem, we terminated the integrations at time of foot-contact (which always occurred within the 800ms limit).

Figure 3: Comparison of the biomechanical effects of the two perturbation methods. Panel **A** compares the perturbatory ankle-torque resulting from surface-translation (ST) and cable-pull (CP) perturbations, for typical trials in a young-adult subject (body mass 70.5kg, height 1.75m). Panel **B** shows the simple inverted-pendulum model and equations of motion used to calculate these torques (T_p), where: M is the muscle-generated ankle moment, J_θ is the rotational inertia about the ankle, θ is the ankle-joint angle, m is the body mass, g is gravitational acceleration, L_{COM} is the distance between the COM and the ankle joint, L_{ASIS} is the distance between the CP cable (attached to the pelvic belt worn at the level of the anterior-superior iliac spine) and the ankle joint, x_{ST} is the displacement of the motion platform recorded during ST

perturbations, and F_c is the cable force recorded during CP perturbations. The equations of motion are based on modelling work by Maki (1987), and the anthropometric and inertial parameters were estimated using data tabulated by Drillis and Contini (1966). Note that the peak value of T_p was similar for the ST- and CP-trials; however, there was a much more rapid rise in T_p in the ST-trial. Note also the reversal in T_p that occurs during the last half of the ST-trial; this reflects the stabilising effect of the platform deceleration (McIlroy and Maki, 1994).

Figure 4: Example results: **A.** percentage of trials in which multi-step reactions were observed; **B.** percentage of AP-perturbation trials in which an “extra” lateral step (subsequent to the initial forward or backward step) was observed; **C.** percentage of ML-perturbation trials in which a collision between the swing and stance limb was observed; **D.** tibialis-anterior latency (“forward fall” trials); and **E.** AP step-length (AP-perturbation trials). In each graph, means and standard-error bars are shown for the young and older adults, for the surface-translation (ST) perturbations and the cable-pull (CP) perturbations. For the frequency (percentage-of-trial) variables, a percentage score was determined for each perturbation-method within each individual subject, and these scores were then used in the subsequent analyses. The interaction p-values are indicated in cases where the 2-way ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between age-group and perturbation-method. Note that certain age-related problems were common in the ST-trials but occurred rarely, if at all, in the CP-trials (panels **B** and **C**). The remaining plots appear to exhibit age-related effects for both perturbation methods. The age-effect was more pronounced in ST-trials in panels **A** and **D**, as was the case in all but one of the analyses (see Table 4). Panel **E** depicts the one exception, where the age-effect was more pronounced in the CP-trials.

Table 1: Examples of previous perturbation studies showing contradictory age-related differences in characteristics of stepping reactions. The findings of the present study are also included (shaded rows).

Study	Unpredictability			Instruction	AP-step measures			ML-step measures	
	Onset Timing	Magnitude	Direction [*]		Foot-off time	Swing duration	Step length	Cross-over steps	Foot collisions
Cable-pull (CP) perturbations:									
Luchies <i>et al.</i> , 1994	Yes	Yes (10 different pull distances)	No (B only)	Not specified	OA<YA [†]	OA<YA	OA<YA	-	-
Rogers <i>et al.</i> , 2001 [‡]	Not specified	Yes (five different magnitudes)	No (F only)	React naturally	OA<YA	OA<YA	-	-	-
Rogers and Mille, 2003 [‡]	Not specified	No	No (F only)	React naturally	OA=YA	-	-	-	-
Schulz <i>et al.</i> , 2005	Not specified	Yes (five different magnitudes)	Yes (F, B)	React naturally	OA=YA	OA=YA	OA<YA (B only)	-	-
Mille <i>et al.</i> , 2005 [‡]	Not specified	No	Yes (L, R)	React naturally	-	-	-	OA>YA	OA>YA
PRESENT FINDINGS	Yes	Yes (STs included) [§]	Yes (L, R, F, B)	React naturally but minimise number of steps	OA<YA	OA=YA	OA<YA	OA=YA ^{**}	OA=YA ^{**}
Surface-translation (ST) perturbations:									
McIlroy and Maki, 1996	Yes	No	Yes (F, B)	Try not to fall	OA=YA	OA=YA	OA=YA	-	-
Maki <i>et al.</i> , 2000	Yes	Yes ('low' and 'high' magnitude) [§]	Yes (L, R, F, B)	React naturally	-	-	-	OA=YA ^{**}	OA>YA ^{**}
PRESENT FINDINGS	Yes	Yes (CPs included) [§]	Yes (L, R, F, B)	React naturally but minimise number of steps	OA<YA	OA=YA	OA=YA	OA=YA ^{**}	OA>YA ^{**}
Release-from-lean (RFL) perturbations:									
Thelen <i>et al.</i> , 1997	Yes	No	No (F only)	Take a single step forward with right foot	OA>YA	-	-	-	-
Wojcik <i>et al.</i> , 1999	Yes	No	No (F only)	Take a single step forward with right foot	OA>YA	-	OA>YA	-	-

^{*} Direction of falling motion induced by perturbation: L = leftward, R = rightward, F = forward, B = backward.

[†] OA = older adults (≥ 65 years), YA = young adults (≤ 40 years). "OA<YA" indicates that the OA mean was significantly smaller than the YA mean, etc.

[‡] These cable-pull studies used an electromechanical actuator, rather than a weight-drop mechanism.

[§] These studies included ST perturbations that were also unpredictable in terms of their waveform, i.e. the timing of the acceleration and deceleration of the moving surface was not the same for all trials.

^{**} These findings pertain to trials in which the perturbation was delivered while subjects walked "in-place" (in all other cases the perturbations were applied during bipedal stance).

Table 2: Details of the balance-perturbation protocol.

Task conditions	Focus of analysis	Perturbations and numbers of trials*	
		Analysed trials	Additional trials
Trial block #1: Stance, arm motion restricted, instructed to react naturally but minimise number of steps if need to step	Stepping evoked by AP perturbation	5 backward translations [†] 3 forward translations [†] 5 forward cable pulls [‡] 3 backward cable pulls <i>Total = 16 trials</i>	2 ML translations (L,R) 4 translations, 2 nd waveform (F,B,L,R) [§] (F,B,L,R) [§] 2 ML cable pulls (L,R) <i>Total = 8 trials</i>
Trial block #2: Walking in-place**, arm motion restricted, instructed to react naturally but minimise number of steps if need to step	Stepping evoked by ML perturbation	5 leftward translations 3 rightward translations 5 rightward cable pulls 3 leftward cable pulls <i>Total = 16 trials</i>	2 AP translations (F,B) 4 translations, 2 nd waveform (F,B,L,R) [§] 2 AP cable pulls (F,B) <i>Total = 8 trials</i>
Trial block #3: Stance, foot motion restricted, instructed to recover balance by grasping handrail (at right of subject)	Grasping evoked by backward perturbation	5 forward translations 5 backward cable pulls <i>Total = 10 trials</i>	4 backward translations 4 forward cable pulls <i>Total = 8 trials</i>

* During each trial block, the listed surface-translation (ST) and cable-pull (CP) perturbations were delivered in an unpredictable randomized sequence, in the directions indicated (F=forward, B=backward, L=left, R=right; AP=anterior-posterior, ML=medio-lateral). The “additional trials” were included solely for the purpose of increasing unpredictability and were not analysed. Given 40 subjects, the specified protocol yields the following numbers of trials for analysis: 640 AP-step trials (40x16) in trials-block #1, 640 ML-step trials (40x16) in trial-block #2, and 400 grasp trials (40x10) in trial-block #3. However, the actual numbers of trials performed were reduced to 622 in trial-block #2 and 364 in trial-block #3, due to a small number of subjects who wished to terminate the session early.

[†] The ST perturbations comprised a 300ms acceleration pulse followed immediately by a 300ms deceleration pulse (Figure 2a). Each pulse was approximately “square”, with an amplitude of 2.0m/s^2 for forward translations (evoking backward falling motion) and 3.0m/s^2 for other translation directions (backward, left, right). The displacement and peak velocity were 0.18m and 0.6m/s for forward translations; 0.27m and 0.9m/s for other directions.

[‡] The CP perturbations were applied by dropping a weight equal to 20% of body weight. The drop height was 40cm for stepping trials and 30cm for grasping trials.

[§] The “2nd waveform” STs were included to deter subjects from learning to use the platform deceleration to aid in recovering balance (McIlroy and Maki, 1994). This waveform comprised a 200ms acceleration pulse, a 400ms constant-velocity interval, and a 200ms deceleration pulse. The acceleration of this second waveform ranged from 1.35m/s^2 to 2.25m/s^2 .

** Perturbations for the walking-in-place trials were timed to occur at foot-lift of the foot contralateral to the fall direction evoked by the perturbation (e.g. right foot-lift for a leftward fall) in order to increase the probability of observing a collision between the step foot and the stance leg (Maki *et al.*, 2000). The perturbation was delivered after a random number of steps (3-8) and was triggered when the stance-leg force-plate loading exceeded 90% of body weight.

Table 3: Effect of perturbation method on centre-of-mass (COM) displacement and velocity.

	COM parameter	Point in time	Young adults			Older adults		
			Mean (SD)			Mean (SD)		
			ST	CP		ST	CP	
Forward “falls” [†]	Forward COM displacement (cm)	100ms after PO [‡]	0.89 (0.88)	0.21 (0.09)	**	1.00 (1.32)	0.29 (0.24)	**
		Foot-off	15.7 (6.8)	18.1 (5.6)	**	11.9 (3.8)	14.1 (4.3)	**
		Foot-contact	24.8 (6.5)	31.9 (7.4)	**	21.9 (5.6)	25.0 (5.9)	**
	Forward COM velocity (cm/s)	100ms after PO	9.6 (1.4)	3.5 (1.0)	**	9.6 (1.4)	4.0 (1.9)	**
		Foot-off	69.5 (17)	72.4 (10.0)		76.9 (5.2)	65.5 (7.9)	**
		Foot-contact	39.7 (13.9)	94.3 (15.7)	**	48.8 (14.6)	84.9 (11.9)	**
Backward “falls” [†]	Backward COM displacement (cm)	100ms after PO	0.92 (0.98)	0.25 (0.17)	**	0.87 (0.72)	0.39 (0.51)	**
		Foot-off	11.3 (5.5)	13.6 (3.1)	**	9.7 (4.5)	11.6 (4.6)	**
		Foot-contact	18.3 (4.4)	26.6 (5.5)	**	15.7 (4.3)	21.0 (6.7)	**
	Backward COM velocity (cm/s)	100ms after PO	11.8 (2.0)	3.6 (1.6)	**	11.4 (1.5)	4.5 (3.0)	**
		Foot-off	58.0 (9.0)	68.1 (8.7)	*	60.2 (8.4)	58.9 (11.4)	
		Foot-contact	25.5 (20.9)	91.0 (15.1)	**	37.4 (15.4)	75.7 (14.6)	**

[†] Forward “falls” were induced by backward surface translations (STs; 200 trials) or forward cable-pulls (CPs; 200 trials). Backward “falls” were induced by forward STs (120 trials) or backward CPs (120 trials).

[‡] PO = perturbation onset.

Significant effect (within the specified age group) due to perturbation-type: *p<0.05, **p<0.001

Table 4: Summary of age effects for surface-translation and cable-pull perturbations.

	Number of trials analysed [†]	Surface-translation (ST) trials			Cable-pull (CP) trials			<i>Age-method interaction (p-value)[§]</i>
		Mean (SD)		Effect size [‡]	Mean (SD)		Effect size [‡]	
		YA	OA		YA	OA		
Trial-block #1: stepping evoked by AP perturbation of stance:								
“Extra” lateral steps (% trials)	640	3.8 (19.1)	19.2 (39.5)	-0.43 ^{**}	0.0 (0.0)	1.3 (11.2)	-0.13	0.005
Earliest TA latency (ms) ^{††}	224	98 (23)	169 (64)	-2.45 ^{***}	137 (24)	166 (62)	-0.47	0.0001
Earliest MG latency (ms) ^{††}	394	127 (26)	176 (56)	-1.58 ^{***}	153 (30)	199 (68)	-0.70	0.053
Foot-off time (ms)	639	387 (85)	353 (41)	0.61 ^{**}	521 (80)	473 (71)	0.63 [*]	0.93
Foot-contact time (ms)	639	545 (83)	492 (57)	0.78 ^{**}	682 (79)	614 (77)	0.83	>0.99
Swing duration (ms)	639	158 (36)	140 (42)	0.44	161 (39)	140 (40)	0.51	0.58
Presence of an APA (% trials)	639	73.8 (44.3)	53.3 (50)	0.41 ^{**}	86.1 (34.8)	71.7 (45.2)	0.33	0.51
Step length (cm)	628	33.5 (9.4)	29.0 (12)	0.39	37.1 (9.8)	28 (10.7)	0.81 ^{***}	0.01
Step width (cm)	628	2.8 (4.2)	1.7 (3.1)	0.33	0.8 (3.5)	1.2 (2.9)	-0.15	0.045
Trial-block #2: stepping evoked by ML perturbation while walking in place:								
Foot collision (% trials)	619	26.3 (44.3)	55.6 (49.8)	-0.59 [*]	1.3 (11.3)	5.7 (23.2)	-0.09	0.21
Crossovers (% trials)	616	41.3 (49.5)	30.7 (46.2)	0.50	56.4 (49.9)	32.2 (46.8)	0.50	0.39
Trial-block #3: grasping evoked by backward perturbation of stance:								
Right bicep latency (ms)	341	116 (30)	147 (31)	-0.95 ^{**}	152 (53)	177 (62)	-0.42	0.35
Right deltoid latency (ms)	349	115 (26)	139 (30)	-0.79 ^{**}	152 (50)	173 (53)	-0.40	0.43
Handrail contact time (ms)	349	494 (61)	546 (88)	-0.62 [*]	602 (94)	654 (154)	-0.37	0.43
Pooled stepping trials (trial-blocks #1 and #2):								
Multi-step reactions (% trials)	1254	25 (43.4)	68.3 (46.6)	-0.87 ^{***}	26.6 (44.3)	50.0 (50.1)	-0.47 ^{**}	0.028
Arm reactions (% trials)	1254	1.3 (11.1)	16.8 (37.4)	-0.46 ^{**}	0.0 (0.0)	1.5 (12.2)	-0.14	0.017
Pooled stepping and grasping trials (trial-blocks #1, #2 and #3):								
Harness-assist (% trials) ^{†††}	1626	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (4.1)	-0.05	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (9.9)	-0.12	0.31

[†] Discrepancies between number of trials actually analysed and trial numbers specified in Table 2 were due to technical problems.

[‡] Effect size is the difference between the young- (YA) and older-adult (OA) means (YA minus OA), divided by the pooled standard deviation. Results from one-way ANOVA indicating significant age-group effects: *p<0.05, **p<0.001, ***p<0.0001.

[§] Results from the two-way ANOVA indicating statistical significance of the age-group by perturbation-type interaction. Significant and near-significant interactions are highlighted with shading.

^{††} Earliest tibialis anterior (TA) latency analysed for “backward fall” trials (i.e. backward CPs and forward STs); medial gastrocnemius (MG) latency analysed for “forward fall” trials (i.e. forward CPs and backward STs).

^{†††} A harness-assisted recovery was deemed to occur if the safety harness loading exceeded 20% of body weight.

A. Multi-step trials

B. Additional lateral steps

D. Tibialis anterior latency

C. Foot collisions

E. Step length