

Identification of Disease-Specific Turning Movement Hallmarks: A Systematic Review towards Establishment of Disease Screening Algorithm

Author names

†Ami Ogawa (PhD)^a ogawa@sd.keio.ac.jp,

Takanori Takeda (PT, MSc)^b ttakeda@jmhc.co.jp,

Kohei Yoshino (PT)^{cd} ant.fb40@gmail.com,

*Hiroataka Iijima (PT, PhD)^{ef} iijima@met.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Affiliations

- a. Department of System Design Engineering, Faculty of Science and Technology, Keio University, Yokohama, Japan
- b. JMDC Inc., Tokyo, Japan
- c. Department of Rehabilitation technique, Ageo Central General Hospital, Saitama, Japan
- d. Graduate Course of Health and Social Services, Graduate School of Saitama Prefectural University, Saitama, Japan
- e. Institute for Advanced Research, Nagoya University, Aichi, Japan
- f. Biomedical and Health Informatics Unit, Department of Integrated Health Science, Graduate School of Medicine, Nagoya University, Aichi, Japan

***Corresponding author**

Hiroataka Iijima (PT, PhD)

Furo-Cho, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 464-8601, Japan

E-mail: iijima@met.nagoya-u.ac.jp

Phone: +81-45-563-1141

†Co-corresponding author

Ami Ogawa (PhD)

3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku Yokohama 223-8522, Japan

E-mail: ogawa@sd.keio.ac.jp

Phone: +81-45-566-1844

Acknowledgments

This study was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP20K13807. This funding source had no role in the study design, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. We thank editage (<https://www.editage.jp/>) for the English language editing.

Word count: 4581

Abstract

Background: Patients with nervous system and musculoskeletal diseases display gait disturbance that is a leading cause of falls. Identification of disease-specific movement hallmarks is therefore an essential first step in preventing falls. Since turning, a common daily activity, is a unique movement that requires inter-limb spatial coordination, turning may be a suitable observational target for the identification of disease-specific movement disorder. However, to date, few comprehensive systematic review regarding disease-specific alterations in turning movement is available.

Research question: This systematic review with meta-analysis summarized the level of knowledge regarding movement disorders during turning in patients with nervous system and musculoskeletal diseases.

Methods: A systematic review was conducted of papers throughout 2021 in accordance with PRISMA guideline. Including criteria were (1) were published in a peer-reviewed journal, (2) were written in English, (3) included adult patients who were diagnosed with musculoskeletal or nervous system diseases, (4) had a control group of age-matched healthy adults, and (5) outcomes included turning parameters.

Results: Meta-analysis revealed a significantly larger step number, longer turn duration, and shorter step length in patients with Parkinson's disease (PD) than in controls during

the 180° turn, suggesting that these biomechanical alterations may be, at least in part, movement disorders associated with PD. Notably, this review identified methodological heterogeneity for turning movement assessments, which limited the identification of disease-specific movement disorders.

Significance: This work serves as a call to action for the establishment of a standard assessment protocol towards the identification of disease-specific turning movement disorders and effective disease screening.

(250 words)

Keywords: Turning; Movement disorder; Nervous system disease; Musculoskeletal disease; Meta-analysis

Introduction

Diseases with gait disturbances, such as nervous system and musculoskeletal diseases, present a high risk of falling in patients, because of limitation of joint movement or lack of balance ability. For instance, in patients with Parkinson's disease (PD), a symptom called freezing of gait (FOG), which causes the sudden loss of the ability to start or continue walking[1], is known as one of the causes of falls[2]. Patients with stroke also have a high risk of falls because of a decline in physical abilities[3]. Preventing falls is required due to the high mortality[4]. Detecting disease-specific early hallmarks is important in delaying disease progression and preventing falls; thus, enabling the appropriate intervention for each disease in the early stages.

Identification of movement disorder during daily activities is a potential staple for the disease early detection. Among daily activities, turning accounts for 8–50% of steps taken within a day[5] and is more physically challenging than level walking that requires inter-limb spatial coordination[6, 7]. Since studies has successfully characterized turning movement disorder in several neurological and musculoskeletal diseases including PD[8, 9] and stroke[10, 11], turning may be a suitable observational target for the disease screening. Identifying disease-specific movement disorder during turning is particularly important given that falls during turning is 7.9 times more likely to cause a hip fracture than those from straight walking in the elderly people[12].

Systematic review with meta-analysis of the literature allows for comparison of inconclusive results across different studies and identification of turning movement hallmarks associated with disease. Although, previous systematic review characterized movement disorder associated with PD[13], no systematic review summarized turning

characteristics across a wide range of diseases that is an essential next step towards the identification disease-specific movement disorder and subsequent disease screening. With this in mind, this systematic review with meta-analysis aimed to summarize level of knowledge regarding the turning movement characteristics in patients with nervous system and musculoskeletal diseases with the goal of identification of disease-specific turning movement disorder. Through this review, we identified methodological heterogeneity for turning movement assessment, which builds a framework for future biomechanical studies.

Methods

This study was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement[14], PRISMA protocols (PRISMA-P)[15], Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) checklist[16], and Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions[17].

Literature search and study selection

PubMed, Physiotherapy Evidence Database, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials were searched. Included studies met the following criteria: (1) were published in a peer-reviewed journal, (2) were written in English, (3) included adult patients who were diagnosed with musculoskeletal or nervous system diseases, (4) had a control group of age-matched healthy adults, and (5) outcomes included turning parameters. We defined

the turn movements as a change of direction to a specific angle before or after a straight walk; thus, a standing turn (turning on the spot) was also included. Diagnostic criteria for musculoskeletal or nervous system diseases were defined by each study's inclusion criteria. Since turning parameter changes during aging, we included only studies with an age-matched control group. No restrictions on study dates, follow-up duration, disease severity, or time since disease onset were used. Electronic searches used combined key terms of PubMed, including "Musculoskeletal Diseases," "Nervous System Diseases," "Turning," "Turn," "Biomechanical Phenomena," "Kinetics," and "Accelerometry" using Medical Subject Headings terms.

In the first review, a single reviewer (HI) conducted an electronic database search throughout June 2019. Two independent reviewers (TT and KY) assessed eligibility in a blinded manner in accordance with the Cochran Handbook recommendations[17]. The second review was conducted by two independent reviewers (AO and TT) throughout April 2021 to ensure that further articles were also assessed for inclusion prior to publication. After duplicates were removed, the two reviewers screened titles and abstracts yielded by the database search. Full manuscripts of the articles that met the eligibility criteria were then obtained and reviewed. During these processes, the reviewers prepared and used simple, pre-designed Google spreadsheets to assess eligibility by extracting study features. Disagreements between the two reviewers were discussed until consensus was achieved.

Outcome measure and data extraction

The primary outcomes in this review were (1) spatiotemporal parameter (i.e., turn velocity, number of steps), (2) kinematics (i.e., joint angle, foot clearance), (3) strategy parameters during a turn. The secondary outcomes were (4) electromyography (EMG) and (5) kinetics parameters during a turn.

Turning involves first recognizing the movement direction and then reorienting each segment and moving toward the new direction by stepping. The variations of movement are made when the new direction is recognized and how each segment is moved, i.e., turning strategy, because turning is accomplished over several steps. Thereby, turning strategy is accounted as one of the categories of outcomes in addition to the traditional outcome categories such as spatiotemporal, kinetics, kinematics, and EMG parameters. The word “strategy” is often used without any definition in previous studies. Thus, we originally defined the category of strategy in this review that includes following three subcategories: (1) how to step toward the new direction, i.e., turn type subcategory (few-step [spin turn and step turn] or multi-step turns), (2) spatial subcategory such as the trajectory of the center of mass (COM) or distance of COM respect to center of turn, and (3) segmental subcategory such as the delay time of reorientation of each segment that shows the linkage of each segment (head, trunk, and pelvis). Regarding turn types, few-step turns including spin and step turns were identified in which the number of steps from the start to the end of the turn is less than three, and those in which the number of steps exceeded four were distinguished as multi-step turn. The spin turn was defined as a strategy in which the foot ipsilateral to the turning direction is the axle foot and the opposite foot crosses the axle foot, while

step turn was defined as a strategy when the foot contralateral to the turning direction is the axle foot and throw the ipsilateral side to the turning direction without crossing[18].

The overview of outcome categorization is shown in **Figure 1**.

The outcome measures were categorized according to turning angle (90°, 120°, 180°, et al.) and whether it was a walking turn or standing turn. Turning angle is one of the factors that determine the turn strategies[8] and it makes the movements change; thus, data should be separately analyzed. Similarly, walking turn and standing turn require different movement mechanisms, and normally they were dealt with separately[19, 20].

Three reviewers (TT, KY, and AO) collected data regarding authors, publication years, subject population, subject disease, outcome measures, and turning tasks using standardized data forms. When mean and standard deviation (SD) values were not directly reported, they were calculated from other available data whenever possible, such as interquartile range[21] or we directly contacted the authors. When data were only provided in figures, the graphical data were converted to numerical data using a digital ruler software (WebPlotDigitizer 4.4)[22].

Data Analysis

Meta-analyses were performed using Review Manager Version 5.4 (Nordic Cochrane Centre, Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark). Pooled estimates and 95% confidence intervals for standardized mean differences (SMD) of outcome measures were calculated using a random effect model[23]. Study heterogeneity, the inter-trial variation in study outcomes, was assessed using I^2 , which is the proportion of

total variance explained by inter-trial heterogeneity[24]. Meta-analyses were done for more than two studies that were gathered in each categorization on turning angle and whether it was a walking turn or standing turn. Data that were not considered appropriate for meta-analysis were also summarized in the table to conduct narrative synthesis.

Results

The database search yielded a total of 735 studies; 53[8-11, 19, 20, 25-71] ultimately met the eligibility criteria and were included in the systematic review (**Figure 2**). The rationales for the exclusion of studies during the full-text screening process were incorrect outcome (47%), without the control group (21%), non-peer review journal (16%), and non-musculoskeletal or nervous system diseases (16%).

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of included studies. Most of the studies were on PD (33 studies) and stroke (10 studies) among nervous system diseases. The other studies included were on cerebellar ataxia (CA; two studies), Fragile X-associated tremor/ataxia syndrome (FXTAS; one study), and Huntington's disease (HD; one study) among those categorized as nervous system diseases. Chronic ankle instability (CAI; three studies), total knee arthroplasty (TKA; two studies), and transmetatarsal amputation (TMA; one study) were categorized in musculoskeletal diseases. In the PD study, a total of 753 patients (mean age: 66.4 years) and 462 age-matched healthy adults (mean age: 67.3 years) were included from 33 studies. Regarding the stroke study, a total of 166 patients (mean age: 59.9 years) and 148 age-matched healthy adults (mean age: 52.4 years) were obtained from 10 studies.

The outcomes and apparatus are shown in **Table 2**. The majority of apparatus used for turning analysis were: 1) three-dimensional motion capture system, 2) force plate, and 3) inertial measurement units. Surface EMG, eye tracker, footswitch, and video cameras were also used.

Systematic review identified methodological heterogeneity for turning movements assessment

The conditions of turning tasks are shown in **Table 3**. An inconsistent method of turning task was revealed. The most common angle of turning was 180° in 31 cases, followed by 90° in 20 cases, 45° in 6 cases, 360° in 4 cases, 120° and 135° in 2 cases each, and 30° and 60° in 1 case each.

In most studies, participants were instructed to turn at a self-selected speed. In some cases, controls were instructed to walk at a slower speed to suit patients, and in other cases, several levels of speed were set (fast, comfortable, slow) or speed was specified.

In 24 studies[8, 9, 11, 25, 27-30, 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, 47, 49, 50, 55, 58, 62-65, 68, 70], the tasks were set the turning position with the center locations marked by cones, poles, stanchions, reflective markers, or tapes. Seven studies[31, 32, 39, 44, 51, 61, 71] defined the foot position of turning with a force plate. Five studies[19, 53, 54, 59, 60] defined a certain zone for a turn, and two studies[43, 56] instructed several steps before turning.

Nine studies measured turning on the spot[10, 20, 37, 41, 46, 48, 52, 66, 67], three studies were radius circle or semicircle[33, 36, 57]. The maximum and average

length of approach path was 7 m and 3.33 m, respectively. Turn direction was set for both sides in 26 studies[9, 10, 27, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39-41, 45-49, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 62, 64-66, 68, 69], and 16 studies limited either side[11, 19, 20, 29, 32, 35, 38, 42-44, 59-61, 67, 70, 71]. The formalized task was only TUG with 7 studies[11, 28, 30, 40, 58, 62, 63], 11 studies including instrumented TUG[50, 55, 59, 68].

Synthesis of Results

The summary of the meta-analysis is shown in **Table 4**. Only PD data was applied to meta-analysis, because of no outcomes commonly reported in more than one study or discrepancy of conditions for other diseases.

Patients with PD performed slow multi-step and “en bloc” turns

Figure 3A shows that the number of steps in PD significantly increased compared to the control group during the 180° turning[60, 64, 70] and 180° turning on the spot[41, 48, 52, 66]. A similar tendency was shown during 90° turning[32, 35] and 90° turning on the spot[48]. Turn duration in patients with PD was significantly longer than controls during 180° turning[9, 60, 64, 68, 70] and 180° turning on the spot[41, 48, 52, 66] (**Figure 3B**). The duration during the 90° turning on the spot[48] showed a similar trend. There was a small differences in step duration between PD and control groups during 180° turning[9, 60, 62, 64, 70] (**Figure 3C**), slightly longer in patients with PD in 90° turning[32, 35]. In addition, maximum step duration in the PD group during 180° turning was barely longer than controls[59, 60]. **Figure 3D** shows that turn velocity in patients with PD was slower than controls during 180° turning[29, 34, 62]. Similarly, the peak angular velocity of the trunk in the horizontal plane in patients with

PD was smaller than controls during 180° turning in TUG[60, 68] (**Figure 3E**). According to **Figures 3F and 3G**, the step length[29, 62, 70] and step width[29, 70] are shorter in patients with PD during 180° turning.

Moreover, kinematic parameters gave us interesting implications although sufficient studies were not gathered for the meta-analysis. The head rotation in patients with PD was also smaller during 90° turning[32, 35]. Son et al. reported a smaller range of motion (ROM) of the hip, knee, ankle, and shoulder, and foot clearance in patients with stroke than controls[62].

The strategy parameter did not show significant trends; however, they were interesting. The distance from COM to the center of turn was slightly larger in PD (**Figure 3H**[9, 34]), reorientation delay time of pelvis in PD was slower than that of controls (**Figure 3I**[19, 35]), and head-pelvis rotation angle was smaller than controls (**Figure 3J**[9, 41]). However, head rotation relative to trunk in PD was smaller than control during 90° turning[32, 35] and 180° turning on the spot[41]. Based on these results with each segment reorientation onset time, controls perform sequential segmental turning from head to pelvis, while patients with PD performs “en bloc” turning which means near-simultaneous rotation of body segments[32, 35, 41, 42, 62].

Other diseases

Since the outcomes were not unified in other diseases, there were no

parameters available to apply meta-analysis. The individual results are gathered for each disease below.

Turn duration in patients with stroke during 90° turning[40] and 180° turning[11, 30] were longer than those in the control group. Step length and step width during 90° turning[40] and 180° turning[11] were shorter in patients with stroke. Moreover, patients with stroke showed longer stance duration[31], shorter single stance phase and swing phase[11], and slower velocity than controls. The paretic limbs of the stroke group showed lower peak hip extension, knee flexion, ankle dorsiflexion[11], and larger foot clearance while shorter of nonparetic side than controls[30]. Delay time of the head, trunk, and pelvis reorientation and these order of patients with stroke were similar to controls during 180° turning[47], while inverse order of segment reorientation from the pelvis to the head was reported in case of fast walkers' paretic turn and slower walkers' non-paretic turn during a 90° turn[45]. The turn type selection ratio was similar to that in the control group[54].

There were no significant differences between the patients with CAI and control groups on ankle inversion angles during 45° step and spin turn movements[44], neither hip nor knee joint angles during 45° step and spin turns[44]. Contrarily, people with CAI performed smaller maximum ankle inversion angle than controls during the 180° turn task[39], as they impaired controlling their ankle joints in situations where they were likely to be injured than those in the control group.

Patients with TKA performed turning at a lower cadence compared to healthy controls[46]. A decreased ROM at the involved side for the stance phases which was caused by the increased peak knee extension at midstance during walking followed by a sidestep was reported[46]. TKA-involved-knee showed a shift towards increased

external and decreased internal rotation in axial plane[46]. The magnitude of acceleration on the knee was significantly larger in patients with TKA compared with controls during 90° turning[43].

Regarding CA, patients with ataxia showed a reduced cycle duration[51], lower body rotation values[61], and a large number of steps[61] compared to the control group. In addition, patients with ataxia showed significantly lower values of peak hip flexion, hip extension ROM, peak knee flexion, knee extension ROM, and ankle plantar-flexion ROM than the controls[61]. Patients with CA never performed spin turns for stability while those in the control group often executed spin turns[51].

Premutation carriers with FXTAS showed significantly longer turn duration compared to controls[55]. Patients with HD showed significantly longer turn duration and greater center of gravity sway velocity[56]. Patients with TMA who had partial foot amputation displayed significantly longer TUG times compared to controls[63].

Discussions

Disease specific turn characteristics

This study revealed the gap of knowledge regarding the characteristics of turning movement for each disease by comprehensively gathering studies that have been individually conducted for each disease, such as bias in amount of knowledge and disparate methodologies. Nervous system diseases, especially PD was the most investigated in previous studies among nervous system and musculoskeletal diseases dealing with turning tasks.

Among the reviewed studies, the most common parameter was spatiotemporal

parameters such as turn duration and the number of steps. These parameters are comparably easy to acquire with simple apparatus such as a stopwatch and video camera. Moreover, strategy parameters especially segmental and turn type subcategories were often reported. The overview of the disease-specific turn characteristics is shown in **Figure 4**. Common features among several diseases were slower movement in PD[9, 25, 29, 32, 35, 41, 48, 49, 52, 59, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68-70], stroke[11, 30, 40], FXTAS[55], HD[56], and TKA[63] than those in the control group, which were reflected in longer turn duration and/or slower velocity. However, only patients with CA[51] and CAI[44, 71] did not show slow movements. Contrarily, the trends of cadence, number of steps, step length, and step width were different for each disease. Patients with CA[51, 61], stroke[11, 40], and PD[29, 70] performed turns with smaller step lengths than those in controls, and this result in a greater number of steps. Different from patients with PD and stroke, patients with CA performed turns with fast steps to walk as rapidly as the individuals in the control group[51]. However, a wider step width is reported as a feature of CA for compensatory instability[51]. Patients with FXTAS performed turn with as a large step length as those in the control group, but the variability was large because of the instability[55]. Few features during turn were confirmed in musculoskeletal diseases discussed in the current study. Especially in patients with CAI, the authors reported a difficulty to distinguish the patient and controls by observing turn task[44, 71]. Characterizing a turn in those musculoskeletal diseases may be difficult. PD is characterized by a large cadence[29]. Although the cadence and turn duration of PD and CA cannot directly be compared, patients with CA are considered to have a higher ability to move forward than PD, since patients with CA perform turns at a similar velocity as controls. Patients with stroke have been reported to have a fewer

cadence than controls[11] different from PD. Regarding strategy parameters, the turn type was likely to be disease dependent[51, 54, 67]. The patients with PD[8, 29] and CA[51] tended to avoid spin turn and select multi-step turn while turn type selection in patients with stroke was similar to controls[54]. Spin turn is known as efficient but unstable because the COM move out of the base of support. The high incidence of spin turns in the elderly may be related to the risk of falling[72]. PD and CA patients chose more stable turn type different from patients with stroke. Regarding the segmental parameters, there was a difference between CA, stroke, and PD in terms of segment reorientation timing; patients with CA[51, 61] and stroke[47, 54] were capable of “steering turn” that head, trunk, and pelvis segments were reorienting in order, while PD performed “en bloc”[32, 35, 41, 42, 62] that simultaneous and delayed segments reorientation. These disease-specific movement characteristics may allow for early screening.

Characteristics of patients with PD and effect of task variation

PD-specific turn characteristics are explained by slow multi-step and “en bloc” performance. The results of the meta-analysis show a larger number of steps, longer turn duration, slower turn velocity, smaller angular velocity, smaller step length, smaller step width, which are mechanisms of slow and multi-step turn. “En bloc” performance was identified by a smaller head-pelvis rotation angle. The segmental characteristics seem more certain than spatial characteristics as the distance from COM to the center of turn showed no differences with controls.

According to the results of the meta-analysis, the turn duration and number of steps during both 180° turn on the spot and 180° turn showed the same trend, while the

differences between patients with PD and controls were larger during 180° turn on the spot than 180° turn. This suggests that the task of walking directly backward on the spot without an approach is more difficult than the task with an approach, such as TUG, and that is easier to detect differences from controls. Turning and turning on the spot are both frequent movements, especially in daily life. Turning on the spot often occurs by a combination of other movements, such as after standing up from a chair or taking something out of a refrigerator or shelf[20]. In addition, there is a high possibility of tight turning like turning on the spot in dead-end spaces such as kitchens, toilets, and closets, where there is not enough space for radius turning. Although no disease-specific differences between turning and turning on the spot have been reported[19, 20], turning on the spot is likely to be more difficult for patients with PD, who presents FOG during gait initiation as well as turning[67, 73].

The number of steps[32, 35, 41, 48, 52, 59, 60, 64, 66, 70], turn duration[9, 48, 49, 59, 60, 64, 68, 70], and step length[29, 62, 70] showed similar trends at 90° and 180°; thus, the same trends can be shown regardless of the angle. However, a similar trend was shown in both angles (90° vs. 180°) in step time[9, 32, 35, 59, 60, 62, 64, 70] which has a little difference between PD and controls.

During the 45° spin turn, longer step length, faster step speed, and longer step time was required than 45° step turn and 90° step turn[67]. This means the high difficulty of spin turn task for PD and turn type has more impact on the movement than turn angle between 45° and 90°.

Implication on standardization of task protocol and evaluation indicator for future research

The selecting ratio of turn types differs depending on the turning angle. A study of CA showed that the 90° turning was more likely to differ from the control group comparing to the 30° turning because the patients prioritized safety and performed alternative strategies (avoiding spin turns and adopting multi-step turns) during only 90° turning[51]. Regarding PD, patients showed more multi-step turns instead of step turns during 180° turning than 90° and 120° turning[29]. These studies indicate the effect of turn angle on strategy differ between 30° and 90°, and between 90° or 120° and 180°. Further investigation of the effects of continuous angle change is required. Also, for asymmetrical symptoms, such as hemiplegia, the turning direction should be classified into the ipsilateral and contralateral sides. The strategy selection ratio for each task (ipsilateral/contralateral) proceeded in several studies[29, 34, 66] should be more conducted in the future.

Since the spatiotemporal, kinematic, and kinetic parameters change depending on the turn types[18], pivot foot and turning direction should be at least distinguished for analysis. Previously defined turn type classifications were step/spin[8, 18, 34, 54], step/spin/multi-step[29, 51], sideway/twisting/backward/festination/forward/wheeling[8], toward/pivotal/lateral/incremental/delayed onset[66]. Concerning early screening, the classification of few-step turn including step turn and spin turn, and multi-step turn is standard, and it may be desirable to subdivide the classification by disease for more detailed consideration. Although some studies have originally defined step type classification, major classification is a few-step turn including step turn and spin turn and multi-step turn. Only few-step turn classification is often adopted in turn tasks with smaller turn angles including 90° turn, while a multi-step turn is additionally used in

most 180° turn. Adamson et al. classified multi-step turn into four types for 180° turn task[8]. This indicates the variety of multi-step turn in PD. Whereas Stack et al. suggested a unique classification of three types of few-step turn in PD for 180° turn on the spot task[66]. This implies that even with the same 180° turn, the step type classification and selection ratio is different between turn on the spot and walking turn.

The major instruction method of the turning location was showing the turn center with some targets such as poles in the study of PD, stroke, FXTAS, and TMA. In this case, the line of sight and the walkable area differ depending on the height of the landmarks, which may affect the movement parameters. Particularly, the reflective markers or tapes were small; hence, the participants could be stepped over. Turning is a complex task that requires not only physical but also cognitive abilities, as we must decide where to start rotating and which leg with during walking. Thereby, the role of the landmarks as indicators of turning position is important for the assessment of patients' abilities. However, no study has reported the recognition of landmarks, although the gaze direction is assessed with the reorientation of the other segments in several studies[10, 25, 45]. In cases of center location settings, COM distance from the center of rotation and COM trajectory can be evaluated. The COM distance of patients with dementia was shorter than that of healthy controls, while that of patients with distal radius fracture was longer[74]. Patients with PD did not show a certain trend in total COM distance. Conradsson et al. reported shorter in PD compared to controls[34] whereas Bengevoord et al. reported opposite result[27]. Mellone et al. showed that patients with PD performed walking on the route including several corners with shorter distances than controls[53], while Willems et al. reported patients with PD made a bigger turn around an obstacle than controls[70]. Instruction of the foot position using

force plates is major in studies of CAI, CA, and TKA. This implies that kinetics are highly important in these diseases. Although force plates are essential for measuring kinetic parameters, it is a concern that they impede observational differences in disease-specific strategies such as positioning against a landmark at the corner. Clarification of the kinetic characteristics of each disease is important; however, it may be useful to focus on other parameters which are easier to acquire from the perspective of early screening. Moreover, the turning task that the timing was specified by audibly signs[51, 61], displays[34, 45, 54], or lightings[39] is more complex because it reflects the effects of cognitive ability, vision, and hearing function.

Speed specification also needs to be mentioned. Although self-selected speed was used in many studies, Van Uem et al. reported that specifying the walking speed as fast as possible for patients with PD made a more significant difference than self-selected velocity[68].

Conclusion

In the current study, we conducted a systematic review to reveal the characteristics of turning in nervous system and musculoskeletal diseases associated with gait disorder for the early screening of diseases. Our results reveal that the spatiotemporal parameters (number of steps, turn duration, step length, and step width) and strategy parameters (turn type and segment subcategories) tended to show characteristics of gait specific to patients with PD. Subsequent studies are required since turning is a more difficult movement than normal walking[75], and accounts for a high percentage of walking movements[5]. There was a lack of uniformity in movement measurement conditions and parameters in previous studies because the necessary

conditions and framework were not established. A uniform protocol having standardized task conditions should be established to understand the trends for each disease for early screening. This review contributes to show the disease-specific characteristic trend beyond multiple diseases for future studies.

Declarations of interest: none.

Author contributions

AO: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition,

Investigation, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Roles/Writing -

original draft, Writing - review & editing

TT: Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Roles/Writing - original

draft, Writing - review & editing

KY: Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing - review & editing

HI: Conceptualization, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision,

Writing - review & editing

Data statement

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the

corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

- [1] N. Giladi, M. McDermott, S. Fahn, S. Przedborski, J. Jankovic, M. Stern, et al., Freezing of gait in PD: prospective assessment in the DATATOP cohort, *Neurology* 56(12) (2001) 1712-1721.
- [2] Y. Okuma, Freezing of gait and falls in Parkinson's disease, *Journal of Parkinson's disease* 4(2) (2014) 255-260.
- [3] V. Weerdesteijn, M.d. Niet, H. Van Duijnhoven, A.C. Geurts, Falls in individuals with stroke, *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development* 45(8) (2008) 1195-1214.
- [4] D. Evans, J. Pester, L. Vera, D. Jeanmonod, R. Jeanmonod, Elderly fall patients triaged to the trauma bay: age, injury patterns, and mortality risk, *The American journal of emergency medicine* 33(11) (2015) 1635-1638.
- [5] B.C. Glaister, G.C. Bernatz, G.K. Klute, M.S. Orendurff, Video task analysis of turning during activities of daily living, *Gait & posture* 25(2) (2007) 289-294.
- [6] M.S. Orendurff, A.D. Segal, J.S. Berge, K.C. Flick, D. Spanier, G.K. Klute, The kinematics and kinetics of turning: limb asymmetries associated with walking a circular path, *Gait & posture* 23(1) (2006) 106-111.
- [7] G. Courtine, M. Schieppati, Human walking along a curved path. I. Body trajectory, segment orientation and the effect of vision, *European Journal of Neuroscience* 18(1) (2003) 177-190.
- [8] M.B. Adamson, G. Gilmore, T.W. Stratton, N. Baktash, M.S. Jog, Medication status and dual-tasking on turning strategies in Parkinson disease, *J Neurol Sci* 396 (2019) 206-212.
- [9] J. Spildooren, S. Vercruyssen, E. Heremans, B. Galna, J. Vandenbossche, K.

Desloovere, et al., Head-pelvis coupling is increased during turning in patients with Parkinson's disease and freezing of gait, *Movement Disorders* 28(5) (2013) 619-625.

[10] R.Y. Ahmad, A. Ashburn, M. Burnett, D. Samuel, G. Verheyden, Sequence of onset latency of body segments when turning on-the-spot in people with stroke, *Gait & posture* 39(3) (2014) 841-846.

[11] C. Bonnyaud, D. Pradon, I. Vaugier, N. Vuillerme, D. Bensmail, N. Roche, Timed Up and Go test: Comparison of kinematics between patients with chronic stroke and healthy subjects, *Gait & posture* 49 (2016) 258-263.

[12] R.G. Cumming, R.J. Klineberg, Fall frequency and characteristics and the risk of hip fractures, *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 42(7) (1994) 774-778.

[13] J. Spildooren, C. Vinken, L. Van Baekel, A. Nieuwboer, Turning problems and freezing of gait in Parkinson's disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis, *Disability and rehabilitation* 41(25) (2019) 2994-3004.

[14] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, P. Group, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement, *Annals of internal medicine* 151(4) (2009) 264-9, W64. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19622511>.

[15] L. Shamseer, D. Moher, M. Clarke, D. Ghersi, A. Liberati, M. Petticrew, et al., Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation, *BMJ* 349 (2015) g7647. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25555855>.

[16] D.F. Stroup, J.A. Berlin, S.C. Morton, I. Olkin, G.D. Williamson, D. Rennie, et al., Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group, *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association* 283(15) (2000) 2008-12.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10789670>.

[17] J.P. Higgins, S. Green, Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions, John Wiley & Sons 2011.

[18] K. Hase, R. Stein, Turning strategies during human walking, *Journal of neurophysiology* 81(6) (1999) 2914-2922.

[19] S. Akram, J.S. Frank, M. Jog, Parkinson's disease and segmental coordination during turning: II. Walking turns, *Canadian Journal of Neurological Sciences* 40(4) (2013) 520-526.

[20] S. Akram, J.S. Frank, M. Jog, Parkinson's disease and segmental coordination during turning: I. Standing turns, *Canadian journal of neurological sciences* 40(4) (2013) 512-519.

[21] N. Wiebe, B. Vandermeer, R.W. Platt, T.P. Klassen, D. Moher, N.J. Barrowman, A systematic review identifies a lack of standardization in methods for handling missing variance data, *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 59(4) (2006) 342-353.

[22] D. Drevon, S.R. Fursa, A.L. Malcolm, Intercoder reliability and validity of WebPlotDigitizer in extracting graphed data, *Behavior modification* 41(2) (2017) 323-339.

[23] J.J. Deeks, J.P. Higgins, Statistical algorithms in review manager 5, *Statistical Methods Group of The Cochrane Collaboration* (2010) 1-11.

[24] J.P. Higgins, S.G. Thompson, J.J. Deeks, D.G. Altman, Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses, *BMJ* 327(7414) (2003) 557-60.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12958120>.

[25] V.P. Ambati, F. Saucedo, N.G. Murray, D.W. Powell, R.J. Reed-Jones, Constraining eye movement in individuals with Parkinson's disease during walking turns,

Experimental brain research 234(10) (2016) 2957-2965.

[26] P. Arias, J. Cudeiro, Effect of rhythmic auditory stimulation on gait in Parkinsonian patients with and without freezing of gait, PloS one 5(3) (2010) e9675.

[27] A. Bengevoord, G. Vervoort, J. Spildooren, E. Heremans, W. Vandenberghe, B. Bloem, et al., Center of mass trajectories during turning in patients with Parkinson's disease with and without freezing of gait, Gait & posture 43 (2016) 54-59.

[28] H. Bernad-Elazari, T. Herman, A. Mirelman, E. Gazit, N. Giladi, J.M. Hausdorff, Objective characterization of daily living transitions in patients with Parkinson's disease using a single body-fixed sensor, Journal of neurology 263(8) (2016) 1544-1551.

[29] H. Bhatt, F. Pieruccini-Faria, Q.J. Almeida, Dynamics of turning sharpness influences freezing of gait in Parkinson's disease, Parkinsonism & related disorders 19(2) (2013) 181-185.

[30] C. Bonnyaud, D. Pradon, D. Bensmail, N. Roche, Dynamic stability and risk of tripping during the timed up and go test in hemiparetic and healthy subjects, PLoS One 10(10) (2015) e0140317.

[31] J.M. Burnfield, Y.-J. Tsai, C.M. Powers, Comparison of utilized coefficient of friction during different walking tasks in persons with and without a disability, Gait & posture 22(1) (2005) 82-88.

[32] I. Carpinella, P. Crenna, E. Calabrese, M. Rabuffetti, P. Mazzoleni, R. Nemni, et al., Locomotor function in the early stage of Parkinson's disease, IEEE transactions on neural systems and rehabilitation engineering 15(4) (2007) 543-551.

[33] A.E. Chisholm, T. Qaiser, T. Lam, Neuromuscular control of curved walking in people with stroke: Case report, Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development 52(7) (2015).

- [34] D. Conradsson, C. Paquette, J. Lökk, E. Franzén, Pre-and unplanned walking turns in Parkinson's disease—Effects of dopaminergic medication, *Neuroscience* 341 (2017) 18-26.
- [35] P. Crenna, I. Carpinella, M. Rabuffetti, E. Calabrese, P. Mazzoleni, R. Nemni, et al., The association between impaired turning and normal straight walking in Parkinson's disease, *Gait & posture* 26(2) (2007) 172-178.
- [36] K. Duval, K. Luttin, T. Lam, Neuromuscular strategies in the paretic leg during curved walking in individuals post-stroke, *Journal of Neurophysiology* 106(1) (2011) 280-290.
- [37] U.M. Fietzek, L. Stuhlinger, A. Plate, A. Ceballos-Baumann, K. Bötzel, Spatial constraints evoke increased number of steps during turning in Parkinson's disease, *Clinical Neurophysiology* 128(10) (2017) 1954-1960.
- [38] B.E. Fisher, Q. Li, A. Nacca, G.J. Salem, J. Song, J. Yip, et al., Treadmill exercise elevates striatal dopamine D2 receptor binding potential in patients with early Parkinson's disease, *Neuroreport* 24(10) (2013) 509-514.
- [39] P. Fuerst, A. Gollhofer, H. Lohrer, D. Gehring, Ankle joint control in people with chronic ankle instability during run-and-cut movements, *International journal of sports medicine* 39(11) (2018) 853-859.
- [40] K. Hollands, D. Agnihotri, S. Tyson, Effects of dual task on turning ability in stroke survivors and older adults, *Gait & posture* 40(4) (2014) 564-569.
- [41] M. Hong, J.S. Perlmutter, G.M. Earhart, A kinematic and electromyographic analysis of turning in people with Parkinson disease, *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* 23(2) (2009) 166-176.
- [42] F. Huxham, R. Baker, M.E. Morris, R. Ianssek, Head and trunk rotation during

walking turns in Parkinson's disease, *Movement disorders: official journal of the Movement Disorder Society* 23(10) (2008) 1391-1397.

[43] H. Khan, P.S. Walker, J.D. Zuckerman, J. Slover, F. Jaffe, R.J. Karia, et al., The potential of accelerometers in the evaluation of stability of total knee arthroplasty, *The Journal of arthroplasty* 28(3) (2013) 459-462.

[44] Y. Koshino, M. Yamanaka, Y. Ezawa, T. Ishida, T. Kobayashi, M. Samukawa, et al., Lower limb joint motion during a cross cutting movement differs in individuals with and without chronic ankle instability, *Physical therapy in sport* 15(4) (2014) 242-248.

[45] A. Lamontagne, J. Fung, Gaze and postural reorientation in the control of locomotor steering after stroke, *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair* 23(3) (2009) 256-266.

[46] J. Leffler, L. Scheys, T. Planté-Bordeneuve, B. Callewaert, L. Labey, J. Bellemans, et al., Joint kinematics following bi-compartmental knee replacement during daily life motor tasks, *Gait & posture* 36(3) (2012) 454-460.

[47] K. Leigh Hollands, M.A. Hollands, D. Zietz, A. Miles Wing, C. Wright, P. Van Vliet, Kinematics of turning 180 during the timed up and go in stroke survivors with and without falls history, *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair* 24(4) (2010) 358-367.

[48] C.A. Lohnes, G.M. Earhart, Saccadic eye movements are related to turning performance in Parkinson disease, *Journal of Parkinson's disease* 1(1) (2011) 109-118.

[49] M. Mancini, M. El-Gohary, S. Pearson, J. McNames, H. Schlueter, J.G. Nutt, et al., Continuous monitoring of turning in Parkinson's disease: rehabilitation potential, *NeuroRehabilitation* 37(1) (2015) 3-10.

[50] M. Mancini, K. Smulders, R.G. Cohen, F.B. Horak, N. Giladi, J.G. Nutt, The clinical significance of freezing while turning in Parkinson's disease, *Neuroscience* 343

(2017) 222-228.

[51] S. Mari, M. Serrao, C. Casali, C. Conte, A. Ranavolo, L. Padua, et al., Turning strategies in patients with cerebellar ataxia, *Experimental brain research* 222(1-2) (2012) 65-75.

[52] M.E. McNeely, G.M. Earhart, The effects of medication on turning in people with Parkinson disease with and without freezing of gait, *Journal of Parkinson's disease* 1(3) (2011) 259-270.

[53] S. Mellone, M. Mancini, L.A. King, F.B. Horak, L. Chiari, The quality of turning in Parkinson's disease: a compensatory strategy to prevent postural instability?, *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation* 13(1) (2016) 1-9.

[54] T. Nakamura, T. Higuchi, T. Kikumoto, T. Takeda, H. Tashiro, F. Hoshi, Slower Reorientation of Trunk for Reactive Turning while Walking in Hemiparesis Stroke Patients, *J Mot Behav* 51(6) (2019) 640-646.

[55] J.A. O'Keefe, E.E. Robertson-Dick, D.A. Hall, E. Berry-Kravis, Gait and functional mobility deficits in fragile X-associated tremor/ataxia syndrome, *The Cerebellum* 15(4) (2016) 475-482.

[56] R. Panzera, D. Salomonczyk, E. Pirogovosky, R. Simmons, J. Goldstein, J. Corey-Bloom, et al., Postural deficits in Huntington's disease when performing motor skills involved in daily living, *Gait & posture* 33(3) (2011) 457-461.

[57] D.S. Peterson, M. Plotnik, J.M. Hausdorff, G.M. Earhart, Evidence for a relationship between bilateral coordination during complex gait tasks and freezing of gait in Parkinson's disease, *Parkinsonism & related disorders* 18(9) (2012) 1022-1026.

[58] C. Pinto, C.P. Schuch, G. Balbinot, A.P. Salazar, E.M. Hennig, A.F.R. Kleiner, et al., Movement smoothness during a functional mobility task in subjects with Parkinson's

disease and freezing of gait - an analysis using inertial measurement units, *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 16(1) (2019) 110.

[59] A. Salarian, F.B. Horak, C. Zampieri, P. Carlson-Kuhta, J.G. Nutt, K. Aminian, iTUG, a sensitive and reliable measure of mobility, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering* 18(3) (2010) 303-310.

[60] A. Salarian, C. Zampieri, F.B. Horak, P. Carlson-Kuhta, J.G. Nutt, K. Aminian, Analyzing 180° turns using an inertial system reveals early signs of progression of parkinson's disease, 2009 Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, IEEE, 2009, pp. 224-227.

[61] M. Serrao, S. Mari, C. Conte, A. Ranavolo, C. Casali, F. Draicchio, et al., Strategies adopted by cerebellar ataxia patients to perform U-turns, *The Cerebellum* 12(4) (2013) 460-468.

[62] M. Son, C. Youm, S. Cheon, J. Kim, M. Lee, Y. Kim, et al., Evaluation of the turning characteristics according to the severity of Parkinson disease during the timed up and go test, *Aging clinical and experimental research* 29(6) (2017) 1191-1199.

[63] S.E. Spaulding, T. Chen, L.-S. Chou, Selection of an above or below-ankle orthosis for individuals with neuropathic partial foot amputation: a pilot study, *Prosthetics and orthotics international* 36(2) (2012) 217-224.

[64] J. Spildooren, S. Vercruyse, K. Desloovere, W. Vandenberghe, E. Kerckhofs, A. Nieuwboer, Freezing of gait in Parkinson's disease: the impact of dual-tasking and turning, *Movement Disorders* 25(15) (2010) 2563-2570.

[65] J. Spildooren, S. Vercruyse, E. Heremans, B. Galna, G. Verheyden, G. Vervoort, et al., Influence of cueing and an attentional strategy on freezing of gait in Parkinson disease during turning, *Journal of neurologic physical therapy* 41(2) (2017) 129-135.

- [66] E. Stack, A. Ashburn, Dysfunctional turning in Parkinson's disease, *Disability and rehabilitation* 30(16) (2008) 1222-1229.
- [67] S. Vallabhajosula, T.A. Buckley, M.D. Tillman, C.J. Hass, Age and Parkinson's disease related kinematic alterations during multi-directional gait initiation, *Gait & posture* 37(2) (2013) 280-286.
- [68] J.M. Van Uem, S. Walgaard, E. Ainsworth, S.E. Hasmann, T. Heger, S. Nussbaum, et al., Quantitative timed-up-and-go parameters in relation to cognitive parameters and health-related quality of life in mild-to-moderate Parkinson's disease, *PLoS One* 11(4) (2016) e0151997.
- [69] G. Vervoort, E. Heremans, A. Bengevoord, C. Strouwen, E. Nackaerts, W. Vandenberghe, et al., Dual-task-related neural connectivity changes in patients with Parkinson's disease, *Neuroscience* 317 (2016) 36-46.
- [70] A.M. Willems, A. Nieuwboer, F. Chavret, K. Desloovere, R. Dom, L. Rochester, et al., Turning in Parkinson's disease patients and controls: the effect of auditory cues, *Movement disorders* 22(13) (2007) 1871-1878.
- [71] Y. Koshino, T. Ishida, M. Yamanaka, Y. Ezawa, T. Okunuki, T. Kobayashi, et al., Kinematics and muscle activities of the lower limb during a side-cutting task in subjects with chronic ankle instability, *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 24(4) (2016) 1071-1080.
- [72] S.B. Akram, J.S. Frank, S. Chenouri, Turning behavior in healthy older adults: is there a preference for step versus spin turns?, *Gait & posture* 31(1) (2010) 23-26.
- [73] N. Giladi, H. Shabtai, E. Simon, S. Biran, J. Tal, A. Korczyn, Construction of freezing of gait questionnaire for patients with Parkinsonism, *Parkinsonism & related disorders* 6(3) (2000) 165-170.

[74] K. Fujita, H. Iijima, R. Eguchi, T. Kuroiwa, T. Sasaki, Y. Yokoyama, et al., Gait analysis of patients with distal radius fracture by using a novel laser Timed Up-and-Go system, *Gait & Posture* 80 (2020) 223-227.

[75] M.K. Mak, A. Patla, C. Hui-Chan, Sudden turn during walking is impaired in people with Parkinson's disease, *Experimental brain research* 190(1) (2008) 43-51.

Table 1 Characteristics of the included studies.

Author, year	Experimental group					Control group				
	<i>n</i>	Age (years)	Height (m)	Weight (kg)	Sex (%F)	<i>n</i>	Age (years)	Height (m)	Weight (kg)	Sex (%F)
<i>PD</i>										
Adamson MB, 2019 ²¹	21	70	1.72	77.8	29.2	16	66	1.75	85.6	56.3
Akram S, 2013 ²³	14	67	NA	NA	50.0	19	66	NA	NA	47.4
Akram S, 2013 ²²	14	67	NA	NA	50.0	19	66	NA	NA	47.4
Ambati V, 2016 ^{*1 29}	8	62	NA	NA	NA	5	74	NA	NA	NA
Arias P, 2010 ^{*2 30}	19	66	NA	NA	36.8	10	70	NA	NA	20.0
Bengevoord A, 2016 ^{*3 31}	30	68	NA	NA	26.7	14	65	NA	NA	85.7
Bernad-Elazari H, 2016 ³²	99	65	1.69	77.6	26.3	38	79	1.63	72.2	65.2
Bhatt H, 2013 ^{*4 33}	20	74	1.72	NA	NA	10	70	1.70	NA	NA
Carpinella I, 2007 ³⁷	7	66	NA	NA	NA	7	68	NA	NA	NA
Conradsson D, 2017 ³⁹	19	72	1.73	74.7	36.8	17	72	1.76	76.1	41.2
Crenna P, 2007 ⁴⁰	7	67	1.66	66.9	28.6	15	68	1.65	65.7	46.7
Fietzek UM, 2017 ^{*5 42}	40	67	NA	NA	NA	16	63	NA	NA	NA
Fisher B, 2013 ⁴³	4	55	NA	NA	25.0	1	58	NA	NA	0.0
Hong M, 2009 ⁴⁶	11	67	NA	NA	18.2	12	72	NA	NA	NA
Huxham F, 2008 ⁴⁷	10	73	1.65	70.3	20.0	10	71	1.68	71.6	NA
Lohnes C, 2011 ^{*6 53}	22	69	NA	NA	36.4	19	69	NA	NA	42.1
Mancini M, 2015 ⁵⁴	13	65	NA	NA	NA	19	67	NA	NA	NA
Mancini M, 2017 ^{*7 55}	28	66	NA	NA	NA	14	66	NA	NA	NA
McNeely ME, 2011 ⁵⁷	20	75	NA	NA	25.0	16	71	NA	NA	50.0
Mellone S, 2016 ⁵⁸	12	66	NA	NA	33.3	19	67	NA	NA	36.8
Peterson DS, 2012 ^{*8 62}	31	71	NA	NA	NA	10	69	NA	NA	NA
Pinto C, 2019 ⁶³	31	65	1.63	76.1	29.0	6	68	1.71	77.6	0.0
Salarian A, 2009 ⁶⁵	12	60	NA	NA	41.7	14	61	NA	NA	78.6

Salarian A, 2010 ⁶⁴	12	60	NA	NA	75.0	12	60	NA	NA	75.0
Son M, 2017 ^{*9} ⁶⁷	20	71	1.58	57.8	45.0	10	64	1.60	62.3	30.0
Spildooren J, 2010 ⁶⁹	28	68	NA	NA	NA	14	65	NA	NA	NA
Spildooren J, 2013 ^{*10} ⁷⁰	27	67	NA	NA	NA	14	65	NA	NA	NA
Spildooren J, 2017 ⁷¹	15	67	NA	NA	NA	14	65	NA	NA	NA
Stack E, 2008 ⁷²	28	72	1.65	NA	46.4	12	70	1.72	NA	50.0
Vallabhajosula S, 2013 ⁷³	11	60	1.74	91.4	NA	11	60	1.68	76.5	NA
Van Uem J, 2016 ⁷⁴	28	65	NA	NA	42.9	20	66	NA	NA	40.0
Vervoort G, 2016 ⁷⁵	73	60	NA	NA	41.1	20	58	NA	NA	30.0
Willems A M, 2007 ⁷⁶	19	64	1.66	68.4	NA	9	63	1.63	72.3	NA
<i>Stroke</i>										
Ahmad R, 2014 ²⁸	10	66	NA	NA	20.0	10	65	NA	NA	40.0
Bonnyaud C, 2015 ³⁴	29	54	1.68	73.2	37.9	25	52	1.67	65.6	56.0
Bonnyaud C, 2016 ³⁵	29	54	1.68	73.2	37.9	25	52	1.67	65.6	56.0
Burnfield J, 2005 ^{*11} ³⁶	28	67	1.68	75.8	46.4	10	73	1.64	73.0	50.0
Chisholm A, 2015 ³⁸	2	60	1.74	76.0	0.0	1	65	1.77	79.3	0.0
Duval K, 2011 ⁴¹	14	53	1.70	77.5	28.6	17	52	1.65	63.8	82.4
Hollands K, 2010 ^{*12} ⁵²	18	60	NA	NA	NA	18	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hollands K, 2014 ⁴⁵	17	64	NA	NA	17.6	15	69	NA	NA	NA
Lamontagne A, 2009 ⁵⁰	8	62	1.72	77.0	12.5	7	65	1.72	74.0	28.6
Nakamura T, 2019 ⁵⁹	11	67	NA	NA	18.2	20	69	NA	NA	0.0
<i>CAI</i>										
Fuerst P, 2018 ^{*13} ⁴⁴	36	24	1.75	69.6	55.6	18	24	1.71	66.6	55.6
Koshino Y, 2014 ⁴⁹	12	21	1.73	64.6	16.7	12	21	1.72	64.7	16.7
Koshino Y, 2016 ⁷⁷	10	21	1.74	65.9	10.0	10	21	1.74	66.5	10.0
<i>TKA</i>										
Khan H, 2013 ⁴⁸	27	50-80 ^{*15}	NA	NA	59.3	18	50-80 ^{*15}	NA	NA	61.1
Leffler J, 2012 ⁵¹	10	67	1.63	79.1	80.0	10	69	1.63	70.1	80.0

<i>CA</i>										
Mari S, 2012 ⁵⁶	10	51	NA	NA	20.0	10	48	NA	NA	30.0
Serrao M, 2013 ⁶⁶	10	51	1.69	72.8	20.0	10	48	1.68	74.6	30.0
<i>FXTAS</i>										
O'Keefe J, 2016 ^{*14 60}	13	67	1.68	72.9	61.5	18	69	1.68	68.4	66.7
<i>HD</i>										
Panzer R, 2011 ⁶¹	11	47	NA	NA	45.5	17	39	NA	NA	58.8
<i>TMA</i>										
Spaulding S, 2012 ⁶⁸	6	58	1.85	110.9	NA	6	58	1.77	86.1	NA

Mean value of age, height, weight, and sex are shown.

n: number, F: female, NA: not available, PD: Parkinson's disease, CAI: chronic ankle instability, TKA: total knee arthroplasty, CA: cerebellar ataxia, FXTAS: fragile X-associated tremor/ataxia syndrome, HD: Huntington's disease, TMA: transmetatarsal amputation.

*1 Only age matched controls are listed.

*2 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (10, 68 years, 40.0% female) and PD without freezing of gait (9, 64 years, 44.4% female).

*3 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (16, 69 years, 75.0% female) and PD without freezing of gait (14, 67 years, 71.4% female).

*4 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (10, 72 years, 1.72 m) and PD without freezing of gait (10, 75 years, 1.71 m).

*5 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (21, 67 years) and PD without freezing of gait (19, 67 years).

*6 Only data who performed 90° turn is listed. The participants are almost the same as those who performed 18° turn (20, 69 years, 35.0% female).

*7 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (16, 67 years) and PD without freezing of gait (12, 65 years).

*8 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (12, 72 years) and PD without freezing of gait (19, 71 years).

*9 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (10, 71 years, 1.56 m, 55.8 kg, 40.0% female) and PD without freezing of gait (10, 70 years, 1.60 m, 59.8 kg, 50.0% female).

*10 Only merged value is listed. PD with freezing of gait (13, 68 years) and PD without freezing of gait (14, 67 years).

*11 Only merged value is listed. Sustained a unilateral stroke (10, 63 years, 1.75 m, 83.7 kg, 20.0% female), diagnosis of diabetes mellitus (10, 70 years, 1.63

m, 71.1 kg, 40.0% female), and presence of lower extremity arthritis (8, 69 years, 1.67 m, 71.7 kg, 87.5% female).

*12 Only merged value is listed. Stroke with a falls history (9, 59 years) and stroke a falls history (9, 61 years).

*13 Only merged value is listed. Purely functional ankle instability (18, 24 years, 1.75 m, 70.1 kg, 55.6% female) and combination of both functionally and mechanically unstable ankle joints (18, 24 years, 1.74 m, 69.0 kg, 55.6% female).

*14 Only merged value is listed. FMR1 premutation carriers with FXTAS (7, 70 years, 1.70 m, 81.7 kg, 42.9% female) and FMR1 premutation carriers without FXTAS (6, 65 years, 1.67 m, 65.4 kg, 83.3% female).

*15 Range (minimum-maximum).

Table 2 Outcomes and apparatus of included studies.

Author, year	Outcomes						Apparatus			
	Spatiotemporal	Kinematics	Kinetics	Strategies	EMG	Other	3DMA	FP	IMU	Others
<i>PD</i>										
Adamson MB, 2019 ²¹				Turn type ratio						Video
Akram S, 2013 ²³		Peak angular velocity		Delay time of reorientation of shoulder, pelvis, foot		FAR score	•			
Akram S, 2013 ²²		Peak angular velocity		Delay time of reorientation of shoulder, pelvis, foot		FAR score	•			
Ambati V, 2016 ^{21, 29}	Turn duration			Delay time of reorientation of eye, head, trunk, pelvis, distance from lead foot to center of turn			•			Eye tracker
Arias P, 2010 ^{72, 30}	Turn duration									Footswitch, photocells
Bengevoord A, 2016 ^{43, 31}	Turn duration, velocity, step width, medial COM position, anterior COM position			Total length of COM trajectory			•			
Bernad-Elazari H, 2016 ³²	TUG time								•	
Bhatt H, 2013 ^{44, 33}	Velocity, step length, step width			Turn type ratio			•			
Carpinella I, 2007 ³⁷	Cadence, stride length, stance phase ratio, double support phase ratio, velocity, number of steps, approach step length, approach step velocity, step duration	Hip flexion, knee flexion, ankle flexion, pelvis tilt, pelvis obliquity, pelvis horizontal rotation, trunk forward inclination, trunk-pelvis lateral flexion, trunk-pelvis horizontal rotation, head rotation, trunk rotation, pelvis rotation		Delay time of reorientation of head, trunk, pelvis, max head / trunk rotation, max trunk / pelvis rotation	EMG		•	•		Surface EMG
Conradsson D, 2017 ³⁹	Velocity, step width, step length	Body rotation		Step turn ratio, total length of COM trajectory, distance from COM to center of turn, delay time of reorientation			•			
Crenna P, 2007 ⁴⁰	Number of steps, approach step length, approach step velocity, step duration	Rotation of head, trunk, max head-trunk rotation		Total length of COM trajectory, delay time of reorientation of head, trunk			•			
Fietzek UM, 2017 ^{42, 45}	Number of steps, turn duration								•	
Fisher B, 2013 ⁴³	Peak of distance between COP and eCOM						•	•		
Hong M, 2009 ⁴⁶	Turn duration, number of steps	ROM of rotation of head, trunk, pelvis		Delay time of reorientation of head, trunk, pelvis	EMG		•			Surface EMG
Huxham F, 2008 ⁴⁷		Rotation of head, thorax, pelvis		Delay time of reorientation of head, thorax, pelvis, rotation measured relative to distance from the corner, rotation measured relative to time from the corner			•			
Lohnes C, 2011 ^{46, 53}	Number of steps, turn duration					Number of saccades, first saccade amplitude, first saccade velocity,	•			Eye tracker

						norm E-H index, norm E-F index					
Mancini M, 2015 ⁵⁴	Turn duration, velocity										•
Mancini M, 2017 ^{57,55}	Average of peak speed, average of jerkiness, number of turns					Freezing ratio during turn, TUG					•
McNeely ME, 2011 ⁵⁷	Turn duration, number of steps			Delay time of reorientation of head, trunk, pelvis	EMG			•	•		Surface EMG
Mellone S, 2016 ⁵⁸	Total duration, velocity, mean turn duration, step length, coefficient of variation of step length, total number of steps, step duration, coefficient of variation of step duration, double support time, turn duration, mean distance between COM and the lateral margin of the feet			Total length of COM trajectory		Difference between path and executed turn angle		•			
Peterson DS, 2012 ^{58,62}	Relative timing of stepping			Coefficient of variation of the series of relative timing of the stepping of one leg, the accuracy and consistency of left-right stepping phases							Footswitch
Pinto C, 2019 ⁶³	TUG time					SPARC values					•
Salarian A, 2009 ⁶⁵	Turn duration, number of steps, step time, max step time, step before turn, number of double steps	Peak angular velocity									•
Salarian A, 2010 ⁶⁴	Turn duration, number of steps, average of step time, step time, last step time before turn, number of double steps	Peak angular velocity of trunk									•
Son M, 2017 ^{69,67}	TUG time, TUG total steps, velocity, step time, step length	ROM of hip, knee, ankle, shoulder, foot clearance height		Max rotation between pelvic vector and shoulder vector				•			
Spildooren J, 2010 ⁶⁹	Number of steps, turn duration, cadence					FOG ratio, secondary-task performance		•			
Spildooren J, 2013 ^{70,70}	Turn duration, step time, velocity	Angular velocity of pelvis		Head-pelvis separation, head-pelvis velocity difference, distance from COM to center of turn, pelvis rotation in reached max head-pelvis rotation		FOG ratio		•			
Spildooren J, 2017 ⁷¹	Medial COM deviation	Angular velocity, knee flexion amplitude		Delay time of reorientation of head, trunk, pelvis, Head-pelvis separation		FOG ratio		•			
Stack E, 2008 ⁷²	Number of steps, turn duration			Turn type							Video
Vallabhajosula S, 2013 ⁷³	Step length, velocity, time to stance leg heel-rise	Rotation of head, trunk, pelvis						•	•		
Van Uem J, 2016 ⁷⁴	Turn duration	Max velocity									•
Vervoort G, 2016 ⁷⁵	Stance time, swing time, step length asymmetry, turn duration, number of steps, cadence							•			

Willems A M, 2007 ⁷⁶	Number of steps, turn duration, step length, step width, step duration			Depth, width, trajectory toward the obstacle		Cued/non-cued	•			
<i>Stroke</i>										
Ahmad R, 2014 ²⁸				Delay time of reorientation of eye, head, shoulder, pelvis, feet		Eye-displacement	•			Eye tracker
Bonnyaud C, 2015 ³⁴	Turn duration, the distance between the most leftward and rightward positions of the COM, distance between the highest and lowest positions of the COM, COM mediolateral velocity, COM vertical velocity	Minimum foot clearance					•			
Bonnyaud C, 2016 ³⁵	TUG time, performance time, percentage of swing phase, percentage of single support phase, step length, step width, velocity, cadence	Peak hip flexion, peak hip extension, peak knee flexion, peak knee extension, peak ankle dorsiflexion, peak ankle plantarflexion					•			
Burnfield J, 2005 ^{*11 36}	Stance duration		Peak utilized coefficient of friction					•		
Chisholm A, 2015 ³⁸			COP position and variability in Medial-lateral, COP displacement in anterior-posterior direction		EMG		•	•		Surface EMG
Duval K, 2011 ⁴¹	Velocity	Joint angle of the hip, knee, and ankle	Foot pressure		EMG			•		Goniometer, surface EMG
Hollands K, 2010 ^{*12 52}	TUG time, time to turn from head onset to COM offset, numbers of steps			Delay time of reorientation of head, thorax, pelvis, distance from turn center at which head/thorax began to reorient				•		
Hollands K, 2014 ⁴⁵	Variability of time to turn, time to turn, step width, step length, single support time						•			
Lamontagne A, 2009 ⁵⁰	Velocity, COM trajectory, COM displacement	Horizontal rotation of gaze, head, thorax, pelvis, feet		Delay time of reorientation of gaze, head, thorax, pelvis			•			Eye tracker
Nakamura T, 2019 ⁵⁹				Step type ratio		Reaction time			•	Video, foot switch
<i>CAI</i>										
Fuerst P, 2018 ^{*13 44}		Ankle angle, ankle angular velocity, ankle joint moment			EMG		•	•		Surface EMG
Koshino Y, 2014 ⁴⁹	Approach velocity, time of stance	Hip flexion, hip adduction, hip internal rotation, knee flexion, ankle dorsiflexion, ankle inversion	Maximum vertical ground reaction force				•	•		
Koshino Y, 2016 ⁷⁷		Hip flexion, hip adduction, hip internal rotation, knee flexion, ankle dorsiflexion, ankle inversion	Maximum vertical ground reaction force		EMG		•	•		Surface EMG
<i>TKA</i>										
Khan H, 2013 ⁴⁸	Total magnitude acceleration values								•	
Leffler J, 2012 ⁵¹	Motion cycle time, timing of foot off	Knee flexion/extension, varus/valgus, endo-/exo-rotation					•	•		Knee alignment

											device
<i>CA</i>											
Mari S, 2012 ⁵⁶	Velocity, turn duration, cycle duration, double support time, stride width, step length, number of steps			Delay time of reorientation of head, trunk, pelvis, step type ratio		Ratio of successful trails, ratio of subject who need more than 2 steps	•	•			
Serrao M, 2013 ⁶⁶	Velocity, step length, step width	Body rotation, peak hip flexion, hip extension ROM, peak knee flexion, knee extension ROM, peak ankle dorsi-flexion, ankle planter-flexion ROM		Degrees of reorientation of head, trunk, pelvis at COM trajectory reversal			•				
<i>FXTAS</i>											
O'Keefe J, 2016 ^{64, 60}	Stride velocity, cadence, double-limb support, stride length coefficient of variation, stride velocity coefficient of variation, cadence coefficient of variation, turn duration, step time before turn, number of steps	Horizontal, sagittal, frontal trunk ROM								•	
<i>HD</i>											
Panzera R, 2011 ⁶¹	Turn duration, sway velocity of COG							•			
<i>TMA</i>											
Spaulding S, 2012 ⁶⁸	TUG time						•	•			In-shoe F-scan system

EMG: electromyography, 3DMA: three-dimensional motion analysis, FP: force plate, IMU: inertial measurement unit, PD: Parkinson's disease, CAI: chronic ankle instability, TKA: total knee arthroplasty, CA: cerebellar ataxia, FXTAS: fragile X-associated tremor/ataxia syndrome, HD: Huntington's disease, TMA: transmetatarsal amputation.

Table 3 Turning conditions.

Author, year	Angle (°)			Speed	Turn position / timing	Length of approach path	Turn direction	Notes
	180	90	other					
<i>PD</i>								
Adamson MB, 2019 ²¹	●	●		NA	Center location (marker)	3.05 m	Unspecified	Planned / unplanned / dual task
Akram S, 2013 ²³		●	45	Self-selected	On the spot	0 m	Right	With their arms crossed in front of their chest
Akram S, 2013 ²²		●	45	Self-selected	In the zone	4 m	Right	
Ambati V, 2016 ^{*1 29}		●		Self-selected	In the zone	5 m	NA	
Arias P, 2010 ^{*2 30}								Auditory stimulation by means of headphones
	●			NA	Push a button on the wall	6.58 m	NA	
Bengevoord A, 2016 ^{*3 31}	●			Self-selected	Center location (refractive marker)	5 m	Both	
Bernad-Elazari H, 2016 ³²	●			Self-selected	Center location	3 m	NA	TUG
Bhatt H, 2013 ^{*4 33}	●	●	120	Self-selected	Center location (cone)	6 m	Right	
Carpinella I, 2007 ³⁷		●		Self-selected	Force plate	2 m	Left	
Conradsson D, 2017 ³⁹	●			Self-selected	Center location (pole)	4.65 m	Both	
Crenna P, 2007 ⁴⁰		●		Self-selected	Center location (pole)	2 m	Left	
Fietzek UM, 2017 ^{*5 42}			360	NA	On the spot	0 m	Both	
Fisher B, 2013 ⁴³		●		Self-selected	Center location (stanchion)	4.6 m	Right	
Hong M, 2009 ⁴⁶	●			Self-selected	On the spot	0 m	Both	
Huxham F, 2008 ⁴⁷			60, 120	Self-selected	Center location (pole)	5 m	Right	Colored 300 mm square targets as direction indicators
Lohnes C, 2011 ^{*6 53}	●	●		Self-selected	On the spot	0 m	Both	
Mancini M, 2015 ⁵⁴	●	●		NA	Center location (wall)	NA	Both	
Mancini M, 2017 ^{*7 55}	●			Self-selected	Center location	7 m	NA	iTUG
McNeely ME, 2011 ⁵⁷	●			NA	On the spot	0 m	Both	
Mellone S, 2016 ⁵⁸	●	●	135	Self-selected / faster /	In the zone	1-2 m	Unspecified	

Peterson DS, 2012 ^{88 62}		360	slower Self-selected	Radius circle	0 m	Both	
Pinto C, 2019 ⁶³	•		Self-selected	Center location (cone)	3 m	Unspecified	TUG
Salarian A, 2009 ⁶⁵	•		Self-selected	In the zone	7 m	Right	
Salarian A, 2010 ⁶⁴	•		Self-selected	In the zone	7 m	Right	iTUG
Son M, 2017 ^{89 67}	•		As quickly as possible	Center location (refractive marker)	2.44 m	Both	TUG
Spildooren J, 2010 ⁶⁹	•		NA	Center location (refractive marker)	5 m	Both	
Spildooren J, 2013 ^{*10 70}	•	360	NA	Center location (refractive marker)	5 m	Both	With / without dual task
Spildooren J, 2017 ⁷¹	•		Self-selected	Center location (refractive marker)	5 m	Both	With / without dual task
Stack E, 2008 ⁷²	•		NA	On the spot	0 m	Both	
Vallabhajosula S, 2013 ⁷³						Self-selected either of the	
	•	45	Self-selected	On the spot	4-6 m	feet	
Van Uem J, 2016 ⁷⁴	•		Self-selected / fast	Center location	3 m	Both	iTUG
Vervoort G, 2016 ⁷⁵		360	Self-selected	NA	0 m	Both	With / without dual task
Willems A M, 2007 ⁷⁶			Self-selected / synchronize every foot-contact with the beat of the metronome	Center location (obstacle)	5 m	Right	
<i>Stroke</i>							
Ahmad R, 2014 ²⁸		45,					
	•	135	NA	On the spot	0 m	Both	Planned / unplanned
Bonnyaud C, 2015 ³⁴	•		Self-selected	Center location (cone)	3 m	NA	TUG
Bonnyaud C, 2016 ³⁵						Paretic side (patients) / non-dominant side	
	•		Self-selected	Center location (cone)	3 m	(controls)	TUG
Burnfield J, 2005 ^{*11 36}	•		Self-selected	Force plate	5 m	NA	
Chisholm A, 2015 ³⁸	•		Self-selected	Semicircle	NA	Both	Large / small semicircle
Duval K, 2011 ⁴¹		360	Self-selected	Radius circle	0 m	Both	Radius of 0.5 / 1.0 / 2.0 m

Hollands K, 2010 ^{*12 52}	●	Self-selected	Center location	3.7 m	Both	With / without dual task
Hollands K, 2014 ⁴⁵	●	As quickly as possible	Center location (cone)	3 m	Both	TUG
Lamontagne A, 2009 ⁵⁰	●	Self-selected	Displayed cue	5 m	Both	
Nakamura T, 2019 ⁵⁹	●	Self-selected	In the zone	4-7 m	Both	
<i>CAI</i>						
Fuerst P, 2018 ^{*13 44}	●	4 ± 0.3 m/s	Force plate	6-8 m	Both	
Koshino Y, 2014 ⁴⁹		45	Self-selected	Force plate	NA	Tested side
Koshino Y, 2016 ⁷⁷		45	Self-selected	Force plate	NA	Tested side
<i>TKA</i>						
Khan H, 2013 ⁴⁸	●	NA	Step number	1 step	Non-tested side	
Leffler J, 2012 ⁵¹	●	Self-selected	On the spot	0 m	Both	
<i>CA</i>						
Mari S, 2012 ⁵⁶	●	30	Self-selected	Force plate	within 10 m	Both
Serrao M, 2013 ⁶⁶	●		Self-selected	Force plate	within 10 m	Right
<i>FXTAS</i>						
O'Keefe J, 2016 ^{*14 60}	●	Self-selected	Center location	7 m	NA	iTUG
<i>HD</i>						
Panzer R, 2011 ⁶¹	●	Self-selected	Step number	2 steps	Both	
<i>TMA</i>						
Spaulding S, 2012 ⁶⁸	●	Self-selected	Center location	3 m	NA	TUG, bare foot

PD: Parkinson's disease, CAI: chronic ankle instability, TKA: total knee arthroplasty, CA: cerebellar ataxia, FXTAS: fragile X-associated tremor/ataxia syndrome, HD: Huntington's disease, TMA: transmetatarsal amputation.


Table 4 Summary of meta-analysis.

Dark blue cells: parameters that meta-analysis was performed. Alphabets are corresponding to Figure 3. -: data available but not enough study for meta-analysis because of discrepancy of conditions. PD: Parkinson's disease, Walking: walking turn, Spot: walking on the spot.

		PD				Stroke			
		90°		180°		90°		180°	
		Walking	Spot	Walking	Spot	Walking	Spot	Walking	Spot
Spatiotemporal	Number of steps	-	-	A	A				
	Turn duration [s]		-	B	B	-		-	
	Average of step duration [s]	-		C					
	Turn velocity [m/s]			D					
	Step length [m]			E		-		-	
	Step width [m]			F		-		-	
Kinematics	Angular velocity [°/s]			G					
	Head rotation [°]	-							
Strategy	Step turn ratio [%]			-					
	Total length of COM trajectory [m]			-					
	Distance from COM to center of turn [m]			H					
	Delay time of pelvis reorientation [s]	I							
	Head-pelvis rotation [°]			J					

Figure 1


Structure of outcome categorization.



[Type here]

Figure 2


Flowchart of study selection according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA).



[Type here]

Figure 3

A. SMD and 95% CI for the number of steps in PD versus control during 180° turning and 180° turning on the spot. SMD, standardized mean differences; CI, confidence interval; PD, Parkinson’s disease




[Type here]

B. SMD and 95% CI for turn duration in PD versus control during 180° turning and 180° turning on the spot.

Author, Year	Subject No		SMD [95% CI]	Weight, %
	C	E		
<i>180° turn</i>				
Salarian A, 2009	14	12	2.80 [1.67, 3.93]	17.9
Spildooren J, 2010	14	14	3.33 [2.14, 4.53]	17.2
Spildooren J, 2013	14	13	1.36 [0.51, 2.21]	20.9
Van Uem J, 2016, iTUG	20	28	0.98 [0.37, 1.59]	23.4
Willems, A. M 2007	9	19	1.30 [0.43, 2.18]	20.6
Overall (Random effects)	71	86	1.86 [1.03, 2.68]	100
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 17.03$ ($P = 0.002$), $I^2 = 77\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.40$ ($p < 0.0001$)				


<i>180° turn on the spot</i>				
Hong M, 2009	12	11	3.02 [1.76, 4.28]	24.8
Lohnes C, 2011	19	20	1.00 [0.33, 1.67]	26.7
McNeely ME, 2011	16	20	7.31 [5.41, 9.22]	22
Stack E, 2008	12	28	0.49 [-0.20, 1.17]	26.6
Overall (Random effects)	59	79	2.75 [0.76, 4.74]	100.0
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 51.49$ ($P < 0.00001$), $I^2 = 94\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.71$ ($p = 0.007$)				



[Type here]


C. SMD and 95% CI for step duration in PD versus control during 180° turning.

Author, Year	Subject No		SMD [95% CI]	Weight, %
	C	E		
<i>180° turn</i>				
Salarian A, 2009	14	12	0.14 [-0.63, 0.91]	20.8
Son M, 2017, TUG	10	10	0.00 [-0.88, 0.88]	17.9
Spildooren J, 2010	14	14	-0.90 [-1.69, -0.12]	20.5
Spildooren J, 2013	14	13	-0.59 [-1.36, 0.19]	20.8
Willems AM, 2007	9	19	0.36 [-0.43, 1.16]	20.0
Overall (Random effects)	61	68	-0.21 [-0.68, 0.26]	100.0
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 6.91$ ($P = 0.14$), $I^2 = 42\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.86$ ($p = 0.39$)				



[Type here]


D. SMD and 95% CI for turn velocity in PD versus control during 180° turning.



[Type here]

E. SMD and 95% CI for angular velocity in PD versus control during 180° turning.


Author, Year	Subject No		SMD [95% CI]	Weight, %
	C	E		
<i>180° turn</i>				
Salarian A, 2009	14	12	-0.32 [-1.10, 0.45]	46.5
Van Uem J, 2016, iTUG	20	28	-1.21 [-1.84, -0.58]	53.5
Overall (Random effects)	34	40	-0.80 [-1.66, 0.07]	100.0
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 3.03$ ($P = 0.08$), $I^2 = 67\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.80$ ($p = 0.07$)				



[Type here]

F. SMD and 95% CI for step length in PD versus control during 180° turning.


Author, Year	Subject No		SMD [95% CI]	Weight, %
	C	E		
<i>180° turn</i>				
Bhatt H, 2013	10	10	-2.01 [-3.13, -0.89]	30.5
Son M, 2017, TUG	10	10	0.00 [-0.88, 0.88]	34.6
Willems AM 2007	9	19	-1.21 [-2.07, -0.34]	34.9
Overall (Random effects)	29	39	-1.03 [-2.15, 0.08]	100.0
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 8.31$ ($P = 0.02$), $I^2 = 76\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.82$ ($p = 0.07$)				



[Type here]

G. SMD and 95% CI for step width in PD versus control during 180° turning.


Author, Year	Subject No		SMD [95% CI]	Weight, %
	C	E		
<i>180° turn</i>				
Bhatt H, 2013	10	10	-1.24 [-2.21, -0.26]	45.8
Willems AM 2007	9	19	-1.47 [-2.37, -0.58]	54.2
Overall (Random effects)	19	29	-1.37 [-2.03, -0.71]	100
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 0.12$ ($P = 0.73$), $I^2 = 0\%$				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 4.06$ ($p < 0.0001$)				



[Type here]


H. SMD and 95% CI for distance from COM to center of turn in PD versus control during 90° turning. COM, center of mass

Author, Year	Subject No		SMD [95% CI]	Weight, %	Distance from COM to center of turn in PD
	C	E			
<i>180° turn</i>					
Conradsson D, 2017	19	17	0.11 [-0.54, 0.77]	57.1	
Spildooren J, 2013	13	14	0.05 [-0.71, 0.80]	42.9	
Overall (Random effects)	32	31	0.09 [-0.41, 0.58]	100	
Test for heterogeneity: $\text{Chi}^2 = 0.02$ ($P = 0.90$), $I^2 = 0\%$					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.34$ ($p = 0.73$)					




[Type here]

I. SMD and 95% CI for reorientation delay time of pelvis in PD versus control during 90° turning.



[Type here]


J. SMD and 95% CI for head-pelvis rotation angle in PD versus control during 180° turning.



[Type here]

Figure 4

The overview of the disease-specific turn characteristics.



[Type here]