

1 **Preclinical mobility limitation outcomes in rehabilitation interventions for middle-aged and**  
2 **older adults population: a scoping review protocol**

3

4 **Author information:**

5 • The names of the authors: Aiping Lai, PhD. (Kin)<sup>1</sup>, Ashley Morgan, PT<sup>1</sup>, Julie Richardson  
6 PT, PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Lauren Griffith, PhD<sup>2</sup>, Ayse Kuspinar PT, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Jenna Smith-Turchyn PT, PhD<sup>1</sup>

7 • The affiliations of the authors:

8 <sup>1</sup>School of Rehabilitation Science, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada

9 <sup>2</sup>Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada

10 • \* **Corresponding author:** Julie Richardson PT, PhD, Email: [jrichard@mcmaster.ca](mailto:jrichard@mcmaster.ca)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Objectives:** This scoping review aims to understand the extent of evidence regarding preclinical  
22 mobility limitation (PCML) intervention studies that have been implemented or planned in  
23 middle-aged and older adult populations.

24 **Introduction:** Individuals with PCML are at a high risk of future functional loss and progression  
25 to disability. An overview of studies undertaken on this emerging topic is now due.

26 **Inclusion criteria:** Rehabilitation intervention studies that measured PCML outcomes or  
27 assessed individuals at the PCML stage will be included. Studies will be considered if the  
28 participants are middle-aged (45-64yrs) or older adults ( $\geq 65$ yrs) in any setting, including  
29 community-dwelling, hospital discharges, or institutional settings.

30 **Methods:** Seven databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, AMED, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Web of Science and  
31 Cochrane CENTRAL) were searched to locate relevant published and unpublished intervention  
32 studies (English evidence from inception onwards). The search strategy will be generated using  
33 the PCC framework (population, concept, and context) and refined after consulting with a  
34 McMaster research librarian. In addition, a manual search from the reference list of retrieved  
35 papers and review articles will also be performed. Two reviewers will use predefined  
36 inclusion/exclusion criteria to independently review titles, abstracts, and full texts of potential  
37 articles. Any disagreements on study selection will be resolved by discussion or consensus  
38 involving a third reviewer. Data will be collected and reported using a predefined data  
39 extraction chart and described using qualitative content analysis.

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

41 **Introduction**

42 Mobility is defined as the ability to move oneself (independently or by using assistive devices or  
43 transportation) around their environment<sup>1-2</sup>. Mobility is a key physical ability that influences the  
44 quality of life as a strong prognostic indicator of disability<sup>3</sup>. A mobility limitation is usually the  
45 first area in which disability occurs. Twenty-four percent of older Canadians aged 65 to 74  
46 experienced mobility disability, and this percentage increases as they grow older. Forty-one

47 percent of older adults aged 75 to 84 years and 61 percent of those aged 85 years and over  
48 experience mobility disability<sup>4</sup>. The trajectory of mobility loss with aging is commonly described  
49 as a descending curve with a steeper decline shown late in life<sup>3</sup>. However, age-related  
50 impairments in mobility-associated physiological systems can be compensated by changing the  
51 manner or the frequency of doing a mobility task<sup>5</sup>. An overt mobility limitation only manifests  
52 when the severity of mobility loss becomes too high to be compensated<sup>3</sup>. The intermediate  
53 stage, which occurs with progressive loss of function and precedes the onset of disability, was  
54 referred to as “preclinical disability”<sup>6</sup>, “preclinical mobility disability”<sup>7</sup>, or “preclinical mobility  
55 limitation” (PCML)<sup>8</sup>. The concept of preclinical disability was first introduced by Fried and  
56 colleagues<sup>6</sup>. They defined it as a functional stage where people can still complete certain tasks  
57 but change the frequency or modify the way of doing the tasks. They linked the progressive  
58 disability to an iceberg and described the stage of PCML as a submerged portion of the iceberg.  
59 Only the tip of the iceberg is visible, representing individuals can no longer compensate  
60 successfully for their loss of physical function.

61 Before significant mobility and functional independence losses, there may be  
62 interventions that can improve recovery likelihood and functional levels<sup>9</sup>. Individuals in the  
63 PCML stage may represent an optimal group to receive disability prevention interventions, as  
64 they are likely to be responsive to altered risk factors<sup>10</sup>. In the primary prevention of disability  
65 among older adults, intervening at the PCML stage might be the most effective strategy to  
66 reduce the burden of disability in this population. However, studies have provided inconclusive  
67 results. For example, an RCT study compared older adults with preclinical gait dysfunction in a  
68 motor learning program incorporating goal-oriented stepping and walking with those in a  
69 standard program employing endurance training by treadmill walking<sup>11</sup>. Both groups improved  
70 walking endurance, but older adults in the motor learning group demonstrated more  
71 improvements in mobility performance parameters (such as gait speed and motor skill)<sup>11</sup>. Yet,  
72 Day and colleagues investigated a group of community-dwelling older adults with PCML in a Tai  
73 Chi group and seated flexibility exercise group for 24 weeks and found little change in  
74 impairments or functional limitations<sup>12</sup>. Many factors may contribute to these conflicting  
75 findings, such as tools used to identify the stage of PCML, eligibility criteria for participants, and

76 interventions selected. A preliminary search also showed that the outcomes measuring changes  
77 of PCML vary among studies<sup>12-14</sup>. Some used self-reported measures, such as the preclinical  
78 disability screening tool by Fried et al.<sup>15</sup> or the Preclinical mobility disability scale by Manty et  
79 al.<sup>8</sup>, while others debate whether performance-based measures can identify more limitations in  
80 physical function than self-report measures<sup>11</sup>. In addition, the characteristics of the sample  
81 recruited (e.g. age, gender, cognitive level, etc. ) and the variation in intervention used (e.g.  
82 type, frequency, length, intensity and delivery professions, etc.) may also contribute to the  
83 variation in results.

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

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

98

99 **Review questions:**

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

- 102 • What types of rehabilitation interventions are used to change PCML outcomes in  
103 middle-aged and older adults?
- 104 • What are the characteristics of the baseline samples included in the PCML intervention  
105 studies (e.g., participants' baseline characteristics, eligibility criteria, PCML stage  
106 assessment)?

107

## 108 **Eligibility criteria**

### 109 ***Participants***

110 Studies will be considered for inclusion in this review if there are PCML outcomes reported or if  
111 participants are identified as at the PCML stage. All the participants in the included studies will  
112 be middle-aged (45-64yrs) or older adults (65yrs or over).

### 113 ***Concept***

114 The concepts of the current review are rehabilitation intervention studies where PCML  
115 outcomes were reported or people who reported functional changes consistent with the PCML  
116 stage received a rehabilitation intervention. A rehabilitation intervention was defined as any  
117 non-surgical or non-pharmacological intervention<sup>16</sup>. Studies using a rehabilitation intervention  
118 as a single-component intervention or as a part of a multifaceted intervention regardless of  
119 frequency, intensity, length, and who delivered them will be included. Measurements of PCML  
120 stage and outcomes could be either self-reported (e.g. Fried task modification and disability  
121 scale, Manty scale, etc.) or physical performance measures (e.g. CS-PFP10, gait speed, etc.) as  
122 long as the term of PCML or synonym (e.g. preclinical disability, subclinical disability, etc.) as  
123 indicated explicitly in the studies.

### 124 ***Context***

125 The present review will consider the studies conducted in any setting, including community-  
126 dwelling, hospital settings (e.g. emergency room, hospital admission, rehab center, etc.), or  
127 institutional settings (e.g. long-term care, supported housing, etc.).

128 ***Types of study to be included***

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

136

137 **Method**

138 The first methodological framework for scoping reviews was developed by Arksey and  
139 O'Malley<sup>17</sup>. It then further developed over the years and was extended by Levac et al.<sup>18</sup>. The  
140 proposed scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping  
141 reviews which a working group developed from JBI and the JBI Collaboration (JBIC)<sup>19-20</sup>.

142 ***Search strategy***

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

153 ***Study selection***

154 After the search is completed, all identified citations will be collated and uploaded into  
155 Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). Duplicate records will be removed  
156 in Covidence. Before screening all retrieved articles, two reviewers will conduct a pilot test of  
157 the eligibility criteria on the first 20 articles in alphabetical order of the author's last name. The  
158 eligibility criteria will be modified as necessary for clarity based on the experience with the pilot  
159 test. After the pilot test, two reviewers will independently review titles, abstracts, and full texts  
160 of potential articles. Reasons for excluding sources of evidence in full text that do not meet the  
161 inclusion criteria will be recorded and reported in the scoping review. Any disagreements about  
162 study selection will be resolved by discussion or consensus involving a third reviewer. The  
163 research results will be reported in full in the final scoping review in JBI Preferred Reporting  
164 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR) flow  
165 diagram<sup>21</sup>.

#### 166 ***Data extraction***

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

#### 175 ***Data analysis and presentation***

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

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

184

## 185 **References**

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



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

238 20. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, Baldini Soares C, Khalil H, Parker D. Chapter 11:  
239 Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's  
240 Manual, JBI, 2017

241 21. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D et al.,. PRISMA Extension  
242 for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med.  
243 2018;169(7):467-473.

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261 **Appendices**262 **Appendix I: Search strategy**

263 OVID MEDLINE (Search conducted on March 19, 2022)

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

264

265

266 **Appendix II: Data extraction instrument**

<b>Study identifiers</b>	
Title:	
First Author's last name:	Year:
Study country:	Funding:
<b>Study design</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> randomized controlled trial (RCT)	<input type="checkbox"/> non-randomized controlled trial (NRS)
<input type="checkbox"/> controlled clinical trials	<input type="checkbox"/> pre-post study
<input type="checkbox"/> interrupted time series study	<input type="checkbox"/> uncontrolled longitudinal study
<input type="checkbox"/> case study	<input type="checkbox"/> registered trial <input type="checkbox"/> protocol
<b>Research purpose/objectives/questions</b>	
<b>Participants' characteristics (baseline)</b>	
Inclusion/exclusion criteria:	
Recruitment methods:	
settings: <input type="checkbox"/> community-dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/> hospital discharges
<input type="checkbox"/> institutional	<input type="checkbox"/> others:
Identified as PCML:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear
If Yes, which assessment was used:	
Chronic condition indicated:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear
If Yes, which condition was indicated:	
<b>For RCTs or NRS</b>	
Sample size:	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:
Age (Mean, SD):	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:
Gender (F %, M %):	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:

For pre-post or other studies	
Sample size:	Drop out % and reasons:
Age (Mean, SD):	Gender (F %, M %):
<b>Interventions</b>	
Types:	<input type="checkbox"/> educational <input type="checkbox"/> exercise <input type="checkbox"/> others:
Approach:	<input type="checkbox"/> single-component <input type="checkbox"/> multifaceted
content	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:
Length/Frequency/duration	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:
Mode of delivery	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:
Characteristics of the deliverers	Intervention group:
	Control/comparator group:
<b>Outcomes</b>	
PCML outcomes reported:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear
If Yes, what outcomes were used to measure PCML changes:	
outcomes reported in association with PCML outcomes:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not clear
If Yes, what outcomes were reported:	
<b>Results</b>	
<b>Conclusions</b>	
<b>Strength and limitations</b>	

267 Reviewer's name:

Data extraction date: