

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

4

5 **FULL NAMES AND INSTITUTIONAL ADDRESSES FOR ALL AUTHORS:**

6 Kelly K. de Wildt* (2, 4)

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

8 Annemiek J. Linn (1)

9 Stephanie K. Medlock (2, 5)

10 Sara S. Groos (1)

11 Kim J. Ploegmakers (2, 4)

12 Lotta J. Seppala (2, 4)

13 Judith E. Bosmans (6)

14 Ameen Abu-Hanna (2, 5)

15 Julia C.M. van Weert (1)

16 Natasja M. van Schoor (2, 3)

17 Nathalie van der Velde (2, 4)

18 on behalf of the ADFICE_IT study team

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

20 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:** n.vandervelde@amsterdamumc.nl

21

22 **Affiliations**

23 1 Amsterdam School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the
24 Netherlands

25 2 Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

26 3 Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data Science, De
27 Boelelaan 1117, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 4 Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Internal Medicine, Section of Geriatric
29 Medicine, Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

30 5 Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Department of Medical Informatics,
31 Meibergdreef 9, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

32 6 Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam
33 Public Health Research Institute, Van der Boechorststraat 7, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands

34

35 **ABSTRACT:**

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

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

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

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

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

63 **Participant recruitment:** 7 July 2022-ongoing *

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

65 **Protocol version:** 1

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

67

68 **Background**

69 Falling among adults aged 65 years and older represents a serious public health problem.

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

75 Besides physical injuries such as head wounds and fractures (3,4), falls can also lead to the
76 development of fear of falling (5,6), reduced perceived quality of life (7), reduced physical activity (8),
77 physical decline (9), social isolation (10), increased healthcare utilization, and institutionalization
78 (9,11,12). Furthermore, falls pose a substantial economic burden as fall-related costs are estimated to
79 amount to 0.85 to 1.5 percent of the total healthcare expenditures in Western countries (13).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

149

150 **Methods**

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

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

165

166 **Study design and settings**

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

173

174 **Ethical considerations**

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

179

180 **Eligibility criteria**

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

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

194

195 Potential subjects will be excluded if they:

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

200

201 Participant recruitment has started in July 2022 and is ongoing.

202

203 **Randomization and blinding**

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

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

217

218 **Intervention**

219 The multicomponent intervention comprises the combined use of a CDSS and a patient portal.

220 Furthermore, patients in the intervention arm will receive a Question Prompt List (QPL) prior to their
221 consultation. Physicians in the intervention arm will be trained to work with the CDSS. The control

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

224

225 *CDSS*

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

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

242

243 *Patient portal*

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

250

251 *Question Prompt List (QPL)*

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

260

261 *Training*

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

268

269 **Comparator**

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

273

274 **Procedures**

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

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

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

290

291 **Data collection**

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

296

297 *Estimating the effectiveness of the intervention on trial outcomes*

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

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

316

317 *Estimating the cost-effectiveness of the intervention*

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

326

327 *Process evaluation*

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

330

331 *Process evaluation: Feasibility*

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

337 Usage data of the CDSS and patient portal will be measured throughout the study period. The
338 extent to which the intervention was implemented as intended (fidelity/dose delivered) and the extent
339 to which the participants actively engage with the intervention (dose received/exposure) will be
340 assessed through data logged by the CDSS and patient portal, and the videotaped consultations. Dose
341 received/exposure will also be assessed through participation data of the CDSS training.

342 Reach/participation rate will be assessed through data logged by the CDSS to analyze the extent to
343 which physicians propose changes in FRID prescriptions. Patients will be asked to self-report changes
344 in medication use on the fall calendar on a weekly basis. These falls calendar entries and pharmacy
345 records will be used to analyze the extent to which patients adhere to the physicians' advice and
346 changes in the treatment plan. Satisfaction with the intervention (dose received/exposure) will be
347 measured through physician evaluations of the CDSS and the WSS questionnaire (patients). The TAM
348 questionnaire assesses the perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and intended usage of the
349 CDSS, and the WSS measures the comprehensibility, satisfaction and Emotional Support of the
350 patient portal (62). Finally, barriers and facilitators (context) will be assessed through the videotaped
351 consultations, and physician evaluations of the CDSS by means of a survey.

352

353 *Process evaluation: Shared Decision Making*

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

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

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

381

382 **Data management**

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

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

394

395 **Statistical analysis**

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

398

399 *Estimating the effectiveness of the intervention on trial outcomes*

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

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

416

417 *Estimating the cost-effectiveness of the intervention*

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

425

426 *Process evaluation: Feasibility*

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

431

432 *Process evaluation: Shared Decision Making*

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

438

439 **Per protocol analysis**

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

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

445

446 **Sample size**

447 Sample sizes of $n = 385$ in the intervention and $n = 385$ in the control group (10 clusters with 77
448 patients in each cluster) are needed to detect a difference in proportion of injurious falls of 0.10 with
449 80% power. We inferred the proportion of patients who will experience an injurious fall to be 0.22 in
450 the control and 0.12 in the intervention group. In these calculations, we assumed the two-sided
451 significance level of 5% and an intraclass correlation coefficient of 0.01 to account for clustering (71).
452 Presupposing a drop-out rate of 10%, 856 patients will need to be included.

453

454 **Monitoring**

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

457

458 **Harms**

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

462

463 **Discussion**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

510

511 **Outlook**

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

520

521 **Abbreviations**

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

524 CDSS: Clinical decision support system; CI: confidence interval; DCS: Decisional Conflict Scale; EQ-
525 5D-5L: EuroQol-5D-5L; FRID: Fall-Risk Increasing Drug; IMCQ: institute for Medical Technology
526 Assessment Productivity Cost Questionnaire Medical Consumption Questionnaire; IPCQ: institute for
527 Medical Technology Assessment Productivity Cost Questionnaire Productivity Cost Questionnaire;
528 MMSE: Mini-Mental State Examination; MOCA: Montreal Cognitive Assessment; MRC: Medical
529 Research Council; NPIRQ: Netherlands Patient Information Recall Questionnaire; PrepDM:
530 Preparation for Decision-making scale; QALY: quality-adjusted life years QPL: Question Prompt List;
531 RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial; SDM: Shared Decision Making; TAM: Technology Acceptance
532 Model; TOPICS-SF: The Older Persons and Informal Caregivers Survey – Short Form; UI: User
533 Interface; WSS: Website Satisfaction Scale

534

535 **Dissemination policy**

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

539

540 **Consent for publication**

541 Not applicable.

542

543 **Availability of data and materials**

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

550

551 **Competing interests**

552 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

553

554 **Funding**

555 The ADFICE_IT study is supported by funding from the Netherlands Organization for Health

556 Research and Development (ZonMw, Grant 848017004), The Hague and the Amsterdams

557 Universiteitsfonds: Gepersonaliseerde Medicatieaanpassing bij Oudere Vallers. The study protocol

558 was reviewed by ZonMW.

559

560 **Authors' contributions**

561 NvdV, NMvS, AA-H, SM, JCMvW contributed in the conception of the study. All authors have made

562 substantial contributions to the design of the study. BvdL and KKdW wrote the manuscript. All the

563 authors read the draft, made contributions and approved the final manuscript.

564

565 **Acknowledgements**

566 Not applicable

567

568 **Authors' information (optional)**

569 Not applicable

570

571 **References**

572 1. Bergen G, Stevens MR, Burns ER. Falls and Fall Injuries Among Adults Aged ≥ 65 Years —

573 United States, 2014. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2016;65:993–8. Available from:

574 <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6537a2>

575 2. Haagsma JA, Olij BF, Majdan M, van Beeck EF, Vos T, Castle CD, et al. Falls in older aged

576 adults in 22 European countries: incidence, mortality and burden of disease from 1990 to 2017.

577 *Inj Prev.* 2020 Oct;26(Supp 1):i67–74. Available from:

578 <https://injuryprevention.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/injuryprev-2019-043347>

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

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

- 629 literature. *Maturitas*. 2013 May;75(1):51–61. Available from:
630 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2013.02.009>
- 631 19. Muir SW, Gopaul K, Montero Odasso MM. The role of cognitive impairment in fall risk
632 among older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age Ageing*. 2012 May;41(3):299–
633 308. Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article-
634 lookup/doi/10.1093/ageing/afs012](https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ageing/afs012)
- 635 20. de Vries M, Seppala LJ, Daams JG, van de Glind EMM, Masud T, van der Velde N, et al. Fall-
636 Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: I. Cardiovascular Drugs. *J*
637 *Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2018 Apr 1;19(4):371.e1-371.e9. Available from:
638 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1525861017306989>
- 639 21. Seppala LJ, Wermelink AMAT, de Vries M, Ploegmakers KJ, van de Glind EMM, Daams JG,
640 et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis: II. Psychotropics. *J*
641 *Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2018 Apr 1;19(4):371.e11-371.e17. Available from:
642 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1525861017307843>
- 643 22. Seppala LJ, van de Glind EMM, Daams JG, Ploegmakers KJ, de Vries M, Wermelink AMAT,
644 et al. Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: III. Others. *J Am*
645 *Med Dir Assoc*. 2018 Apr 1;19(4):372.e1-372.e8.
- 646 23. Seppala LJ, Petrovic M, Ryg J, Bahat G, Topinkova E, Szczerbińska K, et al. STOPPFall
647 (Screening Tool of Older Persons Prescriptions in older adults with high fall risk): a Delphi
648 study by the EuGMS Task and Finish Group on Fall-Risk-Increasing Drugs. *Age Ageing*. 2021
649 Jun 28;50(4):1189–99. Available from:
650 <https://academic.oup.com/ageing/article/50/4/1189/6043386>
- 651 24. Hart LA, Phelan EA, Yi JY, Marcum ZA, Gray SL. Use of Fall Risk-Increasing Drugs Around
652 a Fall-Related Injury in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2020 Jun
653 17;68(6):1334–43. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jgs.16369>

- 654 25. Tinetti ME, Gordon C, Sogolow E, Lapin P, Bradley EH. Fall-Risk Evaluation and
655 Management: Challenges in Adopting Geriatric Care Practices. *Gerontologist*. 2006 Dec
656 1;46(6):717–25. Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/gerontologist/article-](https://academic.oup.com/gerontologist/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/geront/46.6.717)
657 [lookup/doi/10.1093/geront/46.6.717](https://academic.oup.com/gerontologist/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/geront/46.6.717)
- 658 26. Bagge M, Tordoff J, Norris P, Heydon S. Older people’s attitudes towards their regular
659 medicines. *J Prim Health Care*. 2013;5(3):234. Available from:
660 <http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=HC13234>
- 661 27. Laing SS, Silver IF, York S, Phelan EA. Fall Prevention Knowledge, Attitude, and Practices of
662 Community Stakeholders and Older Adults. *J Aging Res*. 2011;2011(2):1–9. Available from:
663 <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/jar/2011/395357/>
- 664 28. Légaré F, Ratté S, Stacey D, Kryworuchko J, Gravel K, Graham ID, et al. Interventions for
665 improving the adoption of shared decision making by healthcare professionals. In: Légaré F,
666 editor. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd;
667 2010. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006732.pub2>
- 668 29. Jansen J, Naganathan V, Carter SM, McLachlan AJ, Nickel B, Irwig L, et al. Too much
669 medicine in older people? Deprescribing through shared decision making. *BMJ*. 2016 Jun
670 3;353(June):i2893. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.i2893>
- 671 30. Weir K, Nickel B, Naganathan V, Bonner C, McCaffery K, Carter SM, et al. Decision-Making
672 Preferences and Deprescribing: Perspectives of Older Adults and Companions About Their
673 Medicines. *Journals Gerontol Ser B*. 2018 Sep 20;73(7):e98–107. Available from:
674 <https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article/73/7/e98/4668532>
- 675 31. Thompson W, Reeve E, Moriarty F, Maclure M, Turner J, Steinman MA, et al. Deprescribing:
676 Future directions for research. *Res Soc Adm Pharm*. 2019 Jun;15(6):801–5. Available from:
677 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1551741118307757>
- 678 32. Elwyn G, Laitner S, Coulter A, Walker E, Watson P, Thomson R. Implementing shared

- 679 decision making in the NHS. *BMJ*. 2010 Oct 14;341(oct14 2):c5146–c5146. Available from:
680 <http://www.bmj.com/content/341/bmj.c5146.abstract>
- 681 33. Simmons M, Hetrick S, Jorm A. Shared Decision-Making: Benefits, Barriers and Current
682 Opportunities for Application. *Australas Psychiatry*. 2010 Oct 1;18(5):394–7. Available from:
683 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3109/10398562.2010.499944>
- 684 34. O'Connor AM, Rostom A, Fiset V, Tetroe J, Entwistle V, Llewellyn-Thomas H, et al. Decision
685 aids for patients facing health treatment or screening decisions: systematic review. *BMJ*. 1999
686 Sep 18;319(7212):731–4. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10487995>
- 687 35. Durand MA, Carpenter L, Dolan H, Bravo P, Mann M, Bunn F, et al. Do Interventions
688 Designed to Support Shared Decision-Making Reduce Health Inequalities? A Systematic
689 Review and Meta-Analysis. Malaga G, editor. *PLoS One*. 2014 Apr 15;9(4):e94670. Available
690 from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094670>
- 691 36. Sutton RT, Pincock D, Baumgart DC, Sadowski DC, Fedorak RN, Kroeker KI. An overview of
692 clinical decision support systems: benefits, risks, and strategies for success. *npj Digit Med*.
693 2020 Dec 6;3(1):17. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41746-020-0221-y>
- 694 37. Tamblyn R, Egualé T, Buckeridge DL, Huang A, Hanley J, Reidel K, et al. The effectiveness
695 of a new generation of computerized drug alerts in reducing the risk of injury from drug side
696 effects: a cluster randomized trial. *J Am Med Informatics Assoc*. 2012 Jul 1;19(4):635–43.
697 Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-lookup/doi/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-](https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-lookup/doi/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000609)
698 [000609](https://academic.oup.com/jamia/article-lookup/doi/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000609)
- 699 38. Kouladjian O'Donnell L, Gnjudic D, Sawan M, Reeve E, Kelly PJ, Chen TF, et al. Impact of
700 the Goal-directed Medication Review Electronic Decision Support System on Drug Burden
701 Index: A cluster-randomised clinical trial in primary care. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2021 Mar
702 2;87(3):1499–511. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/bcp.14557>
- 703 39. Rieckert A, Reeves D, Altiner A, Drewelow E, Esmail A, Flamm M, et al. Use of an electronic

- 704 decision support tool to reduce polypharmacy in elderly people with chronic diseases: cluster
705 randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2020 Jun 18;369:m1822. Available from:
706 <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.m1822>
- 707 40. Damoiseaux-Volman BA, van der Velde N, Ruige SG, Romijn JA, Abu-Hanna A, Medlock S.
708 Effect of Interventions With a Clinical Decision Support System for Hospitalized Older
709 Patients: Systematic Review Mapping Implementation and Design Factors. *JMIR Med*
710 *Informatics*. 2021 Jul 16;9(7):e28023. Available from:
711 <https://medinform.jmir.org/2021/7/e28023>
- 712 41. Turner AM, Osterhage K, Hartzler A, Joe J, Lin L, Kanagat N, et al. Use of Patient Portals for
713 Personal Health Information Management: The Older Adult Perspective. *AMIA . Annu Symp*
714 *proceedings AMIA Symp*. 2015;2015:1234–41. Available from:
715 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26958263>
- 716 42. Carini E, Villani L, Pezzullo AM, Gentili A, Barbara A, Ricciardi W, et al. The Impact of
717 Digital Patient Portals on Health Outcomes, System Efficiency, and Patient Attitudes: Updated
718 Systematic Literature Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021 Sep 8;23(9):e26189. Available from:
719 <https://www.jmir.org/2021/9/e26189>
- 720 43. Tieu L, Sarkar U, Schillinger D, Ralston JD, Ratanawongsa N, Pasick R, et al. Barriers and
721 Facilitators to Online Portal Use Among Patients and Caregivers in a Safety Net Health Care
722 System: A Qualitative Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015 Dec 3;17(12):e275. Available from:
723 <http://www.jmir.org/2015/12/e275/>
- 724 44. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gotsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013
725 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *BMJ*. 2013 Jan
726 9;346(jan08 15):e7586–e7586. Available from:
727 <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.e7586>
- 728 45. Campbell MK, Piaggio G, Elbourne DR, Altman DG. Consort 2010 statement: extension to
729 cluster randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2012 Sep 4;345(sep04 1):e5661–e5661. Available from:

- 730 <https://www.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmj.e5661>
- 731 46. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating
732 complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2008 Sep
733 29;337(7676):a1655. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.a1655>
- 734 47. van de Loo B, Seppala LJ, van der Velde N, Medlock S, Denkinger M, de Groot LC, et al.
735 Development of the ADF ICE_IT Models for Predicting Falls and Recurrent Falls in
736 Community-Dwelling Older Adults: Pooled Analyses of European Cohorts With Special
737 Attention to Medication. Lipsitz LA, editor. *Journals Gerontol Ser A*. 2022 Jul 5;77(7):1446–
738 54. Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/biomedgerontology/advance-
739 article/doi/10.1093/gerona/glac080/6563350](https://academic.oup.com/biomedgerontology/advance-
739 article/doi/10.1093/gerona/glac080/6563350)
- 740 48. Ploegmakers KJ, Medlock S, Linn AJ, Lin Y, Seppälä LJ, Petrovic M, et al. Barriers and
741 facilitators in using a Clinical Decision Support System for fall risk management for older
742 people: a European survey. *Eur Geriatr Med*. 2022 Apr 15;13(2):395–405. Available from:
743 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41999-021-00599-w>
- 744 49. Hill KD, Moore KJ, Dorevitch MI, Day LM. Effectiveness of Falls Clinics: An Evaluation of
745 Outcomes and Client Adherence to Recommended Interventions. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2008
746 Apr;56(4):600–8. Available from: [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1532-
747 5415.2007.01626.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1532-
747 5415.2007.01626.x)
- 748 50. Trzepacz PT, Hochstetler H, Wang S, Walker B, Saykin AJ. Relationship between the
749 Montreal Cognitive Assessment and Mini-mental State Examination for assessment of mild
750 cognitive impairment in older adults. *BMC Geriatr*. 2015 Dec 7;15(1):107. Available from:
751 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12877-015-0103-3>
- 752 51. Federation of Medical Specialists. Effect of medication on fall risk in older adults [In Dutch:
753 Effect medicijnen op valrisico ouderen] [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 Jul 6]. Available from:
754 [https://richtlijndatabase.nl/richtlijn/preventie_van_valincidenten_bij_ouderen/effect_medicij-
755 nen_op_valrisico_ouderen.html](https://richtlijndatabase.nl/richtlijn/preventie_van_valincidenten_bij_ouderen/effect_medicij-
755 nen_op_valrisico_ouderen.html)

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

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

- 807 2;15(1):25–30. Available from:
808 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X9501500105>
- 809 67. O'Connor AM. User Manual – Decisional Conflict Scale.
810 https://DecisionaidOhriCa/Eval_DcsHtml. 1993;1–16.
- 811 68. Jansen J, van Weert J, van der Meulen N, van Dulmen S, Heeren T, Bensing J. Recall in Older
812 Cancer Patients: Measuring Memory for Medical Information. *Gerontologist*. 2008 Apr
813 1;48(2):149–57. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/48.2.149>
- 814 69. Austin PC. A Tutorial on Multilevel Survival Analysis: Methods, Models and Applications. *Int*
815 *Stat Rev*. 2017 Aug;85(2):185–203. Available from:
816 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/insr.12214>
- 817 70. Twisk J, Bosman L, Hoekstra T, Rijnhart J, Welten M, Heymans M. Different ways to estimate
818 treatment effects in randomised controlled trials. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun*. 2018
819 Jun;10(March):80–5. Available from:
820 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2451865417301849>
- 821 71. Adams G, Gulliford MC, Ukoumunne OC, Eldridge S, Chinn S, Campbell MJ. Patterns of
822 intra-cluster correlation from primary care research to inform study design and analysis. *J Clin*
823 *Epidemiol*. 2004 Aug;57(8):785–94. Available from:
824 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0895435604000459>
- 825 72. Shay LA, Lafata JE. Where Is the Evidence? A Systematic Review of Shared Decision Making
826 and Patient Outcomes. *Med Decis Mak*. 2015 Jan 28;35(1):114–31. Available from:
827 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0272989X14551638>
- 828 73. Boyé N. Effectiveness of medication withdrawal in older fallers : results from the Improving
829 Medication Prescribing to reduce Risk Of FALLs (IMPROVeFALL) trial. 2016;142–6.
- 830 74. Bhasin S, Gill TM, Reuben DB, Latham NK, Ganz DA, Greene EJ, et al. A Randomized Trial
831 of a Multifactorial Strategy to Prevent Serious Fall Injuries. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Jul

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

Items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set

1. Primary Registry and Trial Identifying Number

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

Name of Primary Registry: ClinicalTrials.gov

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

2. Date of Registration in Primary Registry

Date when trial was officially registered in the Primary Registry.

7-7-2022

3. Secondary Identifying Numbers

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Source(s) of Monetary or Material Support

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

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

5. Primary Sponsor

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

The sponsor of this study is the Amsterdam UMC.

6. **Secondary Sponsor(s)**

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

A secondary sponsor may have agreed to:

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

There are no secondary sponsors.

7. **Contact for Public Queries**

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

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

Contact: N. van der Velde

Telephone number: +3120 566 9111

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

8. **Contact for Scientific Queries**

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

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

The contact for scientific queries must include:

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

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

Contact: Prof. Dr. Nathalie van der Velde

Telephone number: +3120 566 9111

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

9. **Public Title**

Title intended for the lay public in easily understood language.

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

10. **Scientific Title**

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

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

11. **Countries of Recruitment**

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

Netherlands

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

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

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

Prevention of medication-related injurious falls.

13. **Intervention(s)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

14. Key Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

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

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

Patients meeting the following criteria are eligible for inclusion:

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

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

Potential subjects will be excluded if they:

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

15. Study Type

Study type consists of:

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

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

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

16. Date of First Enrollment

Anticipated or actual date of enrolment of the first participant.

The first patient was enrolled on 7 July 2022.

17. Sample Size

Sample Size consists of:

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

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

18. Recruitment Status

Recruitment status of this trial:

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

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

19. Primary Outcome(s)

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

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

For each primary outcome provide:

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

Example:

Outcome Name: Depression

Metric/method of measurement: Beck Depression Score

Timepoint: 18 weeks following end of treatment

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

20. Key Secondary Outcomes

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

As for primary outcomes, for each secondary outcome provide:

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

Number of injurious falls [Time Frame: 12 months]

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

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

Total number of falls [Time Frame: 12 months]

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

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

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

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

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

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

I.e. a fall that results in no injuries

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CDSS user satisfaction [Time Frame: 12 months]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

iSHARE [Time Frame: 12 months]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21. Ethics Review

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

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

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

22. Completion date

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

N/A: data collection is still ongoing.

23. Summary Results

It consists of:

- Date of posting of results summaries

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

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

24. IPD sharing statement

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

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

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

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

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

Introduction

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

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292464>; this version posted July 28, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Methods: Participants, interventions, and outcomes

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

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

Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)

Allocation:

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

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

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

Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.19.23292886>; this version posted July 23, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

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

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

Methods: Monitoring

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

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

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

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

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

Ethics and dissemination

Research ethics approval 24 Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval Ethics approval and consent to participate, page 20

Protocol amendments 25 Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators) N/A

Consent or assent 26a Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32) Procedures, page 10

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

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

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

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

Figure 1. Schedule of study procedures and assessments

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

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

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

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

CDSS, clinical decision support system.