# Role of Walking Energetics and Perceived Fatigability on Mobility Differ by Walking Speed: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)

*Reagan E. Moffit[1], Terri Blackwell[2], Daniel E. Forman[3], Paul M. Coen[4], Barbara J. Nicklas[5], Yujia (Susanna) Qiao[2], Peggy M. Cawthon[2,6], Frederic G. S. Toledo[7], Bret H. Goodpaster[4], Steven R. Cummings[2], Anne B. Newman[1], and Nancy W. Glynn[1]*

[1]Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.

[2]San Francisco Coordinating Center, California Pacific Medical Center Research Institute, San Francisco, CA, USA.

[3]Department of Medicine (Divisions of Cardiology and Geriatrics), University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, and Geriatrics, Research, Education, and Clinical Center (GRECC), Pittsburgh, PA, USA.

[5]Translational Research Institute for Metabolism and Diabetes, AdventHealth, Orlando, FL, USA.

[5]Department of Internal Medicine, Section on Gerontology and Geriatric Medicine, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC, USA.

[6]Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA.

[7]Department of Medicine (Divisions of Endocrinology and Metabolism), University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.

**Corresponding Author:**
Nancy W. Glynn, PhD
epidnwg@pitt.edu
University of Pittsburgh School of Public Health
130 DeSoto Street, 5120 Public Health, Pittsburgh PA, 15261

**Acknowledgements:**
Preliminary data were presented at the American College of Sports Medicine Annual Meeting, Denver, CO on May 31, 2023.

**Declaration of Sources of Funding:**
This work was supported by funding from the National Institute on Aging (AG 059416). Study infrastructure support was funded in part by NIA Claude D. Pepper Older American Independence Centers at University of Pittsburgh (P30 AG024827) and Wake Forest University (P30 AG021332) and the Clinical and Translational Science Institutes, funded by the National Center for Advancing Translational Science, at Wake Forest University (UL1 0TR001420). Additionally, the Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center, Research Registry and Developmental Pilot Grant (NIH P30 AG024827), and the Intramural Research Program, National Institute on Aging supported N.W.G to develop the Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale.

## Abstract

**Background:** Slow gait speed is a risk factor for poor health outcomes among older adults and may be driven by decreased energy availability and increased fatigability.

**Objective:** Examine walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability with gait speed among slower and faster walkers and understand whether fatigability statistically mediates the association between energetics and gait speed.

**Methods:** Perceived physical fatigability was assessed using the Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale (PFS) Physical score (range 0-50, higher=greater). A three-phase cardiopulmonary exercise treadmill test collected peak oxygen consumption ($VO_2$peak mL/kg/min), energetic cost of walking per distance travelled ($EC_W$, mL/kg/meter), and cost-capacity ratios ($VO_2/VO_2$peak, %). Gait speed was determined by 4m walk; slower (<1.01m/s) vs faster (≥1.01m/s) walkers were classified using median 4m gait speed. Linear regressions and statistical mediation analyses were conducted.

**Results:** Slower walkers had lower $VO_2$peak, higher $EC_W$ at preferred walking speed (PWS), and greater PFS Physical score compared to faster walkers (all $p<0.05$) (N=849). One standard-deviation higher increment of $VO_2$peak, $EC_W$ at PWS, cost-capacity ratios at PWS and slow walking speed (SWS), and PFS Physical score were associated with 0.1m/s faster ($VO_2$peak only) or 0.02-0.09m/s slower gait speed. PFS Physical score was a significant statistical mediator in the associations between $VO_2$peak (15.2%), cost-capacity ratio (15.9%), and $EC_W$ at PWS (10.7%) with gait speed, and stronger among slower walkers.

**Conclusions:** Fitness and fatigability are associated with slower gait speed yet contributions may differ among slower and faster walkers. Future interventions may consider targeting fatigability among slower walkers and fitness among faster walkers.

**Key Words:** oxygen consumption, fatigue, gait speed, energy regulation

## Introduction

Gait speed is a vital sign among older adults.[1,2] As adults age, both usual and fast gait speed decreases[3] and predicts poor health outcomes in older adults, including mortality,[4,5][6] mobility limitations,[7–9] difficulty completing activities of daily living (ADLs),[10] and increased healthcare cost and utilization.[11] Understanding factors associated with age-related slowing of gait speed may help to prevent or delay the onset of these detrimental health outcomes.

Decreasing energy availability and increasing fatigue may be an underlying driver of age-related declines in gait speed.[12,13] Specifically, lower peak oxygen consumption ($VO_2$peak) and reaching fatigue ceilings with less physical activity may lead to compensations, including adaptations of physical behaviors among older adults, such as slowing gait speed.[13][14] Furthermore, previous work suggests that energy requirements during walking and greater perceived physical fatigability, defined as one's vulnerability to whole-body fatigue anchored to specific tasks, contribute to the development of mobility-related limitations in older adults.[15–19] However, the inter-relationship of walking energetics, broadly defined here as the energetic cost (oxygen consumption) associated with walking at various speeds and intensities, and perceived physical fatigability has not been well-studied. To our knowledge, only one longitudinal study found that those with poorer walking energetics had increased risk of developing greater perceived fatigability.[20] Because both may be risk factors to age-related mobility limitations, it is crucial to understand the role each play with the slowing of gait speed. A more complete understanding may inform the development of lifestyle or therapeutic targets for intervention.

The Study of Energy and Aging-Pilot (SEA-Pilot) found significant differences between slower and faster walkers across multiple walking energetics and fatigue measures, but had

limited generalizability due to small sample size (N=36) of primarily high functioning older adults (mean gait speed=1.2 m/s).[15] We extended this work in a large cohort of older adults with a wide range of physical function and fitness to examine the associations of walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability with gait speed and to evaluate whether these associations differed by slower vs faster walkers. We hypothesized that walking energetics, namely lower $VO_2$peak, greater energetic cost of walking ($EC_w$) during preferred (PWS) and slow walking speed (SWS), and greater cost-capacity ratios ($VO_2$ from walking task/$VO_2$peak, %), as well as greater perceived physical fatigability are associated with slower gait speed and that the magnitude of these relations are stronger among slower walkers compared to faster walkers. We planned to examine all potential statistical mediation pathways (perceived physical fatigability→walking energetics→gait speed AND walking energetics→perceived physical fatigability→gait speed) to gain a complete understanding of the inter-relationships. However, we hypothesized that the associations of walking energetics with gait speed are statistically mediated by greater perceived physical fatigability as declining energetic reserves may increase fatigue levels among older adults, and that the percent explained is stronger among slower walkers as they are at higher risk of age-related mobility limitations.

## Methods

### *Study Sample*

The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA) (XXXXXXX) is a multi-site prospective cohort study investigating the biological processes associated with aging and has been described elsewhere.[21] Briefly, 879 participants were recruited from two sites (XXXXXXX) and followed longitudinally. The baseline cohort consisted of community-dwelling older men and women aged 70 years and older with body mass index (BMI) ≤40 kg/m$^2$ who did not have mobility disability and agreed to undergo muscle tissue biopsy and magnetic

resonance scans. Exclusions included self-reported inability to walk one-quarter mile or climb a flight of stairs, active malignancy or dementia, or medical contraindication to biopsy or magnetic resonance scan. Participants must also have been able to complete the 400m walk. During screening, participants who did not appear to be able to complete a 400m walk were asked to complete a 4m walk and were excluded if 4m gait speed was <0.6 m/s. The eligible sample for our analyses includes 849 participants who had no missing data on 4m gait speed, a completed Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale, and at least one walking energetics measure (Figure 1) for final analytic samples. The WIRB-Copernicus Group (WCG) Institutional Review Board (WCGIRB, study number 20180764) approved the study as the single IRB and all participants gave informed written consent.

*Walking Energetics Measures*

Participants completed a three-phase treadmill cardiopulmonary exercise test (CPET) to collect oxygen consumption ($VO_2$, mL/kg/min) across multiple walking intensities. $VO_2$ was measured breath-by-breath using a face mask and cardiopulmonary metabolic cart (Medgraphics Ultima Series, Medgraphics Corporation, St. Paul, MN). During Phase 1, participants completed a 5-minute, 0% grade treadmill walk at their PWS, determined from the usual-paced 400m long distance corridor walk speed. Immediately after completion of Phase 1, participants cleared for maximal CPET underwent Phase 2, a symptom-limited maximal modified Balke protocol, in which speed and grade were increased as necessary. Participants were encouraged to reach a respiratory exchange ratio ≥1.05 and/or a Borg Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE) ≥17 before test termination.[22] $VO_2$peak (mL/kg/min) was the highest 30-second average $VO_2$ over the course of the test. Participants were given a 20-minute seated rest after completion of Phase 2. Participants not cleared to complete Phase 2 (n=27) were given a 10-minute seated rest before beginning Phase 3. During Phase 3, participants completed a 5-minute, 0% grade slow speed

(SWS) treadmill walk. A slow walking speed of 0.67 m/s was used to mimic the minimum walking speed needed for ambulation of daily living.

Average $VO_2$ (mL/kg/min) from Phase 1 and 3 walks were calculated from the last 3 minutes of each test. Phase 1 and 3 $VO_2$ were also divided by walking speed to determine the energetic cost of walking ($EC_W$) per distance travelled (mL/kg/meter) at PWS and SWS. Two cost-capacity ratios of $VO_2$ from Phase 1 (PWS) and 3 (SWS) relative to $VO_2$peak were calculated (%, $VO_2/VO_2$peak) to understand relative intensity (PWS) and the capacity needed to maintain ambulation (SWS, higher ratio=higher energetic cost for task).

*Perceived Physical Fatigability*

Perceived physical fatigability was measured using the validated Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale (PFS).[23,24] The PFS is a 10-item scale that asks participants to rate the level of physical and mental fatigue they expected or imagined they would feel after performing each task (0=no fatigue, 5=extreme fatigue). Each item implied a specific intensity and duration (e.g. leisurely walk for 30 minutes). Participants were asked to respond to all items regardless of whether they have performed that activity in the past month. Each subscale score ranged from 0 to 50; a higher score indicates greater perceived fatigability. Scores were imputed for participants who did not respond to ≤3 items within the scale using established methods (n=18).[25] We only examined PFS Physical score for this analysis.

*4m Gait Speed*

Gait speed was calculated using the faster of two usual-paced 4m trials. Because of the clinical utility of the 4m gait speed test and high correlation with gait speed calculated from longer walking-based tasks (r=0.74 between 4m and 400m walks),[26] we chose this measure as our primary outcome. Participants were categorized as slower (<1.01 m/s) vs faster (≥1.01 m/s) walkers using median 4m gait speed.

*Covariates*

Age, sex, race/ethnicity (white vs nonwhite), and smoking status were self-reported. Height without shoes and weight with light clothing were measured and used to calculate BMI ($kg/m^2$). We queried self-report of a physician diagnosis history (yes/no) of several health conditions. A composite multimorbidity index was calculated using a modified list of chronic conditions from the Rochester Epidemiology Project.[27] Physical activity was objectively measured using a 3-axial accelerometer (ActiGraph GT9X) worn on the non-dominant wrist, with a goal of collecting at least 7 consecutive 24-hour periods (valid wear=≥17 hours wear during 24-hour period). Daily activity was assessed as averaged total activity count per 24-hour valid day.

*Statistical Analysis*

Descriptive characteristics of participants were reported (mean±standard deviation (SD) or frequencies). Comparisons by slower versus faster walking status were evaluated using t-tests for normally distributed continuous variables, Wilcoxon rank-sum test for skewed continuous variables, and for categorical variables a chi-square test or a Fisher's exact test for those with low expected cell counts. We used linear regressions to examine associations of walking energetics and perceived fatigability with 4m gait speed. We also stratified linear regressions by slower and faster walkers to examine whether associations were differential.

We used a statistical mediation approach (PROC CAUSALMED) to examine the percent explained by perceived physical fatigability on the association between walking energetics and gait speed overall, and by slower and faster walkers. This non-parametric approach specifies the direct and indirect effects of the independent variable on the dependent variable and the mediation percentage.[28] Higher mediation percentage indicates the mediator variable is explaining a greater proportion of the association of the independent variable on the dependent

variable. We first examined whether perceived physical fatigability was a statistical mediator between walking energetics and gait speed. Next, we examined the alternative pathway (perceived physical fatigability→walking energetics-→gait speed) for complete understanding of the inter-relationships. All models were adjusted for age, sex, race, total physical activity counts, and clinic site. All analyses were generated using SAS software version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC).

**Results**

The full sample of 849 participants (58.7% Women, 85.9% White, 76.3±4.9 years old) had a mean 4m gait speed of 1.04±0.20 m/s and mean $VO_2$peak of 20.2±4.8mL/kg/min. Mean PFS Physical score was 15.7±8.6, with 53.5% of participants classified as having more severe perceived physical fatigability (PFS Physical score ≥15). Compared to faster walkers (≥1.01 m/s), slower walkers (<1.01m/s) on average were older, more likely to be women, less likely to be White, had higher BMI, had more comorbidities and lower physical activity ($p<0.05$, Table 1). Slower walkers had nearly 4 mL/kg/min lower $VO_2$peak (18.3 vs 22.0 mL/kg/min, $p<0.0001$), higher $EC_W$ PWS (0.21 vs 0.19, $p<0.001$), and 9% higher SWS cost-capacity ratio (53.5% vs 44.4%, $p<0.0001$). Slower walkers also had nearly a 6-point higher PFS Physical score (18.2 vs 13.3 points, $p<0.0001$) (Figure 2).

*Associations of Walking Energetics and Perceived Physical Fatigability on 4m Gait Speed*

Each SD higher increment in fitness ($VO_2$peak) was associated with faster walking speeds of 0.1 m/s after adjustment. Each SD higher increment in worse efficiency while walking ($EC_W$ PWS, PWS and SWS cost-capacity ratio) was associated with slower walking speeds of 0.02-0.09 m/s after adjustment (Table 2). Associations for $VO_2$peak, and SWS cost-capacity ratio were stronger among faster walkers compared to slower walkers; associations were not

different between slower and faster walkers for $EC_W$ PWS or PWS cost-capacity ratio (Table 2). There were no significant associations between $EC_W$ SWS and 4m gait speed.

A 1SD higher increment in PFS Physical score was associated with a 0.06 m/s (95% CI:-0.07, -0.04) slower gait speed after adjustment. Associations did not differ between slower and faster walkers (Table 2).

*Examining PFS Physical Score as a Mediator Between Walking Energetics and Gait Speed*

The mediation analysis revealed that PFS Physical score explained 15.2% (95% CI:8.7%, 21.8%) of the total association between $VO_2$peak and gait speed after adjustment. Among slower walkers, PFS Physical score explained 34.2% (95% CI:9.7%, 58.6%) of the total association, whereas it only explained 4.6% (95% CI:-4.1,13.3%) of the total association among faster walkers. When examining the association between SWS cost-capacity ratio and gait speed, PFS Physical Score explained 15.9% (95% CI:9.3%, 22.5%) of the total associations. Similar to $VO_2$peak model, the mediation percentage of PFS Physical score on the association of SWS cost-capacity on gait speed was larger among slower walkers (17.9%; 95% CI:5.2%, 30.6%) compared to faster walkers (9.0%; 95% CI: -2.9%, 20.9%) (Figure 2). The percent explained by PFS Physical score between $EC_W$ PWS and gait speed was 10.7% (95% CI:3.6%, 17.9%) (Figure A3).

*Understanding Walking Energetics as a Mediator between PFS Physical Score and Gait Speed*

$VO_2$peak, SWS cost-capacity ratio, and $EC_W$ at PWS explained a larger proportion of the total association between PFS Physical score and gait speed ($VO_2$peak: 39.3% (95% CI:27.2%, 51.4%); SWS cost-capacity Ratio: 31.5%, (95% CI:20.8%, 42.2%); $EC_W$ PWS: 8.8% (95% CI:2.8%, 14.85%). Mediation percentages were higher among faster walkers compared to slower walkers (Appendix, Figures A1 and A2). $VO_2$peak explained 66.2% (95% CI:22%, 110.4%) vs

12.7% (95% CI:0.7%, 24.7%) and SWS cost-capacity ratio explained 48.0% (95% CI:11.8%, 84.3%) vs 15.4% (95% CI:4.1%, 26.7%) among faster vs slower walkers.

**Discussion**

In a sample of community-dwelling older men and women, we observed significant associations of walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability with gait speed. Additionally, our statistical mediation results suggested that perceived physical fatigability may be an important contributor to gait speed among slower walkers, whereas walking energetics, specifically $VO_2$peak and SWS cost-capacity ratio, may largely contribute to gait speed among faster walkers.

Our finding of significant associations between walking energetics and gait speed in SOMMA confirms and extends previous work. Specifically, reports from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging (BLSA) show an association between $EC_W$ PWS, $VO_2$peak, and cost-capacity ratios with slow gait speed.[16,18,19] Similarly, the SEA-Pilot found significant associations between $VO_2$peak and PWS $VO_2$ with slow gait speed.[15] Preferred walking speeds tend to be chosen to minimize energetic cost of walking.[29] This trend is consistent with aging, despite older adults having slower gait speed and higher energetic costs of walking compared to younger adults.[30] While we found that $EC_w$ PWS was significantly associated with gait speed, $VO_2$peak and SWS cost-capacity ratio, both measures of functional capacity, were more strongly associated with gait speed in the SOMMA cohort and these associations were stronger among faster walkers compared to slower walkers. When functional capacity is high, older adults may exhibit fewer physiological symptoms of exertion (e.g. heart rate) while walking at higher intensity and speed and thus lower perceptions of fatigue. Recently, mitochondrial dysfunction has been proposed as the primary mechanism of slow walking among older adults.[31,32] Mitochondrial dysfunction is associated with both $VO_2$peak and perceived

physical fatigability,[33–35] suggesting that mitochondrial function may be an important upstream cause of limitations due to fitness and fatigue and should be further explored.

Interestingly, SWS cost-capacity ratio was associated with slower gait speed at a magnitude similar to that of $VO_2$peak. SWS cost-capacity ratios >50% indicate greater risk of mobility limitations.[16] In SOMMA, the average SWS cost-capacity ratio among the overall sample was 48%, but was 53.5% among slower walkers, indicating that those with slower gait speeds (<1.01 m/s) may be at risk for mobility limitation. Recent work in BLSA has shown that cost-capacity ratio increases accelerates with age.[36] Further work understanding longitudinal associations between cost-capacity ratio and gait speed are needed to understand the impact of each other during aging.

Previous literature shows an association between greater perceived physical fatigability and slow gait speeds.[15,37–39] The PFS is a highly sensitive marker of impending functional decline.[38] Our results suggest that periodic clinical assessment of perceived physical fatigability using the PFS may be warranted. We did not include RPE fatigability measured during slow walking because the slow walk may not be strenuous enough to elicit perceptions of exertion among faster walkers.

Since this is a cross-sectional study, we were not able to make any causal inference or infer temporality. However, our statistical mediation analyses provided meaningful insights on the associations of fitness and fatigability on gait speed. Lower energetic reserves are associated with risk of developing greater perceived physical fatigability,[20] suggesting that fatigability may mediate the associations between walking energetics and gait speed. Our results support this as PFS Physical score was a significant mediator between walking energetic measures and gait speed. Interestingly, differences in mediation pathways were observed between slower and faster walkers, with PFS Physical score explaining a third of the association between $VO_2$peak and gait

speed among slower walkers, but only 5% among faster walkers. Greater perceived physical fatigability may be a more downstream marker of mobility decline compared to walking energetics. Those who walk at or below 1.0 m/s have lower fitness and poorer energetic measures. As a result of lower fitness and energetics, these older adults may have already experienced some functional decline and may be primarily limited by their fatigue thresholds. Conversely, older adults who walk above 1.0 m/s may not have experienced meaningful declines in fitness and therefore may not be limited by fatigue. Our examination of the alternative statistical mediation pathway highlights that both perceptual and physiological indices influence gait speed and should be studied in tandem.

Based on our results, it seems logical that future interventions targeting mobility decline should integrate cardiorespiratory fitness, walking and energy use efficiency, and target perceptions of fatigue. Furthermore, interventions can be enhanced if tailored to baseline gait speed. Among faster walkers, interventions are likely to be most effective if focused on improving and maintaining physical fitness. Among slower walkers, interventions are likely to be most effective if focused on reducing perceived fatigability, possibly through a physical activity intervention.[40] Additional research is indicated.

Our study has some limitations. First, the cross-sectional design does not allow for establishment of temporality or causal inference. As such, it is still unknown whether walking energetics or perceived physical fatigability come first in the mobility decline causal pathway. Second, while SOMMA's race/ethnicity distributions reflect the communities in which they were recruited, the cohort is not diverse, limiting the generalizability. Finally, walking energetics was measured on a treadmill. Overground walking may be preferred to treadmill walking to obtain more real-world measures of $VO_2$ and $EC_W$. Despite these limitations, this study has many strengths. All walking energetics were measured using gold standard CPET, which allowed for

objective and robust analyses of walking efficiency and effort. Additionally, perceived physical fatigability was measured using a well-established, validated method. Finally, the SOMMA cohort includes a wide range of physical function and fitness.

In conclusion, our study revealed that walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability are associated with gait speed. Additionally, differences existed in mediation between slower and faster walkers, with greater perceived fatigability acting as the primary statistical mediator among slower walkers and walking energetics among faster walkers. Thus, the driving factors of mobility decline may vary during progression in the age-related disablement pathway. Longitudinal work is needed to establish the causal pathway of mobility decline as well as to better understand the associations between walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability among older adults.

## References

1. Middleton A, Fritz SL, Lusardi M. Walking speed: the functional vital sign. *J Aging Phys Act* 2015;**23**:314–22.

2. Fritz S, Lusardi M. White paper: "walking speed: the sixth vital sign". *J Geriatr Phys Ther* 2009;**32**:46–9.

3. Malatesta D, Simar D, Dauvilliers Y *et al.* Aerobic determinants of the decline in preferred walking speed in healthy, active 65- and 80-year-olds. *Pflugers Arch* 2004;**447**:915–21.

4. Studenski S, Perera S, Patel K *et al.* Gait speed and survival in older adults. *JAMA* 2011;**305**:50–8.

5. Abellan van Kan G, Rolland Y, Andrieu S *et al.* Gait speed at usual pace as a predictor of adverse outcomes in community-dwelling older people an International Academy on Nutrition and Aging (IANA) Task Force. *J Nutr Health Aging* 2009;**13**:881–9.

6. Hirsch CH, Buzková P, Robbins JA *et al.* Predicting late-life disability and death by the rate of decline in physical performance measures. *Age Ageing* 2012;**41**:155–61.

7. Vestergaard S, Patel KV, Walkup MP *et al.* Stopping to rest during a 400-meter walk and incident mobility disability in older persons with functional limitations. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2009;**57**:260–5.

8. Newman AB, Simonsick EM, Naydeck BL *et al.* Association of long-distance corridor walk performance with mortality, cardiovascular disease, mobility limitation, and disability. *JAMA* 2006;**295**:2018–26.

9. Pahor M, Guralnik JM, Ambrosius WT *et al.* Effect of structured physical activity on prevention of major mobility disability in older adults: the LIFE study randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2014;**311**:2387–96.

10. Heiland EG, Welmer A-K, Wang R *et al.* Association of mobility limitations with incident disability among older adults: a population-based study. *Age Ageing* 2016;**45**:812–9.

11. Hardy SE, Kang Y, Studenski SA *et al.* Ability to walk 1/4 mile predicts subsequent disability, mortality, and health care costs. *J Gen Intern Med* 2011;**26**:130–5.

12. Schrack JA, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L. The energetic pathway to mobility loss: an emerging new framework for longitudinal studies on aging. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010;**58 Suppl 2**:S329-36.

13. Alexander NB, Taffet GE, Horne FM *et al.* Bedside-to-Bench conference: research agenda for idiopathic fatigue and aging. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2010;**58**:967–75.

14. Foucher KC, Aydemir B, Huang C-H. Walking energetics and fatigue are associated with physical activity in people with knee osteoarthritis. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2021;**88**:105427.

15. Richardson CA, Glynn NW, Ferrucci LG *et al.* Walking energetics, fatigability, and fatigue in older adults: the study of energy and aging pilot. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2015;**70**:487–94.

16. Schrack JA, Simonsick EM, Ferrucci L. The relationship of the energetic cost of slow walking and peak energy expenditure to gait speed in mid-to-late life. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2013;**92**:28–35.

17. Browning RC, Kram R. Energetic cost and preferred speed of walking in obese vs. normal weight women. *Obes Res* 2005;**13**:891–9.

18. Schrack JA, Simonsick EM, Chaves PHM *et al.* The role of energetic cost in the age-related slowing of gait speed. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012;**60**:1811–6.

19. Schrack JA, Zipunnikov V, Simonsick EM *et al.* Rising energetic cost of walking predicts gait speed decline with aging. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2016;**71**:947–53.

20. Schrack JA, Wanigatunga AA, Zipunnikov V *et al.* Longitudinal Association Between Energy Regulation and Fatigability in Mid-to-Late Life. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2020;**75**:e74–80.

21. Cummings SR, Newman AB, Coen PM *et al.* The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA). A Unique Cohort Study about the Cellular Biology of Aging and Age-related Loss of Mobility. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2023, DOI: 10.1093/gerona/glad052.

22. Pescatello LS. *ACSM's Guidelines For Exercise Testing And Prescription*. 9th ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2014.

23. Glynn NW, Santanasto AJ, Simonsick EM *et al.* The Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale for older adults: development and validation. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2015;**63**:130–5.

24. Renner SW, Bear TM, Brown PJ *et al.* Validation of perceived mental fatigability using the Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2021;**69**:1343–8.

25. Cooper R, Popham M, Santanasto AJ *et al.* Are BMI and inflammatory markers independently associated with physical fatigability in old age? *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2019;**43**:832–41.

26. Rolland YM, Cesari M, Miller ME *et al.* Reliability of the 400-m usual-pace walk test as an assessment of mobility limitation in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2004;**52**:972–6.

27. Espeland MA, Crimmins EM, Grossardt BR *et al.* Clinical Trials Targeting Aging and Age-Related Multimorbidity. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2017;**72**:355–61.

28. VanderWeele TJ. A unification of mediation and interaction: a 4-way decomposition. *Epidemiology* 2014;**25**:749–61.

29. Donelan JM, Kram R, Kuo AD. Mechanical and metabolic determinants of the preferred step width in human walking. *Proc Biol Sci* 2001;**268**:1985–92.

30. Das Gupta S, Bobbert MF, Kistemaker DA. The Metabolic Cost of Walking in healthy young and older adults - A Systematic Review and Meta Analysis. *Sci Rep* 2019;**9**:9956.

31. Tian Q, Lee PR, Walker KA *et al.* Energizing mitochondria to prevent mobility loss in aging: rationale and hypotheses. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2023;**51**:96–102.

32. Tian Q, Mitchell BA, Zampino M *et al.* Muscle mitochondrial energetics predicts mobility decline in well-functioning older adults: The baltimore longitudinal study of aging. *Aging Cell* 2022;**21**:e13552.

33. Santanasto AJ, Coen PM, Glynn NW *et al.* The relationship between mitochondrial function and walking performance in older adults with a wide range of physical function. *Exp Gerontol* 2016;**81**:1–7.

34. Mau T, Lui L-Y, Distefano G *et al.* Mitochondrial energetics in skeletal muscle are associated with leg power and cardiorespiratory fitness in the Study of Muscle, Mobility, and Aging (SOMMA). *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2022, DOI: 10.1093/gerona/glac238.

35. Santanasto AJ, Glynn NW, Jubrias SA *et al.* Skeletal muscle mitochondrial function and fatigability in older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2015;**70**:1379–85.

36. Kuo PL, Schrack JA, Shardell MD *et al.* A roadmap to build a phenotypic metric of ageing: insights from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging. *J Intern Med* 2020;**287**:373–94.

37. Qiao YS, Gmelin T, Renner SW *et al.* Evaluation of the bidirectional relations of perceived physical fatigability and physical activity on slower gait speed. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2021;**76**:e237–44.

38. Simonsick EM, Schrack JA, Santanasto AJ *et al.* Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale: One-Page Predictor of Mobility Decline in Mobility-Intact Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2018;**66**:2092–6.

39. Simonsick EM, Glynn NW, Jerome GJ *et al.* Fatigued, but Not Frail: Perceived Fatigability as a Marker of Impending Decline in Mobility-Intact Older Adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2016;**64**:1287–92.

40. Qiao Y, van Londen GJ, Brufsky JW *et al.* Perceived physical fatigability improves after an exercise intervention among breast cancer survivors: a randomized clinical trial. *Breast Cancer* 2021, DOI: 10.1007/s12282-021-01278-1.

**Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics of the Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA) Participants (N=849), by Median 4m Gait Speed**

| | Overall | Slower Walkers (<1.01 m/s) N=416 | Fast Walkers (≥1.01 m/s) N=433 | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age, years | 76.3 ± 5.0 | 77.5 ± 5.6 | 75.2 ± 4.0 | <.0001 |
| Women | 498 (58.7) | 261 (62.7) | 237 (54.7) | 0.01 |
| White | 729 (85.9) | 341 (82.0) | 388 (89.6) | 0.001 |
| Body mass index, kg/m$^2$ | 27.5 ± 4.6 | 28.5 ± 4.7 | 26.6 ± 4.2 | <.0001 |
| SOMMA multimorbidity index (0-11)† | 0.8 ± 0.9 | 0.9 ± 0.9 | 0.7 ± 0.8 | 0.02 |
| 1. Cancer* | 212 (25.0) | 103 (24.8) | 109 (25.2) | 0.8 |
| 2. Cardiac arrhythmia | 34 (4.0) | 23 (5.5) | 11 (2.5) | 0.02 |
| 3. Chronic kidney disease or renal failure | 30 (3.5) | 17 (4.1) | 13 (3.0) | 0.3 |
| 4. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or other lung disease | 111 (13.1) | 54 (13.0) | 57 (13.2) | 0.9 |
| 5. Coronary artery disease | 57 (6.7) | 31 (7.5) | 26 (6.0) | 0.3 |
| 6. Congestive heart failure | 6 (0.7) | 2 (0.5) | 4 (0.9) | 0.6 |
| 7. Dementia | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8. Depression | 70 (8.3) | 42 (10.2) | 28 (6.5) | 0.05 |
| 9. Diabetes mellitus | 126 (14.8) | 73 (17.5) | 53 (12.2) | 0.02 |
| 10. Stroke | 21 (2.5) | 11 (2.6) | 10 (2.3) | 0.7 |
| 11. Aortic stenosis | 8 (0.9) | 4 (1.0) | 4 (0.9) | 1.0 |
| Smoking Status | | | | |
| Never | 479 (56.6) | 227 (54.8) | 252 (58.2) | 0.3 |
| Past | 343 (40.5) | 172 (41.6) | 171 (39.5) | |
| Current | 25 (3.0) | 15 (3.6) | 10 (2.3) | |
| Total Activity Counts per 100,000 counts | 19.9± 5.9 | 19.2± 5.9 | 20.5± 5.8 | 0.001 |
| 4m Gait Speed, m/s | 1.04 ± 0.2 | 0.88 ± 0.09 | 1.20 ± 0.16 | <0.001 |

Note: mean ± standard deviation or n (%)

†The SOMMA multimorbidity index score included 11 age-related conditions: cancer, chronic kidney disease or renal failure, atrial fibrillation, lung disease (i.e., chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, bronchitis, asthma, or emphysema), coronary heart disease (i.e., blocked artery or myocardial infarction), depression [(e.g., ≥10 score on the 10-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CESD-10)], heart failure, dementia, diabetes, stroke, and aortic stenosis

*excludes nonmelanoma skin cancer

**Table 2. Associations of Walking Energetics and Perceived Fatigability on 4m Gait Speed: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)**

| | Per increment | Overall | Slower Walkers | Faster Walkers |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SD | β (95% CI) | β (95% CI) | β (95% CI) |
| **Walking Energetics** | | | | |
| $VO_2$peak (mL/kg/min) | 4.81 | 0.10 (0.08, 0.12)* | 0.02 (0.01, 0.04)* | 0.07 (0.05, 0.09)* |
| $EC_w$ at PWS (mL/kg/m) | 0.04 | -0.05 (-0.07, -0.04)* | -0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)* | -0.03 (-0.04, -0.01)* |
| $EC_w$ at SWS (mL/kg/m) | 0.04 | -0.01 (-0.03, 0.003) | -0.01 (-0.01, 0.00) | 0.00 (-0.02, 0.02) |
| Cost-capacity Ratio ($VO_2$ PWS / $VO_2$peak) | 12.33 | -0.02 (-0.03, -0.004)* | -0.01 (-0.02, 0.00) | -0.01 (-0.03, 0.01) |
| Cost-capacity Ratio ($VO_2$ SWS / $VO_2$peak) | 12.49 | -0.09 (-0.10, -0.07)* | -0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)* | -0.05 (-0.08, -0.04)* |
| **Perceived Physical Fatigability** | | | | |
| PFS Physical score, 0-50 | 8.57 | -0.06 (-0.07, -0.04)* | -0.02 (-0.03, -0.01)* | -0.03 (-0.05, -0.01)* |

Each row indicates a separate linear regression model with 4m gait speed as the outcome, adjusted for clinic site, age, race (white vs nonwhite), sex, and mean sum of total physical activity counts, measured by ActiGraph GT9X accelerometer

Results are presented per 1 SD increment for explanatory variable. The SD for the overall group was used in the stratified results.

*Indicates significant p-values at the ≤0.05 level

$EC_w$ = Energetic cost of walking; PWS = Preferred walking speed; SWS = Slow walking speed; PFS = Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale

**Figure 1. Flowchart of Analytic Sample for Linear Regressions and Statistical Mediation Analyses: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)**




Peak oxygen consumption ($VO_2$peak), Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale (PFS), Energetic cost of walking per distance travelled ($EC_W$), Preferred walking speed (PWS), slow walking speed (SWS). Participants had to have complete PFS data and at least 1 walking energetic measures to be included into this study.

**Figure 2. Comparisons of Walking Energetics and Perceived Physical Fatigability, stratified by Slower vs Faster Walkers: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging**




Figure 2 presents boxplots of walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability measures stratified by median 4m gait speed. Two-sample t-tests were conducted for all walking energetics and perceived physical fatigability measures and were all significant at $p<0.05$ except for $EC_W$ at slow walking speed (SWS). Panel A shows the distribution of $VO_2$peak by median 4m gait speed. Panel B shows the distribution of $EC_W$ at preferred walking speed (PWS) by median 4m gait speed. Panel C shows the distribution of $EC_W$ SWS by median 4m gait speed. Panel D shows the distribution of PWS cost-capacity ratio by median 4m gait speed. Panel E shows the distribution of SWS cost-capacity ratio by median 4m gait speed. Panel F shows the distribution of PFS Physical score by median 4m gait speed.

**Figure 3. Examining Perceived Physical Fatigability as a Mediator between Walking Energetics and 4m Gait Speed: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)**




Each model was adjusted for age, sex, race, clinic site, and total activity counts. Results are presented per 1-unit increment $VO_2$peak, and slow walking speed (SWS) cost-capacity ratio. Each panel shows the direct, indirect associations between $VO_2$peak and SWS cost-capacity ratio, Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale (PFS) Physical score, and 4m gait speed. It also shows the percent (95% confidence interval) which PFS mediates between $VO_2$peak or SWS cost-capacity ratio and 4m gait speed. Panel A shows the mediations among the overall sample, panel B shows the mediations among the slower walkers, and panel C shows the mediations among faster walkers.

# Appendix for "Role of Walking Energetics and Perceived Fatigability on Mobility Differ by Walking Speed: Findings from the Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)"

**Figure A1. Examining Walking Energetics as a Mediator between Perceived Physical Fatigability and 4m Gait Speed: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)**




Each model was adjusted for age, sex, race, clinic site, and total activity counts. Results are presented per 1-unit increment Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale (PFS)Physical score. Each panel shows the direct, indirect associations between $VO_2$peak and slow walking speed (SWS) cost-capacity ratio, PFS, and 4m gait speed. It also shows the percent which $VO_2$peak or SWS cost-capacity ratio mediates between PFS and 4m gait speed. Panel A shows the mediations among the overall sample, panel B shows the mediations among the slower walkers, and panel C shows the mediations among faster walkers.

**Figure A2. Examining the Mediations of Perceived Physical Fatigability and Energetic Cost of Walking at Preferred Walking Speed with 4m Gait Speed: The Study of Muscle, Mobility and Aging (SOMMA)**




Each model was adjusted for age, sex, race, clinic site, and total activity counts. Results are presented per 1-unit increment Pittsburgh Fatigability Scale (PFS) Physical score. Each panel shows the direct, indirect associations between Energetic cost of walking per distance travelled (mL/kg/m) at preferred walking speed ($EC_W$ PWS), PFS, and 4m gait speed. It also shows the percent which $EC_W$ PWS mediates between PFS and 4m gait speed. Panel A shows the mediations among the overall sample, panel B shows the mediations among the slower walkers, and panel C shows the mediations among faster walkers.