

- 1 **Title:** Digital Health Tools Applications in Frail Older Adults - A Review Article
- 2 Natthanaphop Isaradech¹, natthanaphop.isa@gmail.com, ORCID-ID: 0000-0001-5883-2035
- 3 Wachiranun Sirikul^{1,2,3}, ORCID-ID: 0000-0002-9183-4582
- 4 ¹ Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand.
- 5 ² Center of Data Analytics and Knowledge Synthesis for Health Care, Chiang Mai University,
- 6 Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand.
- 7 ³ Environmental and Occupational Medicine Excellence Center, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University,
- 8 Chiang Mai, 50200, Thailand.
- 9 ***Corresponding author:**
- 10 Wachiranun Sirikul, MD., M.Sc.
- 11 Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand.
- 12 Center of Data Analytics and Knowledge Synthesis for Health Care, Chiang Mai University,
- 13 Chiang Mai 50200, Thailand.
- 14 Tel: 011-66-53-935-472, Fax: 011-66-53-935-476
- 15 Email: wachiranun.sir@gmail.com; wachiranun.sir@cmu.ac.th
- 16

17 **A short title:** Digital Health Tools Applications in Frail Older Adults

18 **Keywords:** Digital Health Tools; Frailty; Geriatrics.

19 **Word count for the body of manuscript:** 2806

20 **Number of tables:** 3

21 **Number of figures:** 0

22 **Number of references:** 45

23 **Number of supplementary tables:** 0

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** Frailty is a common degenerative condition highly prevalent in adults over 60 years old. A frail
26 person has a higher risk of morbidities and mortality when exposed to health-related stressors. However, frailty is a
27 reversible state when it is early diagnosed. Studies have shown that frail people who participated in an exercise
28 prescription have a greater chance to transition from frail to fit. Additionally, with a rapid advancement of
29 technology, a vast majority of studies are supporting evidence regarding the digital health tools application on frail
30 population in recent years.

31 **Objectives:** This review comprehensively summarizes and discusses about technology application in frail persons to
32 capture the current knowledge gaps and propose future research directions to support additional research in this
33 field.

34 **Methods:** We used PubMed to search literature (2012-2023) with pre-specified terms. Studies required older adults
35 (≥ 40 years) using digital tools for frailty comparison, association, or prediction and we excluded non-English studies
36 and those lacking frailty comparison or digital tool use.

37 **Findings:** Our review found potential etiognostic factors in trunk, gait, upper-extremity, and physical activity
38 parameters for diagnosing frailty using digital tools in older adults.

39 **Conclusion:** Studies suggest exercise improves frailty status, emphasizing the need for integrated therapeutic
40 platforms and personalized prevention recommendations.

41 **Keywords:** Digital Health Tools; Frailty; Geriatrics.

42

43 Introduction

44 Aging society is an inevitable ongoing trend in the world. World Health Organization reported that
45 within 2030 1 in 6 people in the world will be aged over 60 years and by 2050 number of persons aged over 60 years
46 old is expected to reach 426 million (1,2). This trend is common in many countries and is attributed to a
47 combination of factors such as improved healthcare and advancements in medical technology, which have allowed
48 people to live longer (3). The world public health is now facing the challenges and opportunities that come with an
49 aging society since older adults are linked to increased multiple chronic diseases, comorbidities and mortality (4–6).

50 Frailty is a clinical condition highly prevalent in the aged population in which a frail individual is more
51 vulnerable to health-related risk exposure (7,8). Studies showed that this condition has been linked to increased
52 hospitalizations, Emergency Department (ED) visits (9–12), poorer quality of life (13), impaired cognitive function
53 (14), increased morbidity and mortality (15). Frailty is commonly defined by Fried et. al. 2001 using unintentional
54 weight loss, gait speed, exhaustion, grip strength and physical activity as a clinical diagnostic criteria (16).

55 There has been an increase in studies on frailty in recent years since frailty could be decreased or reversed
56 with a long-term-based exercise intervention (17,18). Fairhall et. al. 2014 conducted a randomized controlled trial
57 of 241 community-dwelling older adults in Australia where the findings showed that exercise and nutrition
58 intervention could significantly improve frailty status in the treatment group (19). The result agreed with Nakamura
59 et. al. 2022 where 111 community-dwelling older people in Japan were randomly assigned to perform a home-based
60 training during Covid-19 pandemic (20).

61 Several studies have employed digital tools to help diagnose and treat frailty as technology has improved
62 and become more accessible (21,22). We believe that information technology can help us recognize frailty earlier,
63 and that the earlier we identify this condition, the better healthcare providers can treat the patient with a better
64 prognosis and health outcomes. This review aims to identify and summarize prospective characteristics, diagnostic
65 models, and therapeutic studies in utilizing digital health technologies in community-dwelling frail older persons.

66

67

68 **Search Strategy**

69 We used PubMed as our main source of published literature for our search strategy. The combinations of
70 search terms were ("frailty*" OR "frail" OR "frail elderly") AND ("digital" OR "machine learning" OR
71 "smartphone*" OR "AI" OR "artificial intelligence" OR "deep learning" OR "device*") AND ("older adults" OR
72 "elderly" OR "elder" OR "old"). The selected publications in our review were limited to English publications and
73 publications within 2012-2023. Additional literature found in systemic reviews and meta-analysis were manually
74 selected to include in this review. Inclusion Criteria: 1.) The study recruited older adults aged at least over 40 years
75 old; 2.) The study applied digital health tools to find association, causal relationship or make prediction between
76 frail and non-frail population. Exclusion Criteria: 1.) The study was not written in English; The study did not
77 demonstrate a comparison of result between frail and non-frail population; The study did not utilize digital tools.

78

79 **Characteristics studies**

80 We found 9 relevant frailty characteristics studies and summarized them into Table 1. Most studies used
81 various types of digital sensors to measure surrogate outcome of frailty and are categorized into 1.) Trunk parameter
82 2.) Gait parameter and 3.) Non-gait parameters

83 **Table 1.** Characteristics Studies

Author (year)	Study design	Population		Frailty Criteria	Tool	Parameters	Outcome			Interpretation
		Study base	Participants				Mean (\pm SD)		p-value	
							Non-Frail	Frail		
Galán-Mercant et al. 2013 (23)	Measurement of 3D acceleration, angular velocity, and trunk displacement in the turn transition of Sit-to-Stand and Stand-to-Sit Transitions	Community-based	N = 30 volunteers aged > 60 years old.	FFP	iPhone4 attached at the chest	Sit-to-stand RV acceleration mean	4.12 \pm 0.96	2.97 \pm 1.06	0.005	Accelerometer parameters and angular displacement are significantly different between NF and F groups
						Stand-to-sit RV acceleration mean	4.26 \pm 1.05	3.19 \pm 0.71	0.005	
						Sit-to-stand Gyroscope Rotation mean	83.83 \pm 150.56	24.75 \pm 58.16	0.034	
						Stand-to-sit Gyroscope Rotation mean	83.10 \pm 142.18	15.49 \pm 40.88	0.038	
Millor et al. 2013 (24)	Participants were instructed to stand up and sit down from a chair at their preferred speed as many times as possible within 30 seconds	Community-based	47 community-dwelling adults age > 50 years old	FFP	MTx XSENS worn on lumbar spine	30 sec Stand-to-sit cycles (n)	22 \pm 7	6 \pm 1	<0.001	Healthy participant performed Sit-to-stand cycle significantly better than frail participants
Toonsizadeh et al. 2015 (25)	Participants performed a 50s trail of elbow flexion in a seated position in a chair wearing a wireless monitor for data collection.	Community-based	N = 117 community dwelling volunteers aged > 65 years.	FFP	BioSensics LLC on upper arm near biceps muscle and wrist	Speed of elbow flexion	1117 \pm 247	461 \pm 215	0.001	Non-gait related parameters are also associated with frailty status
						Flexibility of elbow flexion	134 \pm 22	87 \pm 28	<0.001	
						Power of elbow flexion	205.1 \pm 116	23.5 \pm 15	<0.001	
Parvaneh et al. 2017 (26)	Participants were instructed to wear sensors for 48 hours to monitor and assess postural transition differences among frailty levels. The first 24 hours were used for data analysis.	Community-based	120 community-dwelling volunteers aged > 70 years old	FFP	PAMSys with sensors located at the chest	Sit-to-stand (n)	85 \pm 45	83 \pm 40	-	The number of sit-to-walk and total transition cycles derived from chest sensors are correlated with frailty status
						Sit-to-walk (n)	23 \pm 11	23 \pm 9	0.664	
						Stand-to-sit (n)	64 \pm 37	66 \pm 34	0.568	
						Stand-to-walk (n)	475 \pm 208	332 \pm 148	0.011	
						Quick sitting (n)	45 \pm 16	40 \pm 15	0.570	
						Walk-to-stand (n)	453 \pm 202	314 \pm 141	0.363	
Castaneda-Gameros et al. 2018 (27)	Participants wore the sensors for 7 days. (at least 10 hr a day)	Community-based	N = 60 community-dwelling volunteers aged >60 years old	FFP	Actigraph GT2X wore at the hip	Sedentary Time	523.7 \pm 85.7	576.7 \pm 7	0.480	Moderate-to-vigorous Physical Activity was the only parameter that was significantly different between frail and robust groups
						Low-light Physical Activity	207.4 \pm 57.8	161.4 \pm 68.7	0.510	
						High-light Physical Activity	27.1 \pm 13.6	18.4 \pm 23	0.360	
						Moderate-to-vigorous Physical Activity	18.4 \pm 19.9	3.4 \pm 4.5	<0.001	

Zhou et al. 2019 (28)	This study aims to examine whether parameters from an instrumented trail-making task (iTMT), gait speed and power could classify frailty stages	Out-patient clinic	61 community-dwelling volunteers aged > 60 years	FFP	iTMT and LEGSys worn on both shins	Gait speed	1.06	0.94	0.032	The study showed that parameters were helpful to discriminate frailty status among the out-patient care patients
						iTMT: Velocity	6.31	5.67	0.025	
						Power	90.56	73.70	0.04	
						Exhaustion	8.23	9.41	0.698	
Jansen et al. 2019 (29)	Participants were asked to wear the sensors while performing a walk test under two conditions: 1. at self-selected distance of 4.57 meter and 2. ask quickly as possible distance of 10 m.	Community-based	N = 112 older adults aged 65 years or older	FFP	PAMSys sensor in a shirt & LEGSys at legs and lumbar spine	Percentage of time walking or standing (%)	25±7.10	16.4±7.30	<0.001	The study showed that percentage of time walking/standing, max step in one test bout, and walking speed are significantly different among frailty status
						Max steps in one bout	1668 ±1724	285±387	<0.001	
						Average steps per bout	39±24	27±12	0.250	
						Normal walking speed	1.18±0.15	0.64±0.25	<0.001	
Apega et al. 2020 (30)	Participants performed TUG test (3m) while wearing the sensors	Not specified	N = 133 community-dwelling adults aged > 60 years	FFP	SHIMMER sensors at bilateral thighs, shins, and feet	TUG time	0.67 (1.89-3.78) ^a		<0.001	TUG, Dynamic gait index score, gait speed, and stride time were correlated with frailty status in community-dwelling older persons
						Dynamic gait Index score	0.71 (0.60-0.83) ^a		<0.001	
						Gait speed	0.92 (0.89-0.95) ^a		<0.001	
						Stride time	1.00 (1.003-1.009) ^a		<0.001	
						Swing Phase	1.00 (1.001-1.015) ^a		0.024	
						Stance phase	1.00 (1.004-1.012) ^a		<0.001	
						Double support time (ms)	1.01 (1.01-1.02) ^a		0.002	
						Candence (step/min)	0.83 (0.78-0.89) ^a		<0.000	
Kikuchi et al. 2021 (31)	Association of intensity-specific PA and bout-specific sedentary time with frailty status → wear the device for 7 days	Community-based	511 community-dwelling adults aged > 65 years	J-CHS	Active style Pro HJA-750C worn at the hip	Short bout of SB	273.1 ±65.4	231 ±59	<0.001	Sedentary behavior and physical activity (moderate-to-vigorous) are significantly different between frail and robust patients
						Prolonged bout of SB	167.3 ±115.3	289.9 ± 157.7	<0.001	
						Light PA	406.2 ±97.4	298.6 ±157.9	0.182	
						Moderate-vigorous PA	58.6 ±40.1	14.9 ±21.1	<0.001	

86 **Trunk parameter**

87 Most studies' methods involved researchers instructing volunteers to perform physical function tests while
88 wearing a digital sensor that measures characteristics that likely represents frailty. Galan-Mercant et. al. (2013)
89 studied 30 community-dwelling volunteers over the age of 60 who performed a sit-to-stand, stand-to-sit test while
90 wearing an iPhone4 attached to the chest to assess 3D acceleration, angular velocity, and trunk displacement during
91 the turn transition (23). The findings revealed all factors differed significantly between frail and non-frail subjects.

92 Parvaneh et. al. 2017 conducted a study using a wearable necklace-like sensors located at the chest of 120
93 community-dwelling participants aged over 70 years old to monitor and assess postural transition differences among
94 frailty levels for 24 hours, and the results showed that the number of Stand-to-walk and total postural transitions
95 were significantly different between groups (26). Millor et. al. (2013) asked 47 community-dwelling volunteers over
96 the age of 50 to perform stand-up and sit-down from a chair as many times as they could in 30 seconds while
97 wearing an inertial orientation tracking sensors on their lumbar spine (24). The study showed that healthy
98 participants outperformed frail people with less sway on the sit-to-stand cycle.

99 Therefore, the parameters derived from sensors attached to the trunk such as 3D acceleration, velocity and
100 postural sway while doing physical function tests could discriminate frail and robust in the community-dwelling
101 older adults.

102 **Gait Parameter**

103 Gait assessment was another method used by researchers to analyze diagnostic variables in frail older
104 adults. Zhou et. al. 2019 investigated whether parameters from an instrumented trail making task (iTMT) and gait
105 sensors worn on both shins to measure gait speed and iTMT derived parameters could distinguish between frail and
106 robust participants (28). The findings revealed that gait speed and iTMT velocity were significant parameters that
107 could help classify frailty status among the outpatient care population. Moreover, Jasen et. al. 2019 carried out an
108 intervention research which 112 community-dwelling older persons were requested to wear a wearable sensor in a
109 shirt while undertaking a walking test under two conditions: 1.) Walk a distance of 4.57 meters at your own speed;
110 and 2.) Walking a 10-meter distance as rapidly as possible (29). The findings correlated with the previous studies,

111 which suggested that the proportion of time spent walking and standing, the maximum steps in one test bout, and
112 walking speed might all be potential predictors of frailty classification (30).

113 **Non-gait Parameters**

114 To determine frailty status, other variables could be used in addition to those mentioned above. Toosizadeh
115 et. al. (2015) studied the association between frailty status and non-gait parameters using a wearable gyroscope
116 sensor attached to the upper arm and wrist of 117 community-dwelling adults over 65 years old to measure elbow
117 function while performing a 50-second trail of elbow flexion in a seated position (25). The results revealed that the
118 speed of elbow flexion, flexibility, and power of elbow flexion differed significantly between robust and frail
119 participants. In the study by Castaneda-Gameros et. al. (2018), moderate-to-vigorous physical activity measured by
120 a sensor that records acceleration and gyroscopic data worn on the hip for 7 days was associated with frailty status in
121 community-dwelling old adults (27). Additionally, Kikuchi et. al. 2020 found the association of intensity-specific
122 physical activity. The results showed that sedentary behavior and physical activity (moderate-to-vigorous) were
123 significantly different between frail and robust in 511 Japanese community-dwelling participants aged over 65 (31).

124 As a result of the mentioned studies, there are multiple potential variables that could represent
125 characteristics of frailty. Non-gait parameters appeared to have the highest clinical feasibility if researchers could
126 integrate a model into a smartwatch since a wrist-worn device is simple to use and most older adults are already
127 accustomed to wearing a smartwatch.

128 **Diagnostic Studies**

129 Frailty identification is a clinically relevant topic since it is a condition that may be reversed from frail to
130 robust. Several studies are being conducted to develop tools and diagnostic models for classifying frail and non-frail
131 older adults. According to the authors' evaluation of the published evidence in this field, there are two types of
132 frailty diagnostic tools that use technology: 1.) Clinical Data; and 2.) Data derived from wearable devices and
133 biological sensors which are summarized in Table 2.

134 Table 1. Diagnostic studies

Author (year)	Study design	Population		Predictors	Frailty-criteria	Tool	Model	Diagnosis performances	Interpretation
		Study base	Participants						
Prediction Model									
Aznar-Tortonda et al. 2020 (32)	Cross-sectional observational study using an application for Android for data collection	Community-based	621 older adults	Sex, age, polypharmacy, hospital admission in the last year, and diabetes.	FFP	Android Application	LGR	AUC 0.78	Simple clinical history could be used for frailty classification in older adults
Sajeev et al. 2022 (33)	Cross-sectional Observational study (Development and internal validation with test sample)	Community-based	656 independent community-dwelling adults aged 40-75 years old	63 anthropometric, environmental, social, lifestyle and physiologic variables	CFS and FFP	In-person Health Assessment	LGR	AUC 0.69	Machine learning methods are useful for frailty diagnosis however some variables might be hard to implement in clinical practice
							LDA	AUC 0.69	
							SVM	AUC 0.69	
							RF	AUC 0.71	
Data derived from wearable devices and biological sensors.									
Greene et al. 2014 (34)	Development of classifier models to assess frailty status using sensor-derived features of TUG, Five Time Sit to Stand and Balance tests	Community-based	124 community dwelling older adults (mean age 75.9 ± 6.6 years, 91 female). 66 F, 58 NF	Time up and go test, Balance test, Five Time Sit to Stand	FFP	SHIMMER sensor worn on each shin, right thigh, L5 spine and sternum. A pressure sensor for balance data.	SVM	Sensitivity 88.63% Specificity 85.06%	TUG, FTSS and Balance test are good predictors for frailty classification using an SVM model
Schwenk et al. 2015 [35]	Participant walked 4.57 m in their home at self-selected speed. Balance was assessed during 15s quiet standing with feet together, eyes closed. PA	Community-based	N = 125 community-dwelling volunteers aged > 65 years old	Stride length, Double support, Balance parameters	FFP	LEGSys, BalanSens, PAMSys with sensors located at shanks, thighs, and lumbar spine	LGR: NF and PF classification	AUC 0.86	Gait parameters had the best performance to separate NF from PF and PF from F in aged-adjusted model
							LGR: PF and F classification	AUC 0.84	
Tooisazadeh et al. 2015 (35)	Participants performed two 15s balance mechanisms between NF, PF and F individuals	Community-based	122 older adults aged > 65 years old	Postural sway, age, BMI, OLCL parameters	FFP	BalanSens at lumbar spine and shin	LGR: Postural sway, age, and BMI	EO: Sensitivity 74%, Specificity 93% EC: Sensitivity 74%, Specificity 83%	Body sway (and age/BMI), OLCL (and age/BMI) can be used for frailty screening tool (high sensitivity)
							LGR: OLCL, age and BMI	EO: Sensitivity 94%, Specificity 98%	

								EC: Sensitivity 100%, Specificity 83%	
Tooiszadeh et al. 2016 (36)	Validate the accuracy of Upper-Extremity-Frailty (UEF) assessment in distinguishing between F and NF participants	Hospital-based	101 hospital in-patients aged > 65 years old	Speed of elbow flexion, Number of flexions, Power, and Moment	TSFI	BioSensics LLC: near biceps and wrist	LGR	Sensitivity 78% Specificity 82%	This study shows that a single sensor worn at wrist could be a viable tool for frailty assessment tool however a higher sensitivity would be better on frailty screening use-case.
Millor et al. 2017 (37)	Participants performed as many CST reps as possible within 30s at self-selected speed starting from seated position with arms folded	Not specified	A total of 718 subjects from an elderly population aged over 70 years	Temporal-spatial gait parameters: Gait Velocity, Step Regularity, Stride Regularity, Symmetry, Step Time variability	FFP	MTx XSENS worn on L3 spine	Decision Tree: GV	AUC 0.82	The results showed that the sensors are useful for frailty classification using gait parameters
Lee et al. 2018 (38)	Participants wore sensors while performing elbow flexion and extension in 20s timeframe to provide physical frailty assessment features	Hospital-based	N = 100 in-patients (old adults) aged over 70 years old	Mean of angle range, PD of power range, CV of elbow extension time, mean of elbow flexion time, CV of elbow flexion time	Rockwood's criteria (TSFI)	LEGSys worn at wrist and upper arm	LR	AUC 0.87	This study shows that a single sensor worn at wrist could be a viable tool for frailty assessment tool

135
136
137

Abbreviations: AUC, Area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve; BMI, Body Mass Index; CFS, Clinical Frailty Scale; CST, Chair-sit-test; CV, coefficient of variation; EC, eyes closed; EO, eyes open; F, Frailty; FFP, Fried Frailty Phenotype; FTSS, Five Time Sit to Stand; GV, Gait Velocity; LDA, Linear Discriminant Analysis; LGR, Logistic Regression; LR, Linear Regression; NF, Non-frailty; OLCL, open-loop close-loop; PD, percentage of decline; PF, Pre-frail; RF, Random Forest; SVM, Support Vector Machine; TSFI, Rockwood's criteria; TUG, Time-up-and-go

138 **Clinical Data**

139 Aznar-Tortonda et. al. 2020 collected data from 621 community-based participants in a cross-sectional
140 observational study utilizing an Android mobile device application. Sex, age, polypharmacy, hospitalization, and
141 diabetes history were chosen characteristics and employed in a logistic regression model (32). This model obtained
142 an AUC of 0.78, suggesting that a brief clinical history might be utilized to classify frailty in older persons. Sajeev
143 et. al. 2022 used 20 anthropometric, environmental, social, lifestyle, and physiologic variables from 656 community-
144 dwelling adults aged 40–65 years old to develop and internally validate four machine learning models, including
145 logistic regression, linear discriminant analysis, support vector machine, and random forest (33). With an AUC of
146 70.8, the random forest model achieved the highest discrimination performance. This study found that machine
147 learning models could be used to diagnose frailty. However, the large number of variables in the purposed models
148 could make it difficult to implement them in clinical practices and community settings, and the selected features
149 appeared to be more difficult to measure and more complicated than the standard diagnostic criteria for frailty. A
150 future study is required to demonstrate the real-world application of a frailty diagnostic machine learning model
151 based on clinical characteristic data.

152 **Data derived from wearable devices and biological sensors.**

153 Most studies for biological sensors and wearable devices employ criteria similar to characteristics research.
154 We divided the parameters into three major categories: 1.) Physical Function test; 2.) Gait and balance test; and 3.)
155 Non-gait-related test.

156 *Physical Function Test*

157 Greene et. al. (2014) created a support vector machine classifier model based on characteristics gathered
158 from 124 community-dwelling people who wore inertial and pressure sensors on each shin, right thigh, L5 spine,
159 and sternum while undertaking Time-up-and-go, Five Time Sit to Stand, and Balance tests (34). Their model had
160 88.63% sensitivity and 85.06% specificity, indicating that the demonstrated tests had good frailty classifying
161 characteristics. Schwenk et. al. (2015) had 125 community-dwelling older adults walk 4.57 meters in their home at
162 their own pace, followed by a balance assessment while wearing multiple sensors on their shanks, thighs, and

163 lumbar spine to collect gait and balance parameters for logistic regression model development (39). The results
164 revealed an AUC of 0.857 for non-frail and pre-frail classification and an AUC of 0.841 for pre-frail and frail
165 classification. The mentioned models have shown good and applicable discrimination performance.

166 *Gait and Balance Test*

167 Tooiszadeh et. al. (2015) demonstrated that postural sway, age, and BMI parameters derived from sensors
168 located at the lumbar spine and shin could predict frailty with 97% sensitivity and 88% specificity (35). Millor et. al.
169 (2017) developed decision tree models using gait characteristics acquired from an inertia sensor worn on the L3
170 spine of 718 senior volunteers aged over 70 years (37). With an AUC of 0.823-0.896, the results also demonstrated
171 that gait characteristics and decision tree models were beneficial for frailty classification.

172 *Upper Extremity*

173 According to Lee et. al. 2018, participants wore accelerometers and gyroscope sensors at their wrist and
174 upper arm while performing elbow flexion and extension in a 20-second timeframe to provide physical features such
175 as the mean of the angle range coefficient of variation of elbow flexion and extension time and the mean of elbow
176 movement time (38). These characteristics were used to develop a linear regression model with an AUC of 0.87.
177 Tooiszadeh et. al. (2016) created a logistic regression model utilizing upper-extremity frailty assessment data from a
178 wearable gyroscope sensor, which was collected from the upper extremities of 101 hospital in-patients over the age
179 of 65 (36). The study's performance was 78% sensitivity and 82% specificity. These studies demonstrated that a
180 single non-gait-related sensor could be used to distinguish frailty and robustness in the elderly population.

181 In conclusion, research revealed that physical function tests, gait-related, and non-gait-related measures
182 were useful in developing prediction models to diagnose frailty state in the aged population. However, the fitness
183 test approach may be unsuitable for prospective frailty data collection because performing all the aforementioned
184 fitness tests would take a significant amount of time to obtain the required feature in order to diagnose frailty in an
185 individual, which may be comparable to simply performing tests according to Fried's criteria. We propose that future
186 research should focus on upper extremity features because we believe that integrating a frailty predictive model into
187 a smartwatch and mobile application has clinically significant implications.

188 **Therapeutic studies**

189 Based on the current evidence summarized in Table 3, pre-frail and frail older adults are recommended for
190 multi-component physical activity program and progressive resistance training program. Multiple studies have
191 shown improved cognitive function, physical function, and frailty status in older adults after physical exercise
192 intervention. Therefore, our review selected frailty therapeutic studies that integrated the use of technology to
193 improve frailty state in the elderly.

194 Daniel et. al. 2012 conducted a study where 23 community-dwelling pre-frail volunteers aged over 70 years
195 old were randomized into one of three groups: control, seated exercise, or Wii®-fit. The findings showed better
196 outcomes for all intervention groups (40). Wii-fit exercises and seated exercises were both superior to the control
197 group in maintaining or improving physical functions. Liao et. al. 2019 recruited a randomized controlled trial of 52
198 prefrail and frail elderly where the participants were divided into two exercise intervention 1.) Exergaming group
199 and 2.) Combined resistance, aerobic and balance exercise group for 36 sessions over 12 weeks (41). The results
200 revealed both gaming exercise and combined exercise groups improved frailty status among the elderly. The study
201 correlated with Moreira et. al. 2021 where an RCT of 66 pre-frail older adults were assigned to either exergaming
202 intervention and traditional multicomponent exercise (42). The findings showed that both programs were clinically
203 effective for delaying frailty status and improving physical and cognitive function.

204 Exergaming have shown positive health outcomes in terms of enhancing physical function, cognitive
205 function, and frailty status. The programs could be done in a home setting, making exercise intervention easily
206 accessible. However, the majority of frail people are older adults, who may face challenges using technologies
207 because of their lack of digital literacy and technology acceptance. One of the studies cited above had a dropout rate
208 of over 30%, which suggests that a portion of older persons might not find the use of a digital intervention tool
209 appropriate.

210 **Table 3.** Therapeutic studies

Author (year)	Study design	Participants	Control Group	Intervention Group	Frailty Criteria	Tool	Qualitative Outcome	Quantitative Outcome
Daniel et al. 2012 (40)	Pre-frail volunteers were recruited to participate in a 15-week exercise intervention or control group. Participants were randomized into one of three groups: control, seated exercise, or Wii®-fit.	23 Community-based pre-frail participants aged over 70 years old	Two intervention groups: (1) Wii®-fit. exercise at home and (2) seated exercise (with trainers)	Normal Physical Activity	FFP	Wii®-fit	Better outcomes for the intervention group. Wii-fit exercises and seated exercises were both superior to the control group in maintaining or improving physical functioning.	Time up and go test remain the same in control group while the treatment group had increased ES = 0.27 (Seated exercise) and 0.30 (Wii)
Takahashi et al. 2012 (43)	Participants were randomized to telemonitoring (with daily input) or to patient-driven usual care. Telemonitoring was accomplished by daily biometrics, symptom reporting, and videoconference. The primary outcome was a composite end point of hospitalizations and ED visits in the 12 months following enrollment.	102 frail individuals with multiple comorbidities	Telemonitoring	Usual Care	ERA	Intel® health guide and other medical equipment at home	No difference between groups in most of the outcome measurements	ES for main outcome = 0.0991
Upatising et al. 2013 (44)	-	194 participants aged over 70 years old with different frailty status and chronic conditions	The intervention group received usual medical care and telemonitoring case management	Usual Care	FFP	Intel® health guide and other medical equipment at home	No difference between group	No transition to a frailty state during the first and the subsequent 6 months (OR 1.41, 95% CI 0.65–3.06, 5.94, 95% CI 0.52–68.48)

<p>Dekker-van Weering et al. 2017 (45)</p>	<p>Participants were randomly assigned to a control group or a 12-week intervention group. Primary outcomes were use of the intervention, adherence to a 3-day exercise protocol and user experience [System Usability Scale (SUS); rating 1–10].</p>	<p>36 prefrail individuals with mean age 70.9</p>	<p>Home exercise program using computer/tablet, 3 times a week for 12 weeks</p>	<p>Usual Care</p>	<p>GFI</p>	<p>Home exercise program (strength, balance, and flexibility exercises)</p>	<p>The study showed that the programs are feasible and easy to use for pre-frail elderly adults</p>	<p>Acceptability: average score SUS 84.2 (±13.3). Adherence: 68%. Quality of life (mental) better in intervention group, other quality of life domains, no difference.</p>
--	---	---	---	-------------------	------------	---	---	--

212

Abbreviations: CI, Confidence Interval; ED, Emergency Department; ERA, Elder Risk Assessment Index; ES, Effect Size; FFP, Fried Frailty Phenotype; GFI, Groninger Frailty Indicator; OR, Odd Ratio

213 **Conclusion**

214 From our review, we found that there are many potential etiognostic factors that could help diagnose frailty
215 status using digital tools from trunk, gait, upper-extremity, and physical activity parameters. Researchers had used
216 these parameters to create multiple well-performing models to classify frailty status in the older adults. We found
217 non-gait parameters the most appealing variables for future research as a frailty diagnostic model integration into a
218 wearable device. However, the model classification results should be interpreted with caution because these models
219 may be overfitting due to a lack of external validation studies.

220 Regardless of the tools used, studies have shown that exercise can improve frailty status. Rather than
221 developing a single standalone exercise platform, digital health technology developers should focus on how to
222 implement these therapeutic platforms with health care providers or coaching platforms that could encourage and
223 motivate prefrail and frail old adults to engage in more physical activity.

224 However, there are gaps between frailty screening and care delivery for patient at risk. We did not find a
225 study that combines screening and therapeutic digital health tools into one. To prevent frailty early on, we propose
226 that future studies should focus on how to integrate a screening/diagnostic tool with personalized
227 therapeutic/prevention recommendations to users.

228 **Supplementary Materials:** None

229 **Author Contributions:** The review's first draft was written by N.I. and W.S. N.I. and W.S. reviewed and edited the
230 manuscript, assisted in the formulation of the research question, and advised on study objectives and methodologies.
231 N.I. and W.S. contributed to the review's conceptualization, design, and development. The final version of the
232 manuscript was reviewed and approved by all authors.

233 **Funding:** This research received no external funding. The APC was funded by Chiang Mai University, Thailand.

234 **Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

235 **Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding
236 author.

237 **Acknowledgments:** This study was partially supported by Chiang Mai University.

238 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study;
239 in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of manuscript, or in the decision to publish results.

240 References

- 241 1. World population ageing, 2019 : highlights. 2019; Available from: <http://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3846855>
- 242 2. Ageing and health [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 2]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health)
243 [sheets/detail/ageing-and-health](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health)
- 244 3. Sabri SM, Annuar N, Rahman NLA, Musairah SK, Mutalib HA, Subagja IK. Major Trends in Ageing
245 Population Research: A Bibliometric Analysis from 2001 to 2021. *Proceedings*. 2022;82(1):19.
- 246 4. MacNee W, Rabinovich RA, Choudhury G. Ageing and the border between health and disease. *Eur Respir J*.
247 2014 Nov 1;44(5):1332–52.
- 248 5. Costa GM da, Sanchez MN, Shimizu HE. Factors associated with mortality of the elderly due to ambulatory
249 care sensitive conditions, between 2008 and 2018, in the Federal District, Brazil. *PLOS ONE*. 2022 Aug
250 5;17(8):e0272650.
- 251 6. Ayaz T, Sahin SB, Sahin OZ, Bilir O, Rakıcı H. Factors Affecting Mortality in Elderly Patients Hospitalized for
252 Nonmalignant Reasons. *J Aging Res*. 2014 Aug 3;2014:e584315.
- 253 7. Lekan DA, Collins SK, Hayajneh AA. Definitions of Frailty in Qualitative Research: A Qualitative Systematic
254 Review. *J Aging Res*. 2021 Jun 2;2021:6285058.
- 255 8. Sternberg SA, Wershof Schwartz A, Karunanathan S, Bergman H, Mark Clarfield A. The identification of
256 frailty: a systematic literature review. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2011 Nov;59(11):2129–38.
- 257 9. Srinonprasert V, Chalerm Sri C, Aekplakorn W. Frailty index to predict all-cause mortality in Thai community-
258 dwelling older population: A result from a National Health Examination Survey cohort. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*.
259 2018 Jul;77:124–8.
- 260 10. End of Life Care in Frailty: Falls [Internet]. British Geriatrics Society. [cited 2022 Aug 2]. Available from:
261 <https://www.bgs.org.uk/resources/end-of-life-care-in-frailty-falls>
- 262 11. Cheng MH, Chang SF. Frailty as a Risk Factor for Falls Among Community Dwelling People: Evidence From
263 a Meta-Analysis: Falls With Frailty. *J Nurs Scholarsh*. 2017 Sep;49(5):529–36.
- 264 12. Davis-Ajami ML, Chang PS, Wu J. Hospital readmission and mortality associations to frailty in hospitalized
265 patients with coronary heart disease. *Aging Health Res*. 2021 Dec;1(4):100042.
- 266 13. Nguyen, Nguyen, Nguyen, Nguyen, Nguyen, Pham, et al. Frailty Prevalence and Association with Health-
267 Related Quality of Life Impairment among Rural Community-Dwelling Older Adults in Vietnam. *Int J Environ*
268 *Res Public Health*. 2019 Oct 12;16(20):3869.
- 269 14. Robertson DA, Savva GM, Kenny RA. Frailty and cognitive impairment—A review of the evidence and causal
270 mechanisms. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2013 Sep;12(4):840–51.

- 271
272
273
15. Castillo-Angeles M, Cooper Z, Jarman MP, Sturgeon D, Salim A, Havens JM. Association of Frailty With Morbidity and Mortality in Emergency General Surgery by Procedural Risk Level. *JAMA Surg.* 2021 Jan 1;156(1):68–74.
- 274
275
16. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, Newman AB, Hirsch C, Gottdiener J, et al. Frailty in Older Adults: Evidence for a Phenotype. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2001 Mar 1;56(3):M146–57.
- 276
17. Liu CK, Fielding RA. Exercise as an Intervention for Frailty. *Clin Geriatr Med.* 2011 Feb;27(1):101–10.
- 277
278
279
280
18. Furtado G, Caldo A, Rodrigues R, Pedrosa A, Neves R, Letieri R, et al. Exercise-Based Interventions as a Management of Frailty Syndrome in Older Populations: Design, Strategy, and Planning [Internet]. *Frailty in the Elderly - Understanding and Managing Complexity.* IntechOpen; 2020 [cited 2022 Dec 20]. Available from: <https://www.intechopen.com/state.item.id>
- 281
282
283
19. Fairhall N, Kurrle SE, Sherrington C, Lord SR, Lockwood K, John B, et al. Effectiveness of a multifactorial intervention on preventing development of frailty in pre-frail older people: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open.* 2015 Feb 9;5(2):e007091–e007091.
- 284
285
286
20. Nakamura M, Ohki M, Mizukoshi R, Takeno I, Tsujita T, Imai R, et al. Effect of Home-Based Training with a Daily Calendar on Preventing Frailty in Community-Dwelling Older People during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022 Oct 30;19(21):14205.
- 287
288
21. Linn N, Goetzinger C, Regnaud JP, Schmitz S, Dessenne C, Fagherazzi G, et al. Digital Health Interventions among People Living with Frailty: A Scoping Review. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2021 Sep;22(9):1802-1812.e21.
- 289
290
291
292
22. Guasti L, Dilaveris P, Mamas MA, Richter D, Christodorescu R, Lumens J, et al. Digital health in older adults for the prevention and management of cardiovascular diseases and frailty. A clinical consensus statement from the ESC Council for Cardiology Practice/Taskforce on Geriatric Cardiology, the ESC Digital Health Committee and the ESC Working Group on e-Cardiology. *ESC Heart Fail.* 2022;9(5):2808–22.
- 293
294
295
23. Galán-Mercant A, Cuesta-Vargas AI. Differences in Trunk Accelerometry Between Frail and Nonfrail Elderly Persons in Sit-to-Stand and Stand-to-Sit Transitions Based on a Mobile Inertial Sensor. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2013 Aug 16;1(2):e21.
- 296
297
298
24. Millor N, Lecumberri P, Gómez M, Martínez-Ramírez A, Izquierdo M. An evaluation of the 30-s chair stand test in older adults: frailty detection based on kinematic parameters from a single inertial unit. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2013 Dec;10(1):86.
- 299
300
25. Toosizadeh N, Mohler J, Najafi B. Assessing Upper Extremity Motion: An Innovative Method to Identify Frailty. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2015 Jun;63(6):1181–6.
- 301
302
303
26. Parvaneh S, Mohler J, Toosizadeh N, Grewal GS, Najafi B. Postural Transitions during Activities of Daily Living Could Identify Frailty Status: Application of Wearable Technology to Identify Frailty during Unsupervised Condition. *Gerontology.* 2017;63(5):479–87.
- 304
305
306
27. Castaneda-Gameros D, Redwood S, Thompson JL. Physical Activity, Sedentary Time, and Frailty in Older Migrant Women From Ethnically Diverse Backgrounds: A Mixed-Methods Study. *J Aging Phys Act.* 2018 Apr;26(2):194–203.
- 307
308
28. Zhou H, Razjouyan J, Halder D, Naik AD, Kunik ME, Najafi B. Instrumented Trail-Making Task: Application of Wearable Sensor to Determine Physical Frailty Phenotypes. *Gerontology.* 2019;65(2):186–97.
- 309
310
29. Jansen CP, Toosizadeh N, Mohler MJ, Najafi B, Wendel C, Schwenk M. The association between motor capacity and mobility performance: frailty as a moderator. *Eur Rev Aging Phys Act.* 2019 Dec;16(1):16.

- 311
312
313 30. Apsega A, Petrauskas L, Alekna V, Daunoraviciene K, Sevcenko V, Mastaviciute A, et al. Wearable Sensors Technology as a Tool for Discriminating Frailty Levels During Instrumented Gait Analysis. *Appl Sci*. 2020 Nov 26;10(23):8451.
- 314
315
316 31. Kikuchi H, Inoue S, Amagasa S, Fukushima N, Machida M, Murayama H, et al. Associations of older adults' physical activity and bout-specific sedentary time with frailty status: Compositional analyses from the NEIGE study. *Exp Gerontol*. 2021 Jan;143:111149.
- 317
318
319 32. Aznar-Tortonda V, Palazón-Bru A, la Rosa DMF de, Espínola-Morel V, Pérez-Pérez BF, León-Ruiz AB, et al. Detection of frailty in older patients using a mobile app: cross-sectional observational study in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract J R Coll Gen Pract*. 2020 Jan;70(690):e29–35.
- 320
321 33. Sajeev S, Champion S, Maeder A, Gordon S. Machine learning models for identifying pre-frailty in community dwelling older adults. *BMC Geriatr*. 2022 Oct 12;22(1):794.
- 322
323 34. Greene BR, Doheny EP, Kenny RA, Caulfield B. Classification of frailty and falls history using a combination of sensor-based mobility assessments. *Physiol Meas*. 2014 Oct 1;35(10):2053–66.
- 324
325 35. Toosizadeh N, Mohler J, Wendel C, Najafi B. Influences of Frailty Syndrome on Open-Loop and Closed-Loop Postural Control Strategy. *Gerontology*. 2015;61(1):51–60.
- 326
327
328 36. Toosizadeh N, Joseph B, Heusser MR, Orouji Jokar T, Mohler J, Phelan HA, et al. Assessing Upper-Extremity Motion: An Innovative, Objective Method to Identify Frailty in Older Bed-Bound Trauma Patients. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2016 Aug;223(2):240–8.
- 329
330
331 37. Millor N, Lecumberri P, Gomez M, Martinez A, Martinikorena J, Rodriguez-Manas L, et al. Gait Velocity and Chair Sit-Stand-Sit Performance Improves Current Frailty-Status Identification. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2017 Nov;25(11):2018–25.
- 332
333
334 38. Lee H, Joseph B, Enriquez A, Najafi B. Toward Using a Smartwatch to Monitor Frailty in a Hospital Setting: Using a Single Wrist-Wearable Sensor to Assess Frailty in Bedbound Inpatients. *Gerontology*. 2018;64(4):389–400.
- 335
336
337 39. Schwenk M, Mohler J, Wendel C, D'’Huyvetter K, Fain M, Taylor-Piliae R, et al. Wearable Sensor-Based In-Home Assessment of Gait, Balance, and Physical Activity for Discrimination of Frailty Status: Baseline Results of the Arizona Frailty Cohort Study. *Gerontology*. 2015;61(3):258–67.
- 338 40. Daniel K. Wii-Hab for Pre-Frail Older Adults. *Rehabil Nurs*. 2012 Jul;37(4):195–201.
- 339
340 41. Liao YY, Chen IH, Wang RY. Effects of Kinect-based exergaming on frailty status and physical performance in prefrail and frail elderly: A randomized controlled trial. *Sci Rep*. 2019 Jun 27;9(1):9353.
- 341
342
343 42. Moreira NB, Rodacki ALF, Costa SN, Pitta A, Bento PCB. Perceptive-Cognitive and Physical Function in Prefrail Older Adults: Exergaming Versus Traditional Multicomponent Training. *Rejuvenation Res*. 2021 Feb;24(1):28–36.
- 344
345
346
347 43. Takahashi PY, Pecina JL, Upatising B, Chaudhry R, Shah ND, Van Houten H, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Telemonitoring in Older Adults With Multiple Health Issues to Prevent Hospitalizations and Emergency Department Visits. *Arch Intern Med [Internet]*. 2012 May 28 [cited 2022 Dec 20];172(10). Available from: <http://archinte.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/archinternmed.2012.256>
- 348
349 44. Upatising B, Hanson, Kim, Cha, Yih Y, Takahashi P. Effects of home telemonitoring on transitions between frailty states and death for older adults: a randomized controlled trial. *Int J Gen Med*. 2013 Mar;145.

350
351
352

45. Dekker-van Weering M, Jansen-Kosterink S, Frazer S, Vollenbroek-Hutten M. User Experience, Actual Use, and Effectiveness of an Information Communication Technology-Supported Home Exercise Program for Pre-Frail Older Adults. *Front Med.* 2017 Nov 27;4:208.

