

1 The iCARE feasibility non-experimental design study: An integrated collection of education
2 modules for fall and fracture prevention for healthcare providers in long term care

3
4 Isabel B. Rodrigues^{1,2}, George Ioannidis¹, Lauren Kane¹, Loretta M. Hillier³, Caitlin McArthur⁴,
5 Jonathan Adachi¹, Lehana Thabane^{1,3,5,6,7}, George Heckman^{8,9}, Jayna Holroyd-Leduc¹⁰, Susan
6 Jaglal¹¹, Sharon Kaasalainen¹², Sharon Straus^{2,13}, Momina Abbas^{3,5}, Jean-Eric Tarride⁵, Sharon
7 Marr², John Hirdes⁹, Arthur N. Lau¹, Andrew Costa⁵, Alexandra Papaioannou^{1,3,5*}

8 ¹McMaster University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Medicine, Hamilton, ON

9 ²Unity Health Toronto St. Michael's Hospital, Knowledge Translation Program, Toronto, ON

10 ³Geras Centre for Aging Research, Hamilton, ON

11 ⁴Dalhousie University, Faculty of Health, School of Physiotherapy, Halifax, NS

12 ⁵McMaster University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Research Methods,
13 Evidence, and Impact, Hamilton, ON

14 ⁶Research Institute of St Joes Hamilton, St Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton, Hamilton ON

15 ⁷Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

16 ⁸Schlegel-UW Research Institute for Aging, Waterloo, ON

17 ⁹University of Waterloo, School of Public Health Sciences, Waterloo, Ontario

18 ¹⁰University of Calgary, Departments of Medicine and Community Health Sciences, Calgary,
19 AB

20 ¹¹University of Toronto, Department of Physical Therapy, Toronto, ON

21 ¹²McMaster University, School of Nursing, Hamilton, ON

22 ¹³University of Toronto, Department of Medicine, Toronto, ON
23

24 *Corresponding author

25 Email: papaioannou@hhsc.ca

26 **ABSTRACT**

27 Falls and hip fractures are a major health concern among older adults in long term care (LTC) with
28 almost 50% of residents experiencing a fall annually. Hip fractures are one of the most important
29 and frequent fall-related injuries in LTC. The purpose of this study was to determine the feasibility
30 (recruitment rate and adaptations) of implementing the PREVENT (Person-centred Routine
31 Fracture PreEVENTion) model in practice, with a subobjective to understand facilitators and
32 barriers. The model includes a multifactorial intervention on diet, exercise, environmental
33 adaptations, hip protectors, medications (including calcium and vitamin D), and medication
34 reviews to treat residents at high risk of fracture. Our secondary outcomes aimed to assess change
35 in knowledge uptake of the guidelines among healthcare providers and in the proportion of fracture
36 prevention prescriptions post-intervention. We conducted a mixed-methods non-experimental
37 design study in three LTC homes across southern Ontario. A local champion was selected to guide
38 the implementation. We reported recruitment rates using descriptive statistics and adaptations
39 using content analysis. We reported changes in knowledge uptake using the paired sample t-test
40 and the percentage of osteoporosis medications prescriptions using absolute change. Within five
41 months, we recruited three LTC homes. We required two months to identify and train the local
42 champion over three 1.5-hour train-the-trainer sessions, and the champion required three months
43 to deliver the intervention to the healthcare team. We identified several facilitators, barriers, and
44 adaptations. Benefits of the model include easy access to the Fracture Risk Scale, clear and
45 succinct educational material catered to each healthcare professional, and an accredited
46 educational module for physicians and nurses. Challenges included misperceptions between the
47 differences in fall and fracture prevention strategies, fear of perceived side effects associated with
48 fracture prevention medications, and time barriers with completing the audit report. Our study did
49 not increase knowledge uptake of the guidelines, but there was an increase in the proportion of
50 osteoporosis medication post-intervention.

51

52 INTRODUCTION

53 Falls and hip fractures are a major health concern among older adults (1). An estimated
54 one in three individuals aged 65 years and older fall each year, and almost half of individuals living
55 in long term care (LTC) fall annually (2). Hip fractures in residents living in LTC are devastating
56 and are likely to increase with current demographic trends in aging (3,4). Each year, almost 50%
57 of residents in LTC facilities fall at least once, and 40% of residents fall twice or more (3,5). Of
58 those LTC residents that fall, 10% to 25% of falls are associated with serious injuries requiring
59 medical treatment with 2% to 6% resulting in fractures of the hip, wrist, or vertebra (6–8). Hip
60 fractures are particularly life altering as both mobility and the capacity to live independently are
61 affected (3,6–8). Moreover, about half of the residents in LTC who experience a hip fracture may
62 die within the next year or develop total dependence within six months of their hip fracture (3,6–
63 8). Thus, interventions to reduce falls and fractures in LTC are important to decrease morbidity
64 and mortality.

65 In 2015, the Canadian recommendations for preventing fractures in LTC were released to
66 facilitate an evidence-based decision-making process (9). Indeed, guidelines have the capacity to
67 promote high quality practice informed by evidence, enable appropriate resource allocation, and
68 advance research by identifying knowledge gaps (10); however, the existence of guidelines alone
69 is not enough to change practice (10,11). The lack of guideline uptake in practice is evident with
70 the ongoing high morbidity and mortality associated with fractures in LTC (12–14). The major
71 gap is the limited evidence on effective knowledge translation strategies to prevent falls and low
72 trauma fractures in residents who are at high risk of fractures (12,15,16). Active strategies that
73 utilize an integrated knowledge translation approach may help to uptake guidelines into practice
74 (12). Current methods to uptake guidelines involve co-developing models with end-users and
75 stakeholders and piloting their implementation under real-world conditions (17).

76 PREVENT (Person-centred Routine Fracture PreEVENTIon) is an educational outreach
77 model for delivering education on fall and fracture prevention to healthcare providers working in
78 LTC. The model includes a multifactorial intervention on diet, exercise, environmental adaptations
79 to reduce falls, hip protectors, medication (including calcium and vitamin D), and medication
80 reviews. The model, herein known as PREVENT, aligns with the 2015 Canadian evidence-based
81 recommendation (9) and with recommendations from Australia and USA (18). PREVENT utilizes

82 a multifactorial knowledge mobilization strategy that engages the entire multi-disciplinary LTC
83 team (e.g., physicians, nurses, physiotherapists, dietitians, personal support workers) and builds
84 automated identification of high-risk fractures into routine care processes.

85 PREVENT may have several benefits including reducing falls and fractures and improving
86 quality of life of residents in LTC. Before a trial can be implemented to determine the effectiveness
87 of PREVENT in practice, we need to determine the feasibility of implementing it under real-world
88 conditions. The purpose of the iCare (integrated collection of education modules for fall and
89 fracture prevention) study was to determine the feasibility of implementing PREVENT to
90 healthcare providers in LTC. Our secondary outcomes were to determine if PREVENT improved
91 knowledge uptake of the Canadian recommendations (9) and increased the proportion of
92 osteoporosis medication prescriptions post-intervention. We selected the proportion of change in
93 osteoporosis medications since these medications currently have the highest certainty of evidence
94 to reduce the risk and the rate of fractures (19,20) and are the easiest outcome to measure in
95 practice.

96 **METHODS**

97 **Study design**

98 We conducted a pre-post non-experimental design study in three LTC homes across
99 Ontario. We conducted our study in accordance with the STROBE 2007 guidelines (21) and
100 TIDieR 2014 checklist (22). We registered our study on clinicaltrials.gov on July 6, 2022
101 (NCT05445336); we updated the registry on December 21, 2022. We received ethics approval
102 from the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (Project ID 14463).

103 **Study setting**

104 Between January to June 2022, we sent emails to five large LTC corporate offices detailing
105 the iCARE study. Each corporation owned between three to 30 homes across Ontario. Two LTC
106 corporations were willing to participate in the feasibility study. We recruited one for-profit and
107 two not-for profit LTC homes, herein known as Home A (120 beds), Home B (425 beds), and
108 Home C (240 beds). All three LTC homes are in southern Ontario, Canada in large metropolitan
109 cities.

110 Knowledge translation model

111 PREVENT is an organizational-level, service provision approach that embeds falls and
 112 fracture education and management strategies in LTC. The model utilizes several intervention
 113 functions and behaviour change techniques based on the Behaviour Change Wheel (Table 1)
 114 (23,24). The specific PREVENT components are detailed in S1.

115 **Table 1: Intervention functions and behaviour change techniques used in PREVENT**

Intervention function from Behaviour Change Wheel	Definition of intervention function	Behaviour change technique	Behaviour change technique example
Education	Improving knowledge and understanding of roles and responsibilities for healthcare professionals responsible for service provision and improving knowledge through a community of practice (24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on behaviour • Prompts/cues • Self-monitoring of behaviour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audit and Feedback Report
Training	Providing key professionals with core skills in management and leadership (24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of the behaviour • Instruction on how to perform a behaviour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train the trainer • Educational videos
Modelling	Discussion of identified successful strategies for change within network (24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of the behaviour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train the trainer • Educational videos • Training manual • Fracture and Fall Prevention Guide

116 PREVENT was designed to be integrated into regularly scheduled healthcare sessions (e.g.,
 117 Professional Advisory Committee, Falls Committee), which usually occur quarterly in LTC. We
 118 identified a local champion to help guide the implementation of the model and continue to promote
 119 best practices (25). The standardized model includes: 1) train-the-trainer sessions with the local
 120 champion (26); 2) a multidisciplinary educational session with fracture prevention care
 121 recommendations and real-world case studies (27); 3) orientation to the Fracture Prevention

122 Toolkit developed by the lead researcher (IBR) that is provided to each home with the Fracture
123 Risk Scale (FRS) which identifies residents at high risk of fracture (score between 4 to 8) and low
124 risk of fracture (score between 1 to 3) (28), templates, standard order sets, and quick reference
125 guide to the 2015 Canadian LTC fracture prevention guidelines (29); 4) an audit and feedback
126 report developed by the local champion for physicians and healthcare providers regarding the
127 number of residents at high versus low risk of fracture, number of residents who have experienced
128 a fragility fracture in the last six months, and the number of high risk of fracture residents on
129 osteoporosis medications (30); and 5) implementation intentions that includes an implementation
130 proposal template, care planning template, and Process Indicator Checklist (home-level policies
131 that support and sustain fracture prevention best practices such as training and education of front-
132 line staff including personal support workers) (31). We utilized a three-step process to implement
133 PREVENT. In step one (train-the-trainer), the research team worked with each home to identify a
134 local champion. We sought champions who the home's management team considered trustworthy
135 and influential, acted as a role model for behaviour change, supported and legitimized the work,
136 provided a mechanism of communication between the research team and healthcare providers in
137 LTC, and served to sustain gains in the long term (25). The lead investigator (IBR) met with each
138 local champion using an online platform (i.e., Zoom) and in-person at the LTC home to review
139 how to deliver PREVENT, which included reviewing how to use the FRS to identify residents at
140 high and low risk of fracture (28), a training manual (see S2), Fracture and Fall Prevention Guide
141 (see S3), educational module, and other point of care tools. Our processes were guided by the
142 Getting to Outcomes Framework, which includes a 10-step program for implementing, evaluating,
143 and continuously improving prevention programs (32). In step two, the local champion adapted
144 the educational meeting to the LTC home and developed the audit and feedback report. During the
145 third step, the local champion presented the adapted PREVENT material during the leadership
146 team meeting which included physicians, nurse practitioners, registered nurses, dietitians,
147 physiotherapists, kinesiologists, personal support workers, and interRAI coordinators. InterRAI
148 coordinators are part of the interRAI network and are responsible for collecting health outcomes
149 in LTC (<https://interrai.org/about-interrai/>). During the meeting, the leadership team also
150 brainstormed and implemented intentions and care plans to identify and treat residents at high risk
151 of fracture. LTC homes were remunerated for their time and participation in the iCARE study.

152 **Intervention timeline**

	Intervention Timeline
Month 1 and Month 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. LTC home recruitment2. Identify local champion
Month 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Train-the-trainer to prepare audit and feedback report and adapt/deliver the educational module
Month 4	<p style="text-align: center;">Interactive Session 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Local champion leads education module with the leadership team2. Audit and feedback report review3. Develop action and care plan
Months 4 to Month 6	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. LTC home implements action and care plan
Month 7	<p style="text-align: center;">Interactive Session 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Focus group with local champion and leadership team to understand barriers, facilitators, and adaptations2. One-on-one interview with local champion to understand barriers, facilitators, and adaptations

153 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

154 As this is a pragmatic study, our inclusion and exclusion criteria were broad and
155 generalizable to represent real world practice. Our organizational level inclusion criterion was to
156 include homes with a minimum of 70 beds, which is the sample size for our larger clinical trial
157 (i.e., PREVENT trial).

158 **Outcomes**

159 **Primary outcome**

160 The primary outcome was feasibility of implementation defined by the number of LTC
161 homes recruited within two months, length of time for the local champion to deliver the PREVENT
162 program, and the length of time it took the local champion to develop the audit and feedback report
163 (Table 2) (33). The lead investigator (IBR) developed a checklist prior to the start of the study to
164 assess fidelity; our method to develop the checklist was defined using a five-step guide proposed
165 by Michie and colleagues (34,35). The fidelity checklist assessed domains related to preparing the
166 educational session (e.g., audit reporting, scheduling a date and time for the leadership team to

167 meet), presenting the educational session (e.g., reviewing the FRS and guidelines, developing, and
168 reviewing the audit and feedback report), and leading discussions on the action and care plan
169 processes. The fidelity checklist included 23 items, and each item was rated from 0 (action was
170 not completed), 0.25 (action was 25% completed), 0.50 (50% completed), 0.75, and 1.00. A total
171 score of 85% (20/23) was considered good fidelity, moderate between 50% to 84%, and poor <50%
172 (34,35). The fidelity checklist was completed by the lead investigator (IBR) during the education
173 session. To understand adaptations after implementing the intervention, we held focus groups with
174 the local champion and the leadership team. Focus groups were recorded and transcribed verbatim.
175 We also held informal one-on-one interviews using open-ended questions with each local
176 champion to identify adaptations to the model; these interviews were held three months after the
177 educational session and led by the lead researcher. The one-on-one interview with the local
178 champion was not recorded, but detailed field notes were taken by the research coordinator (LK).

179 **Table 2: Feasibility outcomes and criteria for success (33)**

Feasibility outcomes	Criteria for success
Recruitment rate (organizational level – length of time to recruit three LTC homes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recruit three LTC homes in Ontario within 2 months
Recruitment rate (participant level - length of time to identify and train local champion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Two months to identify, meet, and train local champion
Determine challenges to deliver the PREVENT model and program	<ul style="list-style-type: none">≥ 80% on the fidelity checklistIdentify facilitators of and barriers to implementation during the focus group
Determine challenges in linking the data for the audit and feedback report	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Identify facilitators of and barriers to developing the audit and feedback report

180 Secondary outcomes

181 Our secondary outcomes were to determine if there was a change in knowledge uptake and
182 in the proportion of osteoporosis medications before and after the intervention. We assessed
183 change in knowledge uptake using a pre-post test. First, we developed a case study of a typical
184 resident living in LTC. Next, healthcare providers were asked to complete a series of multiple-
185 choice questions about identifying the resident’s FRS, prescribing medications, supplements, and
186 exercise, conducting an environmental hazard scan, and using hip protectors. Immediately after
187 the education session, we asked healthcare providers to repeat the multiple-choice questionnaire
188 on the same case study. We collected data on information on osteoporosis medications at baseline
189 (six months prior to implementing the intervention) and post-intervention (three to four months
190 after the intervention). We collected information on the number of residents at high risk of fracture

191 or low risk of fracture using the FRS, the number of residents on an osteoporosis medication (e.g.,
192 bisphosphonates, denosumab), and the number of osteoporotic fractures at baseline and post-
193 intervention. We defined fractures as any major osteoporotic fracture of the hip, pelvis, vertebrae,
194 or distal radius (36,37). The local champion pulled data on FRS scores, fractures, and medications
195 directly from all residents' charts in the electronic medical record or the Ontario Drug Benefit
196 database. A list of osteoporosis medications is provided in S4 table.

197 **Analysis**

198 We reported our recruitment rates and fidelity scores using descriptive statistics as a total
199 score or value. We reported the results of the focus groups using content analysis (descriptive
200 qualitative analysis); two reviewers (IBR and LK or LH) coded the data independently using
201 NVivo, version 14 (QSR International Pty Ltd, Doncaster, VIC, Australia) (38). The reviewers
202 then met to discuss and compare the codes and group the codes into categories (38).
203 Disagreements were resolved by the third reviewer (38). We collected demographic characteristics
204 of the local champion and leadership team, which were reported using the number of individuals
205 and a percentage. To assess change in knowledge uptake, we conducted a paired sample t-test
206 (two-sided p). To report changes in osteoporosis medications, we conducted two data pulls at
207 baseline and post-intervention; we included residents who “moved-in” (i.e., moved into the home
208 during the post-intervention phase) and “moved-out” (i.e., passed away during the post-
209 intervention phase) in the analysis. We reported the results using absolute change. Quantitative
210 results were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 28 (Armonk, NY: IBM
211 Corp).

212 **Results**

213 **Feasibility**

214 We recruited three LTC homes between October 2022 and February 2023; our recruitment
215 process was affected by residual COVID-19 complications. After we identified a home, the home's
216 administrative team took approximately a month to identify a potential local champion. Two of
217 the local champions were nurse practitioners, and the third champion was a kinesiologist.
218 Subsequently, our research team met with the local champion to complete the train-the-trainer
219 sessions. Our research team completed two, one-hour train-the-trainer sessions with Home A;

220 however, based on feedback from Home A, we added a third train-the-trainer session. The local
 221 champion led the third session where they practiced delivering the educational module to the
 222 research team. Home B and C received three sessions and each session was 1.5 hours in length.
 223 After the train-the-trainer sessions, the local champion required at least two months to review the
 224 educational materials, adapt the material to their home, and develop the audit and feedback report.
 225 All leadership team meetings were held in-person at a convenient time at their respective LTC
 226 home. The characteristics of the local champion and leadership team are presented in Table 3.
 227 PREVENT required at least 10 months per home to recruit, train, and implement.

228 **Table 3: Local champion and leadership team characteristics (n = 3)**

	Home A (k=10)	Home B (k=19)	Home C (k=11)
Local champion			
Highest level of education	College	University/post-graduate	University/post-graduate
Fidelity score (total score 23 points)	19.75/23 (86%)	20.25/23 (88%)	20.00/23 (87%)
Leadership team			
Gender (female), n (%)	8 (80%)	8 (42%)	10 (91%)
Level of Education, n (%)			
College	5 (50%)	4 (21%)	1 (9%)
University	5 (50%)	8 (42%)	9 (82%)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)	7 (37%)	1 (9%)
Role in LTC home, n(%)			
Physician	0 (0%)	4 (21%)	1 (9%)
Pharmacist	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (9%)
Administrator	1 (10%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Director of care/Nursing director	1 (10%)	2 (11%)	1 (9%)
Neighbourhood coordinator	2 (20%)	4 (21%)	2 (18%)
Dietitian	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (9%)
Nurse practitioner	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	2 (18%)
Nursing student	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Registered nurse	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Rehabilitation specialist/Physiotherapist	2 (20%)	2 (11%)	2 (18%)
Personal support worker	2 (20%)	3 (16%)	1 (9%)
Length of time worked within current profession in LTC, n (%)			
< 1 year	2 (20%)	1 (5%)	1 (9%)
1 to 2 years	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	1 (9%)
3 to 5 years	2 (20%)	1 (5%)	1 (9%)
> 5 years	5 (50%)	8 (42%)	7 (64%)
Prefer not to answer	1 (10%)	7 (37%)	1 (9%)

Length of time providing care to residents at risk of falls and fractures, n (%)			
< 1 year	2 (20%)	1 (5%)	1 (9%)
1 to 3 years	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)
3 to 5 years	6 (60%)	10(53%)	8 (73%)
> 5 years	1 (10%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0%)	7 (37%)	1 (9%)

229 We had a diverse group of healthcare professionals on the leadership team (Table 3). In
 230 Home A, the local champion recruited ten healthcare professionals to the leadership team, in Home
 231 B, 19 healthcare professionals, and in Home C, 12 healthcare professionals. The attendance rate
 232 during the leadership team for Home A was 90% (9/10), Home B, 84% (16/19), and Home C, 90%
 233 (10/11). Fidelity scores ranged from moderate to good (Table 3).

234 **Challenges, successes, and adaptations**

235 During the focus group, each home identified similar barriers to and facilitators of
 236 implementing PREVENT in practice.

237 **Challenges**

238 Challenges to implementing PREVENT included having an unclear sustainability strategy,
 239 misperceptions between fall and fracture prevention strategies, fear of prescribing osteoporosis
 240 medications, and time barriers with completing the audit report. During the focus group, the local
 241 champion expressed that it was unclear who would sustain the role of implementing PREVENT
 242 after the research team had left. The local champion cited lack of time and other commitments as
 243 a barrier to sustaining the model; all three champions noted that a major barrier was dedicating
 244 time to the audit and feedback report. To manually extract the data and link the variables to each
 245 resident for the audit report, the local champion required at least one full day per week for five
 246 weeks (i.e., 40 hours total). Moreover, several leadership members were unsure of the
 247 implementation plan after identifying a resident at high risk of fracture:

248 *“I found myself often sometimes ignoring the prompts for FRS <Fracture Risk Scale> unless*
 249 *there was a specific reason. Cold calling families to say your fracture risk scale is high, and*
 250 *that’s the only reason I’m calling is weird.” [Home B]*

251 Several healthcare professionals on the leadership team felt the strategy to prevent fractures (i.e.,
252 PREVENT) was akin to their current fall prevention strategy. It was perceived that if a healthcare
253 professional could prevent a fall, it would translate to preventing a fracture.

254 *“I think a lot of homes already are looking at all the PREVENT aspects, it’s just not known as*
255 *PREVENT or they’re not grouping them together, but I think it’s just something that’s already*
256 *being looked at from all the different disciplines.” [Home A]*

257 Other healthcare providers believed PREVENT was a tool to ensure the staff were performing
258 their fall prevention duties, rather than a model of change to prevent fractures in LTC.

259 *“It’s worked well just as a tool to let us know if there’s any missing boxes that we’re not*
260 *checking for fracture prevention. It’s very helpful with just making sure we’re looking at*
261 *everything and yea, just crossing off any things we can possibly to do help the residents.” [Home*
262 *A]*

263 Additionally, several healthcare providers were unsure about the ethical implications of
264 prescribing osteoporosis medications to residents at high risk of fracture. The main barrier to
265 prescribing medications was fear of side effects (i.e., osteonecrosis of the jaw, atypical femur
266 fractures, hypocalcemia). Some providers were also concerned about the ethical implications of
267 prescribing osteoporosis medications to residents who could not consent or had limited knowledge
268 of the medication.

269 *“We are worried that, we weren’t overly confident that would lead to prescription. So there was*
270 *a trigger. We didn’t know if they were going to have informed consent and we didn’t know if our*
271 *nursing staff knew enough about these medications to provide it” [Home B].*

272 Facilitating factors

273 Despite some challenges, we also identified several facilitators to our model. Facilitators
274 included easy access to the FRS, clear and succinct educational material catered to each healthcare
275 professional, and an educational module with an accredited program for physicians and nurses. All
276 three homes deemed it beneficial to have the educational module delivered in person. We also
277 received positive feedback on the type of information included in our educational module. In
278 particular, healthcare providers found it helpful to review real-world case studies followed by
279 discussions and suggestions to overcome barriers to implementation (e.g., using hip protectors for
280 residents with incontinence).

281 “A visual to see the walkers and those pieces, I think even the slide with the hip protectors, like
282 how to apply them and which ones were incorrect. I think that’s a nice reminder because I didn’t
283 even know how to position them correctly and I didn’t even have awareness of the FRS. Like I
284 kind of knew like our FRAT <Falls Risk Assessment Tool> score and our falls risk, and when I
285 go to my units I know who the falls, the higher risk of falls are but I didn’t, and then I just
286 thought of them like okay, we have hip protectors for them, like what are we doing about it but I
287 didn’t necessarily do a full review of like let’s look at their meds and let’s look at their hips, are
288 they wearing hip protectors, what are they, let’s look at all these other things. I wasn’t sort of
289 looking at that.” [Home C].

290 Adaptations

291 The process of developing and implementing models into practice is an iterative process.
292 Through this process, we recognized three adaptations to the PREVENT model including
293 identifying additional characteristics for a successful local champion, developing an automated
294 audit report, and creating tools to facilitate conversations for prescribing osteoporosis medications.
295 It was suggested that the role of the local champion include co-championship with at least two
296 healthcare professionals to help manage the implementation process. Suggested co-championship
297 include one champion be either a registered nurse or a nurse practitioner and the second champion
298 be a registered practical nurse or resident case manager. The benefit of including a resident case
299 manager as a local champion is their established rapport with residents and caregivers and their
300 ability to link residents to other needed services (e.g., referral to a dietitian). Additionally, the local
301 champion must have a basic understanding of medications and have strong collaborations with
302 other healthcare providers including physicians, nurses, dietitians, pharmacists, and
303 physiotherapists. Other adaptations for future practice include working with the electronic medical
304 record company to automate the audit report process, develop conversational toolkits (e.g.,
305 between nurses and residents) to aid dialogues about fracture prevention, and develop one-page
306 educational guides for healthcare professionals and residents about the side effects of osteoporosis
307 medications.

308 Audit report

309 We found that the educational module did not improve knowledge uptake of the LTC
310 recommendations among healthcare providers particularly in utilizing the FRS, administering
311 osteoporosis medications and supplements (calcium and Vitamin D), using hip protectors, and
312 reviewing environmental hazards (mean 0.07, 95% confidence intervals [CI] -0.02 to 0.16).
313 However, our intervention resulted in an absolute increase in the proportion of osteoporosis

314 medications by 6% (Table 4). Home A reported an absolute change of 13%; 21% of residents were
 315 on an osteoporosis medication at baseline while post-intervention 34% of residents were on a
 316 medication (odds ratio [OR] 0.25, 95% CI 0.12 to 0.48). Similarly, Home B reported an absolute
 317 change of 3% (31% at baseline and 34% post-intervention, while Home C had an 8% increase
 318 (29% at baseline and 37% post-intervention).

319 **Table 4: Aggregated pre-and-post audit report**

	Homes A, B and C	
	Pre-intervention	Post-intervention
Total number of residents in Home A, B, and C	739	734
Number and percentage of residents at high risk of fracture	419 (57%)	430 (59%)
Number and percentage of residents at low risk of fracture	320 (43%)	304 (41%)
Number and percentage of residents who sustained a fragility fracture in the last six months	20 (3%)	25 (3%)
Number and percentage of residents at high risk of fracture on osteoporosis medications (unspecified amount of time)	122 (29%)	150 (20%)

320 Note: The number of residents pre-and-post intervention are different because of the “moved-in”
 321 (i.e., moved into the LTC home) and “moved-out” (i.e., passed away).

322 **Discussion**

323 Falls and hip fractures are a major health concern among older adults living in LTC (3,6–
 324 8). The purpose of the iCARE study was to determine the feasibility (recruitment rate, facilitators,
 325 barriers, adaptations) of implementing PREVENT in LTC homes in Canada. The model includes
 326 a multifactorial intervention on diet and supplements, exercise, environmental adaptations, hip
 327 protectors, and medication reviews to treat residents at high risk of fracture (9). The standardized
 328 model utilizes local champions, educational outreach methods, audit and feedback reports, and
 329 implementation intentions to change behaviour. Although we did not meet our recruitment
 330 criterion to recruit three homes in two months, our process was affected by COVID-19.
 331 Nevertheless, it is possible to recruit LTC homes by accounting for a longer recruitment period
 332 (i.e., three homes over five months). We did meet our criterion to recruit a local champion and
 333 provide training within our timeframe. Our local champions successfully delivered PREVENT
 334 with a fidelity score ranging from moderate to good. We also identified several facilitators,

335 barriers, and adaptations to PREVENT. Benefits of the model include easy access to the FRS, clear
336 and succinct educational material catered to each healthcare professionals, and an educational
337 module with an accredited program for physicians and nurses. We also identified a few challenges
338 such as misperceptions between the differences in fall and fracture prevention strategies, fear of
339 prescribing osteoporosis medications, and time barriers with completing the audit report. Our study
340 did not find a statistically significant increase in knowledge uptake regarding recommendations
341 for preventing falls and fractures; however, there was an increase in the proportion of osteoporosis
342 medication prescriptions post-intervention. The development and implementation of knowledge
343 translation models is an iterative process. This study identified additional changes to PREVENT
344 including co-champions, automated audit report, and tools to facilitate conversations when
345 prescribing osteoporosis medications. Our next step will be to lead a large, pragmatic randomized
346 controlled trial to implement PREVENT in 122 homes across Ontario, Canada.

347 Effective and sustainable knowledge translation models are essential to encourage the
348 uptake of evidence-based practices (11). The greatest limitation is that there is limited evidence on
349 effective and sustainable models in practice and such models may not be generalizable from one
350 setting to another (16). Compared with community or acute care settings, there has also been
351 limited implementation models for LTC, especially focused on fracture prevention. PREVENT is
352 a scalable educational outreach model that utilizes a multifactorial intervention to reduce falls and
353 fractures among residents in LTC (39). Our study provides preliminary data that suggests
354 PREVENT may be successfully implemented within the LTC setting, particularly when structured
355 to fit the unique practice environment and organizational structure. Most knowledge translation
356 models have been evaluated in non-LTC settings (39). A 2009 Cochrane review reported
357 improvements in care that ranged from 4% to 12% using educational meetings, educational
358 outreach programs, local champions, audit and feedback reports, and computerized reminders (39).
359 When designing PREVENT, we utilized such techniques (e.g., educational meetings, local
360 champion, audit and feedback) as a method to change behaviour (25,27,30,31,39). We observed
361 improvements similar to the Cochrane review ranging from 3% to 13% in the proportion of
362 osteoporosis medications before and after the intervention. Four months was not enough time to
363 implement change, especially in homes with over 200 beds. We saw greater improvements in
364 prescriptions being filled in homes that had a lower rate of medication use. We specifically focused
365 on osteoporosis medications as the highest certainty of evidence to reduce the rate and risk of

366 fractures is using such medications (19,20) and is the easiest outcome to measure. We hypothesize
367 that an increased uptake of osteoporosis medications will translate to lower fracture rates in LTC;
368 however, a large trial is needed to confirm the hypothesis.

369 Similar models to prevent fractures in LTC include the Bavarian Fall and Fracture
370 Prevention model in Germany that focuses on exercise, documentation of falls, environmental
371 adaptations, medication reviews, vitamin D, hip protectors, and education among healthcare
372 providers (40,41). The Bavarian Fall and Fracture Prevention study is one of the few large studies
373 of an educational outreach program to implement fracture prevention guidelines into LTC (40,41);
374 the authors implemented a multifactorial educational outreach program and after one-year found
375 an 18% reduction in hip fracture in residents from the intervention home (hazard rate ratio 0.82,
376 95% CI 0.72-0.93) (40,41). While the model was effective, it was a non-randomized, quasi-
377 experimental design that utilized insurance company staff to facilitate and disseminate knowledge
378 on fall and fracture prevention. The sustainability or scalability of this model may not be applicable
379 in the Canada healthcare system. Thus, the next steps will be to conduct a large randomized
380 controlled trial of the adapted PREVENT model in several Canadian LTC homes to determine if
381 the model reduces the rate of hip fractures in residents at high risk of fracture.

382 Our PREVENT model attempted to leverage the facilitators and limit barriers to
383 implementation as described in other studies. A recent systematic review by our group identified
384 several barriers to implementing guidelines into LTC settings including time constraints and
385 inadequate staffing, cost and lack of resources, knowledge gaps, and lack of teamwork and
386 organizational support (14). Our model addressed such barriers including time constraints, lack of
387 resources, and knowledge gaps by developing a multi-modal approach to embed a validated
388 computer decision support tool and the FRS into already established care pathways. PREVENT
389 also provides an accredited Continuing Medical Education module to physicians and nurses as a
390 method to disseminate evidence-based knowledge. We worked with the home's management team
391 to identify potential local champions who could help lead the educational module and lead best
392 practices after the research team left; from the literature we identified characteristics for an
393 effective local champion (25,42). Through the iCARE study, we identified additional
394 characteristics to identify a local champion including having co-championship to manage the
395 implementation process and developing conversational toolkits to aid dialogues between
396 healthcare providers and residents on osteoporosis medications. We are also working with a

397 Canadian electronic medical record company to develop an automated audit and feedback report
398 to address the time barrier. We suggest that future knowledge translation and implementation
399 science researchers look to our adapted PREVENT model as there may be important changes to
400 help facilitate the effective translation of evidence into practice.

401 The iCARE study had several methodological strengths including the recruitment of homes
402 that were geographically diverse and located in communities of varied population sizes; we also
403 included not-for-profit and for-profit homes. Our study implemented a multifactorial intervention
404 that engaged a wide variety of healthcare providers. In addition, our study builds on previous
405 knowledge of implementing models into practice and was designed to leverage facilitators and
406 address common barriers to implementation. To date, there are very few models on chronic disease
407 management especially in LTC (43,44), and so, more studies are needed to identified challenges
408 to implementing knowledge translation models into practice. Nonetheless, our study is not without
409 limitations. Given that our intervention was multifaceted, it was challenging to identify the most
410 significant components (e.g., educational outreach, local champion, audit and feedback report) that
411 would result in effective implementation of PREVENT. Moreover, measures of organizational
412 context such as work culture and leadership style, were not captured in the iCARE study which
413 could have a significant impact on our model's components. Healthcare sustainability remains a
414 multi-dimension problem, and so it is unclear if local champions or co-championship is sustainable
415 (45). Lastly, for this study, we did not involve residents or their family caregivers during the
416 implementation process. We acknowledge that all residents have complex needs and multiple
417 healthcare issues, and their preferences for care should be incorporated in the decision-making
418 process. Future adaptations for the PREVENT model will be to include end-users on the research
419 team to aid the implementation process to consider how resident's preferences can be considered.
420 Before we implement the PREVENT model as a randomized controlled trial, we will consult and
421 collaborate with knowledge users on our implementation process.

422 **Conclusion**

423 PREVENT is a multifactorial educational outreach model to implement education on diet,
424 exercise, environmental adaptations, hip protectors, medications (including calcium and vitamin
425 D) and medication reviews to treat residents at high risk of fracture. The model utilizes educational
426 meetings, local champions, and audit and feedback as methods to promote behaviour change. The

427 model requires ten months to recruit, train, and implement PREVENT, with five of the ten months
428 dedicated toward recruitment of LTC homes. We suggest co-championship when delivering
429 multifactorial models in LTC and developing tools that can be easily embedded into routine
430 practice. Our study did not increase knowledge uptake of the guidelines; however, we did observe
431 an increase in the proportion of osteoporosis medication prescriptions post-intervention. Our next
432 steps will be to consult and collaborate with knowledge users on PREVENT and then lead a large,
433 randomized controlled trial to implement PREVENT to determine if the model reduces the risk
434 and rate of hip fractures in residents living in LTC.

435 **List of abbreviations**

436	CI	Confidence Intervals
437	FRS	Fracture Risk Scale
438	iCARE	<u>I</u> ntegrated <u>c</u> ollection of education modules for <u>f</u> all and <u>f</u> racture <u>p</u> revention
439	LTC	Long term care
440	PREVENT	<u>P</u> erson-centred <u>R</u> outine Fracture Pre <u>E</u> VENT <u>I</u> on
441	OR	Odds Ratio

442 **Supporting information**

- 443 S1 File. PREVENT Components
- 444 S2 File. Training Manual for Local Champions
- 445 S3 File. Fracture & Fall Prevention Guide for Long Term Care
- 446 S4 Table. Osteoporosis Drugs
- 447 S5 Table. STROBE Checklist
- 448 S6 Table. TIDieR Checklist
- 449 S7 File. iCARE protocol

451 **References**

- 452 1. Bergen G, Stevens M, Burns E. Falls and Fall Injuries Among Adults Aged ≥ 65 Years -
453 United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2014;65(37):993–8.
- 454 2. O’Loughlin JL, Yvonne Robitaille JFB, Samy Suissa. Incidence of and Risk Factors for
455 Falls and Injurious Falls among the Community-dwelling Elderly. *American journal of*
456 *epidemiology* . 1993;137(3):342–54.
- 457 3. Neuman MD, Silber JH, Magaziner JS, Passarella MA, Mehta S, Werner RM. Survival
458 and functional outcomes after hip fracture among nursing home residents. *JAMA Intern*
459 *Med*. 2014;174(8):1273–80.
- 460 4. Rapp K, Becker C, Lamb SE, Icks A, Klenk J. Hip fractures in institutionalized elderly
461 people: Incidence rates and excess mortality. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 2008
462 Nov;23(11):1825–31.
- 463 5. Zimmerman S, Chandler JM, Hawkes W, Sloane PD, Hebel ; J Richard, Magaziner J, et
464 al. Effect of Fracture on the Health Care Use of Nursing Home Residents [Internet].
465 Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/>
- 466 6. Chandler JM, Zimmerman SI, Girman CJ, Martin AR, Hawkes W, Hebel JR, et al. Low
467 Bone Mineral Density and Risk of Fracture in White Female Nursing Home Residents
468 [Internet]. Available from: <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/>
- 469 7. Ooms M, Vlasman P, Lips, Nauta J, Bouter L, Valkenburg H. The incidence of hip
470 fractures in independent and institutionalized elderly people. *Osteoporosis International*.
471 1994;4(1):6–10.
- 472 8. Weller I, Schatzker J. Hip fractures and Alzheimer’s disease in elderly institutionalized
473 Canadians. *Ann Epidemiol* . 2004;14(5):319–24.
- 474 9. Papaioannou A, Santesso N, Morin SN, Feldman S, Adachi JD, Crilly R, et al.
475 Recommendations for preventing fracture in long-term care. *CMAJ* [Internet].
476 2015;187(15). Available from: www.cmaj.ca/lookup/
- 477 10. Graham ID, Tetroe J, Gagnon M. *Knowledge Translation in Healthcare*. Second Edi. Sons
478 JW&, editor. 2013. 75–92 p.
- 479 11. Lavis JN, Robertson D, Woodside JM, McLeod CB, Abelson J, Group KTS. How Can
480 Research Organizations More Effectively Transfer Research Knowledge to Decision
481 Makers? *Milbank Q*. 2003;81(2):221–48.
- 482 12. Roigk P, Becker C, Schulz C, König HH, Rapp K. Long-term evaluation of the
483 implementation of a large fall and fracture prevention program in long-term care facilities.
484 *BMC Geriatr*. 2018 Oct 1;18(1).

- 485 13. Bai Y, McArthur C, Ioannidis G, Giangregorio L, Straus S, Papaioannou A. Strategies for
486 the implementation of an electronic fracture risk assessment tool in long term care: a
487 qualitative study. *BMC Geriatr.* 2021 Dec 1;21(1).
- 488 14. McArthur C, Bai Y, Hewston P, Giangregorio L, Straus S, Papaioannou A. Barriers and
489 facilitators to implementing evidence-based guidelines in long-term care: a qualitative
490 evidence synthesis. Vol. 16, *Implementation Science*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2021.
- 491 15. Tomasone JR, Kauffeldt KD, Chaudhary R, Brouwers MC. Effectiveness of guideline
492 dissemination and implementation strategies on health care professionals' behaviour and
493 patient outcomes in the cancer care context: A systematic review. Vol. 15, *Implementation*
494 *Science*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2020.
- 495 16. Alamri SH, Kennedy CC, Marr S, Lohfeld L, Skidmore CJ, Papaioannou A. Strategies to
496 overcome barriers to implementing osteoporosis and fracture prevention guidelines in
497 long-term care: A qualitative analysis of action plans suggested by front line staff in
498 Ontario, Canada. *BMC Geriatr.* 2015 Aug 1;15(1).
- 499 17. Cargo M, Mercer SL. The value and challenges of participatory research: Strengthening
500 its practice. In: *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2008. p. 325–50.
- 501 18. Niznik JD, Gilliam MA, Colón-Emeric C, Thorpe CT, Lund JL, Berry SD, et al.
502 Controversies in Osteoporosis Treatment of Nursing Home Residents. *J Am Med Dir*
503 *Assoc.* 2022 Dec 1;23(12):1928–34.
- 504 19. Cummings SR, Lui LY, Eastell R, Allen IE. Association between Drug Treatments for
505 Patients with Osteoporosis and Overall Mortality Rates: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern*
506 *Med.* 2019 Nov 1;179(11):1491–500.
- 507 20. Händel MN, Cardoso I, Von Bülow C, Rohde JF, Ussing A, Nielsen SM, et al. Fracture
508 risk reduction and safety by osteoporosis treatment compared with placebo or active
509 comparator in postmenopausal women: systematic review, network meta-analysis, and
510 meta-regression analysis of randomised clinical trials. *BMJ.* 2023;
- 511 21. Vandembroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, et al.
512 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE):
513 Explanation and Elaboration. *PLOS Med.* 2007;16(4).
- 514 22. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Barbour V, Macdonald H. Better reporting of interventions :
515 template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide.
516 2014;1687(March):1–12. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.g1687>
- 517 23. Michie S, Atkins L, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a guide to designing
518 interventions. 2nd edn. Silverback Publishing, Sutton; 2014. 59–60 p.
- 519 24. Michie S, van Stralen M, West R. The behaviour change wheel: A new method for
520 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation Science.*
521 2011;6(42).

- 522 25. Flodgren G, O'Brien MA, Parmelli E, Grimshaw JM. Local opinion leaders: Effects on
523 professional practice and healthcare outcomes. Vol. 2019, Cochrane Database of
524 Systematic Reviews. John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2019.
- 525 26. Yarber L, Brownson CA, Jacob RR, Baker EA, Jones E, Baumann C, et al. Evaluating a
526 train-the-trainer approach for improving capacity for evidence-based decision making in
527 public health. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2015 Dec 12;15(1).
- 528 27. O'Brien M, Oxman A, Davis D, Haynes R, Freemantle N, Harvey E. Educational outreach
529 visits: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. In: *Cochrane Database of*
530 *Systematic Reviews.* John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 1997.
- 531 28. Ioannidis G, Jantzi M, Bucek J, Adachi JD, Giangregorio L, Hirdes J, et al. Development
532 and validation of the Fracture Risk Scale (FRS) that predicts fracture over a 1-year time
533 period in institutionalised frail older people living in Canada: An electronic record-linked
534 longitudinal cohort study. *BMJ Open.* 2017 Sep 1;7(9).
- 535 29. Papaioannou A, Ioannidis G, McArthur C, Hillier LM, Feldman S, Giangregorio L, et al.
536 Preventing Fractures in Long-Term Care: Translating Recommendations to Clinical
537 Practice. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2021 Jan 1;22(1):36–42.
- 538 30. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, et al. Audit
539 and feedback: Effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane*
540 *Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2012;2012(6).
- 541 31. Shojania KG, Jennings A, Mayhew A, Ramsay CR, Eccles MP, Grimshaw J. The effects
542 of on-screen, point of care computer reminders on processes and outcomes of care.
543 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2009.
- 544 32. Wandersman A, Pamela I, Matthew C, Shakeh K. Getting to outcomes: a results-based
545 approach to accountability. *Eval Program Plann.* 2000;23(3):389395.
- 546 33. Eldridge SM, Lancaster GA, Campbell MJ, Thabane L, Hopewell S, Coleman CL, et al.
547 Defining feasibility and pilot studies in preparation for randomised controlled trials:
548 development of a conceptual framework. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(3).
- 549 34. Walton H, Spector A, Williamson M, Tombor I, Michie S. Developing quality fidelity and
550 engagement measures for complex health interventions. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2020 Feb
551 1;25(1):39–60.
- 552 35. Breitenstein SM, Gross D, Garvey CA, Hill C, Fogg L, Resnick B. Implementation
553 fidelity in community-based interventions. *Res Nurs Health.* 2010 Apr;33(2):164–73.
- 554 36. Kanis JA. Diagnosis of osteoporosis and assessment of fracture risk. 2002;359:1929–36.
- 555 37. Kanis JA, Melton LJ, Christiansen C, Johnston CC, Khaltsev N. The Diagnosis of
556 Osteoporosis. 1994;9(8):1137–41.

- 557 38. White MD, Marsh EE, White MD, Marsh EE. Content Analysis : A Flexible Methodology
558 Content Analysis : A Flexible Methodology. 2017;55(1):22–45.
- 559 39. Grimshaw J, Eccles M, Lavis J, Hill S, Squires J. Knowledge translation of research
560 findings. *Implementation Science*. 2012;7(50).
- 561 40. Becker C, Cameron ID, Klenk J, Lindemann U, Heinrich S, König HH, et al. Reduction of
562 femoral fractures in long-term care facilities: The Bavarian fracture prevention study.
563 *PLoS One*. 2011;6(8).
- 564 41. Schulz C, Lindlbauer I, Rapp K, Becker C, König HH. Long-Term Effectiveness of a
565 Multifactorial Fall and Fracture Prevention Program in Bavarian Nursing Homes: An
566 Analysis Based on Health Insurance Claims Data. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2017 Jun
567 1;18(6):552.e7-552.e17.
- 568 42. Bonawitz K, Wetmore M, Heisler M, Dalton VK, Damschroder LJ, Forman J, et al.
569 Champions in context: Which attributes matter for change efforts in healthcare?
570 *Implementation Science*. 2020 Aug 6;15(1).
- 571 43. Boscart V, Davey M, Crutchlow L, Heyer M, Johnson K, Taucar LS, et al. Effective
572 Chronic Disease Interventions in Nursing Homes: A Scoping Review Based on the
573 Knowledge-to-Action Framework. Vol. 45, *Clinical Gerontologist*. Routledge; 2022. p.
574 1073–86.
- 575 44. Boscart V, Crutchlow LE, Sheiban Taucar L, Johnson K, Heyer M, Davey M, et al.
576 Chronic disease management models in nursing homes: A scoping review. Vol. 10, *BMJ*
577 *Open*. BMJ Publishing Group; 2020.
- 578 45. Fleischer AR, Semenic SE, Ritchie JA, Richer MC, Denis JL. The sustainability of
579 healthcare innovations: A concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs*. 2015 Jul 1;71(7):1484–98.

580

581 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

582 In accordance with local regulatory guidelines and standards for human participants' protection,
583 all methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. Our study
584 was reviewed by the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB), which is associated
585 with McMaster University. Before enrolling in the study, all participants were briefed on the study
586 and written informed consent was obtained. This review was registered on clinicaltrials.gov
587 (NCT05445336).

588 **Consent for publication**

589 Not applicable.

590 **Availability of data and materials**

591 The data generated during the current study are not publicly available due to content that could
592 compromise research participant privacy but are available from the corresponding author on
593 reasonable request for research purposes only.

594 **Competing interests**

595 The authors have no competing interests.

596 **Funding**

597 The authors would like to thank the following funding agents for their support with the project.
598 The lead author (IBR) was funded by the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA),
599 AGE-WELL, the Hamilton Health Sciences New Investigator Fund, the Canadian Institutes of
600 Health Research Postdoctoral Award. The corresponding author (AP) received funding from the
601 Amgen Competitive Grant Program in Bone Research Award. The funders played no part in
602 developing the research design, collecting data collection, analyzing the results, or writing the
603 manuscript.

604

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.22.24304705>; this version posted March 24, 2024. 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/).




Figure 1: STROBE flow chart. STROBE, Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology.

STROBE Flow Diagram