

1 Design of a Clinical Balance Tool for Fall Risk Assessments: A Development and  
2 Usability Study

3  
4 Garvin, Jennifer Hornung Ph.D.<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Yazzie, Virginia M., B.S.<sup>1</sup>, Katsuyama, Natalie A., B.S.<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Rudloff, Truman, B.S.<sup>1</sup>, Worthen-Chaudhari, Lise C., Ph.D.<sup>1,4</sup>, Chaudhari, Ajit M.W., Ph.D.<sup>1,5</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup> School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio,  
8 United States of America

9 <sup>2</sup> Centers for Health Services Research, Regenstrief Institute, Indianapolis, Indiana, United States  
10 of America

11 <sup>3</sup> Health Services Research & Development Center for Health Information and Communication,  
12 Department of Veterans Affairs, Indianapolis, Indiana, United States of America

13 <sup>4</sup> Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, The Ohio State University, Columbus,  
14 Ohio, United States of America

15 <sup>5</sup> Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus,  
16 Ohio, United States of America

17  
18 \*Corresponding author

19 E-mail: [jennifer.garvin@osumc.edu](mailto:jennifer.garvin@osumc.edu) (JG)

20

## 21 **Abstract**

22 **Background:** Falls are a significant source of early morbidity and mortality in the aging  
23 population, yet clinical changes that lead to increased fall risks often escape early identification  
24 and intervention. A device to measure postural control would facilitate evidence-based fall risk  
25 assessment.

26 **Objectives:** Our objectives were to iteratively develop a prototype quantitative posture  
27 instrument (QuPI) to replace the weight scale and to assess barriers and facilitators of its  
28 implementation in a clinical setting.

29 **Methods:** We undertook a formative evaluation and usability study of two QuPI prototypes in  
30 primary care, medical oncology, sports medicine, cardiology, and endocrinology outpatient  
31 clinics. Clinicians evaluated an initial QuPI prototype and completed a semi-structured interview  
32 to determine critical functionality, inform design, and assess usability. The QuPI was modified  
33 according to the results, and a new prototype was tested and evaluated.

34 **Results:** Eighteen clinicians participated in both rounds of interviews. Clinicians who  
35 participated (referred to as participants) reported willingness to use the QuPI with all patients  
36 during the first round of interviews and stated they would replace their current weight scale with  
37 the modified QuPI during the second round of interviews. Participants identified design elements  
38 that were both facilitators and barriers to use. Usability scores for both prototypes were excellent.  
39 Despite several national guidelines for fall risk assessments, lack of consistent use of guidelines  
40 by care teams was found to be a barrier to effective fall risk assessments.

41 **Conclusion:** The QuPI provides a new method for quantifying fall risks with good user  
42 acceptance, usability, and clinical feasibility without disrupting workflow. The QuPI  
43 supplemented and facilitated the use of standard algorithms for fall risk assessment. Greater

44 education of the entire care team regarding evidence-based fall risk assessment will promote  
45 adherence to guidelines and fall prevention.

46

47

## 48 **Introduction**

49 Falls are a significant source of early morbidity and mortality in the aging population[1],  
50 yet the neurological, sensory, and motor changes that lead to increased fall risks often escape  
51 early identification and intervention. Vital signs are commonly used in clinical settings to assess  
52 the cardiovascular system (blood pressure, heart rate), immune system (body temperature), and  
53 respiratory system (respiratory rate) to establish baseline values, screen for increased risk of co-  
54 morbidities or disease, and enable changes from baseline to be identified and communicated  
55 across times and locations[2]. There is no simple vital sign that can be used to assess the balance  
56 system, which draws upon neurological, sensory, and motor functions. Although clinical  
57 measurement of balance can predict the risk of falls[3-6], clinical balance testing is not common  
58 practice in primary care settings because of time constraints, lack of awareness, and other  
59 factors.

60 The prevalence and consequences of injurious falls present an urgent need to capture data  
61 for use as a vital sign for the balance system that is inexpensive, easy to adopt, consistent, and  
62 objective, with an evidence base supporting its sensitivity and specificity. Quantitative posture  
63 control is a good candidate for such a vital sign. Quantitative measurement of posture control is  
64 faster, more sensitive, and more specific than clinical balance testing for fall risk assessment[7-  
65 9]; however, both approaches face barriers to adoption in clinical practice, including time  
66 requirements, expense, lack of awareness, and need for significant technical expertise.

67 The purposes of this qualitative interview-based study were to 1) characterize the  
68 workflow of patient intake, vital sign assessment, and fall risk assessment in physician or  
69 advanced practice provider clinics and 2) identify design requirements for a quantitative posture  
70 instrument (QuPI) to efficiently measure postural control in these settings.

71

## 72 **Methods**

73

## 74 **Theoretic Frameworks**

75 To develop a QuPI as a Health Information Technology (HIT) tool for clinical practice,  
76 we undertook a formative evaluation and usability assessment using three frameworks: the HIT  
77 sociotechnical framework[10], the Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health  
78 Services (PARIHS) framework[11], and the Cabana framework[12]. The HIT sociotechnical  
79 framework[10] emphasizes characteristics of the clinical and organizational contexts in which the  
80 tool will be implemented. The PARIHS framework considers barriers and facilitators to the  
81 intended use of the tool[11]. The Cabana framework identifies provider-related dimensions to  
82 explain barriers (e.g., gaps in knowledge, attitudes, or practice) related to adherence to clinical  
83 practice guidelines[12]. Together, these frameworks informed the design of the QuPI in terms of  
84 understanding the human, clinical, and overall sociotechnical contexts in which the QuPI will be  
85 used.

86

## 87 **Study Design**

88 This was a descriptive formative evaluation study. Clinicians who participated (referred  
89 to as participants) evaluated an initial prototype of the QuPI in a semi-structured interview. A  
90 modified QuPI prototype was then created, and the participants evaluated the modified prototype  
91 in a second semi-structured interview. The QuPI prototypes were used with clinical scenarios for  
92 formative evaluation and usability assessment (**Fig 1 The organizational flow of the study**).

93

## 94 Settings and Description of the Initial QuPI Prototype

95           The research was conducted in outpatient clinics including primary care, cardiology,  
96 oncology, endocrinology, and sports medicine practices within an academic healthcare  
97 organization and a large primary care network. The QuPI initial prototype was based on a  
98 standard balance platform similar to those commonly used in studies of postural sway[13-16],  
99 except that its dimensions were chosen to match the length and width of the weight scales used  
100 in most clinics (40 cm × 33 cm), but with a lower height (4.4 cm). The user interface of the  
101 initial prototype indicated the weight of the patient and had an onscreen button to start a 60-  
102 second timer for balance measurement. Upon completion, the display gave a number  
103 representing the balance score, which was calculated as the root-mean-square deviation of the  
104 center of pressure in the medial-lateral direction [7,13,14,17]. The device was accompanied by  
105 an information card with instructions to be read to the patient and a visual scale to interpret the  
106 balance score as low risk, medium risk, high risk, or immediate risk of a fall. The modified  
107 version of QuPI used in the second round of interviews had the following additional design  
108 features: reduced time required for the test from 60 seconds to 30 seconds; extended time for the  
109 score and weight display on the screen; an audible tone when timer expires; and display of  
110 balance score with tenths, not just the integer value. The instruction card was also modified to  
111 include notation that it is permissible to tell the patient how much time is left (halfway done, 15  
112 seconds to go, 10 seconds to go, etc.) and that they are doing a good job.

113

## 114 Human Subject Protection

115           This study was approved by The Ohio State University Biomedical IRB. The initial  
116 approval was provided on October 30, 2018 with the start of prospective recruiting on November

117 8, 2018 and the end of recruitment June 30, 2019. Informed consent was obtained verbally with a  
118 documentation of consent waiver approved by the IRB. There were no minors participating in  
119 this study.

120

## 121 Participants

122 We sought a diverse group of clinicians as participants from academic and non-academic  
123 medical centers. The participants were not part of the study team and came from primary care,  
124 sports medicine, and other specialty practices in two healthcare systems. In this study,  
125 “providers” are defined as physicians and nurse practitioners, and “support staff” are defined as  
126 medical assistants and physician extenders.

127

## 128 Procedure

129 We conducted two rounds of semi-structured interviews in the participants’ practice  
130 settings (**Table 1**).

131 **Table 1.** Evaluation questions used to guide assessment of the QuPI.

Evaluation Component	Evaluation Questions
Guideline-directed care	Was the clinical content relevant? Describe your knowledge of the guidelines. Describe barriers to the use of the guidelines.
Support	Was the tool aligned with workflow?

Adoption and uptake of evidence using Health Information Technology	Did the tool increase awareness of the indications of falls risk and facilitate the use of treatment evidence as expressed in the ordering?
End-user design effectiveness	Was the QuPI useful?
Usability	Was the human interface with the QuPI well designed?

132



133           The participants were able to use an initial prototype of the QuPI during the first  
134 interview and then a modified prototype during the second interview. These prototypes were  
135 used with clinical scenarios for formative evaluation and usability assessment. We also asked the  
136 participants to describe and demonstrate their work process for collecting vital signs from  
137 patients. Responses were captured via written notes and video/audio recordings. Audio  
138 recordings of the participants' responses were transcribed and used to conduct an applied  
139 thematic analysis in which two researchers independently reviewed the transcripts, identified  
140 snippets to inform redesign, iterated codes in three to four cycles to evaluate concepts from the  
141 theoretical framework, identified thematic domains, and developed themes [18-19]. The whole  
142 research team then reviewed the themes (illustrated by snippets), refined them, and provided  
143 them to the design team for modification of the QuPI.

144           We used the System Usability Scale (SUS) [20-22] during the interviews to assess the  
145 usability of the QuPI. The SUS was composed of 10 questions scored on a five-point scale from  
146 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree.' The final overall scaled score of the SUS had a possible  
147 range from 0 to 100, where higher scores indicate greater usability of the QuPI by end-users  
148 (**Table S1**). The grading analog for the SUS is supported by an adjective rating scale and quartile  
149 and acceptability ranges [22]. A score of 80.3 or higher was considered an 'A' (top 10% of  
150 scores), allowing users to recommend the QuPI to others [22]. The interview and SUS results  
151 were used to iteratively redesign the QuPI between the first and second rounds of interviews (**Fig**  
152 **1**).

153

154 **Interviews**

155 The semi-structured interviews were developed using theoretical models [10,11,12]  
156 (Table 2).

157 **Table 2.** Theoretical models used in this study and the aspects in which they were applied

Theoretical Model	Application Areas
Promoting Action on Research in Implementation of Health Services [11]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Evidence-based research</li><li>• Context of implementation</li><li>• Facilitation techniques to overcome known barriers to implementation</li></ul>
Sociotechnical Model for Health Information Technology [10]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hardware and software</li><li>• Workflow and communication</li><li>• Clinical content</li><li>• Human-computer interface (usability)</li></ul>
Cabana Framework [12]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Providers' attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors regarding clinical evidence</li></ul>

158  
159 Information concerning the participants' knowledge of fall risk assessments and their  
160 current ability to determine fall risk was gathered to identify requirements and assess workflow  
161 to iteratively develop the QuPI prototype. The initial and modified QuPI prototypes were used  
162 with clinical scenarios for formative evaluation and usability assessment. We explored the  
163 usability of the QuPI in clinical settings [20-22] and identified features needed by end-users to  
164 incorporate the QuPI into routine clinical practice and clinical decision-making. We also  
165 explored the alignment of the QuPI with current processes for weight-measurement devices and  
166 explored barriers to the use of the QuPI in terms of hardware and software for electronic health

167 records (EHR) systems, workflow and communication of the care team, and clinical guidelines  
168 [10,11].

169

## 170 Results

### 171 Participants

172 A total of 18 participants (5 male, 13 female) completed the first and second rounds of  
173 interviews and assessments. The participants included three primary care physicians, three  
174 physicians with other specialty practices, two sports medicine physicians, one primary care nurse  
175 practitioner, one nurse practitioner with a different specialty practice, two primary care medical  
176 assistants, two medical assistants with a different specialty practice, and four sports medicine  
177 physician extenders.

178

### 179 Fall Risk Assessment and Documentation

180 We evaluated the workflow as described in the HIT sociotechnical framework [10] to  
181 determine the current state of fall risk assessments in the clinics and inform the development of  
182 the QuPI. The participants assessed fall risks by a variety of methods at several locations within  
183 their clinical practice. Fall risks were sometimes documented in the medical record as well as  
184 outside the medical record via notes, verbal information, and behavioral cues. In the first round  
185 of interviews, participants indicated that they assessed fall risks via pre-visit review of  
186 medications (11%, 2/18), patient reports (44%, 8/18), review of the vital signs flowsheet (11%,  
187 2/18), observation by a member of the care team before and during the examination (83%,  
188 15/18), clinician questioning (77%, 14/18), and review of the EHR template (11%, 2/18). The

189 instruments used to assess fall risks included clinical guidelines (22%, 4/18), observation (72%,  
190 13/18), a fall risk scale (5%, 1/18), a fall risk calculator (22%, 4/18), ad hoc questioning (44%,  
191 8/18), and tests for specific underlying conditions that affect balance (33%, 6/18), including  
192 auscultation, electrocardiography, blood pressure measurement for cardiovascular conditions,  
193 deep tendon reflex and monofilament tactile sensation assessment for neurosensory deficits, and  
194 static visual acuity assessment for visual deficits.

195 The results of fall risk assessments were documented in several locations, including  
196 medical assistant notes (77%, 14/18), the flowsheet or vital signs package of the EHR (72%,  
197 13/18), structured questions about fall risk within the medical record or on paper (16%, 3/18),  
198 and free-text notes within a set of structured data related to fall risk (16%, 3/18). Fall risk was  
199 also noted using an EHR template (22%, 4/18), in the chief complaint (50%, 9/18), in the History  
200 and Physical Exam (16%, 3/18), or in progress notes or other provider documents (61%, 11/18).  
201 Other communication occurred via verbal or written information given to providers by other  
202 team members outside of the medical record (16%, 3/18). This communication from the team  
203 was sometimes (22%, 4/18) incorporated later into the provider notes within the EHR.

204

## 205 Knowledge of and Adherence to Clinical Guidelines

206 We assessed the use of clinical guidelines as part of the HIT sociotechnical  
207 framework[10] to inform the use of the QuPI. Participants expressed agreement with existing  
208 clinical guidelines but also described limitations related to the guidelines. They reported general  
209 knowledge of evidence-based fall risk assessments but often lacked detailed knowledge of the  
210 guidelines (**Table S2** and **Table S3**). The participants often prioritized other injuries or concerns

211 over fall risks because of a lack of time or because the primary purpose of the visit was  
212 something other than concern about fall risk.

213 A majority (67%, 12/18) of the participants knew or had heard of at least one or more of  
214 the nationally promoted algorithms from the Centers for Disease Control (STEADI), the Johns  
215 Hopkins Healthcare System (JHFRAT), or the American Geriatric Society (AGS) [23-25];  
216 however, none (0/6) of the subset of participants specializing in sports medicine had heard of any  
217 of these algorithms. Only two of the participants reported having undergone previous specialized  
218 training to work with geriatric patients.

219

## 220 [Recommendations for Modification of the QuPI and its Use in Clinical](#) 221 [Practice](#)

222 In the first round of interviews, the majority (89%, 16/18) of participants suggested  
223 features that could be added to the initial QuPI prototype and provided recommendations. Time  
224 constraints, the size of the device, the size of the information displayed, and difficulty using the  
225 device with patients who were obese and/or had ambulation difficulties were reported as  
226 potential barriers to routine use of the initial QuPI prototype. The low height of the device, ease  
227 of use and interpretation of results, and use of the device for both weight and balance  
228 measurement were reported as potential facilitators of routine use (**Table S4**).

229 In the second round of interviews, the participants expressed broad acceptance of the  
230 modified device and said they would use the device with all their patients in place of a  
231 conventional weight scale (**Table S4**). The changes made to the initial QuPI prototype are  
232 described in the settings section above based on the feedback described below. Participants  
233 suggested in the second round of interviews that it would be easier for patients to stand still for

234 the measurement if verbal feedback about how much time was remaining was given every 10 to  
235 15 seconds. Several participants also suggested the duration of the measurement should be  
236 shortened further if possible, and that there should be handrails placed around the device to make  
237 it safer to use by patients with balance problems. Another suggestion for further improvement  
238 was that the values shown on the screen could be given with green-yellow-red color coding to  
239 make it easier to quickly interpret the results.

240

## 241 SUS Reports

242 Two SUS reports were conducted for the initial and final designs of QuPI. The initial  
243 mean SUS score was 83.57. The final QuPI prototype achieved a mean SUS score of 86.80,  
244 indicating a system with excellent usability (**Table 3**).

245 **Table 3.** System Usability Scale [20-22] results from the first and second interviews

Summative/Formative Evaluation Questions	1 <sup>st</sup> Interview (average, n=18)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Interview (average, n=18)
1. I would like to use the QuPI.	4	5
2. I find the QuPI to be unnecessarily complex.	2	1
3. I think the QuPI is easy to use.	5	5
4. I would need the support of a technical person to be able to use the QuPI.	1	1
5. I think the QuPI functions are well integrated.	4	4
6. I think there is too much inconsistency in the QuPI.	2	4

7. I imagine that most people would get used to the QuPI very quickly.	5	5
8. I find the QuPI to be cumbersome to use.	2	1
9. I am confident using the QuPI.	5	4
10. I needed to know a lot more about the QuPI before I felt comfortable using it.	2	2
SUS Scale	83.57	86.80
<sup>1</sup> Note that the SUS uses a Lickert Scale with 1 equal to “Strongly Disagree” and 5 equal to “Strongly Agree”. For scoring details please see Brooke [20]		
Letter grade and adjective rating (see Supplementary Table S1)	A/Excellent	A/Excellent

246

247

248

## 249 Emergent Themes

250 Several themes emerged from the analysis of the semi-structured interviews (**Table S5**)

251 and are described below.

252

### 253 **Fall risk assessment is a team effort**

254 Providers assess fall risks both individually and as a team. Team processes involve  
255 multiple inputs throughout the patient visit, which are ultimately directed to the provider for  
256 interpretation and decision-making. In practice, participants commented on the overall benefits  
257 and potential modifications of the current algorithms and assessment techniques.

258

### 259 **Hesitation about using the QuPI with certain types of patients**

260 Participants were hesitant to use the QuPI with certain types of patients, including those  
261 using assistive devices (cane, walker, wheelchair) or with a diagnosis of diabetes, obesity, or  
262 peripheral neuropathy. There were also minor hesitations about using the QuPI tool with patients  
263 with big feet, patients that could not place their feet close together, and some patients 65 years of  
264 age or older (**Table 4**).

265 **Table 4.** Participants' experience in initial use of the QuPI

Implications	78% (14/18) liked how well the QuPI worked in terms of their clinical process.
--------------	--



	<p>100% (18/18) said that, with some hesitation or qualifications for certain patients, they would use the QuPI with all patients. Reasons for hesitation included: patient age, obesity, osteoporosis, poor results on observation test, large feet, visual impairment, use of wheelchair or walker, workflow bottleneck, complaint about a recent fall or concerns, patients coming for a follow-up appointment.</p> <p>89% (16/18) agreed that the QuPI would be easily added to the vital sign assessment in their clinical practice.</p>
Concerns/Discussion	<p>61% (11/18) stated that time constraints, such as taking off shoes, cost of the device, amount of time training staff, and patients with assistive devices would prevent the use of the QuPI.</p> <p>100% (18/18) had some hesitation about using the QuPI with certain types of patients. The concerns were related to patients over 65 years of age and patients with osteoporosis, assistive devices (wheelchair, cane, etc.), obesity, or foot issues (size, neuropathy).</p>
Replacement of current scales with the new scale	<p>100% (18/18) stated they would like to use the QuPI in place of a scale.</p> <p>The preferred physical location for the QuPI would be in the triage room (1 participant), vital station (15 participants), or exam room (2 participants).</p>
Recommendations	<p>Features the participants liked were ease of use, simple instructions, appropriate height and size, dual-purpose for balance and weight measurements, audible tone to indicate the end of the test, ability to</p>

	give feedback during the test, portability, and the 30-second time for the test.
	Participants suggested improvements including making the scale larger, adding rails or handlebars near the tool, allowing the feet to be further apart, and having the tool flatter to the ground.
	64% (9/14) liked having the test only take 30 seconds instead of 60 seconds. The other four participants did not see a prototype with a 60-second test duration.
	67%, (12/18) mentioned other desired features for the QuPI, including automatic data entry into electronic health records; inclusion of a level to facilitate placement of the tool; addition of height measurement to the tool; color codes on the display to reflect normal, moderate, and high-risk values for easier interpretation; and placement of an outline of the feet similar to those on airport scanners.

266

267 *"...I might not say all my patients, but you know my hardest patients [including] all of my*  
268 *Medicare patients...Maybe I would just use it on 65 and older and anyone who might be*  
269 *just complex."*

270 *"I mean, I think I could see it being used on every patient versus like if we could identify*  
271 *a higher risk population..."*

272

273 **Knowledge of national algorithms**

274 Two-thirds (12/18) of the participants knew or had heard of one or more of the nationally  
275 promoted algorithms from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Johns  
276 Hopkins, or the AGS [23-25]. These algorithms for fall risk assessments each begin with three  
277 similar key questions: Has the patient fallen in the past year? Does the patient feel unsteady?  
278 Does the patient have difficulty walking? If the patient does not answer ‘yes’ to any of these  
279 questions, the fall risk assessment is concluded. On the other hand, if the patient answers ‘yes’ to  
280 any of these key questions, then providers ask more in-depth questions regarding medication  
281 history and any injury from previous falls. The algorithms then proceed from this qualitative  
282 assessment to a quantitative analysis using functional mobility testing.

283 In terms of fall risk assessments, 50% (9/18) of the participants asked patients  
284 specifically about fall risks, and 50% (9/18) assessed patients’ gait by watching them walk from  
285 the waiting room to the examination room. Only 43% (6/14) of the participants that took vital  
286 signs for every patient at every visit said that information about fall risks or balance problems  
287 was brought up by patients. The other 57% of participants said information about fall risks was  
288 brought up explicitly by a medical assistant, nurse practitioner, or physician through direct  
289 questioning.

290

### 291 **Desire to use the QuPI in place of a scale**

292 All the participants said they would like to use the QuPI in place of a conventional weight  
293 scale. The physical location in which the participants said they would replace the current scale  
294 with the QuPI was the triage room (1 participant), the vitals station (15 participants), and the  
295 exam room (12 participants) (**Table S6**).

296 *"I think in terms of workflow it would be pretty easy minus the added step. But I mean,*  
297 *like I said, we've got a patient on a scale every time they come and get their vitals. So, in*  
298 *terms of the workflow, no matter which clinic you're in, they're probably going to go into*  
299 *a vitals room or hallway and get their weights anyways. So just adding to that, I think it's*  
300 *reasonable."*

301 *"Since it takes the place of a scale, it's already getting your weight so that's nice. And*  
302 *then it gives you another objective, almost like a vital sign or data point for the issue of*  
303 *falls."*

304

## 305 **The QuPI was easy to use**

306 The participants liked that the QuPI was easy to use, provided objective data, had simple  
307 instructions, was the right height and size, has an interface that was easy to interpret and use, was  
308 dual-purpose (weight and balance), provided an audible 'ding' at end of the test, was portable,  
309 and took only 30 seconds to use. They also appreciated being able to give patients feedback  
310 regarding the time remaining on the test and the patients' cooperation with the test procedure  
311 **(Table S7 and Table S8).**

312 *"It's helpful, it gives some more objective data that the patient and me could both visually*  
313 *look at and see that progress was made. And it's quick, I think that's helpful. Easy to use."*

314 *"I think it'd be easy. There's already a weight machine, so it's much different than them*  
315 *having to stand on another machine to get the weight, and then it's small. It fits well. It's*  
316 *short duration overall."*

317

## 318 **Discussion**

319 The central premises underlying this work are that an inexpensive, easy-to-use QuPI  
320 system can detect significant balance deficits below the threshold of patients' and providers'  
321 perceptions and generate quantitative data for evidence-based assessment. Previous studies  
322 demonstrated that clinical research coordinators or other medical assistants were capable of using  
323 similar QuPI systems to detect balance changes in patients on chemotherapy that preceded  
324 patient-reported or provider-reported neurological, sensory, or motor changes [13-14]. This  
325 suggests that by overcoming barriers to QuPI implementation in clinical settings, providers can  
326 screen for balance changes more sensitively and objectively than they can using current  
327 approaches. The participants unanimously expressed acceptance of the second prototype and said  
328 they would replace their current weight scale with the modified QuPI, which suggests that the  
329 changes made between the first and second rounds of interviews made progress in overcoming  
330 barriers to implementation. In particular, several participants indicated the QuPI overcame some  
331 limitations of national algorithms, including dependence on patient recall and awareness,  
332 potential over-reliance on medications or injurious falls as evidence of poor balance, and the  
333 significant time and expertise needed to conduct functional balance testing.

334 *"I do, I guess I do have concerns about [the JHFRAT]. Because, I don't have it in front*  
335 *of me, it's medicine and it's age, and I think some people score higher than I would*  
336 *expect them to have a problem and I sometimes don't think, because of the medicines, the*  
337 *medicines are very high I think on the list. Which does make sense, but I... Yeah, yeah in*  
338 *some ways I don't [inaudible] that, yeah. It's not perfect, at all."*

339 The processes for fall risk assessments varied across the clinics in our study, despite the  
340 existence of national guidelines designed specifically to make fall risk assessments more  
341 consistent. Use of the QuPI, which can be easily integrated into existing workflows, would

342 facilitate consistency of the process for fall risk assessments. By providing an interpretable score,  
343 the QuPI can also facilitate communication among members of the care team. In many cases, fall  
344 risk assessments are done via a team process, whereby several members of the care team each  
345 collect some information that they then share with the provider of record to use in a treatment  
346 plan. This approach has several advantages but also several disadvantages. One major advantage  
347 of the team-based approach is that it provides multiple opportunities for the provider and support  
348 staff to observe and collect information on the patient, rather than depending solely on the  
349 limited time that the provider spends with the patient. For example, medical assistants often act  
350 as an ‘extra set of eyes’ by observing the patient walk from the waiting room to the vitals station  
351 and the exam room. Observation or questioning of the patient outside the formal encounter with  
352 the provider also has the potential benefit of avoiding bias due to the Hawthorne effect, whereby  
353 the patient moves differently when they know they are being evaluated.[26] A primary  
354 disadvantage of the team approach may be a lack of consistent training for all members of the  
355 care team on how to diagnose fall risks. For the 86% (16/18) of participants who had not  
356 received formal training to work with geriatric patients (e.g., during a geriatrics fellowship), all  
357 of their training presumably came ‘on the job’ as directed by a mentor, preceptor, or provider (in  
358 the case of medical assistants or physician extenders). Inconsistency in such informal training  
359 might lead to inconsistent diagnoses of fall risk and potentially injurious falls. Use of the QuPI  
360 could potentially enhance the advantages of a team-based approach by providing a quantitative  
361 assessment that can be communicated in place of or in addition to subjective observations.  
362 Moreover, use of the QuPI would help overcome the disadvantages of inconsistent training by  
363 providing a simple-to-use tool that everyone on the care team can be trained to use reliably.  
364

## 365 **Conclusions**

366           The majority of participants reported that they would use the QuPI for quantitative  
367 postural control measurement with all their patients. Furthermore, all of the participants stated  
368 that they would replace their current weight scale with the QuPI. The QuPI provides a new  
369 method to quantify fall risks that was well accepted by users and was feasible to use in a clinical  
370 environment without disrupting existing workflows. The QuPI holds promise to enhance  
371 advantages and overcome barriers related to documentation, team-based workflow, and variable  
372 methods for fall risk assessments in clinical settings.

373

## 374 **Protection of Human and Animal Subjects**

375 This study was performed in compliance with the World Medical Association Declaration of  
376 Helsinki on Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects and was  
377 reviewed and approved by The Ohio State University Biomedical Sciences Institutional Review  
378 Board. At the time of the interview, the oral consent script was read by the interviewer to the  
379 participant, and the interviewer answered any questions from the participant. Once the  
380 participant agreed to continue, the interview began. Written consent was waived by the IRB for  
381 this study.

382

## 383 **Author Contributions**

384 All authors contributed to the conception of the work, interviews of participants, data analysis,  
385 and drafting of the paper.

## 386 **Acknowledgments**

387 We thank the participants for their valuable insights.





## 389 **References**

- 390 1. World Health Organization. WHO Global Report on Falls Prevention in Older Age.  
391 2008. World Health Organization. Available from:  
392 <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/43811>.
- 393 2. Flaherty JH, Rudolph J, Shay K, et al. Delirium is a serious and under-recognized  
394 problem: why assessment of mental status should be the sixth vital sign. *J Am Med Dir*  
395 *Assoc.* 2007;8(5):273-275.
- 396 3. Agrawal Y, Carey JP, Hoffman HJ, Sklare DA, Schubert MC. The modified Romberg  
397 Balance Test: normative data in U.S. adults. *Otol Neurotol.* 2011;32(8):1309-1311.
- 398 4. Wilson SJ, Garner JC, Loprinzi PD. The influence of multiple sensory impairments on  
399 functional balance and difficulty with falls among U.S. adults. *Prev Med.* 2016;87:41-46.
- 400 5. Bulat T, Hart-Hughes S, Ahmed S, et al. Effect of a group-based exercise program on  
401 balance in elderly. *Clin Interv Aging.* 2007;2(4):655-660.
- 402 6. Howe TE, Rochester L, Neil F, Skelton, DA, Ballinger C. Exercise for improving balance  
403 in older people. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011;(11). Available from:  
404 <https://doi.org//10.1002/14651858.CD004963.pub3>.
- 405 7. Maki BE, Holliday PJ, Topper AK. A prospective study of postural balance and risk of  
406 falling in an ambulatory and independent elderly population. *J Gerontol.*  
407 1994;49(2):M72-M84.
- 408 8. Granata KP, Lockhart TE. Dynamic stability differences in fall-prone and healthy adults.  
409 *J Electromyogr Kinesiol.* 2008;18(2):172-178.
- 410 9. Lin CF, Chang CL, Kuo LC, et al. Postural control while dressing on two surfaces in the  
411 elderly. *Age (Omaha).* 2011;33(2):187-196.

- 412 10. Sittig DF, Singh H. A new sociotechnical model for studying health information  
413 technology in complex adaptive healthcare systems. *Qual Saf Health Care*.  
414 2010;19(Suppl 3):i68-i74.
- 415 11. Kitson AL, Rycroft-Malone J, Harvey G, McCormack B, Seers K, Angie T. Evaluating  
416 the successful implementation of evidence into practice using the PARIHS framework:  
417 Theoretical and practical challenges. *Implement Sci*. 2008;3(1):1.
- 418 12. Cabana MD, Rand CS, Powe NR, et al. Why don't physicians follow clinical practice  
419 guidelines? *JAMA*. 1999;282(15):1458.
- 420 13. Monfort SM, Pan X, Patrick R, et al. Gait, balance, and patient-reported outcomes during  
421 taxane-based chemotherapy in early-stage breast cancer patients. *Breast Cancer Res*  
422 *Treat*. 2017;164(1):69-77.
- 423 14. Monfort SM, Pan X, Patrick R, et al. Natural history of postural instability in breast  
424 cancer patients treated with taxane-based chemotherapy: A pilot study. *Gait Posture*.  
425 2016;48:237-242.
- 426 15. Clark RA, Bryant AL, Pua Y, McCrory P, Bennell K, Hunt M. Validity and reliability of  
427 the Nintendo Wii Balance Board for assessment of standing balance. *Gait Posture*.  
428 2010;31(3):307-310.
- 429 16. Clark RA, Howells B, Pua YH, Feller J, Whitehead T, Webster K. Assessment of  
430 standing balance deficits in people who have undergone anterior cruciate ligament  
431 reconstruction using traditional and modern analysis methods. *J Biomech*.  
432 2014;47(5):1134-1137.

- 433 17. Worthen-Chaudhari LC, Monfort SM, Bland C, Pan X, Chaudhari AMW. Characterizing  
434 within-subject variability in quantified measures of balance control: A cohort study. *Gait*  
435 *Posture*. 2018;64:141-146.
- 436 18. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*.  
437 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 438 19. Guest G, MacQueen K, Namey E. *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage  
439 Publications; 2012.
- 440 20. Brooke J. SUS: a “quick and dirty” usability scale. In: Jordan PW, Thomas B,  
441 McClelland IL, Weerdmeester B, editors. *Usability Evaluation in Industry*. 1st ed.  
442 London: Taylor & Francis; 1996:189-194.
- 443 21. Anonymous. System Usability Scale (SUS). Available from:  
444 <https://www.usability.gov/how-to-and-tools/methods/system-usability-scale.html>.
- 445 22. Will T. System Usability Scale (SUS). *UIUX Trend*. Available from:  
446 <https://uiuxtrend.com/measuring-system-usability-scale-sus/>.
- 447 23. Stevens JA. The STEADI tool kit: A fall prevention resource for health care providers.  
448 *IHS Prim Care Provid*. 2013;39(9):162-166.
- 449 24. Institute for Johns Hopkins Nursing. Fall Risk Assessment. Johns Hopkins Medicine.  
450 Available from: [https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/institute-nursing/models-tools#fall-](https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/institute-nursing/models-tools#fall-risk)  
451 [risk](https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/institute-nursing/models-tools#fall-risk).
- 452 25. Drootin M. Summary of the updated American geriatrics society/British geriatric society  
453 clinical practice guideline for prevention of falls in older persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc*.  
454 2011;59(1):148-157.

455 26. Robles-García V, Corral-Bergantiños Y, Espinosa N, et al. Spatiotemporal gait patterns  
456 during overt and covert evaluation in patients with Parkinson’s disease and healthy  
457 subjects: is there a Hawthorne effect? J Appl Biomech. 2015;21(3):189-194.

458

## 459 **Supporting information captions**

460 **S1 Table.** SUS quartile ranges and scores.

461 **S2 Table.** Barriers to the use of guidelines based on the Cabana Framework.

462 **S3 Table.** Participant descriptions of barriers to use of guidelines based on the Cabana  
463 Framework.


464 **S4 Table.** Recommended tool changes and modifications from the first round of interviews.

465 **S5 Table.** Emerging themes with supporting snippets.

466 **S6 Table.** Work processes associated with obtaining vital signs.

467 **S7 Table.** Example snippets from the first round of interviews.

468 **S8 Table.** Example snippets from the second round of interviews.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.28.24305053>; this version posted March 30, 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. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

Figure 1