

Comparison of characteristics of bimanual coordinated movements in older adults with frailty, pre-frailty, and robust health

1 Shoya Fujikawa^{1,2}, Shin Murata^{1,4}, Akio Goda³, Shun Sawai^{1,2}, Ryosuke Yamamoto^{1,5},
2 Yusuke Shizuka^{1,2}, Takayuki Maru^{4,6}, Kotaro Nakagawa^{4,7}, Hideki Nakano^{1,4,*}

3 ¹Graduate School of Health Sciences, Kyoto Tachibana University, Kyoto, Japan

4 ²Department of Rehabilitation, Kyoto Kuno Hospital, Kyoto, Japan

5 ³Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Hokuriku University,
6 Kanazawa, Japan

7 ⁴Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, Kyoto Tachibana University, Kyoto,
8 Japan

9 ⁵Department of Rehabilitation, Tesseikai Neurosurgical Hospital, Shijonawate, Japan

10 ⁶Department of Rehabilitation, Junshinkai Kobe Hospital, Kobe, Japan

11 ⁷Department of Rehabilitation, Nagashima Neurosurgery Rehabilitation Clinic, Osaka, Japan

12 * **Correspondence:**

13 Hideki Nakano, PhD

14 nakano-h@tachibana-u.ac.jp

15 **Keywords: bimanual coordination, finger-tapping, older adults, frailty, pre-frailty, robust**
16 **health**

17 **Abstract**

18 **Introduction:** Despite the growing concern regarding a potential increase in the number of older
19 adults with frailty owing to an aging global population, the characteristics of bimanual coordination
20 in such older adults remain unclear. This study aimed to compare bimanual coordinated movements
21 among community-dwelling older adults with frailty, pre-frailty, and robust health and identify the
22 specific characteristics of these movements in older adults with frailty. **Methods:** Participants were
23 divided into frail, pre-frail, and robust groups on the basis of Kihon Checklist scores; they performed
24 in-phase (tapping the thumb and index finger together as fast as possible) and anti-phase (alternating
25 the movement between the left and right fingers) bimanual coordination tasks, and the task

26 parameters were then compared among the groups. **Results:** The total travel distance during the anti-
27 phase task in the frail group was significantly shorter than that in the robust group. However, all three
28 groups showed lower finger dexterity during the anti-phase task than the in-phase task and in the left
29 hand than in the right hand. **Conclusions:** Older adults with frailty show less movement in bimanual
30 coordination tasks than robust older adults, suggesting that bimanual coordination tasks may be
31 useful tools for assessing frailty.

32 1 Introduction

33 The percentage of older adults in the population is increasing annually worldwide. According to the
34 World Health Organization, between 2020 and 2050, the population of individuals aged ≥ 60 years is
35 estimated to double to 2.1 billion, and the population of those aged ≥ 80 years is projected to triple to
36 426 million (1). The rapid aging of the global population has driven interest in improving the
37 understanding of healthy aging and identifying assessment methods for it (2,3). Healthy aging is a
38 complex multidimensional concept that encompasses biological, functional, lifestyle, and
39 psychosocial factors (3). Additionally, achievement of healthy aging requires early interventions to
40 prevent significant declines in physical and cognitive functions (4). The amount of older adults with
41 frailty is also expected to increase as the older adult population grows. Frailty is characterized by a
42 heightened risk of comorbidities and mortality (5). However, physical function in individuals with
43 frailty has been reported to improve with appropriate interventions (6). Furthermore, prevention of
44 frailty has been identified as a key future project in public health (7) and holds significant social
45 importance. Therefore, establishing a method for assessing frailty is crucial for maintaining the health
46 of older adults.

47 In daily life, hands are the most frequently used body part (8), and healthy older adults have been
48 found to engage in activities involving both hands more frequently than those involving only one
49 hand (9). Upper limb function in humans has been shown to change with age. Ingram et al. compared
50 upper limb muscle strength, positional and superficial sensations, one-handed dexterity, bimanual
51 coordination, muscle power stability, and functional performance in healthy participants aged 20–95
52 years (10). Their results showed that the participants' performance on all the parameters decreased
53 with age, and the decline in bimanual coordination was particularly significant. Additionally, studies
54 have reported that bimanual movements exhibit decreased accuracy, increased variability, and
55 prolonged motor execution times with age (11). These results indicate that bimanual coordinated
56 movements play an important role in the daily lives of older adults, and that the coordination
57 underlying these movements declines with age.

58 Although older adults with frailty have been reported to exhibit lower dexterity in one-handed
59 movements than healthy older adults (12,13), the characteristics of bimanual coordinated movements
60 in older adults with frailty have not been clarified. Frailty in older adults has also been reported to

61 result in less independence in activities of daily living than healthy older adults (14), a higher risk of
62 falling (15), and sarcopenia (16). In contrast, higher finger dexterity has been reported to be
63 associated with better predictive postural control ability in stepping movements (17), and improved
64 upper limb function has been reported to enhance gait ability and overall quality of life (18).
65 Furthermore, sensory stimulation from the fingertips resulting from light contact has been shown to
66 reduce ankle joint and body sway in the standing posture of older adults (19), suggesting that upper
67 limb function, including finger function, can compensate for the decline in gait ability and standing
68 balance. Therefore, if the characteristics of bimanual coordinated movements in frail older adults are
69 clarified, they can be used as an early intervention tool to detect frailty. Thus, this study aimed to
70 compare the bimanual coordinated movements of community-dwelling older adults with frailty, pre-
71 frailty, and robust health and determine the characteristics of bimanual coordinated movements in
72 older adults with frailty. We hypothesized that older adults with frailty would exhibit lower bimanual
73 coordination than robust older adults.

74 **2 Methods**

75 **2.1 Participants**

76 This cross-sectional study was conducted with 358 community-dwelling older adults who
77 participated in physical fitness assessment sessions held in two cities in September 2023. The
78 exclusion criteria for the participants were: (i) age < 65 years; (ii) Mini-Mental State Examination
79 (MMSE) scores < 24; (iii) presence of hand dexterity impairments due to musculoskeletal or central
80 nervous disease; (iv) left-handedness; (v) inability to undergo any measurements; and (vi) maximum
81 distance amplitude ≥ 30 cm in the bimanual coordination task (20). After applying these exclusion
82 criteria, the remaining 312 participants were included in the analysis (Supplementary Figure 1).

83 **2.2 Ethics declarations**

84 This study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and informed consent was
85 obtained from all participants. This study was approved by the Kyoto Tachibana University Research
86 Ethics Committee (approval number 24-30). This study was registered in the UMIN Clinical Trials
87 Registry (UMIN000056340).

88 **2.3 Measures**

89 First, we assessed the frailty of the participants using the Kihon Checklist (KCL). The KCL is a
90 questionnaire developed in Japan to identify older adults who are at high risk of needing care in the
91 near future (21,22). In recent years, the KCL has been used as a tool for frailty assessment (23) and
92 has been recommended as a validated tool in international clinical guidelines for frailty (24,25). The
93 KCL is a self-administered questionnaire with “yes/no” responses that consists of 25 questions

94 covering seven domains: activities of daily living, physical function, nutritional status, oral function,
95 social withdrawal, cognitive function, and depressive mood. In the KCL, higher scores indicate a
96 greater risk of needing care in daily life. In this study, participants with scores of 0–3, 4–7, and ≥ 8
97 were categorized into robust, pre-frail, and frail groups, respectively (23).

98 Next, all the participants performed a bimanual coordination task. Participants sat on chairs with
99 backrests and placed their forearms on a platform. During each task, the forearms were positioned in
100 neutral rotation with the third, fourth, and fifth fingers slightly flexed, and the participants underwent
101 measurements with their eyes closed (Supplementary Figure 2). The bimanual coordination task
102 consisted of two tasks: the in-phase task, wherein tapping movements of the thumb and index finger
103 were performed simultaneously as quickly as possible with both hands; and the anti-phase task,
104 wherein tapping movements alternated between the left and right hands (Supplementary Figure 3)
105 (26,27). The participants performed the 15-s measurement after a 15-s pre-practice in each task. We
106 instructed the participants to “perform as fast as possible and in the same rhythm.”

107 Finger movements during bimanual coordination tasks were measured using a magnetic sensor
108 finger-tapping device (UB-2, Maxell Ltd. Tokyo, Japan) (26). Magnetic sensors were attached to the
109 participant's thumb and index finger with a rubber band, and the distance was calculated on the basis
110 of the strength of the magnetic field generated between the two fingers. This device yields highly
111 reproducible and reliable measurements across periods, devices, and measurement examiners (27).
112 During the bimanual coordination task, the participants were instructed to open their fingers to a
113 width of 4 cm to minimize amplitude variations across participants (28,29). The parameters of the
114 bimanual coordination task (distance, tap interval, and phase difference) were obtained from the
115 recorded data (Table 1) (27). Four parameters of "Distance" were used to evaluate the distance and
116 movement amplitude of the thumb and index finger during the task; four parameters of "Tap interval"
117 were used to evaluate the average speed of movement and variability of tapping; and one parameter
118 of "Phase difference" was used to evaluate the timing discrepancy of tapping between the hands.

119 **2.4 Statistical analysis**

120 Participants were divided into frail, pre-frail, and robust groups based on the KCL results. First, a
121 chi-square test was conducted to compare the male/female ratios among the groups. Participants' age,
122 height, weight, and MMSE and KCL scores were compared between the groups using one-way
123 analysis of variance (ANOVA). Next, three-way ANOVA with a mixed design was conducted to
124 compare the total travel distance, average of local maximum distance, standard deviation (SD) of
125 local maximum distance, slope of the approximate line of local maximum points, number of taps,
126 average of tap intervals, frequency of taps, and SD of inter-tap interval during the bimanual
127 coordination task, considering hand (left, right), task (in-phase task, anti-phase task), and group (frail,
128 pre-frail, robust) as factors. Additionally, a two-way ANOVA with a mixed design was used to

129 compare the SD of the phase difference between left- and right-hand tapping (SD of phase
130 difference), considering task (in-phase task, anti-phase task) and group (frail, pre-frail, robust) as
131 factors. Bonferroni post-hoc tests were performed for parameters showing significant interactions or
132 main effects in all ANOVAs. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 29.0 (IBM,
133 Armonk, NY, USA), with the significance level set at 5%.

134 **3 Results**

135 **3.1 Characteristics of the participants**

136 Based on the KCL's assessment of frailty, we divided the participants into the frail (47 participants; 8
137 males, 39 females), pre-frail (136 participants; 27 males, 109 females), and robust (129 participants;
138 33 males, 96 females) groups. The results of the chi-square test showed no significant differences
139 among male/female ratios in each group ($\chi^2 = 2.10$, $p = 0.37$). One-way ANOVA revealed no
140 significant intergroup differences in age, height, weight, or MMSE score ($p > 0.05$), but showed
141 significant differences in the KCL score ($p < 0.05$). Post-hoc tests showed that the KCL scores in the
142 pre-frail and frail groups were significantly higher than that in the robust group, and the score in the
143 frail group was significantly higher than that in the pre-frail group ($p < 0.05$; Table 2).

144 **3.2 Results of three-way ANOVA with hand, task, and group as factors**

145 The three-way ANOVA results showed no significant interactions among the three factors (hand \times
146 task \times group) for the total travel distance, average of local maximum distance, SD of local maximum
147 distance, slope of the approximate line of local maximum points, number of taps, average of tap
148 intervals, frequency of taps, and SD of the inter-tap interval ($p > 0.05$). Additionally, no significant
149 hand \times group and task \times group interactions were observed. Conversely, the slope of the approximate
150 line of local maximum points and the SD of the inter-tap interval showed significant hand \times task
151 interactions ($p < 0.05$). Post-hoc test results indicated that in the in-phase task, the slope of the
152 approximate line of the local maximum points was significantly higher in the right hand than in the
153 left hand ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, the slope of the approximate line of the local maximum points in
154 the right hand was significantly higher in the in-phase task than in the anti-phase task ($p < 0.05$). The
155 SD of the inter-tap interval was significantly higher in the left hand than in the right hand in both the
156 in-phase and anti-phase tasks ($p < 0.05$). In addition, the SD of the inter-tap interval was significantly
157 higher in the anti-phase task than in the in-phase task for both the left and right hands ($p < 0.05$).

158 The total travel distance showed a significant main effect of the group factor ($p < 0.05$). Post-hoc test
159 results indicated that the total travel distance was significantly longer in the robust group than in the
160 frail group ($p < 0.05$). The total travel distance and average of the local maximum distance, SD of the
161 local maximum distance, slope of the approximate line of local maximum points, number of taps,

162 average of tap intervals, frequency of taps, and SD of the inter-tap interval had significant main
163 effects of the task factor ($p < 0.05$). The post-hoc test results showed that the total travel distance,
164 number of taps, and frequency of taps showed significant main effects of the task factor ($p < 0.05$).
165 The frequency of taps was significantly higher in the in-phase task than in the anti-phase task ($p <$
166 0.05). The average of the local maximum distance, SD of the local maximum distance, and average
167 of the tap intervals were significantly higher in the anti-phase task than in the in-phase task ($p <$
168 0.05). The total travel distance, SD of the local maximum distance, number of taps, average tap
169 interval, frequency of taps, and SD of the inter-tap interval showed significant main effects of the
170 hand factor ($p < 0.05$). According to the post-hoc tests, the total travel distance, number of taps, and
171 frequency of taps were significantly higher for the right hand than for the left hand ($p < 0.05$). In
172 contrast, the SD of the local maximum distance and average of tap intervals were significantly higher
173 for the left hand than for the right hand ($p < 0.05$; Table 3).

174 **3.3 Results of two-way ANOVA with task and group as factors**

175 In the two-way ANOVA, the SD of the phase difference showed no significant interaction between
176 the task and group factors, nor a main effect of the group factors. However, a significant main effect
177 of the task factor was observed ($p < 0.05$). The post-hoc test results showed that the SD of the phase
178 difference was significantly higher for the anti-phase task than for the in-phase task ($p < 0.05$; Table
179 4).

180 **4 Discussion**

181 This study compared the characteristics of bimanual coordinated movements in community-dwelling
182 older adults with frailty, pre-frailty, and robust health. The results showed that the total distance of
183 the bimanual coordinated movements was shorter in the frail group than in the robust group.
184 Additionally, regardless of the degree of frailty, finger dexterity during the bimanual coordination
185 task was lower in the anti-phase task than in the in-phase task and lower in the left hand than in the
186 right hand. These results suggest that older adults with and without frailty exhibit similar levels of
187 bimanual coordination. However, the amount of movement in bimanual coordination tasks was lower
188 in older adults with frailty than in robust older adults.

189 **4.1 Relationship between bimanual coordination and frailty**

190 In this study, older adults were divided into pre-frail, frail, and robust groups and asked to perform a
191 bimanual coordination task consisting of in-phase and anti-phase tasks. The results showed that the
192 total travel distance was shorter in the frail group than in the robust group. The total travel distance is
193 influenced by the velocity and number of movement taps (30), which represents the amount of finger
194 movement. In a study evaluating the relationship between frailty and finger movement control while

195 performing unilateral movements using the dominant hand, agility, smoothness of movement, and
196 strength were reported to be lower in older adults with frailty than in healthy older adults (13). Frailty
197 is defined as “a medical syndrome caused by multiple causes and triggers, characterized by a decline
198 in muscle strength and endurance and a decrease in physiological function, with an increased
199 vulnerability to requiring care or death” (5). Since a decrease in muscle strength leads to a decline in
200 movement velocity (31), the frail group in this study may have had slower bimanual coordinated
201 movements than the robust group, resulting in the shorter total travel distance in the frail group than
202 in the robust group. Although the difference in the amount of movement between the frail and robust
203 groups could also be attributed to reduced endurance in the frail group (5,32), the slope of the
204 approximate line of the local maximum points, which reflects the effect of fatigue based on the
205 relationship between the maximum distance between two fingers per tap and time, showed no
206 significant difference between the frail and robust groups in this study. Therefore, we inferred that a
207 decline in endurance was unlikely to affect the amount of movement in the bimanual coordinated
208 movement task. Interhemispheric interactions via the corpus callosum have also been reported to play
209 an important role in bimanual coordinated movements (33). The structural and functional
210 connectivity of the corpus callosum has been shown to be altered with age, leading to reduced
211 performance in bimanual coordinated movements (34,35). Furthermore, structural alterations in the
212 cerebral corpus callosum have been reported to be more pronounced in older adults with frailty than
213 in healthy older adults (36). Therefore, the frail group may have had reduced finger dexterity due to
214 altered structural and functional connectivity of the cerebral corpus callosum, which may have
215 caused the differences in performance of the bimanual coordination task between the robust and frail
216 groups.

217 **4.2 Comparison of in-phase and anti-phase tasks**

218 Our findings also showed that the total travel distance, number of taps, and frequency of taps were
219 higher in the in-phase task than in the anti-phase task. The average of the local maximum distance,
220 SD of the local maximum distance, average of the tap intervals, and SD of the phase difference were
221 higher in the anti-phase task than in the in-phase task. The slope of the approximate line of the local
222 maximum points is suspected to be influenced by fatigue because the distance between the two
223 fingers becomes narrower over time if the slope has a negative value. In the present study, the slope
224 of the approximate line of the local maximum points was negative for the anti-phase task and positive
225 for the in-phase task for the right hand. Therefore, the anti-phase task may have been affected by
226 fatigue. In addition, the SD of the inter-tap interval showed that the rhythm of movement was more
227 variable in the anti-phase task. The number of taps, average tap interval, and frequency of taps
228 indicated that the anti-phase task involved fewer taps, a lower frequency, and longer periods than the
229 in-phase task. The total travel distance and the average and SD of the local maximum distance
230 revealed that the amount of movement was smaller in the anti-phase task than in the in-phase task

231 and that the distance between two fingers per tap and its variation were larger in the anti-phase task
232 than in the in-phase task. The SD of the phase difference showed that the anti-phase task had more
233 timing deviations than the in-phase task for both tasks. Thus, in this study, the anti-phase task was
234 inferior to the in-phase task for all parameters of finger dexterity. The anti-phase task requires
235 specific muscle activity with continuous timing to maintain alternating bimanual movements, and
236 this timing is asymmetric between the left and right hands (37). In addition, maintaining attention is
237 necessary to preserve the phase relationship between hands. For anti-phase tasks and cognitive
238 function, research involving community-dwelling older adults with declining cognitive function has
239 shown a correlation between tapping velocity in the anti-phase task and decline in working memory
240 and attention (29). Therefore, the anti-phase task, which requires independent alternating movements
241 of both hands, is suggested to be more challenging than the in-phase task or unilateral motor tasks
242 and is prone to differences in finger function (28). Thus, similar to robust older adults, older adults
243 with frailty in this study may have experienced higher difficulty in the anti-phase task than in the in-
244 phase task and showed characteristics of reduced finger dexterity for each parameter.

245 **4.3 Comparison of left and right hand in bimanual coordinated movement**

246 Since the participants performed the same finger-tapping task with their left and right hands, we
247 expected no significant differences between the parameters for each hand. However, the total travel
248 distance was significantly longer with the right hand than with the left. In addition, the SD of the
249 local maximum distance was lower for the right hand than for the left hand. The right hand showed a
250 higher number, and frequency, of taps as well as longer intervals than the left hand. Furthermore, the
251 SD of the inter-tap interval was smaller for the right hand than for the left hand. If the thumb is
252 repeatedly moved in a specific direction, the trained movement increases cortical excitability (38).
253 Thus, repetitive movements induces plastic reorganization in the primary motor cortex, and this
254 phenomenon is called use-dependent plasticity (39,40). This use-dependent plasticity has been found
255 to inhibit motor errors and reduce motor planning time, even in complex daily activities (41). The
256 dominant hand is used more frequently than the non-dominant hand in daily life, and older adults are
257 trained to use the dominant hand in their daily activities themselves (34). These findings suggest that
258 the primary motor cortex innervating the dominant hand enables spatially and temporally efficient
259 movements through use-dependent plasticity (42). In the present study, the right hand may have had
260 higher finger dexterity than the left hand for all parameters, regardless of other factors. Therefore,
261 older adults with frailty, like robust older adults, have higher finger dexterity during bimanual
262 coordination tasks with their right hand than with their left hand.

263 **4.4 Limitations**

264 The limitations of this study include the fact that it examined the characteristics of bimanual
265 coordination only at the behavioral level and did not examine the neural mechanisms underlying

266 bimanual coordination. Previous studies comparing unilateral movements in participants of a wide
267 range of ages, from children to healthy older adults, have shown that immature or degenerated motor
268 systems may maintain or improve performance by bilateral mobilization of brain regions in
269 comparison with normal motor systems (35,43). Since structural changes in the corpus callosum have
270 been shown to occur in older adults with frailty (28), older adults with and without frailty may have
271 shown differences in the neural mechanisms in the brain during the bimanual coordination task in
272 this study. Future studies should examine interhemispheric inhibition and facilitation functions
273 during bimanual coordination tasks using techniques such as transcranial magnetic stimulation to
274 elucidate the neural mechanisms underlying bimanual coordination in older adults with frailty.

275 **5 Conclusions**

276 This study characterized bimanual coordinated movements in older adults with frailty, pre-frailty,
277 and robust health. Based on the bimanual coordination task, the total traveling distance was shorter in
278 the frail group than in the robust group. Regardless of the severity of frailty, participants showed
279 lower bimanual coordination in the anti-phase task than in the in-phase task, and finger dexterity
280 during the bimanual coordination tasks was lower in the left hand than in the right hand. Thus, while
281 older adults with frailty exhibit bimanual coordination similar to that of robust older adults, the
282 amount of movement in the bimanual coordination task by those with frailty is lower than that by
283 robust older adults. The results of this study suggest that bimanual coordination tasks may be
284 applicable as an assessment tool for frailty.

285 **6 Conflict of Interest**

286 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
287 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

288 **7 Author Contributions**

289 Author contributions included conceptualization (SM, and HN), data curation (SF), formal analysis
290 (SF), funding acquisition (SM, TM, KN, and HN), investigation (SF, SM, AG, SS, YS, and HN),
291 methodology (SM, and HN), project administration (SM, and HN), resources (SM, and HN),
292 supervision (SM, and HN), visualization (SF), writing – original draft (SF), writing – review &
293 editing (SF, SM, AG, SS, YS, TM, KN and HN), and approval of final version to be published and
294 agreement to be accountable for the integrity and accuracy of all aspects of the work (all authors).

295 **8 Funding**

296 This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP23K21578 for SM, JP23K10417 for
297 HN, JP23K19907 for KN, and JP24K23764 for TM.

298 **9 Acknowledgments**

299 We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all participants for their willingness to participate in
300 this study. We gratefully acknowledge Mr. Tomohiko Mizuguchi at Maxell, Ltd. for advice and
301 suggestions of analysis.

302 **10 References**

- 303 1. World Health Organization. Ageing and health. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health)
304 [sheets/detail/ageing-and-health](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health) (2022).
- 305 2. Beard JR, Officer A, de Carvalho IA, Sadana R, Pot AM, Michel JP, et al. The World report
306 on ageing and health: a policy framework for healthy ageing. *Lancet* (2016) 387:2145–54. doi:
307 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00516-4
- 308 3. Behr LC, Simm A, Kluttig A, Grosskopf Großkopf A. 60 years of healthy aging: On
309 definitions, biomarkers, scores and challenges. *Ageing Res. Rev.* (2023) 88:101934. doi:
310 10.1016/j.arr.2023.101934
- 311 4. Silva N, Rajado AT, Esteves F, Brito D, Apolónio J, Roberto VP, et al. Measuring healthy
312 ageing: current and future tools. *Biogerontology* (2023) 24:845–66. doi: 10.1007/s10522-023-10041-
313 2
- 314 5. Morley JE, Vellas B, van Kan GA, Anker SD, Bauer JM, Bernabei R, et al. Frailty consensus:
315 a call to action. *J. Am. Med. Dir. Assoc.* (2013) 14:392–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2013.03.022
- 316 6. de Labra C, Guimaraes-Pinheiro C, Maseda A, Lorenzo T, Millán-Calenti JC. Effects of
317 physical exercise interventions in frail older adults: a systematic review of randomized controlled
318 trials. *BMC Geriatr.* (2015) 15:154. doi: 10.1186/s12877-015-0155-4
- 319 7. Liotta G, Ussai S, Illario M, O’Caoimh R, Cano A, Holland C, et al. Frailty as the Future Core
320 Business of Public Health: Report of the Activities of the A3 Action Group of the European
321 Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing (EIP on AHA). *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public*
322 *Health* (2018) 15:2843. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15122843
- 323 8. Lee KS, Jung MC. Quantitative comparison of marker attachment methods for hand motion
324 analysis. *Int. J. Occup. Saf. Ergon.* (2015) 21:30–8. doi: 10.1080/10803548.2015.1017960
- 325 9. Kilbreath SL, Heard RC. Frequency of hand use in healthy older persons. *Aust. J. Physiother.*
326 (2005) 51:119–22. doi: 10.1016/s0004-9514(05)70040-4

- 327 10. Ingram LA, Butler AA, Walsh LD, Brodie MA, Lord SR, Gandevia SC. The upper limb
328 Physiological Profile Assessment: Description, reliability, normative values and criterion validity.
329 *PLoS One* (2019) 14:e0218553. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0218553
- 330 11. Kang N, Ko DK, Cauraugh JH. Bimanual motor impairments in older adults: an updated
331 systematic review and meta-analysis. *EXCLI J.* (2022) 21:1068–83. doi: 10.17179/excli2022-5236
- 332 12. Lammers F, Zacharias N, Borchers F, Mörgeli R, Spies CD, Winterer G. Functional
333 Connectivity of the Supplementary Motor Network Is Associated with Fried’s Modified Frailty Score
334 in Older Adults. *J. Gerontol. A Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.* (2020) 75:2239–22. doi: 10.1093/gerona/glz297
- 335 13. Schmidle S, Gulde P, Herdegen S, Böhme GE, Hermsdörfer J. Kinematic analysis of
336 activities of daily living performance in frail elderly. *BMC Geriatr.* (2022) 22:244. doi:
337 10.1186/s12877-022-02902-1
- 338 14. Tornero-Quiñones I, Sáez-Padilla J, Espina Díaz A, Abad Robles MT, Sierra Robles Á.
339 Functional Ability, Frailty and Risk of Falls in the Elderly: Relations with Autonomy in Daily
340 Living. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* (2020) 17:1006. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17031006
- 341 15. Anders J, Dapp U, Laub S, von Renteln-Kruse W. [Impact of fall risk and fear of falling on
342 mobility of independently living senior citizens transitioning to frailty: screening results concerning
343 fall prevention in the community]. *Z. Gerontol. Geriatr.* (2007) 40:255–67. doi: 10.1007/s00391-
344 007-0473-z
- 345 16. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Sayer AA. Sarcopenia. *Lancet* (2019) 393:2636–46. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
346 6736(19)31138-9
- 347 17. Sun R, Shea JB. Probing attention prioritization during dual-task step initiation: a novel
348 method. *Exp. Brain Res.* (2016) 234:1047–056. doi: 10.1007/s00221-015-4534-z
- 349 18. Leblebici G, Tarakcı E, Kısa EP, Akalan E, Kasapçopur Ö. The effects of improvement in
350 upper extremity function on gait and balance in children with upper extremity affected. *Gait Posture*
351 (2024) 110:41–7. doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2024.02.017
- 352 19. Barela AMF, Caporicci S, de Freitas PB, Jeka JJ, Barela JA. Light touch compensates
353 peripheral somatosensory degradation in postural control of older adults. *Hum. Mov. Sci.* (2018)
354 60:122–30. doi: 10.1016/j.humov.2018.06.001
- 355 20. Enokizono T, Ohto T, Tanaka M, Maruo K, Sano Y, Kandori A, et al. Quantitative
356 assessment of fine motor skills in children using magnetic sensors. *Brain Dev.* 42:421–30. doi:
357 10.1016/j.braindev.2020.03.004

- 358 21. Arai H, Satake S. English translation of the Kihon Checklist. *Geriatr. Gerontol. Int.* (2015)
359 15:518–19. doi: 10.1111/ggi.12397
- 360 22. Satake S, Shimokata H, Senda K, Kondo I, Toba K. Validity of Total Kihon Checklist Score
361 for Predicting the Incidence of 3-Year Dependency and Mortality in a Community-Dwelling Older
362 Population. *J. Am. Med. Dir. Assoc.* (2017) 18:552.e1–552.e6. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2017.03.013
- 363 23. Satake S, Senda K, Hong YJ, Miura H, Endo H, Sakurai T, et al. Validity of the Kihon
364 Checklist for assessing frailty status. *Geriatr. Gerontol. Int.* (2016) 16:709–15. doi: 10.1111/ggi
- 365 24. Sentandreu-Mañó T, Cezón-Serrano N, Cebrià I Iranzo MA, Tortosa-Chuliá MA, Tomás JM,
366 Salom Terrádez JR, et al. Kihon Checklist to assess frailty in older adults: Some evidence on the
367 internal consistency and validity of the Spanish version. *Geriatr. Gerontol. Int.* (2021) 21:262–67.
368 doi: 10.1111/ggi.14126
- 369 25. Dent E, Lien C, Lim WS, Wong WC, Wong CH, Ng TP, et al. The Asia-Pacific Clinical
370 Practice Guidelines for the Management of Frailty. *J. Am. Med. Dir. Assoc.* (2017) 18:564–75. doi:
371 10.1016/j.jamda.2017.04.018.
- 372 26. Sugioka J, Suzumara S, Kawahara Y, Osawa A, Maeda, N, Ito M, et al. Assessment of finger
373 movement characteristics in dementia patients using a magnetic sensing finger-tap device. *Japanese*
374 *Journal of Comprehensive Rehabilitation Science* (2020) 11:91–7. doi: 10.11336/jjcrs.11.91
- 375 27. Sano, Y. *et al.* Reliability of Finger Tapping Test Used in Diagnosis of Movement Disorders.
376 in *2011 5th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering* 1–4 (IEEE,
377 2011).
- 378 28. Sugioka J, Suzumura S, Kuno K, Kizuka S, Sakurai H, Kanada Y, et al. Relationship between
379 finger movement characteristics and brain voxel-based morphometry. *PLoS One* (2022)
380 17:e0269351. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0269351
- 381 29. Suzumura S, Kanada Y, Osawa A, Sugioka J, Maeda N, Nagahama T, et al. Assessment of
382 finger motor function that reflects the severity of cognitive function. *Fujita Med J* (2021) 7:122–29.
383 doi: 10.20407/fmj.2020-013
- 384 30. Tomita Y, Tanaka S, Takahashi S, Takeuchi N. Detecting cognitive decline in community-
385 dwelling older adults using simple cognitive and motor performance tests. *Geriatr. Gerontol. Int.*
386 (2020) 20:212–17. doi: 10.1111/ggi.13863

- 387 31. Alcazar J, Csapo R, Ara I, Alegre LM. On the Shape of the Force-Velocity Relationship in
388 Skeletal Muscles: The Linear, the Hyperbolic, and the Double-Hyperbolic. *Front. Physiol.* (2019)
389 10:769. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2019.00769
- 390 32. Angulo J, El Assar M, Álvarez-Bustos A, Rodríguez-Mañas L. Physical activity and exercise:
391 Strategies to manage frailty. *Redox Biol* (2020) 35:101513. doi: 10.1016/j.redox.2020.101513
- 392 33. Wu T, Wang L, Hallett M, Li K, Chan P. Neural correlates of bimanual anti-phase and in-
393 phase movements in Parkinson's disease. *Brain* (2010) 133:2394–409. doi: 10.1093/brain/awq151
- 394 34. Suzumura S, Osawa A, Nagahama T, Kondo I, Sano Y, Kandori A, et al. Assessment of
395 finger motor skills in individuals with mild cognitive impairment and patients with Alzheimer's
396 disease: Relationship between finger-to-thumb tapping and cognitive function. *Japanese Journal of*
397 *Comprehensive Rehabilitation Science* (2016) 7:19–28. doi: 10.11336/jjcrs.7.19
- 398 35. Fujiyama H, Van Soom J, Rens G, Gooijers J, Leunissen I, Levin O, et al. Age-Related
399 Changes in Frontal Network Structural and Functional Connectivity in Relation to Bimanual
400 Movement Control. *J. Neurosci.* (2016) 36:1808–22. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3355-15.2016
- 401 36. Morishita T, Timmermann JE, Schulz R, Hummel FC. Impact of interhemispheric inhibition
402 on bimanual movement control in young and old. *Exp. Brain Res.* (2022) 240:687–701. doi:
403 10.1007/s00221-021-06258-7
- 404 37. Tian Q, Williams OA, Landman BA, Resnick SM, Ferrucci L. Microstructural Neuroimaging
405 of Frailty in Cognitively Normal Older Adults. *Front. Med.* (2020) 7:546344. doi:
406 10.3389/fmed.2020.546344
- 407 38. Classen J, Liepert J, Wise SP, Hallett M, Cohen LG. Rapid plasticity of human cortical
408 movement representation induced by practice. *J. Neurophysiol.* (1998) 79:1117–123. doi:
409 10.1152/jn.1998.79.2.1117
- 410 39. Raffin E, Siebner HR. Use-Dependent Plasticity in Human Primary Motor Hand Area:
411 Synergistic Interplay Between Training and Immobilization. *Cereb. Cortex* (2019) 29:356–71. doi:
412 10.1093/cercor/bhy226
- 413 40. Mawase F, Uehara S, Bastian AJ, Celnik P. Motor Learning Enhances Use-Dependent
414 Plasticity. *J. Neurosci.* (2017) 37:2673–685. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3303-16.2017.
- 415 41. Spampinato, D. & Celnik, P. Multiple Motor Learning Processes in Humans: Defining Their
416 Neurophysiological Bases. *Neuroscientist* (2021) 27:246–67. doi: 10.1177/1073858420939552.

417 42. Shin HW, Sohn YH, Hallett M. Hemispheric asymmetry of surround inhibition in the human
418 motor system. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* (2009) 120:816–19. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2009.02.004.

419 43. Addamo PK, Farrow M, Bradshaw JL, Moss S, Georgiou-Karistianis N. Characterizing the
420 developmental profile of effort-induced motor overflow across a timed trial. *Am. J. Psychol.* (2013)
421 126:227–34. doi: 10.5406/amerjpsyc.126.2.0227.

422 **11 Data Availability Statement**

423 The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding
424 author, HN, upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to their containing
425 information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.

426

427 **12 Tables**

428 Table 1. Characteristics of the bimanual coordinated task

	Parameter	Description	Assessment
Distance	Total travel distance (mm)	The sum of the distances moved by the thumb and index finger. The overall amount of movement.	Higher values indicate higher finger dexterity.
	Ave of local max distance (mm)	Average amplitude of the distance waveform.	Values closer to 40 mm indicate higher finger dexterity.
	SD of local max distance (mm)	Variation in the amplitude of the distance waveform.	Lower values indicate higher finger dexterity.
	Slope of approximate line of local max points (mm/s)	The slope is a linear regression of the relationship between the maximum point of each tap and time. As the tap amplitude decreases due to fatigue, the slope increases in the negative direction. When there is no effect of fatigue, the slope is 0.	Lower values indicate higher finger dexterity.
Tap interval	Number of taps	Number of taps during the measurement time.	Lower values indicate higher finger dexterity.
	Ave of tap intervals (s)	Average in time difference between two consecutive taps.	Lower values indicate higher finger dexterity.
	Frequency of taps (Hz)	Inverse to the mean of the tap interval.	Higher values indicate higher finger dexterity.
	SD of inter-tap interval (s)	Variations in time difference between two consecutive taps.	Lower values indicate higher finger dexterity.
Phase difference	SD of phase difference (degree)	Assuming the interval between one tap is 360°, the time lag between the left and right hands is expressed as an angle. This parameter is the variation of its value.	Lower values indicate higher finger dexterity.

429 Ave, average; Max, maximum; SD, standard deviation.

430

431

Table 2. Characteristics of the participants

	Frail (n = 47)	Pre-frail (n = 136)	Robust (n = 129)	F	Post-hoc test
Age (years)	78.38 (5.73)	77.94 (6.25)	76.85 (6.04)	1.57	
Height (cm)	152.09 (8.77)	152.92 (7.60)	154.07 (8.32)	1.26	
Body weight (kg)	50.41 (8.27)	52.48 (9.87)	53.70 (9.46)	2.13	
MMSE (score)	27.74 (1.99)	28.35 (1.76)	28.46 (1.85)	2.68	
KCL (score)	9.47 (1.70)	5.10 (1.07)	1.91 (0.99)	772.14**	Robust < Pre-frail < Frail

432 MMSE, mini-mental state examination; KCL: kihon checklist; ** $p < 0.01$.

433

(mm/s)		R	-0.18 (0.55)	-0.11 (0.75)	-0.13 (0.72)										
Number of taps	IP	L	43.32 (12.57)	43.79 (14.58)	46.94 (13.32)										
		R	43.72 (12.67)	44.77 (15.54)	47.81 (14.11)										
	AP	L	26.64 (8.37)	27.69 (7.77)	29.60 (9.36)	0.53	0.46	0.32	0.13	20.05**	590.79**	2.74	L < R ^b	AP < IP ^b	
		R	27.13 (9.10)	28.40 (8.15)	30.13 (9.79)										
Ave of intervals (s)	IP	L	0.37 (0.12)	0.39 (0.17)	0.35 (0.13)										
		R	0.37 (0.12)	0.38 (0.17)	0.34 (0.13)										
	AP	L	0.61 (0.24)	0.57 (0.17)	0.56 (0.23)	0.12	1.88	0.52	0.05	4.52*	339.70**	1.50	R < L ^b	IP < AP ^b	
		R	0.60 (0.21)	0.56 (0.17)	0.55 (0.24)										
Frequency of taps (Hz)	IP	L	2.93 (0.84)	2.96 (0.97)	3.17 (0.89)										
		R	2.95 (0.84)	3.03 (1.04)	3.23 (0.95)										
	AP	L	1.83 (0.56)	1.90 (0.52)	2.02 (0.62)	0.76	0.52	0.80	0.06	17.43**	583.26**	2.73	L < R ^b	AP < IP ^b	
		R	1.84 (0.61)	1.94 (0.54)	2.05 (0.66)										
SD of inter-tapping interval (s)	IP	L	0.04 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)	0.04 (0.03)										
		R	0.03 (0.02)	0.04 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)										
	AP	L	0.09 (0.07)	0.09 (0.07)	0.10 (0.08)	0.02	0.27	5.48*	0.53	36.49**	129.20**	0.03	IP: R < L ^a AP: R < L ^a	L: IP < AP ^a R: IP < AP ^a	
		R	0.08 (0.08)	0.07 (0.05)	0.08 (0.08)										

435 Ave, average; Max: maximum; SD, standard deviation; IP, in-phase task; AP, anti-phase task; L, left; R, right, IE, interaction effect; *a*, post-
436 hoc test of interaction effect; *b*, post-hoc test of main effect; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

437

438

439

Table 4. Results of two-way ANOVA with task and group as factors

Task	Frail (n = 47)	Pre-frail (n = 136)	Robust (n = 129)	IE	Main effect	Main effect	Post-hoc test	
				Task × Group	Task	Group	Task	Group
				F	F	F	Task	Group
SD of phase difference (degree)	IP	26.46 (18.70)	27.99 (17.26)	29.68 (25.57)	0.12	36.99**	0.41	IP < AP ^b
	AP	37.87 (24.32)	37.59 (21.15)	38.93 (18.86)				

440 SD, standard deviation; IP, in-phase task; AP, anti-phase task; L, left; R, right; IE, interaction effect;
 441 ^b, post-hoc test of main effect; ** $p < 0.01$.