Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

Contribution of arm movements to balance recovery after tripping in older adults.

3

4 Sjoerd M. Bruijn^{1,2}, Lizeth H. Sloot³, Idsart Kingma¹, Mirjam Pijnappels¹

5

6 ¹ Department of Human Movement Sciences, Faculty of Behavioural and
7 Movement Sciences, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Amsterdam Movement
8 Sciences, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

9 ² Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, First Affiliated Hospital, Fujian Medical
10 University, Fuzhou, Fujian, PR China

11 ³ Optimization, Robotics and Biomechanics Lab, Institut für Technische
12 Informatik (ZITI), Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany

13

14

15 Corresponding author at:

16 Room A626,

17 Department of Human Movement Sciences,

18 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,

19 Van der Boechorststraat 9,

20 1081 BT Amsterdam,

21 The Netherlands.

22 s.m.bruijn@gmail.com

23

24 **Keywords:** perturbation, accidental falls, arm swing, angular momentum, gait
25 stability, elderly, upper extremity

26

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

Abstract

Falls are common in daily life, often caused by trips and slips and, particularly in older adults, with serious consequences. Although arm movements play an important role in balance control, there is limited research into the role of arm movements during balance recovery after tripping in older adults. We investigated how older adults use their arms to recover from a trip and the difference in the effects of arm movements between fallers (n=5) and non-fallers (n=11).

Sixteen older males and females (69.7±2.3 years) walked along a walkway and were occasionally tripped over suddenly appearing obstacles. We analysed the first trip using a biomechanical model based on full-body kinematics and force-plate data to calculate whole body orientation during the trip and recovery phase. With this model, we simulated the effects of arm movements at foot-obstacle impact and during trip recovery on body orientation.

Apart from an increase in sagittal plane forward body rotation at touchdown in fallers, we found no significant differences between fallers and non-fallers in the effects of arm movements on trip recovery. Like earlier studies in young adults, we found that arm movements during the recovery phase had most favourable effects in the transverse plane: by delaying the transfer of angular momentum of the arms to the body, older adults rotated the tripped side more forward thereby allowing for a larger recovery step. Older adults that are prone to falling might improve their balance recovery after tripping by learning to prolong ongoing arm movements.

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

Introduction

Falls are common in daily life, particularly in older adults, and a large proportion of these falls are caused by trips and slips (Talbot et al., 2005). The often-seen flailing of the arms after a perturbation makes one think that humans use their arms for balance recovery. Previous work has shown that arm swing during normal walking decreases stability (Bruijn et al., 2010; Meyns et al., 2013; Pijnappels et al., 2010), whereas prolonging ongoing arm swing after a perturbation may be beneficial for balance recovery (Pijnappels et al., 2010). After tripping, roughly two recovery strategies can be observed; the elevating strategy, in which the tripped foot is placed over the obstacle, and the lowering strategy, in which the tripped foot is placed back on the ground before the obstacle (Eng et al., 1994). Pijnappels et al. (2010) showed that during the elevating strategy, young adults use their arms to change their body orientation mainly in the transverse plane. Prolongation of the ongoing arm movements after obstacle impact by exaggerated shoulder anteflexion on the tripped side, and exaggerated shoulder retroflexion on the contralateral side, delays the transfer of angular momentum from the arms to the body. This leads to a more favourable body orientation in the transverse plane with the tripped side being rotated more forward, which allows for a larger recovery step. Although the role of the arms in recovering from a perturbation has mostly been studied in young adults, this role may change with increasing age (Akinlosotu et al., 2020; Merrill et al., 2017; Roos et al., 2008). It has been suggested that, after tripping over an obstacle, older adults exhibit a more protective arm

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

74 strategy, by reaching both arms forward in anticipation of an unsuccessful
 75 recovery, rather than using the arms to prevent themselves from falling (Roos et
 76 al., 2008). Possibly, older adults who fall after a trip, do so (partly) because of
 77 these less effective arm movements for trip recovery.

78 Thus, we investigated whether and how older adults use their arms to recover
 79 from a trip with an elevation strategy. Specifically, we evaluated the difference
 80 in the effect of arm movements between older adults who fell and those who did
 81 not fall.

82

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

83

Methods

84 Participants

85 Sixteen older adults (11 males, mean age 69.7 (SD 2.3) years, mean weight 77
86 (SD 13)kg, mean height 1.68 (SD 0.09)m) participated. All participants were fit
87 and had no orthopedic, neuromuscular, cardiac or visual problems. All
88 participants signed informed consent, and the protocol was approved by the local
89 ethical committee (#2010-10).

90 Procedure

91 First, participants were fitted with clusters of 3 infrared LED's for movement
92 registration on the feet, shanks, thighs, pelvis, trunk, upper and lower arms.
93 Kinematics were sampled at 50 samples/second (Optotrak, Northern Digital,
94 Waterloo, Ontario, Canada). Ground reaction forces were sampled at 1000
95 samples/second. Participants walked repeatedly at a self-selected speed along
96 a 12 by 2.5 m walkway, in which 21 obstacles were hidden. (Pijnappels et al.,
97 2010). Each subject walked on average 64 (SD 10) times along the walkway, in
98 which they were randomly perturbed 7 (SD 2) times on the right leg. Participants
99 were encouraged to take breaks when needed. On average, the first trip occurred
100 after 9 walks.

101

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

102 Calculations

103 For this study, we analysed only the first trip, as subsequent trips may contain
 104 habituation effects (Akinlosotu et al., 2020; Pijnappels et al., 2010). Tripping
 105 responses were classified by visual inspection of 3D kinematics by two
 106 independent observers (LHS & SMB) into 1) lowering strategy, 2) successful
 107 elevating strategy, 3) unsuccessful elevating strategy. In the current study, we
 108 analysed the latter two, and discriminated between participants that fell
 109 ('fallers', n=5) and those that did not ('non-fallers', n=11).

110 We calculated angular momenta (L) of all segments around the total body center
 111 of mass (CoM), as well as the combined inertia of trunk and legs ($I_{trunklegs}$) with
 112 respect to the CoM (Pijnappels et al., 2010). We estimated the isolated effects
 113 of arm movements at foot-obstacle impact ("impact") and during the recovery
 114 phase, lasting from impact until touchdown of the recovery foot
 115 ("touchdown")(Pijnappels et al., 2010). First, we calculated the body orientation
 116 during the recovery phase (Actual). Second, we calculated how the body would
 117 have rotated if the angular momentum of the arms at impact would be
 118 instantaneously transferred to the rest of the body, without allowing any further
 119 arm movements after impact (Transfer & Cut). Third, we calculated how the
 120 body would have rotated if no angular momentum of the arms would be
 121 transferred to the body at impact, and the arms would prolong their movements
 122 throughout the recovery phase (Cut). For each of these three angular momenta
 123 curves ($L_{calculation}$), we calculated the angular velocity ($\omega_{calculation}$) from:

$$124 \quad L_{calculation} = I_{trunklegs} * \omega_{calculation}$$

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

This angular velocity was subsequently integrated over the recovery phase, starting from 0^0 at impact, to obtain the 3D orientation of the body at touchdown (figure 1). For mathematical details, see (Pijnappels et al., 2010).

Statistical analysis

We compared pre-tripping walking speed and time between impact and touchdown between fallers and non-fallers using an unpaired t-test. To test for differences in the effects of arm movements on body orientation at touchdown for each plane, we used a mixed model ANOVA, with Group (faller, non-faller) as between factor, and Calculation mode (Actual, Transfer & Cut, Cut) as within factor. Significant effects were followed up by paired t-tests with Bonferroni correction. All analyses were performed in Matlab (R2019A, Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc.), with $\alpha=0.05$.

Figure 1: The effects of Calculation mode (different colours) on the total body orientation (y-axis) as a function of normalised time (x-axis, 0 = impact, 1.0= touchdown) in the Sagittal (left), Frontal (middle), and Transverse (right) planes. Data represent the mean for the non-fallers. For each panel, the figures on the right illustrate what each orientation indicates. Shaded regions represent standard deviations.

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

144

145 **Table 1:** Results of the statistical tests. Significant effects are displayed in **bold**.

	Calculation mode		Fallstatus		Calculation mode X Fallstatus	
	F(2,28)	p	F(F1,14)	p	F(2,28)	p
Sagittal	5.04	0.014	9.82	0.007	0.85	0.438
Frontal	16.74	<0.001	0.05	0.831	1.18	0.324
Transverse	67.34	<0.001	0.46	0.508	0.70	0.507

146

147

148 **Table 2:** Posthoc results. Significant effects are displayed in **bold**.

	Cut Vs Cut & Transfer	Actual Vs Cut	Actual Vs Cut & Transfer
Sagittal	0.00	0.07	0.35
Frontal	0.07	0.01	0.00
Transverse	0.00	0.04	0.00

149

150 Results

151 There were no temporal differences in recovery between fallers and non-fallers.

152 Walking speed of the fallers (1.48m/s (SD 0.21)) was not significantly different

153 from the non-fallers (1.43m/s (SD 0.07), $p=0.48$). Also, time between impact and

154 touchdown of fallers (464ms (SD 84)) did not significantly differ from non-fallers

155 (496ms (SD 61), $p=0.40$). Thus, there were no differences in the time over which

156 angular velocities were integrated.

157 Arm movements had an effect on trip recovery in all three planes, and this effect

158 was not different between fallers and non-fallers. In the sagittal plane, the Cut

159 calculation led to small, although significantly more forward body rotation of

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

about 1° than the Transfer & Cut calculation (figures 1 & 2, table 1 & 2). Thus, in the sagittal plane, it may be undesirable to delay transfer of angular momentum from the arms to the body, as this would lead to more sagittal plane forward body rotation (as in the Cut calculation). In the frontal plane, the Actual calculation led to a significantly more vertical body orientation than both the Cut and Transfer & Cut calculations, which were more laterally rotated towards the tripped side. This indicates that participants were able to fully cancel all angular momentum that was present at impact (i.e. the Transfer & Cut calculation), and even could cancel angular momentum from the body (since the actual orientation of the body was rotated significantly less than the Cut calculation). Effects of arm movements were largest in the transverse plane. In this plane, the Actual calculation led to an orientation with the tripped side rotated significantly less forward than the Cut calculation, yet rotated significantly more forward than the Transfer & Cut calculation. This indicates that in the transverse plane, participants benefitted from delaying transfer of angular momentum from the arms to their body, so much even, that would they not do so, the tripped right side of their body would have been rotated backward at recovery foot touchdown. Still, participants did not manage to delay transfer of all arm angular momentum, as indicated by a significant difference between Actual and Cut calculations.

There were only significant differences between fallers and non-fallers in the sagittal plane; Fallers had a more Actual sagittal plane forward body rotation at touchdown than non-fallers (figure 2, table 1).

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

Figure 2. Body orientation at touchdown for non-fallers (non-filled bars) and fallers (solid colours) as a function of Calculation mode (colours). Error bars represent standard deviations, and lines represent individual data.

Discussion

We studied the effects of arm movements on recovery after a trip in older fallers and non-fallers. Similar to earlier studies in young adults, we found that arm movements had most effect in the transverse plane, where older adults (regardless of fall-status) delayed the transfer of angular momentum of the arms to the body (i.e. behaved like the Cut calculation). This allowed them to gain a more favourable body orientation in the transverse plane, with the tripped right side rotated more forward, thereby lengthening the recovery step. Apart from an increase in sagittal plane forward body rotation in fallers compared to non-fallers, we found no significant differences between fallers and non-fallers. Interestingly, the effects of arm movements did not significantly differ between fallers and non-fallers in the transverse plane. A post-hoc analysis showed that fallers (0.56 (SD 0.14)m) took a significantly shorter recovery step than non-

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

fallers (0.82 (SD 0.11)m, $P < 0.01$). Thus, falling after a trip seems to be related to problems with step lengthening, which in our sample could not be connected to ineffective arm movements. Although Roos et al. (2008) suggested that older adults use a protective strategy of extending both arms to negotiate impact in case of a fall, which would be destabilizing according to our analyses, we did not observe such strategy in our older participants. Alternatively, earlier work suggests that problems in generating hip, knee and ankle moments during push-off may be a more crucial in successful recovery from a trip than the contribution of arm movements (Pijnappels et al., 2005).

Another approach to understanding the importance of arm movements during trip recovery in older adults is to compare our results to findings in young adults. In the sagittal plane, body orientation at touchdown in our older non-fallers seems more vertical than in young adults (-20° forward rotation in (Pijnappels et al., 2010), $\sim 16^\circ$ in our study). While this could indicate that older non-fallers were better at recovering from a trip, it could also be related to the fact that they generally walked slower, thus carrying less momentum (1.54m/s in (Pijnappels et al., 2010), 1.48m/s in ours). Moreover, other factors, like push-off ability mentioned previously could be underlying differences in orientation at touchdown.

In the frontal plane, our older adults' Actual body orientation at touchdown was comparable to that of young adults (Pijnappels et al. (2010), even though the effect of arm movements differed. In the older adults, both the Transfer & Cut and Cut calculations led to significantly more lateral rotation towards the tripped

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

side. Thus, our results suggest that in the frontal plane, older adults were able to cancel the angular momentum of the arms at impact, and also to transfer some of the (hindering) angular momentum from the body to the arms. How they were able to do so is an interesting topic for further investigation.

In the transverse plane, older adults rotated their tripped side forward by only 6.5° versus 18° reported for young adults (Pijnappels et al. (2010), which indicates a substantially more favourable body orientation for the latter group.

Like in young adults, arm movements in older adults contributed to this orientation at touchdown. However, there was also a slight but significant difference between the Actual and Cut calculations, implying that older adults did not cancel all angular momentum of the arms at impact. Thus, older adults could perhaps improve their recovery by further prolonging the ongoing movements of the arms, thereby delaying the transfer of angular momentum from the arms to the body, achieving more forward rotation of the tripped side, like younger adults, and potentially increasing recovery step length.

Limitations

Our number of participants, particularly fallers, was small, so we may have missed smaller effects. Second, kinematics data was sampled at a relatively low sample rate of 50Hz. However, the analyzed trip recovery period was 400ms, and arm and trunk motions are unlikely to show substantial motions at >10Hz.

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

244 Conclusion

245 Arm movements during tripping in older adults help to move the body in a more
246 favourable orientation for balance recovery in the transverse plane. While the
247 recovery step was smaller in fallers, we found only minor differences in body
248 orientation and arm contribution between fallers and non-fallers. This suggests
249 that arm movements are not a major factor differentiating fallers from non-
250 fallers.

251

252 Acknowledgements

253 SMB was funded by a VIDI grant (016.Vidi.178.014) from the Dutch Organization
254 for Scientific Research (NWO), SMB and MP were funded by a by a VIDI grant (VIDI
255 grant (no. 91714344)) from the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research (NWO)

256 Literature

257 Akinlosotu, R.Y., Alissa, N., Sorkin, J.D., Wittenberg, G.F., Westlake, K.P., 2020.
258 Age-Related Differences in Arm and Trunk Responses to First and Repeated
259 Exposure to Laterally Induced Imbalances. *Brain Sci* 10.
260 Bruijn, S.M., Meijer, O.G., Beek, P.J., van Dieen, J.H., 2010. The effects of arm
261 swing on human gait stability. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 213, 3945-3952.
262 Eng, J.J., Winter, D.A., Patla, A.E., 1994. Strategies for recovery from a trip in
263 early and late swing during human walking. *Experimental brain research*.
264 *Experimentelle Hirnforschung. Experimentation cerebrale* 102, 339-349.
265 Merrill, Z., Chambers, A.J., Cham, R., 2017. Arm reactions in response to an
266 unexpected slip-Impact of aging. *Journal of biomechanics* 58, 21-26.
267 Meyns, P., Bruijn, S.M., Duysens, J., 2013. The how and why of arm swing during
268 human walking. *Gait & posture* 38, 555-562.
269 Pijnappels, M., Bobbert, M.F., van Dieen, J.H., 2005. Push-off reactions in
270 recovery after tripping discriminate young subjects, older non-fallers and older
271 fallers. *Gait & posture* 21, 388-394.

Contribution of arm movements to trip recovery in older adults

272 Pijnappels, M., Kingma, I., Wezenberg, D., Reurink, G., Dieën, J.H., 2010. Armed
 273 against falls: the contribution of arm movements to balance recovery after
 274 tripping. *Experimental Brain Research* 201, 689-699.
 275 Roos, P.E., McGuigan, M.P., Kerwin, D.G., Trewartha, G., 2008. The role of arm
 276 movement in early trip recovery in younger and older adults. *Gait & posture* 27,
 277 352-356.
 278 Talbot, L.A., Musiol, R.J., Witham, E.K., Metter, E.J., 2005. Falls in young,
 279 middle-aged and older community dwelling adults: perceived cause,
 280 environmental factors and injury. *BMC Public Health* 5, 86.
 281

282

283