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ABSTRACT

Background and Purpose: The purpose of this study was to compare individuals with Parkinson’s disease (PD) exhibiting fear of falling avoidance behavior to those with no fear of falling avoidance behavior. Because avoidance behavior can have deleterious downstream consequences, it is important to determine what potentially mitigated physical and psychological factors are associated with it.

Subjects: Fifty-six community dwelling individuals (age=72.1 years, SD=9.6; males=42, females=14) with PD (Hoehn and Yahr Scale stage median=2.0, mode=3.0) were classified into two groups using the Fear of Falls Avoidance Behavior Questionnaire (FFABQ): avoiders (n=26, ≥20 FFABQ), and non-avoiders (n=30, <20 on the FFABQ).

Methods: Avoiders and non-avoiders were compared using five domains: demographics (age, gender, socioeconomic status (SES), education), PD (Parkinson’s Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS), Hoehn and Yahr Scale, Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39)), balance and falls (fall history, Berg Balance Scale (BBS), Activities Specific Balance Scale (ABC)), physical performance (2-minute step test (2MST), 30 second Sit to Stand Test (30STS), Timed Up and Go Test (TUGT), ActivPAL physical activity monitor data), and psychological factors (Zung Anxiety Scale (ZAS), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)).

Results: There were no differences between avoiders and non-avoiders in age, gender, SES, education, year of diagnosis, and fall history, including injurious falls (ps>0.272). Avoiders had worse scores on the MDS-UPDRS (sections I-III, ps<0.014) and the PDQ (mobility, ADLs, emotion, stigma, cognition, and bodily discomfort subscales, ps<0.028). Avoiders also exhibited poorer balance performance and less balance
confidence (BBS, \(p=0.003\); ABC, \(p<0.001\); FES, \(p=0.048\)). Avoiders reported higher depression, anxiety, and catastrophization (BDI, \(p=0.015\); ZAS, \(p=0.028\); CAFS, \(p=0.001\); CoFQ, \(p<0.001\)).

**Discussion:** Results of this study suggest that individuals with PD who report higher avoidance behaviors have more involved PD symptoms, score lower for balance, strength and conditioning, and have greater psychological distress, including depression, anxiety, and catastrophization. There were no differences in fall history between the two groups, presumably because avoiders may have avoided activities that increase the risk for a potential fall. While these findings suggest that avoidance behavior has both physical and psychological dimensions, the cause-effect relationship cannot be determined.
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INTRODUCTION

Falling is a major problem among those with Parkinson’s disease (PD) where 60.5% fall annually and 39% are recurrent fallers with an average fall rate of 20.8 times per year.\(^1\) Falls in those with PD are associated with decreased function and quality of life, an increased risk of hospital/nursing home admission, and increased mortality.\(^2-4\) Recurrent falls substantially increase the likelihood of injury and long-term disability.\(^5\) Allen et al found that fall history, longer PD history, increased motor impairment, and fear of falling (FOF) were factors associated with recurrent falling.\(^1\)

Fear of falling can easily develop among the general elderly population after experiencing a fall, with about one-third developing FOF after a fall event.\(^6\) However, Howland et al\(^7\) found that a recent fall is not necessary in developing FOF, with 20% of older individuals reporting a FOF without a recent fall, and among those with PD, a FOF appears to be unrelated to fall history.\(^8\) Individuals with PD who have FOF are estimated to be 35-59%, and as many as 70% of people with PD acknowledge activity avoidance due to a FOF.\(^9-15\) Fear of falling can lead to worry, low balance confidence, and activity avoidance, and may affect social interaction, which leads to disability.\(^7,14\)

Up to three-quarters of all adults 65 and older avoid at least one activity due to FOF, with 15% reporting severe activity restrictions.\(^16\) It is thought that catastrophization, or focusing on the worst possible outcome, can be the root of avoidance behavior and has been described as a leading cause of disability.\(^17,18\) While avoidance due to a FOF may initially decrease the chances of a fall, decreasing activity leads to lower activity...
tolerance and functional ability. The cycle of falling and FOF is propagated by impaired balance due to inactivity and postural instability in those with PD.\textsuperscript{9,19} Fear of falling can lead to various levels of activity avoidance by people, which can be described as non-avoiders and avoiders.\textsuperscript{19} Impaired balance due to inactivity, coupled with postural instability, perpetuates the cycle of falling and FOF in individuals with PD.\textsuperscript{9,19}

Avoiders may have a lower quality of life due to their decreased participation in activities of daily living. Understanding the role of fear-based avoidance of activities, and its relationship to activity and function is an important topic that has received little attention in the PD literature. Understanding this phenomenon may help to develop more effective rehabilitative treatment plans for people with PD. The purpose of this study was to examine FOF avoidance behaviors in people with PD and to identify possible differences between non-avoiders and avoiders in six different domains: demographics domain, PD domain, balance and fall domain, physical performance domain, and psychological domain. By identifying common characteristics among people with PD and high avoidance behavior, individualized treatments can be better administered and lead to improved treatment outcomes.\textsuperscript{19,20} Ultimately, this study hopes to identify modifiable and non-modifiable characteristics of high avoiders.
METHODS

Subjects

Fifty-six community dwelling individuals (age mean = 72.1 years, SD = 9.6; males = 42, females = 14) with neurologist-diagnosed idiopathic PD (Hoehn and Yahr Scale score median = 2.0, mode = 3.0) participated in this study. Participants were excluded if they were unable to read or speak English (n = 0), non-compliance (n = 1), had cognitive impairment (Mini-Mental State Exam score < 23 (n = 4)), or if they had comorbidities that significantly impaired balance (n = 0). Subjects were from local PD support groups via print ads and snowball recruitment.

Study Design

A prospective, cross-sectional research design was used to compare the characteristics of subjects with PD who were classified as having moderate/high avoidance behavior (avoiders) or low-avoidance behavior (non-avoiders) as a result of FOF. The Fear of Falling Avoidance Behavior Questionnaire (FFABQ) was used to dichotomize subjects into avoider and non-avoider groups (Table 1).

The FFABQ is based on the construct of avoidance behavior due to FOF and is a separate and distinct construct from measures of balance confidence, self-efficacy, and FOF. This questionnaire consists of 14 Likert scale items (completely disagree, disagree, unsure, agree, completely agree) related to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF) on the participation level. Scores range from 0 to 56 with higher scores indicative of more avoidance behavior. A score of 20 was determined to be the cut-point (avoiders ≥ 20; non-avoiders < 20), because an overall
score of 20 for the 14 items indicates that the average response for each item would fall into the range of “Completely disagree” or “Disagree.” In order to compare the avoiders and non-avoiders, subjects were assessed across the following five domains:

1. **Demographic domain:** this domain was used to determine if demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, socioeconomic status (income per year), educational attainment, and year of diagnosis) were associated with avoidance behavior;

2. **PD domain:** this domain included the Movement Disorder Society-Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS), Hoehn and Yahr Scale, and Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire (PDQ-39) (Table 2);

3. **Balance and fall domain:** this domain included items about subjects’ fall history that could logically be associated with avoidance behavior (fall history = more than one unexplained fall during the most recent year, recent falls = number of falls during the most recent month, fall injury = number of falls resulting in an injury) and also scales of balance performance (Berg Balance Scale (BBS)), balance confidence (Activities-Specific Balance Confidence Scale (ABC) and Falls Efficacy Scale (FES)), psychological impact of a fall (Impact of Events Scale (IES)), and fall catastrophization (Consequences of Falls Questionnaire (CoFQ) and Catastrophization about Falls Scale (CAFS) (Table 3);

4. **Physical performance domain:** this domain was used to understand subjects’ current state of strength and conditioning (Two Minute Step Test (2MST), 30 Second Sit to Stand Test (30STS)), functional mobility (Timed-Up and Go Test
(TUGT)), and average daily physical activity levels using activPAL monitors\(^1\) (Metabolic equivalents (METS) expended, time sitting or lying, time standing, time stepping, number of steps taken, and up/down transitions) (Table 4); and,

5. **Psychological domain:** this domain was used to determine the role of other psychological constructs putatively associated with the consequences of experiencing a fall or having balance impairment (Zung Anxiety Scale (ZAS) and Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)) (Table 5).

Data for all subjects were collected at the subjects’ residence since it was theorized that many high avoiders would be reluctant to leave their homes for participation in a study. Subjects were assessed twice: once for the initial assessment and once approximately one week later to collect the activity monitor and self-report questionnaires (Figure 1).

**Data Analysis**

All data were analyzed using SPSS version 21.0.\(^2\) The level of significance for all of the analyses was set at \( \alpha = 0.05 \). Avoiders and non-avoiders were compared using t-tests for all parametric variables unless there was a violation of an assumption wherein a Mann-Whitney nonparametric analysis was used. Mann-Whitney analyses were also utilized for dependent variables at the ordinal measurement level. Chi-square was used to compare gender proportions.

---
\(^1\)PAL Technologies LTD, Glasgow, United Kingdom  
\(^2\)SPSS Inc, Chicago, Illinois
RESULTS

Demographic domain

There were no differences between avoiders and non-avoiders in age, gender, SES, education, year of PD diagnosis, and mental status (ps>0.221) (Table 1).

PD domain

Avoiders had worse scores on the MDS-UPDRS (sections I-III, ps<0.014) and the PDQ-39 (mobility, ADLs, emotion, stigma, cognition, and bodily discomfort subscales, ps<0.028) (Table 1). No statistically significant differences were found between avoiders and non-avoiders in the following variables: MDS-UPDRS section IV, Hoehn & Yahr score, PDQ Social support, PDQ Communication (p>0.14)(Table 1; Figures 2,3).

Balance and fall domain

While there were no differences between avoiders and non-avoiders in fall history and injurious falls (ps≥0.292), avoiders exhibited significantly poorer balance performance (BBS, p=0.003) (Table 1; Figure 4). Additionally, avoiders reported less balance confidence (ABC, p<0.001; FES, p=0.048) and were more likely to catastrophize about falls (CoFQ, p≤0.001; CAFS, p=0.001) (Table 1; Figure 5). For individuals reporting a fall history (avoiders n=22; non-avoiders n=18), the IES was used to explore the subjective impact of a traumatic event (i.e., fall/falls). Avoiders exhibited greater total subjective stress (p=0.018) and more feelings of intrusion (p=0.006), avoidance (p=0.050), and hyperarousal (p=0.023) from the fall/falls (Table 1; Figure 6).
Physical performance domain

There were no differences between avoiders and non-avoiders on the TUGT (p=0.100) and the 2MST (p=0.110); however, avoiders had fewer completions on the 30STS test (p=0.029) (Table 1; Figure 7). Average daily activity levels (hours stepping per day, steps taken in a day, METs per day) were lower for avoiders (ps≤0.018) (Table 1; Figure 8).

Psychological domain

Avoiders reported more depressive symptoms (BDI, p=0.015) and anxiety (ZAS, p=0.028) than non-avoiders (Table 1; Figure 9).
DISCUSSION

These results indicate that individuals with PD who report higher avoidance behaviors have more involved PD symptoms, reduced scores for balance and physical performance, as well as greater psychological distress, including depression, anxiety, and catastrophization. There were no differences in fall history between the two groups despite the fact that avoiders had lower balance performance and lower balance confidence. It is theorized that avoiders may be naturally responding to their own sense of balance confidence by avoiding activities that put them at risk for a fall. While these findings suggest that avoidance behavior has both physical and psychological dimensions, the cause-effect relationship cannot be determined. Therefore, it is unclear whether the avoidance behavior has caused these symptoms or if these symptoms have caused the avoidance behavior.

Demographic profiles of the individuals in the two groups were found to be similar between avoiders and non-avoiders, with no significant between group difference in age, SES, education, or year of diagnosis. As such, the results suggest that these non-modifiable demographic factors are not the primary contributors to FOF avoidance behaviors.

The MDS-UPDRS overall score, and mental, ADL, and motor subscales were significantly different between avoiders and non-avoiders. The difference in subjective mental measures include memory, cognition, hallucinations, anxiety, depression, bowel and bladder complications, pain, fatigue, and apathy. The differences between the two
groups suggest that these non-motor aspects of PD that increase with disease progression are also likely to play a role in FOF avoidance behavior. On the other hand, it is possible that these symptoms may indicate disease severity and are not directly related to FOF avoidance behavior. In consideration of the former, addressing these factors with pharmacotherapeutic approaches may lead to decreased activity avoidance and a resultant increase in QOL of individuals with PD. The ADL subscale is the one section of the MDS-UPDRS that is completely self-reported. The significantly higher scores in the avoiders compared to the non-avoiders supports their awareness of their impaired function and/or their lack of confidence in their ability to perform various ADLs. The difference between the avoiders and non-avoiders in the motor subsection of the MDS-UPDRS including key motor symptoms of PD of rigidity, resting tremor, bradykinesia, akinesia, and postural instability indicates a potential role of increasing severity of these symptoms on FOF and resultant avoidance of activities. Again, it is difficult to ascertain if these motor have caused the FOF avoidance behavior or if the avoidance behavior has caused the neurodegeneration to progress more rapidly. Several studies suggest that physical inactivity can increase the risk for PD and increase the rate of PD progression.

While Masud et al reported approximately one third of older people develop FOF after an incidental fall, not all people who have a FOF have a history of falls, and not all people with a history of falls have a FOF. According to Howland et al, 20% of individuals without a recent history of falls reported to be very or somewhat afraid of experiencing a fall. When compared to experiencing an actual fall, the FOF may be more
problematic and a greater contributor to activity avoidance for individuals with or without a fall history. The lack of a difference in the current study’s results found in fall history (number of falls within the past year, number of falls within the past month, and total number of falls resulting in injury) is consistent with this notion. The results support other previous findings that FOF and related avoidance behaviors are not the direct result of a prior incident and are multifactorial.

Activity avoidance minimizes participation in common tasks that would require normal body movements such as weight-bearing, weight-shifting, and reaching outside one’s base of support. An inverse relationship was found between FOF avoidance level and subjective, self-report balance questionnaire scores, including the ABC. Clinically, balance confidence may be an important, potentially modifiable target for health care providers to assess and treat in PD. Evidence suggests that clinical-setting balance confidence can be improved with skilled intervention.

As functional balance declines, a person is more likely to cope with their lack of balance by avoiding the tasks that challenge balance altogether. Consequently, a reduction in activity due to FOF, poor balance, and low balance confidence may contribute to physical deconditioning, functional decline, social isolation, and decreased QOL, which are factors correlating with increased fall incidence. The results of this study suggest that PD avoiders are indeed less physically conditioned as is evidenced by lower 30STS scores. Again, based on the design of the present study, it is difficult to determine if the deconditioning is a cause of the avoidance behavior or the result thereof. It is also
possible that this relationship could be bidirectional, which would result in a vicious cycle.

Although the findings of the 30STS suggest a relationship between strength and FOF avoidance behavior classification, other measures, including TUGT and 2MST, do not. While 2MST requires single leg balance and functional lower extremity range of motion, its ability to be used as an isolated measure of strength may be limited. A potential floor and ceiling effect of the TUGT may exist in this study cohort. However, future large-scale studies would be necessary to examine the relationship between FOF and physical performance.

All psychological factors utilized in this study assessed were different between the two groups. This finding is supported by the finding by Howland et al\textsuperscript{17} who suggests that activity avoidance is not just associated with extreme levels of fear but rather is complex and multifactorial. Previous research, including Lachman et al,\textsuperscript{18} has proposed a multidimensional treatment approach for addressing fall risk. This approach may entail assessment of avoidance behaviors, anxiety, and depression, while attempting to alter a person’s sense of control over falls through cognitive restructuring. The findings of the present study support this approach and of approaches utilizing physical and psychological interventions for FOF avoidance behaviors.
CONCLUSION

This study suggests that individuals with PD who show higher avoidance behaviors report more involved PD symptoms, reduced scores of balance and physical performance, as well as greater psychological distress, including depression, anxiety, and catastrophization. Avoidance behaviors in individuals with PD have not been found to be a direct consequence of a fall incident and resultant fear of future falls but rather have been demonstrated to be multifactorial. This study suggests that when treating patients with PD, the contributing factors to patients’ FOF avoidance behaviors outlined previously should be taken into consideration. Further research is needed to confirm whether modifiable factors (physical performance, balance, balance confidence) identified in this study can be improved with rehabilitative treatment.
APPENDIX A- TABLES

Table 1. Comparisons of avoiders and non-avoiders using t-tests with means (standard deviations) of the five domains. Several analyses were conducted using non-parametric analyses (indicated). In those cases, medians (ranges) and frequencies are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Non-Avoiders N=30</th>
<th>Avoiders N=26</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.5 (9.4)</td>
<td>72.7 (9.9)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 males (80.0%)</td>
<td>18 males (69.2%)</td>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status (SES)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50-75,000</td>
<td>$50-75,000</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney*</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BS degree</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis year</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005.8 (4.2)</td>
<td>2004.4 (4.8)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Mental State Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.1 (1.3)</td>
<td>28.7 (1.2)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease subtype</td>
<td></td>
<td>PIGD (55.2%)</td>
<td>PIGD (69.2%)</td>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PD domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement Disorders Society (MDS)-UPDRS I (non-motor experiences of daily living)</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.5 (28.4)</td>
<td>82.2 (21.5)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDS-UPDRS II (motor experiences of daily living)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5 (8.6)</td>
<td>22.3 (7.5)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDS-UPDRS III (Motor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8 (15.6)</td>
<td>37.0 (14.2)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDS-UPDRS IV (Motor complications)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 (4.4)</td>
<td>5.6 (4.8)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoehn &amp; Yahr</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 (40.0%)</td>
<td>3.0 (46.2%)</td>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire (PDQ)-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.7 (13.7)</td>
<td>36.3 (14.2)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.2 (22.1)</td>
<td>50.0 (20.9)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ ADLs</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.6 (21.3)</td>
<td>41.4 (20.9)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7 (14.4)</td>
<td>29.2 (18.4)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Stigma</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0 (13.8)</td>
<td>22.1 (19.9)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Social support</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1 (15.8)</td>
<td>22.1 (24.0)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1 (22.5)</td>
<td>40.4 (17.2)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.5 (23.3)</td>
<td>41.3 (20.5)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ Bodily discomfort</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.8 (20.2)</td>
<td>42.6 (24.7)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls in the last year</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4 (24.8)</td>
<td>16.6 (68.1)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney*</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls in the last month</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 (15.5)</td>
<td>1.4 (5.9)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney*</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injurious falls in the last year</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6 (1.6)</td>
<td>0.4 (0.6)</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney*</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Events Scale – revised</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73 (2.00)</td>
<td>3.38 (2.21)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Events Scale – avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63 (0.73)</td>
<td>1.11 (0.79)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Events Scale – intrusion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.28 (0.81)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Events Scale – hyperarousal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53 (0.68)</td>
<td>1.10 (0.81)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg Balance Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.8 (11.8)</td>
<td>38.3 (10.5)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities-Specific Balance Confidence Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.7 (23.8)</td>
<td>50.9 (19.6)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of Falls Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.6 (5.0)</td>
<td>30.7 (5.2)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls Efficacy Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4 (16.2)</td>
<td>33.4 (24.2)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catastrophizing about Falls Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 (2.1)</td>
<td>7.4 (1.8)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance and fall domain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical performance domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-minute Step Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.8 (36.8)</td>
<td>41.5 (37.1)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Second Sit-To-Stand Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8 (7.4)</td>
<td>6.8 (5.6)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed Up and Go Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1 (6.2)</td>
<td>20.7 (27.0)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours sitting/laying down per day</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7 (1.9)</td>
<td>19.7 (3.1)</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours standing per day</td>
<td>4.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (2.2)</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours stepping per day</td>
<td>1.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>0.7 (0.8)</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps taken in a day</td>
<td>5798 (2580)</td>
<td>3381 (3878)</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up/down transitions</td>
<td>51.6 (12.4)</td>
<td>46.5 (21.6)</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolic equivalents (METs) per day</td>
<td>32.8 (1.1)</td>
<td>31.8 (1.7)</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological domain</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zung Anxiety Scale</td>
<td>43.3 (9.8)</td>
<td>49.2 (9.6)</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck Depression Inventory</td>
<td>9.6 (6.9)</td>
<td>15.2 (9.7)</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Violation of an assumption of normal distribution or non-parametric dependent variable

# Indicates a significant difference at p <0.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Evidence for reliability</th>
<th>Evidence for validity in PD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDS-UPDRS(^{27})</td>
<td>65 item clinical rating scale for PD including interview, clinician rating and self-assessment of PD severity that has 4 parts: I. Non motor experiences of daily living; II. Motor experiences of daily living; III. Motor examination; IV. Motor complications</td>
<td>High internal consistency (Cronbach’s α= 0.79 – 0.93 across parts)</td>
<td>Found to be highly correlated with the original UPDRS (r=.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoehn and Yahr(^{28})</td>
<td>0 to 5 Staging scale that provides a general estimate of disease severity clinical function in PD 5 with 0 indicating that the individual is asymptomatic and 5 indicating severely impaired postural stability and functional mobility.</td>
<td>Good reliably for moderate stages (2-4)(^{28})</td>
<td>Correlations with β-CIT SPECT scanning(^{29}) and fluorodopa PET scanning(^{30}) suggesting convergent validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ-39(^{31,32})</td>
<td>Self-report measure of PD related QOL with 39 items in 8 sections (mobility, activities of daily living, emotional well-being, stigma, social support, cognition, communication, bodily discomfort). Each item ranges from 0 (never) to 4 (always). The mean of each section and the overall mean are obtained for analysis. Respondents must affirm one of five categories (from never to always), because of their PD, they have experienced the problem defined by each item during the past month.</td>
<td>Cronbach’s α= 0.72 – 0.95; test-retest reliability .76 – 0.93</td>
<td>Correlations found with BDI&gt;17, MMSE&lt;25, history of falls, postural instability and gait impairments (p &lt; 0.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Balance and fall domain variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Evidence for reliability</th>
<th>Evidence for validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falls Efficacy Scale (FES)(^33)</td>
<td>Measure of one’s confidence in their ability to avoid falling during daily activities with 10 items answered on a 10-point scale. 1 being very confident and 10 being not at all confident. A total score of &gt;70 indicates a fear of falling</td>
<td>High internal consistency (Cronbach’s (\alpha = .90)) and test retest reliability ((r=0.71))(^33)</td>
<td>Concurrent validity with ABC scale ((r = 0.83))(^34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catastrophizing about Falling Questionnaire (CFQ)(^35)</td>
<td>Three questions assessing the perceived impact that a fall would have on one’s functional status answered on a 4 point scale. A score of 12/12 indicates the highest degree of catastrophization</td>
<td>High internal consistency (Cronbach’s (\alpha = .83))(^17)</td>
<td>Independent predictor of concerns about falling and subsequent mobility restrictions(^17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Events Scale (IES)(^36)(^37)</td>
<td>15 item self-report measure to assess subjective distress levels related to a specific life event. The total score is the overall subjective stress from the event (fall/falls). There are three subscales: intrusion (e.g., intrusive thoughts, nightmares, intrusive feelings and imagery, dissociative-like re-experiencing), avoidance (e.g., numbness of responsiveness, avoidance of feelings, situations, and ideas), and hyperarousal (e.g., anger, irritability, hypervigilance, difficulty concentrating, heightened startle).</td>
<td>High internal consistency (Cronbach’s (\alpha = .86) for intrusion, and Cronbach’s (\alpha = .82) for avoidance)(^38)</td>
<td>Can discriminate between stress reactions at different times after an event and highly correlates with post-traumatic stress disorder diagnosis(^38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg Balance Scale (BBS)(^39)</td>
<td>Clinician-rated assessment of balance with 14 tasks. Scores range from 0 to 56 with higher scores suggesting better balance performance.</td>
<td>Excellent test-retest reliability (ICC = 0.94)(^40) and interrater reliability (ICC = 0.95 in PD)(^41)</td>
<td>Area under the ROC curve (0.851) for predicting fall status in those with PD(^42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed Up and Go Test (TUGT)(^43)</td>
<td>A timed test of functional mobility consisting of time it takes to rise from a chair, walk three meters, turn around, walk back to the chair, and sit down.</td>
<td>Good test-retest reliability in PD (ICCs &lt; 0.80)(^40)(^44) and excellent interrater reliability ((r=0.99)) in PD(^45)</td>
<td>Moderate to good convergent validity evidence in PD (correlated with the BBS ((r=0.78)), Fast gait speed ((r=0.69)), and comfortable gait speed ((r=0.67))(^46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Physical performance domain variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Evidence for reliability</th>
<th>Evidence for validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Minute Step Test (2MST)</strong>$^{47}$</td>
<td>Functional measure of aerobic endurance by counting the number of full right knee steps subject make, raising each leg to a height midway between the patella and iliac crest, in a two minute period.</td>
<td>Excellent test-retest reliability (ICC=0.95)$^{48}$</td>
<td>Able to discriminate physically active from sedentary older adults$^{48}$ and also exercisers and nonexercisers$^{47}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ActivPAL</strong> Activity monitor</td>
<td>Electronic device measuring five components: hours standing, hours stepping, hours sitting or lying, up/down transitions, and metabolic equivalent of tasks</td>
<td>Inter-device reliability of step number and cadence: ICC (2,1) ≥ 0.99$^{49}$</td>
<td>Absolute percentage of error &lt;1% for outdoor ambulation, &lt;2% for walking speeds of ≤0.67 m/s$^{50}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30 second Sit-to-Stand Test (30STS)</strong>$^{47,51}$</td>
<td>Assessment of one’s ability to perform repeated sit to stands from a chair for 30 seconds as a measure of functional lower extremity strength</td>
<td>Excellent test-retest reliability (ICCs&gt;0.84)$^{48,51}$</td>
<td>Able to discriminate physically active from sedentary older adults$^{48}$ and also exercisers and nonexercisers$^{47}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Psychological domain variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Evidence for reliability</th>
<th>Evidence for validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zung Anxiety Scale (ZAS)</strong></td>
<td>A self-rating instrument for anxiety disorders with 20 items that are identified by: a little, some, good part, or most of the time.</td>
<td>Good item-total correlations and a good test-retest reliability in non-PD populations</td>
<td>In non-PD patients it has shown to be sensitive to change in treatment studies of anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)</strong></td>
<td>Most widely used instrument for measuring the severity of depression based on symptoms from 21-items rated by the individual on a 0-3 scale.</td>
<td>Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.88$ and ICC = 0.89 in patients with PD</td>
<td>85.67% - 88.0% area under the ROC curve for distinguishing depressed from nondepressed in PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B - FIGURES

Figure 1. Overall study design.

Diagnosing Parkinson’s disease leads to fear of falling and avoidance behavior.

- **Non-avoiders**
  - Demographic domain: Age, Gender, Socioeconomic status, Education, Diagnosis Year
  - Parkinson’s disease domain: MDS-UPDRS, Hoehn & Yahr Scale, PDQ39

- **Avoiders**
  - Balance and fall domain: Falls in the last year, Falls in the last month, Falls resulting in injury, Berg Balance Scale, ABC, Falls Efficacy Scale, Impact of Events Scale, Consequences of Falls Questionnaire, Catastrophizing about Falls Scale
  - Physical performance domain: 2-minute Step Test, 30 Second Sit-To-Stand Test, Timed Up and Go Test, Physical activity monitoring
  - Psychological domain: Zung Anxiety Scale, Beck Depression Inventory
Figure 2. Radar plot of non-avoiders and avoiders on the Movement Disorders Society Unified Parkinson’s Disease Rating Scale (MDS-UPDRS) total score and each of the four subscales.
Figure 3. Radar plot of non-avoiders and avoiders on the Parkinson’s Disease Questionnaire – 39 (PDQ-39) total score and each of the eight subscales.
Figure 4. A comparison of non-avoiders and avoiders across three different measures of fall history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non-avoiders</th>
<th>Avoiders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falls in the last year</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls in the last month</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injurious falls in the last year</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 5.** Radar plot of non-avoiders and avoiders on measures of balance and related issues.
Figure 6. Radar plot of non-avoiders and avoiders on the Impact of Events Scale and each of the three subscales.
Figure 7. A comparison of non-avoiders and avoiders on three different measures of physical performance.
Figure 8. Radar plot of non-avoiders and avoiders on time spent in different daily physical activities.
Figure 9. A comparison of non-avoiders and avoiders on anxiety and depression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zung Anxiety Scale</th>
<th>BECK DEPRESSION INVENTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Avoiders</td>
<td>Avoiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.13</td>
<td>67.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>24.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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