



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Aging Clin Exp Res. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 October 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Aging Clin Exp Res. 2023 October ; 35(10): 1991–2007. doi:10.1007/s40520-023-02503-x.

Accelerometry applications and methods to assess standing balance in older adults and mobility-limited patient populations: A narrative review

Kayla Bohlke^a, Mark S Redfern^a, Andrea L Rosso^b, Ervin Sejdic^{c,d,*}

^aDepartment of Bioengineering, Swanson School of Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Ave, Pittsburgh, PA, 15260, USA

^bDepartment of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Ave, Pittsburgh, PA, 15260, USA

^cThe Edward S. Rogers Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, University of Toronto, 27 King's College Cir, Toronto, Ontario, ON M5S, Canada

^dNorth York General Hospital, 4001 Leslie St., Toronto, Ontario, ON M2K, Canada

Abstract

Accelerometers provide an opportunity to expand standing balance assessments outside of the laboratory. The purpose of this narrative review is to show that accelerometers are accurate, objective, and accessible tools for balance assessment. Accelerometry has been validated against current gold standard technology, such as optical motion capture systems and force plates. Many studies have been conducted to show how accelerometers can be useful for clinical examinations. Recent studies have begun to apply classification algorithms to accelerometry balance measures to discriminate populations at risk for falls. In addition to healthy older adults, accelerometry can monitor balance in patient populations such as Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, and traumatic brain injury. The lack of software packages or easy-to-use applications have hindered the shift into the clinical space. Lack of consensus on outcome metrics has also slowed the clinical adoption of accelerometer-based balance assessments. Future studies should focus on metrics that are most helpful to evaluate balance in specific populations and protocols that are clinically efficacious.

Keywords

accelerometry; balance; fall risk; accessibility

*Corresponding Author: ervin.sejdic@utoronto.ca.
Author Contributions

The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: review conception and design: K. Bohlke, E. Sejdic, A. L. Rosso; data collection, analysis, and interpretation of literature: K. Bohlke; draft manuscript preparation: K. Bohlke, A. L. Rosso, M. S. Redfern, E. Sejdic. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

1 Introduction

Over one quarter of adults over the age of 65 fall every year; and of those falls, 10% of them result in injury (Moreland et al., 2020). The highest rates of injury-related hospitalizations and death for older adults are due to falls (Stevens et al., 2006). Annually, \$50 billion is spent on fall-related healthcare costs in the United States (Florence et al., 2018). Further, many older adults develop a fear of falling, whether or not they have a history of falls. Fear of falling can lead to decreases in socialization, independence, mobility, quality of life, and life expectancy (Segev-Jacobovski et al., 2011). With the national population of older adults expected to increase by 40% by 2030 (Moreland et al., 2020), the impact of falls will only increase without better detection and prevention. Declines in static balance performance have been associated with falls (Rogers et al., 2003). While many studies examine gait of individuals to assess fall risk, standing balance assessment is easier to perform and administer, requiring less of the individual and of the testing environment. Static, standing balance only requires the individual to keep their center of gravity over an immobile base of support, meaning the feet are not moving. Standing balance measurements have the potential to minimize burden on the patient and the clinician. Using accelerometry will additionally reduce that burden by providing objective measurements in a noninvasive manner. Recent systematic reviews have explored accelerometry for balance assessment in older adults as a method of early diagnosis (Leirós-Rodríguez et al., 2019), in children to monitor psychomotor development (García-Soidán et al., 2021), in patient populations (Anderson et al., 2018; Valenciano et al., 2022), as well as for comparisons to alternative cost-effective devices for gait assessment (Zhong & Rau, 2020). This narrative review provides a broader exploration of how accelerometry is currently used for measuring balance characteristics, comparisons to laboratory technology and clinical assessments, and brief explorations into different applications for various patient populations.

Accelerometry is becoming more ever-present in society as most people carry around at least one smart device that has embedded accelerometers. This highlights the potential of accelerometry to be better utilized in clinical settings for balance assessments. With every smart device such as phones, tablets, and watches having pre-installed accelerometers, these sensors have never been more available or more affordable. Technological advancements have led to increased sensitivity of these devices (Whitney et al., 2011). Accelerometers have been used to measure standing balance through the recording and processing of sway accelerations. Most studies have been conducted in the laboratory setting; however, there is now the potential to transition this methodology to the clinic. Current clinical evaluations of balance are heavily reliant on subjective observations by a physician and often suffer from ceiling and floor effects. Accelerometers can provide objective measurements with higher granularity for diagnostic tests and patient monitoring.

Accelerometers are portable, opening the possibility to move beyond a laboratory setting. They also allow for more freedom of movement for the subject. In contrast, traditional methods of evaluating balance with motion capture systems and force plates require a fixed environment and only allow for minimal subject movement (Whitney et al., 2011). This portability allows for more freedom in experimental design and provides the opportunity for assessments to take place in less controlled settings. Increasingly, accelerometers have

been implemented to assess fall risk, detect falls, and diagnose and monitor changes in mobility conditions (Bet et al., 2019; Buckley et al., 2019; Islam et al., 2019; Lippi et al., 2023; Montesinos et al., 2018; Wilson et al., 2021). Incorporating technology, like sensory biofeedback or exergames, into fall prevention and mobility interventions is also an area of expanding research (Calafiore et al., 2021; Choi et al., 2017; Valenzuela et al., 2018). Developing and implementing new technologies for early detection, diagnosis, and fall prevention are important steps in reducing falls. In addition to their portability, accelerometers are affordable, easy to use, and allow for more continuous and close monitoring of changes over time.

We propose that accelerometers have an advantage over current standard practices as they provide objective quantification of balance that is highly correlated with several clinical and laboratory balance assessments while also being economical and accessible. Here we review the emerging literature on the use of accelerometers to assess balance to demonstrate their potential for clinical use.

This review focuses on accelerometry methods for standing balance. The different metrics calculated from the collected acceleration time-series are described, including emerging data analytic techniques used to classify high and low fall risk. We discuss the different patient populations where accelerometry measures of standing balance are being used. We conclude with a discussion of current limitations and future applications.

2 Methods

Publications for this narrative review were obtained using Google Scholar, PubMed, and Web of Sciences databases. Groups of search terms were used to find publications that focused on accelerometry to assess balance in older adults. The following groups of search terms were used: 1) “accelerometry” “postural control” and 2) “accelerometry” “community” “balance” “older adults”. Publications were included if they were experimental studies using accelerometry to measure balance published in English. Other inclusion criteria were: 1) outcome metrics were derived from acceleration signals; AND 2) study population performed static, standing balance tasks which includes standing on one or both legs, in any stance, on compliant surfaces; AND either 3) study population focused on older adults or mobility-limited, adult, patient populations; OR 4) accelerometers or smart devices using accelerometry were compared to force plates, motion capture systems. We also included publications that used accelerometers or smart devices using accelerometry to 5) compare or predict scores of clinical balance assessments OR 6) provide sensory (e.g., auditory, visual, vibrotactile) feedback of balance performance. If these criteria were not met, publications were excluded. Publications that focused on gait assessment were not considered unless the study included postural control assessments as well. The data collection, analysis, and interpretation of the included publications were conducted by a single reviewer (K.Bohlke). The search was completed on May 26th of 2023.

3 Standing Balance Overview

Balance is defined as the ability to keep the center of gravity over the base of support. Good balance means that your body's position can be controlled and well maintained in static and dynamic conditions (Meyer & Ayalon, 2006). Static balance is defined by having a base of support that is not moving, but postural adjustments are still required to keep the center of gravity over the base of support. Upright standing is the most common posture. Walking, on the other hand, is defined as a "dynamic" balance task that requires postural adjustments to keep the center of gravity over a moving base of support (Meyer & Ayalon, 2006). Postural control requires several neural systems to work together. The motor system and several sensory systems form the control pathway for balance, as well as other deeper motor systems like the basal ganglia and the cerebellum (Mierau et al., 2017). Somatosensory, visual, and vestibular information combine to help the nervous system maintain balance. The sensory systems detect the status of the body, monitoring the current state of balance. This information undergoes sensory integration within the brain. The sensory feedback helps inform motor commands that are sent back to the body (Zampogna et al., 2020). Breakdowns in any aspect of this control system can lead to balance deficits and increase the risk of falling.

As adults age, they are more likely to fall due to various reasons: muscle weakness, joint pain, poor vision, neuropathy, and pathologies like vestibular disorders, Parkinson's disease, and dementia. However, postural stability declines with age, even without overt disease pathology (Rosso et al., 2017). This age-related decline is being studied in various ways to see how balance becomes less automatic, requiring more cognitive resources to perform what was once automatic (Holtzer et al., 2007; Rosso et al., 2017; Woollacott & Shumway-Cook, 2002). Additionally, research has indicated that older adults may have deficits in sensory integration, or an inability to reweight sensory inputs (Redfern et al., 2019). Detecting balance changes early enough is imperative to develop effective preventative care. There are many different balance assessments, some relying only on clinicians and others requiring laboratory equipment. With an increasingly aging population, fall prevention will become that much more important, necessitating an increase in balance assessment accessibility.

Modeling the body as a single inverted pendulum is the basis for most static balance measurements, particularly when using force plates. This model also assumes that the body acts as a single link about the ankle. The center of mass (CoM) of that link is defined by the anthropometry of the individual and is approximately at the level of the navel. The center of pressure (CoP), measured using force plates, is reflective of the torques about the angle that control the position of the CoM against gravity (Whitney et al., 2011). Force plates track under-foot CoP by measuring the location of the resultant vertical ground reaction force vector (Moe-Nilssen & Helbostad, 2002). The difference between CoP and CoM is proportional to CoM movement (Moe-Nilssen, 1998; Winter, 1995). The difference between CoP and CoM is reflective of the torque response required to maintain upright balance. In this inverted pendulum model, the sensory systems involved in balance (vision, proprioception, and vestibular) are used to establish the position and velocity of movement

of the body about the ankle and ankle torques are generated (reflected in the CoP) to control the CoM position to maintain stability (Moe-Nilssen, 1998; Winter, 1995).

The single inverted pendulum model is an approximation. In reality, the other joints of the body (e.g., hip, knee) also can play a role. For example, movement about the hip as well as the ankle can be used to control upright stance. Different balance strategies, ankle strategy versus hip strategy, result in different movement relationships (Panzer et al., 1995). Ankle strategy, i.e. control about the ankle, is more likely to be used by younger, healthier individuals, whereas hip strategy is more common in older adults and in pathological cases like vestibular problems, peripheral neuropathy (Manchester et al., 1989), or ankle sprains (Abe et al., 2014).

4 Accelerometry

A uniaxial accelerometer measures acceleration in one direction. Tri-axial accelerometers measure acceleration in three orthogonal directions which are commonly aligned along medial-lateral, vertical, and anterior-posterior axes respectively. Most modern accelerometers are developed using micro-electromechanical systems (MEMS) technology (Martínez et al., 2021). MEMS accelerometers can be classified by how acceleration is sensed: capacitive, piezoresistive, piezoelectric, optical, inductive, etc. (Niu et al., 2018). These methods for measuring acceleration are all based on simple mass-spring systems and Hooke's Law (Mathie et al., 2004) (Fig. 1a). Fig. 1b shows a simplified example of how this mass-spring system would look in a capacitive MEMS accelerometer. As the mass in the system moves, the distance between electrodes changes. The difference between in the capacitance of the two capacitors is proportional to the acceleration the sensor is experiencing (Martínez et al., 2021).

Accelerometry can monitor the approximate accelerations of the CoM of the human body when affixed to the low back. Many studies have used the lower back as the location for their accelerometer placement, with several describing the location as the L3 level of the spine (Adleron et al., 2003; Bohlke et al., 2021; Cerrito et al., 2015; D'Silva et al., 2017; Ihira et al., 2016; Kosse et al., 2015; Lamoth & van Heuvelen, 2012; Makizako et al., 2013; Martínez-Ramírez et al., 2011; McManus et al., 2022; Moe-Nilssen & Helbostad, 2002; O'Sullivan et al., 2009; Saunders et al., 2015). However, some researchers also use the L4 (Alsubaie et al., 2022; Armstrong et al., 2010; Caña-Pino et al., 2021, 2023; T. Chen et al., 2018; Cruz-Montecinos, Carrasco, et al., 2020; Dasgupta et al., 2022; Doheny et al., 2012; Johnston et al., 2020; Mansson et al., 2021; Pau et al., 2017), L5 (Chiari et al., 2005; Del Din et al., 2016; Flood et al., 2020; Fuschillo et al., 2012; Godfrey et al., 2015; Greene et al., 2014; Halická et al., 2014; Heebner et al., 2015; Huisinga et al., 2018; Kegelmeyer et al., 2017; King et al., 2014; Lindemann et al., 2012; Mancini et al., 2011; Mancini, Carlson-Kuhta, et al., 2012; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; Neville et al., 2015; Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018; Pirini et al., 2011; Porciuncula et al., 2020), or S2 (Cho & Kamen, 1998; De Groote et al., 2021; Ibara et al., 2021; Schelldorfer et al., 2015) levels. Other studies use a range from L3-L5 (Lee et al., 2016; Shahzad et al., 2017; Weiss et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2021), L5-S1 (Olsen et al., 2023; Turcot et al., 2009), or describe the sensor placement as the lower back (Alberts et al., 2015; Alqahtani et al., 2017,

2020; Buchman et al., 2020; Dawe et al., 2018; Doherty et al., 2017; Fuschillo et al., 2012; Hasegawa et al., 2021; Helbostad et al., 2004; Howcroft et al., 2016; Howell et al., 2019; Najafi et al., 2010; Narayanan et al., 2010; Pantall, Del Din, et al., 2018; Similä et al., 2014, 2017; Wall & Weinberg, 2003), waist (Furman et al., 2013; Kasser et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2011; Marchetti et al., 2013; Navarrete-Opazo et al., 2017; Suttanon et al., 2020; Whitney et al., 2011), or sacrum (Matheron et al., 2016; Noamani et al., 2021; Ozinga et al., 2017). Additional common accelerometer placements on the body include the chest (Cerrito et al., 2015; Cruz-Montecinos, Cuesta-Vargas, et al., 2020; Dewan et al., 2019; Doheny et al., 2013; Dugan et al., 2021; Frechette et al., 2020; Greene et al., 2014; Hasegawa et al., 2021; Hsieh et al., 2019; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Huisinga et al., 2018; Janssen et al., 2008; Kasser et al., 2015; Mejía et al., 2023; Navarrete-Opazo et al., 2017; Parvaneh et al., 2017; Reynard et al., 2019; Rivolta et al., 2019), the shins (Flood et al., 2020; Fuschillo et al., 2012; Greene et al., 2014; Hasegawa et al., 2021; Howcroft et al., 2016; Huisinga et al., 2018; Olsen et al., 2023; Schwenk et al., 2014; Turcot et al., 2009), and the thighs (Armstrong et al., 2010; Doheny et al., 2013; Flood et al., 2020; Fuschillo et al., 2012; Greene et al., 2014; Löppönen et al., 2021; Schellendorfer et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2021). Howcroft *et al.* tested faller classification models based on accelerations recorded from different locations. The best single-accelerometer classifiers were from head and pelvis accelerometers. However, the pelvis location was better for the dual-task experiments classification model because the head often makes non-balance related movements during cognitive tasks (Howcroft et al., 2016). Additional accelerometers can be added to allow for more joints to be included in biomechanical model assumptions, allowing for double-link (Najafi et al., 2010) and even triple-link models (Fuschillo et al., 2012) (Fig. 2). For the double-link model, accelerometers are placed on the trunk and the shank, accounting for the ankle and hip joints (Najafi et al., 2010). The knee joint can be added for the triple-link model by placing another sensor on the thigh (Fuschillo et al., 2012).

5 Balance Measures

In this review, we focused on experimental papers that measured features directly from acceleration signals during standing balance. The most common outcome measures for accelerometry-based balance assessments are in the medial-lateral (ML) and anterior-posterior (AP) directions. Some studies use the resultant vector which combines the ML and AP signals into signal in the transverse plane. The most reported metrics used in the studies in this review are root-mean-square, jerk, normalized path length, 95% confidence ellipse area, 95% power frequency, and sample entropy (and additional variables derived from sample entropy like multiscale entropy and complexity index) (Table 1).

6 Comparison of Accelerometry to Laboratory Measurements

6.a Gold Standard Laboratory Technology

In the laboratory setting, researchers use a variety of technologies to evaluate balance. Motion capture systems and force plates are by far the most common and are considered the gold standard. The following describes studies that compare accelerometry measures to those taken with force plates and motion capture.

Force plates are the most common balance evaluation technology used in research laboratories. Changes in CoP location during standing can show how the body adjusts to different postural conditions. Accelerometry measurements have been compared many times to force plate measurements (Abe et al., 2014; Adlerton et al., 2003; Alberts et al., 2015; Cerrito et al., 2015; Chiari et al., 2005; De Groote et al., 2021; Dewan et al., 2019; Doherty et al., 2017; Fuschillo et al., 2012; Heebner et al., 2015; Hsieh et al., 2019; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Hu et al., 2020; Janssen et al., 2008; Lindemann et al., 2012; Mancini et al., 2011; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; Neville et al., 2015; Whitney et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2021), some of which have found that accelerometers have comparable or higher reliability than force plates (Cerrito et al., 2015; Whitney et al., 2011). Force plate CoP metrics and accelerometry measurements are not perfectly correlated. Even in studies where both accelerometers and force plates can distinguish between patient populations (Hsieh et al., 2019; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012) or task conditions (De Groote et al., 2021; Heebner et al., 2015), correlations range from 0.37–0.92, depending on the conditions (De Groote et al., 2021; Heebner et al., 2015; Hsieh et al., 2019; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012). The explained variance tends to be low to moderate. One study reported that accelerometry was more correlated to motion capture ($r=0.887$) than to force plate measurements ($r=0.793$) – which showed only a moderate coefficient of determination ($r^2=0.6294$) (Neville et al., 2015). Accelerometer measures and CoP differ due to the relationship between the ankle torques, reflected in the CoP, and the movements of the CoM that are in response to the torques. Another reason could be that standing balance is not a perfect inverted pendulum system with just one joint (ankle), as force plate CoP measurements assume (Lindemann et al., 2012; Manchester et al., 1989). Accelerometers may be useful in patient populations that are more likely to compensate with hip strategy, such as patients with hip fractures (Lindemann et al., 2012), ankle sprains (Abe et al., 2014), or Parkinson's disease (Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012).

Optical motion capture systems image a whole room or interior environment using a large set of cameras that are installed in the laboratory space. Reflective markers are placed on different segments of the body to track body movements and joint angles. These systems are very expensive and require a specialized set up and trained staff to run. The benefit of this big system is that markers can be attached to different parts of the body to monitor complex movements. The markers are tracked from several angles, so the output is a 3D reconstruction of how the body is moving. Despite not providing positional (location in space) information like motion capture, accelerometry balance assessments have been validated against motion capture systems by comparing measurements made by each system (Neville et al., 2015; Olsen et al., 2023; Suttanon et al., 2020). Root-mean-square of resultant acceleration magnitudes showed high correlations between motion capture and accelerometry ($r=0.88$, $p<0.001$) when subjects performed various standing tasks like quiet stance, tandem stance with eyes closed, and tandem stance on foam with eyes open (Neville et al., 2015). Olsen *et al.* found that a smartphone application that used accelerometry showed excellent validity compared to motion capture outcomes ($r=0.98$, 95% confidence interval = 0.98–0.99) (Olsen et al., 2023). Another study developed a sway meter using accelerometers that calculated center of mass sway angles that were significantly correlated to those measured by a motion capture system ($r=0.98$, $p<0.01$) (Suttanon et al., 2020).

6.b Laboratory Balance Tasks

Two of the most common balance tasks performed while on a force plate are the Romberg test and the Sensory Organization Test; the latter requires the force plate to be integrated into a dynamic posturography system. Romberg tests involve subjects standing with the feet close together (Buckley et al., 2019); often subjects perform the Romberg test on solid and foam surfaces. The Sharpened Romberg test has the feet aligned heel-to-toe. Normally, the Romberg test is performed with eyes open and eyes closed. People with poor balance are more easily discriminable because their performances diverge more from healthy individuals during challenging balance tasks than easy balance tasks. In general, the more difficult the task, the more discriminable the sway measure outcomes are (Doheny et al., 2012; Najafi et al., 2010; O'Sullivan et al., 2009; Reynard et al., 2019). Computerized dynamic posturography systems allow researchers to eliminate different sensory systems for the subject. Computerized dynamic posturography allows the visual surrounding to be “sway-referenced”, meaning the surrounding moves at the same speed and angle as the subject. This creates the condition where the visual system does not detect movement. Additionally, the platform the subject is standing on can be rotated about the ankle such that the ankle angle is sway-referenced. Platform sway-referencing is used to make ankle proprioceptive information unreliable for balance control (Mancini & Horak, 2010). Computerized dynamic posturography protocols, termed the Sensory Organization Test, include six different conditions: 1) fixed stance and eyes open, 2) fixed stance and eyes closed, 3) fixed stance and sway-referenced vision, 4) sway-referenced platform and eyes open, 5) sway-referenced platform and eyes closed, and 6) both sway-referenced platform and vision (Ford-Smith et al., 1995). These tasks are considered even more difficult than the Romberg tasks because they involve dynamic postural perturbations, or the illusion of postural perturbations, that require the subject to compensate to maintain balance. Romberg test conditions, by comparison, are all static. The measures during force plate tests are usually based upon the center of pressure. Recently, accelerometers are also being used. A study by Whitney *et al.* compared force plate and accelerometry balance measurements during the Sensory Organization Test conditions and found significant correlations for the six conditions (Whitney et al., 2011). Normalized path length measurements had the greatest coefficients of correlation compared to root-mean-square and peak-to-peak measurements. Across each measurement, correlations were greater as task difficulty increased (Whitney et al., 2011). Another study compared CoM accelerations derived from force plate measurements to those recorded using an accelerometer. The CoM estimation from force plates assumes a single inverted pendulum model. The signal traces showed moderate to strong correlations ($r=0.65-0.76$) in both ML and AP directions for conditions 4–6 (Ozinga et al., 2017).

In addition to the Sensory Organization Test, researchers have compared accelerometry to force plate measurements during various single-leg stances (Abe et al., 2014; Adlerton et al., 2003; Dewan et al., 2019; Doherty et al., 2017; Heebner et al., 2015; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021), tandem stances (Doherty et al., 2017; Heebner et al., 2015; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021), and dynamic movements (Heebner et al., 2015; Janssen et al., 2008) (Table 2). Some studies found significant correlations between force plate and accelerometry parameters during single leg stances (Adlerton et al., 2003; Dewan et al., 2019; Heebner et al., 2015), but

other studies had contradicting findings (Doherty et al., 2017; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021). In Abe *et al.*, only healthy subjects had correlated parameters between measurement modalities (Abe et al., 2014). Additionally, only accelerometry parameters were significantly different between ankle sprain subjects and healthy controls (Abe et al., 2014). Doherty *et al.* failed to find significant correlations between accelerometry and force plates for single leg stances but were able to use accelerometry to detect failures during the single-leg (AUC =0.91, 95% CI=0.86–0.96) and tandem (AUC=0.91, 95% CI=0.85–0.96) stances of the Balance Error Scoring System (Doherty et al., 2017). While Hsieh *et al.* were unable to differentiate between assisted device users and non-users from the single-leg stances, the semi-tandem stance was successful with accelerometry parameters outperforming force plate parameters (AUC=0.77–0.85 for accelerometry, AUC=0.72–0.78 for force plate) (Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021). For dynamic tasks, the specific movement seems to have a lot of weight when comparing accelerometry and force plate measurements. Janssen *et al.* found moderate to high correlations between force plate and accelerometry root-mean-square and area-under-the-curve when subjects were asked to perform sit-to-stand tests (Janssen et al., 2008). Using the balance conditions from the Dynamic Postural Stability Index, Heebner *et al.* concluded that the two modalities were measuring different aspects of balance and body position (Heebner et al., 2015).

7 Algorithms and Smart Devices

The lack of transformed, easy-to-understand outcomes has prevented widespread accelerometry adoption in the clinic. Clinicians need user-friendly signal analysis software to interpret raw values. Different studies have tried to tackle this problem by developing algorithms and classifier models for distinguishing between individuals with balance disorders, testing subjects using commercially available accelerometers in smart devices, or building their own systems.

Work toward developing software packages and classifier algorithms is underway to discern which features are most important for differentiating between populations with good and poor balance (Dasgupta et al., 2022; Rivolta et al., 2019; Similä et al., 2014; Weiss et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2021). Accelerometry-derived TUG times were used in a binary logistic regression for distinguishing between fallers and non-fallers (Weiss et al., 2011). Another study used two classification methods for determining high or low fall risk: an artificial neural network and a linear model. The artificial neural network and the linear model displayed misclassification errors of 0.11 and 0.21, respectively (Rivolta et al., 2019). Fall risk predictors have been developed using machine learning techniques, where accelerometry data is the input. Examples of these techniques include linear least squares model (Shahzad et al., 2017), lasso regression model (Rivolta et al., 2019; Shahzad et al., 2017), leave-one-out cross-validation model (Similä et al., 2014), and hybrid-convolutional recurrent neural network model (Dasgupta et al., 2022). These predictions are then compared to various clinical assessments (Rivolta et al., 2019; Shahzad et al., 2017) or occurrence of falls (Dasgupta et al., 2022). These techniques can assist in classifying and predicting fall risk for older adults should help in making accelerometry-based balance assessments more popular in the clinic and community.

Many groups are starting to look to smart devices such as phones and tablets that contain accelerometers to monitor balance instead of force plates or research-grade accelerometers that are used in laboratory settings (Cerrito et al., 2015; De Groot et al., 2021; Hsieh et al., 2019; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Kosse et al., 2015; Mansson et al., 2021; Olsen et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2021). One study measured sit-to-stand movements and found peak force and total movement duration were highly correlated between a smartphone and a force plate ($r=0.86$ and $r=0.98$) and, in addition to peak power, had high reliability (intra-class correlations= $0.86-0.93$) (Cerrito et al., 2015). A different research group found smartphone root-mean-square measurements were correlated to force plate velocities and sway ellipse during challenging balance tasks (e.g., semi-tandem, tandem, single-leg standing). Vertical and AP root-mean-square receiver operating characteristic curves were able to distinguish between older adults with low and high fall risk ($p=0.01-0.04$) (Hsieh et al., 2019). That research group later found significant correlations between root-mean-square and sway ellipse measurements from a smartphone, force plate, and research-grade accelerometer. All smartphone measurements were able to discriminate between assisted device users and non-users ($p<0.0001-0.02$) (Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021). Another study compared an iPod touch to an accelerometer and found high cross-correlations between devices (0.88) (Kosse et al., 2015). Additionally, root-mean-square and sway area had high intra-class correlations for iPod validity (0.97) and test-retest reliability (0.81) (Kosse et al., 2015). The use of smart devices to analyze postural stability has also been explored in patient populations. Accelerometry measurements from a smartphone were able to discriminate between individuals with and without Parkinson's disease from Sensory Organization Test conditions while the equilibrium score from this test was unable to discriminate (Ozinga et al., 2017). Additionally, impaired and non-impaired wheelchair users were distinguished by smartphone accelerometry (Frechette et al., 2020). These smart devices are commercially available, making them a cheap and accessible assessment tool. Transitioning from research-grade accelerometers to commercially available devices that are already in high-use is imperative for bringing balance assessment outside of the laboratory.

8 Clinical Settings

8.a Clinical Examinations

In the clinical setting, healthcare providers evaluate balance using a variety of methods. Many research studies have focused on comparing or integrating accelerometry into these methods like the Berg Balance Scale (Buckley et al., 2019; O'Sullivan et al., 2009), TUG (Timed Up and Go) test (Galán-Mercant & Cuesta-Vargas, 2014; O'Sullivan et al., 2009; Weiss et al., 2011), or the 5-times sit-to-stand (Doheny et al., 2013; Shahzad et al., 2017). The Berg Balance Scale involves 14 different tasks that require the subjects to perform different static poses and dynamic movements to evaluate the individual's balance (Berg et al., 1989). Examples of static poses are sitting, standing with eyes closed, and standing on one leg. Reaching, retrieving an object from the floor, and turning to look behind are some of the dynamic movements. Each task is scored from 0 of 4 and the individual task scores are added up to a maximum of 56 (Berg et al., 1989; O'Sullivan et al., 2009). The TUG test has subjects start sitting, rise from the chair, walk 3 meters, turn and return to the chair, and sit down again. The main outcome of this assessment is the time to complete the whole TUG

test (O'Sullivan et al., 2009; Podsiadlo & Richardson, 1991; Weiss et al., 2011). 5-times sit-to-stand measures how long it takes subjects to stand from a seated position and return to sitting five times (Csuka & McCarty, 1985; Doheny et al., 2013). Most of these balance assessments rely on subjective observations from the clinician and often floor and ceiling effects result in poor granularity (Buckley et al., 2019). It is important to note that the TUG test and 5-times sit-to-stand are not strictly balance assessments, although balance is heavily involved in the tasks. These evaluations were included in this review as some of the studies related accelerometry features from TUG or 5-times sit-to-stand to other clinical balance assessment scores.

Experiments have been conducted to compare these different evaluations to balance as assessed by accelerometry, to see if the scores of the different tests align with various accelerometry signal variables. Some experiments focus on comparing accelerometry outcomes to the scores of the clinical exams (Godfrey et al., 2015; O'Sullivan et al., 2009) or using accelerometry to estimate clinical exam scores (McManus et al., 2022; Narayanan et al., 2010; Shahzad et al., 2017; Similä et al., 2014, 2017; Yu et al., 2021) (Table 3). Godfrey *et al.* compared accelerometry-derived times to stopwatch times for TUG (Godfrey et al., 2015). No significant differences were detected between accelerometry and TUG times, suggesting accelerometry is a feasible method for balance assessment (Godfrey et al., 2015). A study conducted by O'Sullivan *et al.* showed that accelerometry root-mean-square had strong negative correlations with the Berg Balance Scale and strong positive correlations with TUG scores while subjects stood on a foam mat with their eyes open. Low Berg Balance Scale scores and high TUG scores indicate poor balance, as does high root-mean-square (O'Sullivan et al., 2009). Similarly, another study found that larger summed magnitude area of resultant accelerometry signals corresponded to higher Berg Balance Scale scores and lower TUG scores (Similä et al., 2017). A previous study by the same group estimated Berg Balance Scale scores from accelerations recorded during the assessment. Classifiers using the estimated scores showed high performance (89.5%) when identifying individuals with high fall risk (Similä et al., 2014). Subjects in a study by Shahzad *et al.* performed TUG, 5-times sit-to-stand, and alternative step test while features were extracted from the accelerometry data to be used in various machine learning algorithms to produce Berg Balance Scale estimates. Shahzad was able to find strong correlations ($\rho=0.86$) between the average of two estimates and the standard Berg Balance Scale assessment score (Shahzad et al., 2017).

Other studies have focused on using the accelerometry measures from the assessments (particularly TUG) to classify adults as having better or worse balance performance (Dasgupta et al., 2022; Doheny et al., 2013; Galán-Mercant & Cuesta-Vargas, 2014; Greene et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2011; McManus et al., 2022; Mulas et al., 2021; Weiss et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2021). These studies break down the tests into different segments, instead of just using overall TUG time to classify patients. One study even had access to a dedicated, commercial software that automatically detected the different segments (Mulas et al., 2021). Weiss *et al.* found that accelerometry-derived TUG duration was different between non-fallers and fallers while standard stopwatch TUG duration did not show significant differences (Weiss et al., 2011). Additionally, a model using three different accelerometry-derived metrics (jerk during sit-to-stand, standard

deviation, step duration) correctly classified 87.8% of the subjects, compared to just 63.4% from the stopwatch duration (Weiss et al., 2011). Low and high fall risk subjects were more discriminable using accelerometry metrics, specifically signal complexity and jerk, from segmented TUG than traditional TUG measurements (Lee et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2019). Similar results were found in a study classifying frail and non-frail adults (Galán-Mercant & Cuesta-Vargas, 2014). Another study using 5-times sit-to-stand had better classification using four accelerometry-derived metrics (74.4%) compared to overall time (59.0%) (Doheny et al., 2013). The results from these studies provide support for instrumenting balance assessments because accelerometers can provide additional, useful information to detect balance changes.

There are other types of balance assessments for specific patient populations that have also been assessed in relation to accelerometry. For example, the Balance Error Scoring System is often used to evaluate concussed individuals (Doherty et al., 2017; Furman et al., 2013; Heebner et al., 2015; King et al., 2014) and the Unified Parkinson's Disease Rating Scale (UPDRS) III has its own Postural Instability and Gait Disorders (PIGD) subscore (Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012).

8.b Patient Populations

8.b.i Neurodegenerative Disorders—Parkinson's disease causes significant deficits in balance and researchers have been using accelerometry to explore this postural control decline (Caudron et al., 2014; Y. Chen et al., 2018; Del Din et al., 2016; Flood et al., 2020; Hasegawa et al., 2021; Mancini et al., 2011; Mancini, Carlson-Kuhta, et al., 2012; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; Pantall, Del Din, et al., 2018; Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018). Accelerometry signals can successfully distinguish between Parkinson's patients and healthy controls. Additionally, accelerometry-derived outcomes correlate significantly to the PIGD (Mancini et al., 2011) and are more sensitive to Parkinsonian progression compared to Motor UPDRS, PIGD, bradykinesia and rigidity sub-scores (Mancini, Carlson-Kuhta, et al., 2012). Similarly, accelerometers are also being used to detect balance deficits in patient populations such as multiple sclerosis (Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Huisinga et al., 2018; Kasser et al., 2015; Pau et al., 2017), Huntington's disease (Kegelmeyer et al., 2017; Porciuncula et al., 2020), stroke (Helbostad et al., 2004; Mitsutake et al., 2020), lower back pain (Caña-Pino et al., 2021, 2023; Schelldorfer et al., 2015), spinal cord injury (Navarrete-Opazo et al., 2017; Noamani et al., 2021), osteoarthritis (Ibara et al., 2021), and arthropathy (Cruz-Montecinos, Carrasco, et al., 2020). For people with multiple sclerosis, assisted device usage is an important risk factor for falls. Hsieh *et al.* found that root mean square and 95% ellipse area were able to successfully discriminate between assisted device users and non-users in people with multiple sclerosis (AUC=0.77–0.89, $p<0.001-0.03$) (Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021). Another study found that sway amplitude and jerk significantly improved in people with multiple sclerosis after completing a 10-week balance intervention (Kasser et al., 2015). For people with Huntington's disease, the premanifest stage occurs prior to motor diagnosis; however, patients display deficits that are not apparent in clinical assessments. In a study conducted by Porciuncula *et al.*, jerk and sway amplitude of low back accelerations were able to differentiate among manifest Huntington's disease, premanifest Huntington's disease, and controls (Porciuncula et al., 2020). Individuals with

chronic lower back pain exhibit acceleration signals with higher energy spectral density than healthy controls (Caña-Pino et al., 2021), which can be reduced with supervised or laser-guided exercise therapies (Caña-Pino et al., 2023).

8.b.ii Concussions and Sports Injuries—Balance performance is also a common assessment for concussion patients, as poor balance is a major symptom of traumatic brain injury. Several studies of accelerometry-measured balance have thus focused on individuals with concussions (Doherty et al., 2017; Dugan et al., 2021; Furman et al., 2013; Howell et al., 2019; Johnston et al., 2020; King et al., 2014). Researchers have been using accelerometers during the Balance Error Scoring System when evaluating athletes after concussions. One study found that normalized path length (from the NIH Balance Accelerometry Measure) underperformed in comparison to the Balance Error Scoring System (Furman et al., 2013); however, the Balance Accelerometry Measure was not developed for concussion testing. Conversely, Doherty *et al.* showed that 95% sway volume during bilateral stance was significantly different between concussed and healthy subjects (Doherty et al., 2017). Detecting differences in the bilateral stance is important as subjects often do not make errors during that condition, meaning that the Balance Error Scoring System suffers from ceiling effects. Additionally, this study showed that accelerometers could identify when an error occurred (AUC=0.91) which could be useful for providing objective assistance to the clinical assessment (Doherty et al., 2017). Another study found that accelerometry values were significantly different between patients mild and persistent concussion symptoms, unlike scores from the Balance Error Scoring System (King et al., 2014). Other sports injuries that affect balance also benefit from using accelerometry as a measurement tool. Abe *et al.* compared healthy controls to individuals with a history of ankle sprain, using accelerometers on the head and foot, and found that the healthy controls had a lower head-to-foot acceleration ratio than the ankle sprain subjects (Abe et al., 2014).

8.b.iii Sensory Deficit Patients and Feedback Systems—The balance system relies on inputs from visual, somatosensory, and vestibular systems. Some studies have focused on poor balance resulting from damage to the vestibular system (Alsubaie et al., 2022; D’Silva et al., 2017; Marchetti et al., 2013; Turcot et al., 2009). The NIH’s Balance Accelerometry Measure was tested to see if it could accurately differentiate between healthy subjects and patients with vestibular disorders (Marchetti et al., 2013). The results showed that four of the six conditions of the Balance Accelerometry Measure were reliable in vestibular subjects and the composite score output by the test showed high sensitivity and specificity to discriminate between vestibular and healthy groups (Marchetti et al., 2013). Another type of balance deficit can occur with the loss of somatosensory information from peripheral limbs. Individuals with diabetic peripheral neuropathy have reduced sensitivity in their feet which reduces the amount of sensory feedback that the postural control system can use to adjust balance. Turcot *et al.* found that patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathy had higher accelerations and worse postural stability than controls and diabetic patients without peripheral neuropathy (Turcot et al., 2009).

Patients with poor balance may see improvements when using artificial feedback systems (Caudron et al., 2014; Chiari et al., 2005; Cruz-Montecinos, Cuesta-Vargas, et al., 2020;

Halická et al., 2014; Kegelmeyer et al., 2017; Pirini et al., 2011; Wall & Weinberg, 2003). These feedback systems rely on accelerometers to monitor the subject's balance and then that sway information is relayed, processed, and output in some other modality as an additional form of sensory feedback. Vibrotactile feedback (Wall & Weinberg, 2003), auditory feedback (Kegelmeyer et al., 2017), and visual feedback (Caudron et al., 2014) have been successful for people with vestibulopathic conditions, Huntington's disease, and Parkinson's disease respectively. Artificial feedback can also help subjects that have good balance (Chiari et al., 2005; Cruz-Montecinos, Cuesta-Vargas, et al., 2020; Halická et al., 2014; Pirini et al., 2011). Audio feedback conveyed sway accelerations in two directions by modulating frequency (AP), left/right audio balance (ML), and volume (magnitude of acceleration). The audio feedback helped subjects improve their balance, particularly when posture was challenged by reducing sensory feedback (closing eyes or standing on foam) (Chiari et al., 2005). Visual biofeedback also enhanced postural control learning in healthy individuals that underwent single leg stance training (Cruz-Montecinos, Cuesta-Vargas, et al., 2020). This research shows that not only can accelerometry be used as an assessment tool but also as a component of balance treatment or enhancement.

9 Community Settings

Accelerometers allow researchers and clinicians to assess subjects and patients at their residence and in their daily life, without the bias of a laboratory or clinical setting. There have not been many balance studies conducted in community settings with accelerometers, but those that do exist have shown promising results (Alqahtani et al., 2017, 2020; Löppönen et al., 2021; Mejía et al., 2023; Parvaneh et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2019; Zhou et al., 2021). Alqahtani *et al.* used accelerometers to assess participants' balance in their residence facility to analyze the reliability and validity of accelerometers in a community setting. They found that accelerometers had good to excellent intra-class correlations in all but one of their test conditions (AP semi-tandem stance). They also found that normalized path length had the best test-retest reliability (Alqahtani et al., 2020). This group had previously found that accelerometry root-mean-square and normalized path length were significantly correlated to the Duke Comorbidity Index (Alqahtani et al., 2017). In residential communities in Taiwan, Wu *et al.* was able to discriminate between low and high fall risk residents and their accelerometry features outperformed traditional assessment measurements (Wu et al., 2019). Another study investigated application-based balance tests in laboratory settings and self-administered at home and found that the balance features from the application were sensitive to age and task condition in both testing locations (Zhou et al., 2021). Self-administered, smartphone-based balance tests were also used to explore the relationship between subjective balance confidence and objective sway measurements. The authors concluded that older adults at higher fall risk display greater postural sway on days with higher balance confidence (Mejía et al., 2023). Conducting balance assessments within the home or residential communities increases healthcare access for underserved populations, mobility-impaired patients, and individuals unable to get transportation to clinics.

10 Conclusion

In this narrative review, the literature demonstrates that accelerometry is highly correlated with or outperforms several clinical and laboratory balance assessments. Accelerometers can be used to monitor changes in balance due to general aging or from different types of pathology. The portability of accelerometers and their sensitivity to different task and disease conditions show that this technology can reduce burden on clinicians and patients, particularly patients that already have mobility deficits. Commercially available smart devices are being shown to be useful in measuring balance and thus expanding accessibility further to patients and use in community or residential settings.

This review has a few limitations. The heterogeneity of many of the studies in terms of sensor placement, outcome, and balance tests employed make comparisons across studies difficult. Additionally, only papers published in English were considered, reducing the variety of study populations. Many of these studies also lacked diverse samples, particularly in terms of race and education, which limits the generalizability of these conclusions. Additionally, male participants were more common than female participants especially for studies that focused more on comparing accelerometers to other technologies and not on a particular study population. Lastly, a single reviewer was responsible for the data search, extraction, and analysis. As a result, studies could have been missed or omitted that should have been included. Despite these limitations, this narrative review does give a comprehensive overview of accelerometry methods and applications for standing balance assessment.

Accelerometers have been used in many different studies for balance assessment. They have been compared to laboratory technology like force plates and motion capture. Accelerometers provide additional information to clinical assessments like the Berg Balance Scale, TUG test, and 5-times sit-to-stand. They have been used with numerous patient populations, such as Parkinson's disease, Huntington's disease, multiple sclerosis, and concussion. Additionally, many studies now are looking at activity monitoring, using accelerometers in fitness watches or other smart devices to monitor function of community-dwelling older adults in their daily lives (Cavanaugh et al., 2007; Kocherginsky et al., 2017; Mañas et al., 2018; Schrack et al., 2018; Van Schooten et al., 2015). Despite the potential of these devices, the current literature is limited because it is difficult to make comparisons across studies as the field has not yet agreed on standardized outcomes to measure and report. It is also important to consider whether older adults will use this technology in their community or whether it should be used mostly in the clinic. Studies do not currently examine how older adults feel about incorporating this technology. A previous review has looked into older adults' perceptions of technology and their conclusions point to the importance of older adults thinking the technology is useful and non-invasive (Hawley-Hague et al., 2014). With the rise in activity monitoring and commercially available accelerometers in smart devices, balance assessments should move to the community, not requiring a trip to a clinic. However, accelerometers are not yet part of the clinical diagnostic process despite the breadth of clinically relevant uses, diagnostic sensitivity, and widespread accessibility of commercially available devices. For accelerometers to move into the clinical

space, a consensus on relevant outcomes is necessary as well as a reliable, user-friendly signal analysis software that clinicians can use in the balance assessment process.

Overall, accelerometers provide additional insight to current standard clinical assessments and diagnostics for patients, but their full potential is not yet realized. Accelerometers offer clinicians an objective, portable, and cost-effective measurement tool that could increase accessibility to balance assessments for older adults in an increasingly aging population.

Funding

This research was funded by the National Institute of Aging, grant numbers K01 AG053431 and R01 AG057671, as well as by the Pittsburgh Claude D. Pepper Older Americans Independence Center, grant number P30 AG024827.

References

- Abe Y, Sugaya T, & Sakamoto M (2014). Postural control characteristics during single leg standing of individuals with a history of ankle sprain: Measurements obtained using a gravicorder and head and foot accelerometry. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*, 26(3), 447–450. 10.1589/jpts.26.447 [PubMed: 24707105]
- Adlerton A-K, Moritz U, & Moe-Nilssen R (2003). Forceplate and accelerometer measures for evaluating the effect of muscle fatigue on postural control during one-legged stance. *Physiotherapy Research International*, 8(4), 187–199. 10.1002/pri.289 [PubMed: 14730723]
- Alberts JL, Hirsch JR, Koop MM, Schindler DD, Kana DE, Linder SM, Campbell S, & Thota AK (2015). Using accelerometer and gyroscopic measures to quantify postural stability. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 50(6), 578–588. 10.4085/1062-6050-50.2.01 [PubMed: 25844853]
- Alqahtani BA, Ferchak MA, Huppert TJ, Sejdic E, Perera S, Greenspan SL, & Sparto PJ (2017). Standing balance and strength measurements in older adults living in residential care communities. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, 29(5), 1021–1030. 10.1007/s40520-016-0693-4 [PubMed: 28000144]
- Alqahtani BA, Sparto PJ, Whitney SL, Greenspan SL, Perera S, & Brach JS (2020). Psychometric properties of instrumented postural sway measures recorded in community settings in independent living older adults. *BMC Geriatrics*, 20(1), 82. 10.1186/s12877-020-1489-0 [PubMed: 32111166]
- Alsubaie SF, Whitney SL, Furman JM, Marchetti GF, Sienko KH, & Sparto PJ (2022). Rating of perceived difficulty scale for measuring intensity of standing balance exercises in individuals with vestibular disorders. *Journal of Vestibular Research*, 32(6), 529–540. 10.3233/VES-210146 [PubMed: 36120749]
- Anderson JL, Green AJ, Yoward LS, & Hall HK (2018). Validity and reliability of accelerometry in identification of lying, sitting, standing or purposeful activity in adult hospital inpatients recovering from acute or critical illness: a systematic review. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 32(2), 233–242. 10.1177/0269215517724850 [PubMed: 28805075]
- Armstrong WJ, McGregor SJ, Yaggie JA, Bailey JJ, Johnson SM, Goin AM, & Kelly SR (2010). Reliability of mechanomyography and triaxial accelerometry in the assessment of balance. *Journal of Electromyography and Kinesiology*, 20(4), 726–731. 10.1016/j.jelekin.2010.02.002 [PubMed: 20227294]
- Berg K, Wood-Dauphinee S, Williams JI, & Gayton D (1989). Measuring balance in the elderly: Preliminary development of an instrument. *Physiotherapy Canada*, 41(6), 304–311. 10.3138/ptc.41.6.304
- Bet P, Castro PC, & Ponti MA (2019). Fall detection and fall risk assessment in older person using wearable sensors: A systematic review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 130, 103946. 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.08.006 [PubMed: 31450081]
- Bohlke K, Zhu X, Sparto PJ, Redfern MS, Rosano C, Sejdic E, & Rosso AL (2021). The effect of a verbal cognitive task on postural sway does not persist when the task is over. *Sensors*, 21(24), 8428. 10.3390/s21248428 [PubMed: 34960520]

- Buchman AS, Dawe RJ, Leurgans SE, Curran TA, Truty T, Yu L, Barnes LL, Hausdorff JM, & Bennett DA (2020). Different combinations of mobility metrics derived from a wearable sensor are associated with distinct health outcomes in older adults. *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 75(6), 1176–1183. 10.1093/GERONA/GLZ160 [PubMed: 31246244]
- Buckley C, Alcock L, McArdle R, Ur Rehman RZ, Del Din S, Mazzà C, Yarnall AJ, & Rochester L (2019). The role of movement analysis in diagnosing and monitoring neurodegenerative conditions: Insights from gait and postural control. *Brain Sciences*, 9(2), 34. 10.3390/brainsci9020034 [PubMed: 30736374]
- Calafiore D, Invernizzi M, Ammendolia A, Marotta N, Fortunato F, Paolucci T, Ferraro F, Curci C, Cwirlej-Sozanska A, & de Sire A (2021). Efficacy of Virtual Reality and Exergaming in Improving Balance in Patients With Multiple Sclerosis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 12. 10.3389/FNEUR.2021.773459
- Caña-Pino A, Apolo-Arenas MD, Carmona del Barco P, Montanero-Fernández J, & Espejo-Antúnez L (2023). Supervised exercise therapy versus laser-guided exercise therapy on postural control in subjects with non-specific chronic low back pain: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, 59(2), 201. 10.23736/s1973-9087.23.07430-0 [PubMed: 36745155]
- Caña-Pino A, Espejo-Antúnez L, Carmona del Barco P, Montanero-Fernández J, Lluch-Girbés E, Roussel NA, & Apolo-Arenas MD (2021). Energy spectral density as valid parameter to compare postural control between subjects with nonspecific chronic low back pain vs healthy subjects: A case-control study. *Musculoskeletal Science and Practice*, 53, 102370. 10.1016/j.msksp.2021.102370 [PubMed: 33836396]
- Caudron S, Guerraz M, Eusebio A, Gros JP, Azulay JP, & Vaugoyeau M (2014). Evaluation of a visual biofeedback on the postural control in Parkinson's disease. *Neurophysiologie Clinique*, 44(1), 77–86. 10.1016/j.neucli.2013.10.134 [PubMed: 24502908]
- Cavanaugh JT, Coleman KL, Gaines JM, Laing L, & Morey MC (2007). Using step activity monitoring to characterize ambulatory activity in community-dwelling older adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 55(1), 120–124. 10.1111/j.1532-5415.2006.00997.x [PubMed: 17233695]
- Cerrito A, Bichsel L, Radlinger L, & Schmid S (2015). Reliability and validity of a smartphone-based application for the quantification of the sit-to-stand movement in healthy seniors. *Gait and Posture*, 41(2), 409–413. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.11.001 [PubMed: 25467428]
- Chen T, Fan Y, Zhuang X, Feng D, Chen Y, Chan P, & Du Y (2018). Postural sway in patients with early Parkinson's disease performing cognitive tasks while standing. *Neurological Research*, 40(6), 491–498. 10.1080/01616412.2018.1451017 [PubMed: 29869975]
- Chen Y, Yu Y, Niu R, & Liu Y (2018). Selective effects of postural control on spatial vs. nonspatial working memory: A functional near-infrared spectral imaging study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 12, 243. 10.3389/fnhum.2018.00243 [PubMed: 29950981]
- Chiari L, Dozza M, Cappello A, Horak FB, Macellari V, & Giansanti D (2005). Audio-biofeedback for balance improvement: An accelerometry-based system. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 52(12), 2108–2111. 10.1109/TBME.2005.857673 [PubMed: 16366234]
- Cho CY, & Kamen G (1998). Detecting balance deficits in frequent fallers using clinical and quantitative evaluation tools. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 46(4), 426–430. 10.1111/J.1532-5415.1998.TB02461.X [PubMed: 9560063]
- Choi SD, Guo L, Kang D, & Xiong S (2017). Exergame technology and interactive interventions for elderly fall prevention: A systematic literature review. *Applied Ergonomics*, 65, 570–581. 10.1016/J.APERGO.2016.10.013 [PubMed: 27825723]
- Cruz-Montecinos C, Carrasco JJ, Guzmán-González B, Soto-Arellano V, Calatayud J, Chimeno-Hernández A, Querol F, & Pérez-Alenda S (2020). Effects of performing dual tasks on postural sway and postural control complexity in people with haemophilic arthropathy. *Haemophilia*, 26(3), e81–e87. 10.1111/HAE.13955 [PubMed: 32197275]
- Cruz-Montecinos C, Cuesta-Vargas A, Muñoz C, Flores D, Ellsworth J, Fuente C. D. la, Calatayud J, Rivera-Lillo G, Soto-Arellano V, Tapia C, & García-Massó X (2020). Impact of visual biofeedback

- of trunk sway smoothness on motor learning during unipedal stance. *Sensors*, 20(9), 2585. 10.3390/s20092585 [PubMed: 32370050]
- Csuka M, & McCarty DJ (1985). Simple method for measurement of lower extremity muscle strength. *The American Journal of Medicine*, 78(1), 77–81. 10.1016/0002-9343(85)90465-6
- D’Silva LJ, Kluding PM, Whitney SL, Dai H, & Santos M (2017). Postural sway in individuals with type 2 diabetes and concurrent benign paroxysmal positional vertigo. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, 127(12), 1065–1073. 10.1080/00207454.2017.1317249 [PubMed: 28385058]
- Dasgupta P, Frisch A, Huber J, Sejdic E, & Suffoletto B (2022). Predicting falls within 3 months of emergency department discharge among community-dwelling older adults using self-report tools versus a brief functional assessment. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 53, 245–249. 10.1016/j.ajem.2021.12.071 [PubMed: 35085878]
- Dawe RJ, Leurgans SE, Yang J, Bennett JM, Hausdorff JM, Lim AS, Gaiteri C, Bennett DA, & Buchman AS (2018). Association between Quantitative Gait and Balance Measures and Total Daily Physical Activity in Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 73(5), 636–642. 10.1093/gerona/glx167 [PubMed: 28957994]
- De Groot F, Vandevyvere S, Vanhevel F, & Orban de Xivry JJ (2021). Validation of a smartphone embedded inertial measurement unit for measuring postural stability in older adults. *Gait and Posture*, 84, 17–23. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.11.017 [PubMed: 33260077]
- Del Din S, Godfrey A, Coleman S, Galna B, Lord S, & Rochester L (2016). Time-dependent changes in postural control in early Parkinson’s disease: What are we missing? *Medical and Biological Engineering and Computing*, 54(2–3), 401–410. 10.1007/s11517-015-1324-5 [PubMed: 26049413]
- Dewan BM, Roger James C, Kumar NA, & Sawyer SF (2019). Kinematic validation of postural sway measured by Biodex Biosway (force plate) and SWAY Balance (accelerometer) technology. *BioMed Research International*, 2019, 8185710. 10.1155/2019/8185710 [PubMed: 31930140]
- Doheny EP, McGrath D, Greene BR, Walsh L, McKeown D, Cunningham C, Crosby L, Kenny RA, & Caulfield B (2012). Displacement of centre of mass during quiet standing assessed using accelerometry in older fallers and non-fallers. *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, 3300–3303. 10.1109/EMBC.2012.6346670
- Doheny EP, Walsh C, Foran T, Greene BR, Fan CW, Cunningham C, & Kenny RA (2013). Falls classification using tri-axial accelerometers during the five-times-sit-to-stand test. *Gait and Posture*, 38(4), 1021–1025. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.05.013 [PubMed: 23791781]
- Doherty C, Zhao L, Ryan J, Komaba Y, Inomata A, & Caulfield B (2017). Quantification of postural control deficits in patients with recent concussion: An inertial-sensor based approach. *Clinical Biomechanics*, 42, 79–84. 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2017.01.007 [PubMed: 28110244]
- Dugan EL, Shilt JS, Masterson CM, & Ernest KM (2021). The use of inertial measurement units to assess gait and postural control following concussion. *Gait and Posture*, 83, 262–267. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.10.004 [PubMed: 33220659]
- Flood MW, O’Callaghan BPF, Diamond P, Liegey J, Hughes G, & Lowery MM (2020). Quantitative clinical assessment of motor function during and following LSVT-BIG[®] therapy. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 17(1), 1–19. 10.1186/S12984-020-00729-8/FIGURES/9 [PubMed: 31900169]
- Florence CS, Bergen G, Atherly A, Burns E, Stevens J, & Drake C (2018). Medical costs of fatal and nonfatal falls in older adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 66(4), 693–698. 10.1111/jgs.15304 [PubMed: 29512120]
- Ford-Smith CD, Wyman JF, Elswick RK, Fernandez T, & Newton RA (1995). Test-retest reliability of the sensory organization test in noninstitutionalized older adults. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 76(1), 77–81. 10.1016/S0003-9993(95)80047-6 [PubMed: 7811180]
- Frechette ML, Abou L, Rice LA, & Sosnoff JJ (2020). The validity, reliability, and sensitivity of a smartphone-based seated postural control assessment in wheelchair users: A pilot study. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 2, 540930. 10.3389/fspor.2020.540930 [PubMed: 33367273]

- Furman GR, Lin CC, Bellanca JL, Marchetti GF, Collins MW, & Whitney SL (2013). Comparison of the balance accelerometer measure and balance error scoring system in adolescent concussions in sports. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 41(6), 1404–1410. 10.1177/0363546513484446 [PubMed: 23585486]
- Fuschillo VL, Bagalà F, Chiari L, & Cappello A (2012). Accelerometry-based prediction of movement dynamics for balance monitoring. *Medical and Biological Engineering and Computing*, 50(9), 925–936. 10.1007/s11517-012-0940-6 [PubMed: 22802142]
- Galán-Mercant A, & Cuesta-Vargas AI (2014). Differences in trunk accelerometry between frail and non-frail elderly persons in functional tasks. *BMC Research Notes*, 7(1), 1–9. 10.1186/1756-0500-7-100 [PubMed: 24382056]
- García-Soidán JL, Leirós-Rodríguez R, Romo-Pérez V, & García-Liñeira J (2021). Accelerometric assessment of postural balance in children: A systematic review. *Diagnostics*, 11(1), 8. 10.3390/diagnostics11010008
- Godfrey A, Lara J, Munro CA, Wiuff C, Chowdhury SA, Del Din S, Hickey A, Mathers JC, & Rochester L (2015). Instrumented assessment of test battery for physical capability using an accelerometer: A feasibility study. *Physiological Measurement*, 36(5), N71–N83. 10.1088/0967-3334/36/5/N71 [PubMed: 25903399]
- Greene BR, Doheny EP, Kenny RA, & Caulfield B (2014). Classification of frailty and falls history using a combination of sensor-based mobility assessments. *Physiological Measurement*, 35(10), 2053–2066. 10.1088/0967-3334/35/10/2053 [PubMed: 25237821]
- Halická Z, Lobotková J, Buková K, & Hlaváková F (2014). Effectiveness of different visual biofeedback signals for human balance improvement. *Gait and Posture*, 39(1), 410–414. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.08.005 [PubMed: 24001870]
- Hasegawa N, Maas KC, Shah VV, Carlson-Kuhta P, Nutt JG, Horak FB, Asaka T, & Mancini M (2021). Functional limits of stability and standing balance in people with Parkinson's disease with and without freezing of gait using wearable sensors. *Gait and Posture*, 87, 123–129. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2021.04.023 [PubMed: 33906091]
- Hawley-Hague H, Boulton E, Hall A, Pfeiffer K, & Todd C (2014). Older adults' perceptions of technologies aimed at falls prevention, detection or monitoring: A systematic review. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 83(6), 416–426. 10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2014.03.002 [PubMed: 24798946]
- Heebner NR, Akins JS, Lephart SM, & Sell TC (2015). Reliability and validity of an accelerometry based measure of static and dynamic postural stability in healthy and active individuals. *Gait and Posture*, 41(2), 535–539. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.12.009 [PubMed: 25544692]
- Helbostad JL, Askim T, & Moe-Nilssen R (2004). Short-term repeatability of body sway during quiet standing in people with hemiparesis and in frail older adults. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 85(6), 993–999. 10.1016/J.APMR.2003.07.020 [PubMed: 15179656]
- Holtzer R, Friedman R, Lipton RB, Katz M, Xue X, & Verghese J (2007). The relationship between specific cognitive functions and falls in aging. *Neuropsychology*, 21(5), 540–548. 10.1037/0894-4105.21.5.540 [PubMed: 17784802]
- Howcroft J, Lemaire ED, & Kofman J (2016). Wearable-sensor-based classification models of faller status in older adults. *PLoS ONE*, 11(4), e0153240. 10.1371/journal.pone.0153240 [PubMed: 27054878]
- Howell DR, Lugade V, Potter MN, Walker G, & Wilson JC (2019). A multifaceted and clinically viable paradigm to quantify postural control impairments among adolescents with concussion. *Physiological Measurement*, 40(8), 084006. 10.1088/1361-6579/ab3552 [PubMed: 31342939]
- Hsieh KL, Roach KL, Wajda DA, & Sosnoff JJ (2019). Smartphone technology can measure postural stability and discriminate fall risk in older adults. *Gait and Posture*, 67, 160–165. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.10.005 [PubMed: 30340129]
- Hsieh KL, & Sosnoff JJ (2021). Smartphone accelerometry to assess postural control in individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Gait and Posture*, 84, 114–119. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.11.011 [PubMed: 33307327]
- Hu Y, Bishnoi A, Kaur R, Sowers R, & Hernandez ME (2020). Exploration of machine learning to identify community dwelling older adults with balance dysfunction using short duration

- accelerometer data. Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 812–815. 10.1109/EMBC44109.2020.9175871
- Huisinga J, Mancini M, Veys C, Spain R, & Horak F (2018). Coherence analysis of trunk and leg acceleration reveals altered postural sway strategy during standing in persons with multiple sclerosis. *Human Movement Science*, 58, 330–336. 10.1016/j.humov.2017.12.009 [PubMed: 29277247]
- Ibara T, Takahashi M, Shinkoda K, Kawashima M, & Anan M (2021). Hip sway in patients with hip osteoarthritis during one-leg standing with a focus on time series data. *Motor Control*, 25(3), 502–518. 10.1123/MC.2020-0055 [PubMed: 34098529]
- Ihira H, Makizako H, Mizumoto A, Makino K, Matsuyama K, & Furuna T (2016). Age-related differences in postural control and attentional cost during tasks performed in a one-legged standing posture. *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy*, 39(4), 159–164. 10.1519/JPT.000000000000063 [PubMed: 26352519]
- Islam MM, Neom NH, Imtiaz MS, Nooruddin S, Islam MR, & Islam MR (2019). A review on fall detection systems using data from smartphone sensors. *Ingenierie Des Systemes d'Information*, 24(6), 569–576. 10.18280/ISI.240602
- Janssen WGM, Geler Külcü D, Horemans HLD, Stam HJ, & Bussmann JBJ (2008). Sensitivity of accelerometry to assess balance control during sit-to-stand movement. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 16(5), 479–484. 10.1109/TNSRE.2008.2003386 [PubMed: 18990651]
- Johnston W, Heiderscheid B, Sanfilippo J, Brooks MA, & Caulfield B (2020). Athletes with a concussion history in the last two years have impairments in dynamic balance performance. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 30(8), 1497–1505. 10.1111/SMS.13691 [PubMed: 32311175]
- Kasser SL, Jacobs JV, Ford M, & Tourville TW (2015). Effects of balance-specific exercises on balance, physical activity and quality of life in adults with multiple sclerosis: A pilot investigation. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 37(24), 2238–2249. 10.3109/09638288.2015.1019008 [PubMed: 25738911]
- Kegelmeyer DA, Kostyk SK, Fritz NE, Fiumedora MM, Chaudhari A, Palettas M, Young G, & Kloos AD (2017). Quantitative biomechanical assessment of trunk control in Huntington's disease reveals more impairment in static than dynamic tasks. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*, 376, 29–34. 10.1016/j.jns.2017.02.054 [PubMed: 28431622]
- King LA, Horak FB, Mancini M, Pierce D, Priest KC, Chesnutt J, Sullivan P, & Chapman JC (2014). Instrumenting the balance error scoring system for use with patients reporting persistent balance problems after mild traumatic brain injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 95(2), 353–359. 10.1016/j.apmr.2013.10.015 [PubMed: 24200875]
- Kocherginsky M, Huisingh-Scheetz M, Dale W, Lauderdale DS, & Waite L (2017). Measuring physical activity with hip accelerometry among U.S. older adults: How many days are enough? *PLoS ONE*, 12(1), e0170082. 10.1371/journal.pone.0170082 [PubMed: 28081249]
- Kosse NM, Caljouw S, Vervoort D, Vuillerme N, & Lamoth CJC (2015). Validity and reliability of gait and postural control analysis using the tri-axial accelerometer of the iPod Touch. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, 43(8), 1935–1946. 10.1007/s10439-014-1232-0 [PubMed: 25549774]
- Lamoth CJC, & van Heuvelen MJG (2012). Sports activities are reflected in the local stability and regularity of body sway: Older ice-skaters have better postural control than inactive elderly. *Gait and Posture*, 35(3), 489–493. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.11.014 [PubMed: 22178031]
- Lee CH, Sun TL, Jiang BC, & Choi VH (2016). Using wearable accelerometers in a community service context to categorize falling behavior. *Entropy*, 18(7), 257. 10.3390/e18070257
- Leirós-Rodríguez R, García-Soidán JL, & Romo-Pérez V (2019). Analyzing the use of accelerometers as a method of early diagnosis of alterations in balance in elderly people: A systematic review. In *Sensors* (Vol. 19, Issue 18, p. 3883). MDPI AG. 10.3390/s19183883 [PubMed: 31505828]
- Lindemann U, Moe-Nilssen R, Nicolai SE, Becker C, & Chiari L (2012). Assessment of balance in unsupported standing with elderly inpatients by force plate and accelerometers. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, 24(1), 37–41. 10.1007/BF03325352 [PubMed: 22643303]

- Lippi L, Turco A, Folli A, D'Abrosca F, Curci C, Mezian K, de Sire A, & Invernizzi M (2023). Technological advances and digital solutions to improve quality of life in older adults with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: a systematic review. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, 35(5), 953–968. 10.1007/S40520-023-02381-3 [PubMed: 36952118]
- Liu Y, Redmond SJ, Narayanan MR, & Lovell NH (2011). Classification between non-multiple fallers and multiple fallers using a triaxial accelerometry-based system. *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, EMBS*, 1499–1502. 10.1109/IEMBS.2011.6090342
- Löppönen A, Karavirta L, Portegijs E, Koivunen K, Rantanen T, Finni T, Delecluse C, Van Roie E, & Rantalainen T (2021). Day-to-day variability and year-to-year reproducibility of accelerometer-measured free-living sit-to-stand transitions volume and intensity among community-dwelling older adults. *Sensors*, 21(18), 6068. 10.3390/S21186068/S1 [PubMed: 34577275]
- Makizako H, Furuta T, Ihira H, & Shimada H (2013). Age-related differences in the influence of cognitive task performance on postural control under unstable balance conditions. *International Journal of Gerontology*, 7(4), 199–204. 10.1016/J.IJGE.2013.01.014
- Mañas A, del Pozo-Cruz B, Guadalupe-Grau A, Marín-Puyalto J, Alfaro-Acha A, Rodríguez-Mañas L, García-García FJ, & Ara I (2018). Reallocating accelerometer-assessed sedentary time to light or moderate- to vigorous-intensity physical activity reduces frailty levels in older adults: An isotemporal substitution approach in the TSHA Study. *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, 19(2), 185.e1–185.e6. 10.1016/j.jamda.2017.11.003
- Manchester D, Woollacott M, Zederbauer-Hylton N, & Marin O (1989). Visual, vestibular and somatosensory contributions to balance control in the older adult. *Journal of Gerontology*, 44(4), M118–127. 10.1093/GERONJ/44.4.M118 [PubMed: 2786896]
- Mancini M, Carlson-Kuhta P, Zampieri C, Nutt JG, Chiari L, & Horak FB (2012). Postural sway as a marker of progression in Parkinson's disease: A pilot longitudinal study. *Gait and Posture*, 36(3), 471–476. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2012.04.010 [PubMed: 22750016]
- Mancini M, & Horak FB (2010). The relevance of clinical balance assessment tools to differentiate balance deficits. *European Journal of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine*, 46(2), 239–248. [PubMed: 20485226]
- Mancini M, Horak FB, Zampieri C, Carlson-Kuhta P, Nutt JG, & Chiari L (2011). Trunk accelerometry reveals postural instability in untreated Parkinson's disease. *Parkinsonism and Related Disorders*, 17(7), 557–562. 10.1016/j.parkreldis.2011.05.010 [PubMed: 21641263]
- Mancini M, Salarian A, Carlson-Kuhta P, Zampieri C, King L, Chiari L, & Horak FB (2012). ISway: A sensitive, valid and reliable measure of postural control. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 9(1), 59. 10.1186/1743-0003-9-59 [PubMed: 22913719]
- Mansson L, Bäckman P, Öhberg F, Sandlund J, Selling J, & Sandlund M (2021). Evaluation of concurrent validity between a smartphone self-test prototype and clinical instruments for balance and leg strength. *Sensors*, 21(5), 1–19. 10.3390/S21051765
- Marchetti GF, Bellanca J, Whitney SL, Lin JCC, Musolino MC, Furman GR, & Redfern MS (2013). The development of an accelerometer-based measure of human upright static anterior-posterior postural sway under various sensory conditions: Test-retest reliability, scoring and preliminary validity of the Balance Accelerometry Measure (BAM). *Journal of Vestibular Research: Equilibrium and Orientation*, 23(4–5), 227–235. 10.3233/VES-130490 [PubMed: 24284603]
- Martínez-Ramírez A, Lecumberri P, Gómez M, Rodríguez-Mañas L, García FJ, & Izquierdo M (2011). Frailty assessment based on wavelet analysis during quiet standing balance test. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 44(12), 2213–2220. 10.1016/J.JBIOMECH.2011.06.007 [PubMed: 21719016]
- Martínez J, Asiain D, & Beltrán JR (2021). Lightweight thermal compensation technique for mems capacitive accelerometer oriented to quasi-static measurements. *Sensors*, 21(9), 3117. 10.3390/s21093117 [PubMed: 33946219]
- Matheron E, Yang Q, Delpit-Baraut V, Dailly O, & Kapoula Z (2016). Active ocular vergence improves postural control in elderly as close viewing distance with or without a single cognitive task. *Neuroscience Letters*, 610, 24–29. 10.1016/j.neulet.2015.10.065 [PubMed: 26522373]
- Mathie MJ, Coster ACF, Lovell NH, & Celler BG (2004). Accelerometry: Providing an integrated, practical method for long-term, ambulatory monitoring of human movement. *Physiological Measurement*, 25(2), R1. 10.1088/0967-3334/25/2/R01 [PubMed: 15132305]

- McManus K, Greene BR, Ader LGM, & Caulfield B (2022). Development of Data-Driven Metrics for Balance Impairment and Fall Risk Assessment in Older Adults. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 69(7), 2324–2332. 10.1109/TBME.2022.3142617 [PubMed: 35025734]
- Mejía ST, Su T-T, Hsieh KL, Griffin AM, & Sosnoff JJ (2023). The Dynamic Interplay of Objective and Subjective Balance and Subsequent Task Performance: Implications for Fall Risk in Older Adults. *Gerontology*, 69(5). 10.1159/000528649
- Meyer G, & Ayalon M (2006). Biomechanical aspects of dynamic stability. *European Review of Aging and Physical Activity*, 3(1), 29–33. 10.1007/s11556-006-0006-6
- Mierau A, Pester B, Hülzdünker T, Schiecke K, Strüder HK, & Witte H (2017). Cortical correlates of human balance control. *Brain Topography*, 30(4), 434–446. 10.1007/s10548-017-0567-x [PubMed: 28466295]
- Mitsutake T, Sakamoto M, Ueta K, & Horikawa E (2020). Standing postural stability during galvanic vestibular stimulation is associated with the motor function of the hemiplegic lower extremity post-stroke. *Topics in Stroke Rehabilitation*, 27(2), 110–117. 10.1080/10749357.2019.1667662 [PubMed: 31618124]
- Moe-Nilssen R (1998). Test-retest reliability of trunk accelerometry during standing and walking. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 79(11), 1377–1385. 10.1016/S0003-9993(98)90231-3 [PubMed: 9821897]
- Moe-Nilssen R, & Helbostad JL (2002). Trunk accelerometry as a measure of balance control during quiet standing. *Gait and Posture*, 16(1), 60–68. 10.1016/S0966-6362(01)00200-4 [PubMed: 12127188]
- Montesinos L, Castaldo R, & Pecchia L (2018). Wearable inertial sensors for fall risk assessment and prediction in older adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 26(3), 573–582. 10.1109/TNSRE.2017.2771383 [PubMed: 29522401]
- Moreland B, Kakara R, & Henry A (2020). Trends in nonfatal falls and fall-related injuries among adults aged 65 years — United States, 2012–2018. In *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (Vol. 69, Issue 27). Centers for Disease Control MMWR Office. 10.15585/mmwr.mm6927a5
- Mulas I, Putzu V, Asoni G, Viale D, Mamei I, & Pau M (2021). Clinical assessment of gait and functional mobility in Italian healthy and cognitively impaired older persons using wearable inertial sensors. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, 33(7), 1853. 10.1007/S40520-020-01715-9 [PubMed: 32978750]
- Najafi B, Horn D, Marclay S, Crews RT, Wu S, & Wrobel JS (2010). Assessing postural control and postural control strategy in diabetes patients using innovative and wearable technology. *Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology*, 4(4), 780–791. 10.1177/193229681000400403 [PubMed: 20663438]
- Narayanan MR, Redmond SJ, Scalzi ME, Lord SR, Celler BG, & Lovell NH (2010). Longitudinal falls-risk estimation using triaxial accelerometry. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 57(3), 534–541. 10.1109/TBME.2009.2033038 [PubMed: 19789094]
- Navarrete-Opazo A, Alcayaga JJ, Sepúlveda O, & Varas G (2017). Intermittent Hypoxia and locomotor training enhances dynamic but not standing balance in patients with incomplete spinal cord injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 98(3), 415–424. 10.1016/j.apmr.2016.09.114 [PubMed: 27702556]
- Neville C, Ludlow C, & Rieger B (2015). Measuring postural stability with an inertial sensor: Validity and sensitivity. *Medical Devices: Evidence and Research*, 8, 447–455. 10.2147/MDER.S91719 [PubMed: 26604839]
- Niu W, Fang L, Xu L, Li X, Huo R, Guo D, & Qi Z (2018). Summary of research status and application of MEMS accelerometers. *Journal of Computer and Communications*, 6(12), 215–221. 10.4236/JCC.2018.612021
- Noamani A, Lemay JF, Musselman KE, & Rouhani H (2021). Characterization of standing balance after incomplete spinal cord injury: Alteration in integration of sensory information in ambulatory individuals. *Gait and Posture*, 83, 152–159. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2020.10.027 [PubMed: 33152610]

- O'Sullivan M, Blake C, Cunningham C, Boyle G, & Finucane C (2009). Correlation of accelerometry with clinical balance tests in older fallers and non-fallers. *Age and Ageing*, 38(3), 308–313. 10.1093/ageing/afp009 [PubMed: 19252205]
- Olsen S, Rashid U, Allerby C, Brown E, Leyser M, McDonnell G, Alder G, Barbado D, Shaikh N, Lord S, Niazi IK, & Taylor D (2023). Smartphone-based gait and balance accelerometry is sensitive to age and correlates with clinical and kinematic data. *Gait and Posture*, 100, 57–64. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2022.11.014 [PubMed: 36481647]
- Ozinga SJ, Linder SM, & Alberts JL (2017). Use of mobile device accelerometry to enhance evaluation of postural instability in Parkinson Disease. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 98(4), 649–658. 10.1016/j.apmr.2016.08.479 [PubMed: 27670925]
- Pantall A, Del Din S, & Rochester L (2018). Longitudinal changes over thirty-six months in postural control dynamics and cognitive function in people with Parkinson's disease. *Gait and Posture*, 62, 468–474. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2018.04.016 [PubMed: 29674286]
- Pantall A, Suresparan P, Kapa L, Morris R, Yarnall A, Del Din S, & Rochester (2018). Postural dynamics are associated with cognitive decline in Parkinson's disease. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 9, 1044. 10.3389/fneur.2018.01044 [PubMed: 30568629]
- Panzer VP, Bandinelli S, & Hallett M (1995). Biomechanical assessment of quiet standing and changes associated with aging. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 76(2), 151–157. 10.1016/S0003-9993(95)80024-7 [PubMed: 7848073]
- Parvaneh S, Mohler J, Toosizadeh N, Grewal GS, & Najafi B (2017). Postural Transitions during Activities of Daily Living Could Identify Frailty Status: Application of Wearable Technology to Identify Frailty during Unsupervised Condition. *Gerontology*, 63(5), 479–487. 10.1159/000460292 [PubMed: 28285311]
- Pau M, Porta M, Coghe G, Corona F, Pilloni G, Loreface L, Marrosu MG, & Cocco E (2017). Are static and functional balance abilities related in individuals with Multiple Sclerosis? *Multiple Sclerosis and Related Disorders*, 15, 1–6. 10.1016/j.msard.2017.04.002 [PubMed: 28641764]
- Pirini M, Mancini M, Farella E, & Chiari L (2011). EEG correlates of postural audio-biofeedback. *Human Movement Science*, 30(2), 249–261. 10.1016/J.HUMOV.2010.05.016 [PubMed: 20800912]
- Podsiadlo D, & Richardson S (1991). The Timed "Up & Go": A test of basic functional mobility for rail elderly persons. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 39(2), 142–148. 10.1111/j.1532-5415.1991.tb01616.x [PubMed: 1991946]
- Porciuncula F, Wasserman P, Marder KS, & Rao AK (2020). Quantifying postural control in premanifest and manifest huntington disease using wearable sensors. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 34(9), 771–783. 10.1177/1545968320939560 [PubMed: 32672492]
- Redfern MS, Chambers AJ, Sparto PJ, Furman JM, & Jennings JR (2019). Inhibition and decision-processing speed are associated with performance on dynamic posturography in older adults. *Experimental Brain Research*, 237(1), 37–45. 10.1007/s00221-018-5394-0 [PubMed: 30302490]
- Reynard F, Christe D, & Terrier P (2019). Postural control in healthy adults: Determinants of trunk sway assessed with a chest-worn accelerometer in 12 quiet standing tasks. *PLoS ONE*, 14(1), e0211051. 10.1371/journal.pone.0211051 [PubMed: 30673753]
- Richman JS, & Moorman JR (2000). Physiological time-series analysis using approximate and sample entropy. *American Journal of Physiology - Heart and Circulatory Physiology*, 278(6 47–6), 2039–2049. 10.1152/ajpheart.2000.278.6.h2039
- Rivolta MW, Aktaruzzaman M, Rizzo G, Lafortuna CL, Ferrarin M, Bovi G, Bonardi DR, Caspani A, & Sassi R (2019). Evaluation of the Tinetti score and fall risk assessment via accelerometry-based movement analysis. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 95, 38–47. 10.1016/j.artmed.2018.08.005 [PubMed: 30195985]
- Rogers ME, Rogers NL, Takeshima N, & Islam MM (2003). Methods to assess and improve the physical parameters associated with fall risk in older adults. *Preventive Medicine*, 36(3), 255–264. 10.1016/S0091-7435(02)00028-2 [PubMed: 12634016]
- Rosso AL, Cenciarini M, Sparto PJ, Loughlin PJ, Furman JM, & Huppert TJ (2017). Neuroimaging of an attention demanding dual-task during dynamic postural control. *Gait and Posture*, 57, 193–198. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2017.06.013 [PubMed: 28662465]

- Saunders NW, Koutakis P, Kloos AD, Kegelmeyer DA, Dicke JD, & Devor ST (2015). Reliability and validity of a wireless accelerometer for the assessment of postural sway. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, 31(3), 159–163. 10.1123/JAB.2014-0232 [PubMed: 25558822]
- Schellendorfer S, Ernst MJ, Rast FM, Bauer CM, Meichtry A, & Kool J (2015). Low back pain and postural control, effects of task difficulty on centre of pressure and spinal kinematics. *Gait and Posture*, 41(1), 112–118. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2014.09.004 [PubMed: 25270326]
- Schrack JA, Leroux A, Fleg JL, Zipunnikov V, Simonsick EM, Studenski SA, Crainiceanu C, & Ferrucci L (2018). Using heart rate and accelerometry to define quantity and intensity of physical activity in older adults. *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 73(5), 668–675. 10.1093/gerona/gly029 [PubMed: 29509832]
- Schwenk M, Grewal GS, Honarvar B, Schwenk S, Mohler J, Khalsa DS, & Najafi B (2014). Interactive balance training integrating sensor-based visual feedback of movement performance: A pilot study in older adults. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 11(1). 10.1186/1743-0003-11-164
- Segev-Jacobovskii O, Herman T, Yogev-Seligmann G, Mirelman A, Giladi N, & Hausdorff JM (2011). The interplay between gait, falls and cognition: Can cognitive therapy reduce fall risk? *Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics*, 11(7), 1057–1075. 10.1586/ern.11.69 [PubMed: 21721921]
- Shahzad A, Ko S, Lee S, Lee JA, & Kim K (2017). Quantitative assessment of balance impairment for fall-risk estimation using wearable triaxial accelerometer. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 17(20), 6743–6751. 10.1109/JSEN.2017.2749446
- Similä H, Immonen M, & Ermes M (2017). Accelerometry-based assessment and detection of early signs of balance deficits. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 85, 25–32. 10.1016/j.combiomed.2017.04.009 [PubMed: 28432935]
- Similä H, Mäntyjärvi J, Merilahti J, Lindholm M, & Ermes M (2014). Accelerometry-based berg balance scale score estimation. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 18(4), 1114–1121. 10.1109/JBHI.2013.2288940 [PubMed: 24235319]
- Stevens JA, Corso PS, Finkelstein EA, & Miller TR (2006). The costs of fatal and non-fatal falls among older adults. *Injury Prevention*, 12(5), 290–295. 10.1136/ip.2005.011015 [PubMed: 17018668]
- Suttanon P, Kuhaphensaeng B, Choawanachan T, Prathum T, Saelee P, & Apibantaweesakul S (2020). Concurrent validity of a developed accelerometry-based device for postural sway assessment. *Songklanakarin Journal of Science and Technology*, 42(5), 984–990. 10.14456/sjst-psu.2020.127
- Turcot K, Allet L, Golay A, Hoffmeyer P, & Armand S (2009). Investigation of standing balance in diabetic patients with and without peripheral neuropathy using accelerometers. *Clinical Biomechanics*, 24(9), 716–721. 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2009.07.003 [PubMed: 19683372]
- Valenciano PJ, Conceição NR, Marcori AJ, & Teixeira LA (2022). Use of accelerometry to investigate standing and dynamic body balance in people with cerebral palsy: A systematic review. *Gait and Posture*, 96, 357–364. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2022.06.017 [PubMed: 35820240]
- Valenzuela T, Okubo Y, Woodbury A, Lord SR, & Delbaere K (2018). Adherence to Technology-Based Exercise Programs in Older Adults: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy* (2001), 41(1), 49–61. 10.1519/JPT.0000000000000095 [PubMed: 27362526]
- Van Schooten KS, Pijnappels M, Rispens SM, Elders PJM, Lips P, & Van Dieën JH (2015). Ambulatory fall-risk assessment: Amount and quality of daily-life gait predict falls in older adults. *Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 70(5), 608–615. 10.1093/gerona/glu225 [PubMed: 25568095]
- Wall C, & Weinberg MS (2003). Balance prostheses for postural control. *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine*, 22(2), 84–90. 10.1109/EMEMB.2003.1195701
- Weiss A, Herman T, Plotnik M, Brozgol M, Giladi N, & Hausdorff JM (2011). An instrumented timed up and go: The added value of an accelerometer for identifying fall risk in idiopathic fallers. *Physiological Measurement*, 32(12), 2003–2018. 10.1088/0967-3334/32/12/009 [PubMed: 22094550]
- Whitney SL, Roche JL, Marchetti GF, Lin CC, Steed DP, Furman GR, Musolino MC, & Redfern MS (2011). A comparison of accelerometry and center of pressure measures during computerized

dynamic posturography: A measure of balance. *Gait and Posture*, 33(4), 594–599. 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.01.015 [PubMed: 21333541]

- Wilson J, Heinsch M, Betts D, Booth D, & Kay-Lambkin F (2021). Barriers and facilitators to the use of e-health by older adults: a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*, 21(1), 1–12. 10.1186/S12889-021-11623-W/TABLES/2 [PubMed: 33388037]
- Winter DA (1995). Human balance and posture control during standing and walking. *Gait and Posture*, 3(4), 193–214. 10.1016/0966-6362(96)82849-9
- Woollacott M, & Shumway-Cook A (2002). Attention and the control of posture and gait: a review of an emerging area of research. *Gait and Posture*, 16(1), 1–14. 10.1016/S0966-6362(01)00156-4 [PubMed: 12127181]
- Wu CH, Lee CH, Jiang BC, & Sun TL (2019). Multiscale entropy analysis of postural stability for estimating fall risk via domain knowledge of timed-up-and-go accelerometer data for elderly people living in a community. *Entropy*, 21(11), 1076. 10.3390/e21111076
- Yu L, Zhao Y, Wang H, Sun TL, Murphy TE, & Tsui KL (2021). Assessing elderly's functional balance and mobility via analyzing data from waist-mounted tri-axial wearable accelerometers in timed up and go tests. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 21(1). 10.1186/s12911-021-01463-4
- Zampogna A, Mileti I, Palermo E, Celletti C, Paoloni M, Manoni A, Mazzetta I, Dalla Costa G, Pérez-López C, Camerota F, Leocani L, Cabestany J, Irrera F, & Suppa A (2020). Fifteen years of wireless sensors for balance assessment in neurological disorders. *Sensors*, 20(11), 3247. 10.3390/s20113247 [PubMed: 32517315]
- Zhong R, & Rau PLP (2020). Are cost-effective technologies feasible to measure gait in older adults? A systematic review of evidence-based literature. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 87, 103970. 10.1016/J.ARCHGER.2019.103970 [PubMed: 31743825]
- Zhou J, Yu W, Zhu H, Lo OY, Gouskova N, Trivison T, Lipsitz LA, Pascual-Leone A, & Manor B (2021, March 1). A novel smartphone App-based assessment of standing postural control: Demonstration of reliability and sensitivity to aging and task constraints. 2020 IEEE International Conference on E-Health Networking, Application and Services, HEALTHCOM 2020. 10.1109/HEALTHCOM49281.2021.9398972




Fig. 1.
A Diagram of a mass-spring system and Hooke’s Law, where F is force, k is the spring constant, x is the displacement, m is the mass, and a is the acceleration **B** Simplified diagram of a capacitive micro-electromechanical accelerometer where m is the mass, k_1 and k_2 are springs, and C_1 and C_2 are capacitors.




Fig. 2. Diagram of the single-link (left), the double-link (center), and the triple-link (right) biomechanical models.

Table 1

Description of the most commonly reported outcome metrics calculated from acceleration signals from the experimental studies discussed in this review.

Feature	Calculation	Relationship to Balance	Number of Studies that Measured Feature
Root-Mean-Square	$= \sqrt{\frac{(\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} ACC_j)^2}{N}}$ <p>Where N is the total number of data points, and ACC_j is the acceleration data at sample j.</p>	Measure of spread of accelerations, relates to amount of postural sway (Alqahtani et al., 2020).	54 (Abe et al., 2014; Alqahtani et al., 2017, 2020; Alsubaie et al., 2022; Bohlke et al., 2021; Buchman et al., 2020; T. Chen et al., 2018; Chiari et al., 2005; Cho & Kamen, 1998; Cruz-Montecinos, Carrasco, et al., 2020; D’Silva et al., 2017; Dawe et al., 2018; De Groote et al., 2021; Del Din et al., 2016; Doheny et al., 2012, 2013; Frechette et al., 2020; Godfrey et al., 2015; Greene et al., 2014; Halická et al., 2014; Hasegawa et al., 2021; Heebner et al., 2015; Helbostad et al., 2004; Hsieh et al., 2019; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Hu et al., 2020; Janssen et al., 2008; Kasser et al., 2015; King et al., 2014; Kosse et al., 2015; Lamothe & van Heuvelen, 2012; Liu et al., 2011; Makizako et al., 2013; Mancini et al., 2011; Mancini, Carlson-Kuhta, et al., 2012; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; Mansson et al., 2021; Matheron et al., 2016; McManus et al., 2022; Mejía et al., 2023; Narayanan et al., 2010; Navarrete-Opazo et al., 2017; Neville et al., 2015; Noamani et al., 2021; O’Sullivan et al., 2009; Ozinga et al., 2017; Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018; Pirini et al., 2011; Reynard et al., 2019; Saunders et al., 2015; Shahzad et al., 2017; Turcot et al., 2009; Whitney et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021)
Jerk	$= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \left(\frac{dACC}{dt} \right)^2$ <p>Where t is the total time, ACC is the acceleration signal.</p>	Measures the change in acceleration (slope) and indicates postural control smoothness (Mancini et al., 2011).	25 (Buchman et al., 2020; T. Chen et al., 2018; Cruz-Montecinos, Cuesta-Vargas, et al., 2020; Dasgupta et al., 2022; Dawe et al., 2018; Del Din et al., 2016; Dewan et al., 2019; Doheny et al., 2013; Dugan et al., 2021; Flood et al., 2020; Godfrey et al., 2015; Hasegawa et al., 2021; Johnston et al., 2020; Kasser et al., 2015; Lee et al., 2016; Mancini et al., 2011; Mancini, Carlson-Kuhta, et al., 2012; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; McManus et al., 2022; Navarrete-Opazo et al., 2017; Noamani et al., 2021; Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018; Porciuncula et al., 2020; Shahzad et al., 2017; Weiss et al., 2011; Yu et al., 2021)
Normalized Path Length	$= \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} ACC_{j+1} - ACC_j $ <p>Where t is the total time, N is the total number of data points, and ACC_j is the acceleration data at sample j.</p>	Measure of speed, similar to integrating acceleration (Alqahtani et al., 2020).	12 (Alqahtani et al., 2017, 2020; Bohlke et al., 2021; Flood et al., 2020; Furman et al., 2013; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; Mansson et al., 2021; Marchetti et al., 2013; McManus et al., 2022; Ozinga et al., 2017; Whitney et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2021)
95% Ellipse Area	Area containing 95% of accelerations in transverse plane (anterior-posterior and medial-lateral).	Planar measure of spread of accelerations, relates to the amount of postural sway (Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018).	11 ^a (Del Din et al., 2016; Doherty et al., 2017; Frechette et al., 2020; Godfrey et al., 2015; Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021; Lindemann et al., 2012; Matheron et al., 2016; McManus et al., 2022; Mejía et al., 2023; Ozinga et al., 2017; Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018)
95% Power Frequency	95% of power is present below this frequency.	Measure of frequency content of the acceleration signal (Doheny et al., 2013).	10 (Chiari et al., 2005; Del Din et al., 2016; Doheny et al., 2013; Godfrey et al., 2015; Greene et al., 2014; Mancini et al., 2011; Mancini, Carlson-Kuhta, et al., 2012; Mancini, Salarian, et al., 2012; McManus et al., 2022; Pantall, Suresparan, et al., 2018)

Feature	Calculation	Relationship to Balance	Number of Studies that Measured Feature
Sample Entropy	$= - \ln \left(\frac{C^{m+1}(r)}{C^m(r)} \right)$ <p>Where $C(r)$ is the conditional probability that two sequences match for length $m + 1$ or m, r is the tolerance for match acceptance which is usually defined as a percentage of the standard deviation.</p>	Measure of complexity/regularity of acceleration signals (Richman & Moorman, 2000; Wu et al., 2019).	8^b (Cruz-Montecinos, Carrasco, et al., 2020; Dugan et al., 2021; Johnston et al., 2020; Lamoth & van Heuvelen, 2012; Lee et al., 2016; Pantall, Del Din, et al., 2018; Rivolta et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2019)

^aOne study (Doherty et al., 2017) used ellipsoid volume instead of ellipsoid area and included the vertical acceleration signal.

^bSome groups used just sample entropy (Lamoth & van Heuvelen, 2012; Pantall, Del Din, et al., 2018; Rivolta et al., 2019), others went further to find multiscale entropy (Lee et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2019) and then additionally to calculate the complexity index (Dugan et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2019).

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table 2

Studies comparing accelerometers to force plates that required subjects to perform single-leg standing, tandem stances, or dynamic movements.

Paper	Accelerometer Location	Activity
Abe <i>et al.</i> 2014 (Abe et al., 2014)	Forehead, dominant ankle	Single-leg standing
Adlerton <i>et al.</i> 2003 (Adlerton et al., 2003)	L3	Single-leg standing during resting and fatigued conditions
Dewan <i>et al.</i> 2019 (Dewan et al., 2019)	Midsternum level	Double leg standing, single-leg standing, anterior-posterior sway, medial-lateral sway
Doherty <i>et al.</i> 2017 (Doherty et al., 2017)	Lower back	Bilateral stance, tandem stance, unilateral stance (single-leg) from the Balance Error Scoring System
Heebner <i>et al.</i> 2015 (Heebner et al., 2015)	L5	Dynamic postural stability index, forward jump over hurdle to one leg, lateral jump over hurdle to one leg, double leg stance on firm and foam, tandem stance, single-leg standing
Hsieh <i>et al.</i> 2021 (Hsieh & Sosnoff, 2021)	Sternum	Eyes open and closed bilateral stance, semi-tandem stance, tandem stance, and single-leg standing
Janssen <i>et al.</i> 2008 (Janssen et al., 2008)	Sternum	Sit-to-stand on firm, foam, and balance board surface, sit-to-stand rising on single dominant leg

Table 3

Studies that focused on comparing accelerometry to or predicting scores of clinical examinations.

Paper	Tasks Completed with Accelerometer	Clinical Examination	Main Takeaway
Godfrey <i>et al.</i> 2015 (Godfrey et al., 2015)	TUG	TUG	TUG times detected with accelerometry were not significantly different from stopwatch times, indicating algorithm could replace stopwatch timing.
McManus <i>et al.</i> 2022 (McManus et al., 2022)	Standing on firm and foam surfaces in a semitandem stance, with eyes closed in a narrow stance, TUG	Berg Balance Scale, TUG	The Balance Score developed from accelerometry features was significantly correlated to TUG time ($\rho = 0.30, 0.34; p < 0.001$). Accuracy was higher for fall risk assessment classifiers that used accelerometry data (66%, 68%) than classifiers using just TUG time (59%) or Berg Balance Scale scores (59%).
Narayanan <i>et al.</i> 2010 (Narayanan et al., 2010)	Physiological Profile Assessment, TUG, Alternative Step Test, 5-times Sit-to-Stand	Physiological Profile Assessment	A model developed mostly using accelerometry features from the Alternative Step Test and Sit-to-Stand was highly correlated to the Physical Profile Assessment ($\rho = 0.81, p < 0.001$).
O'Sullivan <i>et al.</i> 2009 (O'Sullivan et al., 2009)	Standing on firm and foam surfaces with eyes open and closed	Berg Balance Scale, TUG	Acceleration root-mean-square during standing on foam with eyes open was significantly correlated with Berg Balance Scale ($\rho = -0.829, p < 0.001$) and TUG ($r = 0.621, p < 0.01$).
Shahzad <i>et al.</i> 2017 (Shahzad et al., 2017)	TUG, Alternative Step Test, 5-times Sit-to-Stand	Berg Balance Scale	The average of Berg Balance Scale score estimation models that were trained using accelerometry features was strongly correlated to standard Berg Balance Scale scores ($\rho = 0.86, p < 0.001$).
Similä <i>et al.</i> 2014 (Similä et al., 2014)	Berg Balance Scale, 10m Walk	Berg Balance Scale	The gait-based Berg Balance Scale estimation model was most accurate in identifying high fall risk subjects (77.8%) and low fall risk subjects (96.6%); the balance task estimation model performed better with high fall risk (89.5%) than low fall risk (62.1%).
Similä <i>et al.</i> 2017 (Similä et al., 2017)	Romberg test, Berg Balance Scale, TUG, 5-times Sit-to-Stand, 4m Walk	Berg Balance Scale, TUG, 5-times Sit-to-Stand	Results from the estimation models using accelerometry features averaged normalized root-mean-square errors of 0.28 for Berg Balance Scale scores, 0.18 for TUG times, and 0.22 for 4m walk times. Standard deviation of vertical acceleration could predict decline in Berg Balance Scale (AUC = 0.82, sensitivity = 80%, specificity = 73%).
Yu <i>et al.</i> 2021 (Yu et al., 2021)	TUG	Short Form Berg Balance Scale	Accelerometer features from TUG performance were the inputs to an estimation model for Short Form Berg Balance Scale scores, with an elastic net regression model performing the best (mean absolute error = 2.12, root-mean-square error = 2.68). Predicted subtask scores were also able to discriminate between fall risk levels (AUC = 0.72–0.79).