

Supplementary Table S1. Detailed description of FRIDs evaluated in studies

	Source for FRID Ascertainment	CNS-Active									Cardiovascular					Other		
		Anticholinergics ^a	Antidepressants	Anti-dementia	Anti-Parkinson	Antipsychotics	Anti-seizure	Benzodiazepines/Sedatives/Hypnotics	Opioids	Skeletal muscle relaxants	Anti-arrhythmics	Antihypertensives ^b	Digoxin	Diuretics	Nitrates and Vasodilators	Alpha blockers	Beta blocker eye drops	Hypoglycemics
OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES																		
Bennett¹⁴	Medical records	x	x			x		x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x
Benuza-Sola¹⁵	Medical records		x		x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x			
Francis¹⁶	Medical records		x			x	x	x										
Hill-Taylor¹⁷	Pharmacy claims							x										
Kragh^{18,d}	National registry	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x				
Marvin¹⁹	Medical records	x				x		x	x			x		x	x			
McMahon²⁰	Pharmacy claims		x	x		x		x										
Sjöberg²¹	National registry	x	x		x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		
Trenaman²²	Pharmacy claims					x												
Walsh²³	Medical records					x		x						x				
INTERVENTION STUDIES																		
Blalock²⁴	Pharmacy records		x			x	x	x	x	x								
Boyé²⁵	Interview, GP, pharmacist	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Sjöberg²⁶	Medication list		x		x	x		x	x			x		x	x			
van der Velde⁹	Interview, GP, pharmacist	x	x			x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

Abbreviations: ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB = angiotensin II receptor blocker; CNS = central nervous system; FRID = fall-risk-increasing drug; GP = general practitioner; HMG-CoA = 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A; NSAIDs = nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs

^aAnticholinergics include: antihistamines, antivertigo, urinary antispasmodics, and/or others not otherwise specified

^bAntihypertensives include: ACE inhibitors/ARBs (and others acting on renin angiotensin system), beta blockers, calcium channel blockers, and others not otherwise specified

^c"Others" within Other category include: steroids, NSAIDs, anti-gout, hydroquinine, adrenergics (respiratory), HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors

^dKragh: Noted cardiovascular medications, but did not specify individual classes (though excluded lipid-lowering medications)

Supplementary Table S2. Prevalence of FRID use at admission among observational studies

Study	Overall FRID Use	CNS-Active FRID Use	Cardiovascular FRID Use	Other FRID Use
Bennett¹⁴	2.5 ± 2.1 ^a	Anxiolytics 16.0% Antidepressants 24.0% Antipsychotics 3.0% Opioids 21.0% Anticholinergics 14.0% Antihistamines 0.0% Antivertigo 1.0%	Antihypertensives 74.0% Antiarrhythmics 3.0% Vasodilators 7.0% Digoxin 4.0%	Hypoglycemics 12.0% Beta blocker eye drops 1.0%
Benuza-Sola¹⁵	91.3%	Opioids 4.4% Anti-Parkinson 2.5% Antipsychotics 5.4% Anxiolytics 9.8% Hypnotics and sedatives 8.5% Antidepressants 15.0%	Cardiac glycosides 2.7% Class IA antiarrhythmics 0.0% Vasodilators 2.2% Antihypertensives 0.1% Diuretics 18.0% Beta blockers 8.0% Calcium channel blockers 5.7% Agents acting on renin-angiotensin system 16.0%	Alpha adrenergic antagonists 1.9%
Francis¹⁶	N/A ^b	N/A	N/A	N/A
Marvin¹⁹	65.0%	Not available	Not available	Not available
Sjöberg²¹	93.0%	Antipsychotics 14.0% Sedatives 51.0% Benzodiazepines 31.0% Antidepressants 40.0% Urinary spasmolytics 3.0% Anti-Parkinson 1.0% Opioids 21.0%	Cardiovascular (overall) 62.0% Digoxin 5.0% Nitrates 11.0% Type IA antiarrhythmics 0.0% Diuretics 45.0% Beta blockers 39.0% Calcium channel blockers 17.0% ACE inhibitors and ARBs 22.0%	Alpha blockers 5.0% Beta blocker eye drops 5.0%

Abbreviations: ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB = angiotensin II receptor blocker; CNS = central nervous system; FRID = fall risk increasing drug; N/A = not applicable

^aAverage FRID count per participant reported, rather than percentage of participants on FRID at baseline

^bThis study only included subjects with potentially inappropriate medication use on admission

Supplementary Table S3. Risk of bias in observational studies^a

Study	Selection				Comparability Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	Outcome		
	Representativeness of the exposed cohort ^b	Selection of the non exposed cohort ^c	Ascertainment of exposure	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study		Assessment of outcome	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur ^d	Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
Bennett ¹⁴	* Somewhat representative the average older adult admitted to emergency department or hospital for fall in Australia	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A
Benuza-Sola ¹⁵	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult in Spain admitted to hospital for fall-related fracture	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	* Yes	N/A
Francis ¹⁶	* Somewhat representative the average older adult in Canada admitted to hospital for fall	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A
Hill-Taylor ¹⁷	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult in Canada with hospitalization for fall-related injury	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A
Kragh ¹⁸	* Truly representative of the average older adult with hip fracture in southern Sweden	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A

Marvin ¹⁹	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult hospitalized for fall in United Kingdom	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A
McMahon ²⁰	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult with emergency department visit for fall in Ireland	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A
Sjöberg ²¹	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult undergoing surgery for hip fracture in Sweden	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	* Yes	N/A
Trenaman ²²	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult in Canada with hospitalization for fall-related injury	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A
Walsh ²³	* Somewhat representative of the average older adult with fall, fracture, or syncope in Ireland	N/A	* Secure record	N/A	N/A	* Record linkage	No	N/A

^aRisk of bias was measured using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale.

^b Studies can receive a point for being assessed as truly representative or somewhat representative of the population. We were conservative and rated studies as "somewhat representative" if they did not assess the entire population.

^c Studies did not include a control group of people without a fall-related injury.

^d Studies were given a point (star) if the method of outcome assessment was able to capture a change in FRID use at a specific time point following discharge (rather than looking at change in use at discharge or within a period of time following discharge).

Supplementary Table S4. Risk of bias in intervention studies^a

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding: participants and personnel	Blinding: outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting
Blalock ²⁴	Low	Low	Unclear	Low	High	Low
Boyé ²⁵	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low	High	Low
Sjöberg ²⁶	Low	Low	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Low
van der Velde ^{9,b}	High	High	High	Low	Unclear	Low

^aRisk of bias was measured using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool.

^bThe study by van der Velde et al. was not a randomized controlled trial, but for consistency, its risk of bias was analyzed using the same Cochrane tool used for the randomized controlled trials.

Supplementary Figure S1. Summary of intervention studies and main results

