

Appendix C
Characteristics of included studies

Study	Methods				Demographics			
	Country	Design	Type of intervention (if applicable)	Type of control (if applicable)	Sample size	Type of sample	Age	Female (%)
Aartolahti et al. (2013)	Finland	cross-sectional study	multidisciplinary intervention, focused on medication, nutrition, and exercise	n/a	576	community-dwelling	76-100	70.0
Abellan et al. (2013)	France	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	3,025	community-dwelling	≥75	100.0
Ahluwalia et al. (2010)	USA	qualitative study using interviews and grounded theory	n/a	n/a	23	community-dwelling	≥78	61.0
Behm et al. (2015)	Sweden	RCT with follow-up after 1 and 2 years	preventive home visit group, senior meeting group	access to the ordinary range of services for older persons	459	community-dwelling	80-97	64.0
Berkemeyer et al. (2009)	Germany	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	440	community-dwelling	≥75	44.8
Blain et al. (2010)	France	longitudinal study	n/a	n/a	1300	community-dwelling	≥75	100.0
Bollwein et al. (2013)	Germany	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	192	community-dwelling	75-96	64.6
Brown et al. (2016)	USA	longitudinal cohort study	n/a	n/a	410	community-dwelling	≥75	57.0

Byles et al. (2015)	Australia	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	260	community-dwelling	75-80	50.4
Calvert et al. (2009)	USA	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	306	community-dwelling	≥85	62.0
Chipperfield et al. (2008)	Canada	prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	198	community-dwelling	80-98	63.1
Diez-Ruiz et al. (2016)	Spain	prospective cohort study with 2 years follow-up	n/a	n/a	215	community dwelling	≥75	63.0
Eckerblad et al. (2015)	Sweden	qualitative study using semi-structured interviews and content analysis	n/a	n/a	20	community-dwelling	79-89	80.0
El-Khoury et al. (2015)	France	RCT	2-year exercise programme of progressive balance retraining in reducing injurious falls, weekly supervised group sessions supplemented by individually prescribed home exercises	brochures about fall prevention, newsletters, four free exercise sessions	706	community-dwelling	75-85	100.0
Eronen et al. (2016)	Finland	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	848	community-dwelling	75-90	62.0
Fabre et al. (2007)	USA	population-based cohort study	n/a	n/a	74	community-dwelling	≥90	51.3

Formiga et al. (2014)	Spain	longitudinal study	n/a	n/a	167	community-dwelling	≥85	60.5
Formiga et al. (2016)	Spain	RCT with 5-year follow-up	falls and malnutrition prevention	general primary care assessment	328	community-dwelling	≥85	61.6
Fritel et al. (2013)	France	observational cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	1,942	community-dwelling	75-85	100.0
Gustafsson et al. (2013)	Sweden	RCT	preventive home visit group, senior meeting group	ordinary range of community services offered by the municipal care for the aged	459	community-dwelling	80-97	64.0
Gustafsson et al. (2012)	Sweden	RCT	preventive home visit group, senior meeting group	access to the ordinary range of community services offered by the municipal agency	459	community-dwelling	80-97	64.0
Hammar et al. (2014)	Sweden	qualitative study using interviews and grounded theory	n/a	n/a	11	community-dwelling	84-95	54.5
Hegendörfer et al. (2017)	Belgium	prospective, observational, population based cohort study	n/a	n/a	501	community-dwelling	≥80	63.0
Heyl & Wahl (2010)	Germany	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	271	community-dwelling	75-94	54

Hoeksema et al. (2017)	Netherlands	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	1026	community-dwelling	≥75	59.0
Horgen et al. (2012)	Norway	mixed methods study	n/a	n/a	165	community-dwelling	75	n/a
Houston et al. (2011)	USA	secondary analysis of a longitudinal study with 3 years of follow-up	n/a	n/a	988	community-dwelling	77-100	64.5
Idland et al. (2013)	Norway	prospective, observational cohort study with 9 years follow-up	n/a	n/a	307 (baseline) 113 (follow-up)	community-dwelling	75-92	100.0
Iwarsson et al. (2009)	Sweden, Germany, Latvia	secondary analysis of a longitudinal survey study with 1 year follow-up	n/a	n/a	834	community-dwelling	75-89	79.7
Landi et al. (2010a)	Italy	secondary analysis of a prospective cohort study (baseline)	n/a	n/a	357	community-dwelling	≥80	67.0
Landi et al. (2010b)	Italy	secondary analysis of a prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	364 (baseline) 205 (follow-up)	community-dwelling	≥80	67.0

Laudisio et al. (2013)	Italy	with 2 years follow-up cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	356	community-dwelling	≥75	54.5
Laudisio et al. (2015)	Italy	longitudinal, population-based study with 1-year follow-up	n/a	n/a	342	community-dwelling	≥75	56.0
Laudisio et al. (2010)	Italy	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	350	community-dwelling	≥75	54.3
Lofqvist et al. (2017)	Latvia	secondary analysis of a longitudinal study with 9 years follow-up	n/a	n/a	59	community-dwelling	77-90	90.0
Mangani et al. (2008)	Italy	secondary analysis of a prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	364	community-dwelling	≥80	67.0
Mänty et al. (2014)	Denmark, Finland	secondary analysis of a longitudinal study	n/a	n/a	561	community-dwelling	75	55.0
Mikkola et al. (2016)	Finland	secondary analysis of a cross sectional and	n/a	n/a	766	community-dwelling	75-90	62.7

		longitudinal study							
Mikkola et al. (2015)	Finland	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	848	community-dwelling	75-90	62.0	
Murabito et al. (2008)	USA	secondary analysis of a prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	830	community-dwelling	79-88	61.4	
Muscari et al. (2017)	Italy	prospective, longitudinal population-based study with 7 years follow-up	n/a	n/a	500	community-dwelling	85-102	65.8	
Nitsch et al. (2011)	UK	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	2,967	community-dwelling	≥75	59.7	
Nykänen et al. (2013)	Finland	population based randomized comparative study	n/a	n/a	696	community-dwelling	≥75	69.4	
Polku et al. (2015)	Finland	prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	848	community-dwelling	75-90	62.0	
Portegijs et al. (2016)	Finland	secondary analysis of a cross-sectional study (baseline data & follow-up)	n/a	n/a	753	community-dwelling	75-90	64.0	

Quail et al. (2007)	Canada	secondary analysis of a population-based cohort study	n/a	n/a	508	community-dwelling	75-96	66.9
Rantakokko et al. (2014)	Finland	secondary analysis of a cross-sectional study (baseline data)	n/a	n/a	847	community-dwelling	75-90	62.0
Rantakokko et al. (2016)	Finland	secondary analysis of a cross-sectional study (baseline data & follow-up)	n/a	n/a	848 (baseline), 816 (1 year follow-up), 761 (2 years follow-up)	community-dwelling	75-90	62.0
Rantz et al. (2015)	USA	secondary analysis of a cross-sectional study	living with sensors	living without sensors	133	residents of independent living facility	mean age: 83	64.7
Rao et al. (2016)	Canada	secondary analysis of a cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	1,668	community-dwelling	mean age: 82.9 (SD 6.9)	58.0
Rapo-Pylkko et al. (2016)	Finland	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	106	community-dwelling	75-85	74.0

Rydwik et al. (2010)	Sweden	RCT 24 month follow-up	1) nutritional treatment (individual dietary counseling + 5 group sessions + general physical training advice) 2) physical training (regular physical group training of approx. 1h, twice a week for 12 weeks +general diet advice) 3) Training & nutrition (specific physical training & specific diet counseling/group session education)	general physical training advice & general diet advice	96	community-dwelling	≥75	60.4
Rydwik et al. (2008)	Sweden	RCT	1) nutrition (diet counseling/group session education + general physical training advice) 2) training (specific physical training + general diet advice) 3) Training & nutrition (specific physical training & specific diet counseling/group session education)	general physical training advice & general diet advice	96	community-dwelling	≥75	60.4
Sabayan et al. (2012)	Netherlands	population-based prospective follow-up study with cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses	n/a	n/a	572	community-dwelling	≥85	66.8
Sampson et al. (2009)	UK	prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	10,720	community-dwelling	≥75	59.6

Savikko et al. (2010)	Finland	cross-sectional study within an RCT	psychosocial group rehabilitation intervention	not named (participants were not considered for analysis)	117	community-dwelling and residents of independent living facility	75-92	74.0
Sixsmith et al. (2014)	Hungary, Latvia, United Kingdom, Germany, and Sweden	qualitative study using in-depth, semi-structured interviews and grounded theory	n/a	n/a	190	community-dwelling	75-89	61.6
Thompson et al. (2011)	USA	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	27	inhabitants of an independent retirement community	78-94	67.0
Tsai et al. (2015)	Finland	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	174	community-dwelling	75-90	64.0
Tsai et al. (2013)	Finland	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	657	community-dwelling	75-81	75.0
van Bommel et al. (2010)	Netherlands	prospective population-based study	n/a	n/a	277	community-dwelling	≥85	72.6
van Houwelingen et al. (2015)	Netherlands	cluster RCT	care plan for people with a combination of problems at the functional, somatic, mental, or social level	usual care	2,681 (baseline) 2,172 (follow-up)	community-dwelling	≥75	68.3

Vestergaard et al. (2008)	Denmark	RCT	home-based video exercises; 26min/day; 3 times/week; 5 months; bi-weekly telephone call	bi-weekly telephone call	53	community-dwelling	75-91	100.0
Wang et al. (2017)	Australia	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	81	community-dwelling	mean age: 83.8 (SD 3.83)	44.4
Williams et al. (2007)	Australia	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	546	community-dwelling	75-96	68.0
Wilson et al. (2007)	UK	cross-sectional study	n/a	n/a	242	community-dwelling	80-90	69.9
Young (2009)	USA	prospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	298	people living in the independent living unit of a continuing care retirement community	75-94	69.1
Zingmond et al. (2011)	USA	retrospective cohort study	n/a	n/a	21,310	community-dwelling	≥75	78.0

Note. n/a = not applicable, N/A = not available