



BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Uncovering the boundary conditions of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations: A scoping review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-083234
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Dec-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Amireault, Steve; Purdue University, Health & Kinesiology Reed, Jason; Purdue University, Libraries and School of Information Studies Kerschner, Reese; Purdue University, Psychological Sciences Chadwell, Emilie; Purdue University, School of Biomedical Engineering Roh, Heesoo; Purdue University, Health and Kinesiology Jakob, Emily; Purdue University, Health and Kinesiology Muller, Kelsie; Purdue University, Human Development and Family Science
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, Systematic Review, Behavior, Stress, Psychological

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Uncovering the boundary conditions of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations: A scoping review protocol

Steve Amireault
Department of Health & Kinesiology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Jason Brian Reed
Libraries and School of Information Studies
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Reese Colby Kerschner
Department of Psychological Sciences
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Emilie Ann Chadwell
School of Biomedical Engineering
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Heesoo Roh
Department of Health & Kinesiology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Emily Ryan Jakob
Department of Health & Kinesiology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Kelsie Jo Muller
Department of Human Development and Family Science
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Word count: 4245 words

Author Note

Steve Amireault  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3372-2555>

Jason B. Reed  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6712-9413>

Correspondence for this article should be addressed to Steve Amireault, Department of Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, 800 W. Stadium Ave., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA. Phone: 765-496-0568. Email: samireau@purdue.edu

For peer review only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

1026

1027

1028

1029

1030

1031

1032

1033

1034

1035

1036

1037

1038

1039

1040

1041

1042

1043

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1077

1078

1079

1080

1081

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

1161

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

1215

1216

1217

1218

1219

1220

1221

1222

1223

1224

1225

1226

1227

1228

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

1235

1236

1237

1238

1239

1240

1241

1242

1243

1244

1245

1246

1247

1248

1249

1250

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

1265

1266

1267

1268

1269

1270

1271

1272

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

1363

1364

1365

1366

1367

1368

1369

1370

1371

1372

1373

1374

1375

1376

1377

1378

1379

1380

1381

1382

1383

1384

1385

1386

1387

1388

1389

1390

1391

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

1404

1405

1406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

1413

1414

1415

1416

1417

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422

1423

1424

1425

1426

1427

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

1434

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

1465

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- The proposed scoping review will include both qualitative and quantitative studies, providing a more complete picture of the availability of empirical evidence of moderation.
- The electronic database search was designed and pilot tested to ensure high sensitivity and reliability while balancing time and cost constraints.
- Data will be analyzed by mapping the empirical evidence of moderation to theory-derived moderation hypotheses.
- Given that an assessment of risk of bias of the studies included in the proposed review will not be conducted, the specific clinical and policy implications of the proposed review may be limited.

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation and reduction of concerns about falling and the promotion of physical activity are two fundamental aspects of fall prevention and management [1]. Although regular engagement in physical activity and adherence to multicomponent physical activity programs can reduce concerns about falling and prevent falls, concerns about falling may represent for many a barrier to physical activity participation [2–5]. This is an important public health issue because both fallers and non-fallers in various adult populations are concerned about falling, and such concerns can interfere with participation in various activities of daily living and reduce quality of life. Ultimately, concerns about falling may increase the risk of future falls and care dependency, which can both be further heightened by physical inactivity [1].

Concerns about falling tend to be negatively associated with physical activity participation. However, concerns about falling may not uniformly influence physical activity behavior across populations and contexts [6]. For instance, concerns about falling may have a stronger negative influence on physical activity participation among older adults, people with disease-specific symptoms and disabilities, or people with a history of falls [5,7,8]. Moreover, theoretical [9–11] and qualitative [3] evidence indicate that concerns about falling could positively influence physical activity in certain contexts. Despite evidence of variation in how concerns about falling influences physical activity behavior, many of the currently available knowledge syntheses assume this relationship is uniform across populations and contexts. Consequently, practitioners and researchers may rely on a knowledge base with limited information to determine with precision for whom or when concerns about falling should be considered for promoting physical activity in the context of fall prevention and management.

In this article, we propose a scoping review protocol to guide a summary of the body work that has examined the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations (age ≥ 18 years), with an eye on the availability of empirical evidence of moderation, also known as effect modification. In the context of the proposed scoping review, moderation represents the variation in the degree to which concerns about falling relate to physical activity as a function of another factor, called a moderator variable. We expect the findings of the proposed scoping review to make a significant contribution to the literature by encouraging researchers to specify variables as moderators of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior at the onset of their studies and make sampling and measurement related decisions that would enable them to perform more sensitive moderation analyses. It is also expected that these findings will help researchers to provide a more compelling rationale for the a priori planning and conduct of subgroup and meta-regression analyses of future meta-analyses. Ultimately, the proposed scoping review is expected to provide new insights that could help practitioners and researchers determine more precisely for whom and when concerns about falling should be considered for promoting physical activity more effectively in the context of fall prevention and management.

Theoretical Rationale

According to the social cognitive framework, concerns about falling could be linked to the construct of beliefs [12,13] or representations [14] about a health threat. Beliefs or representations about a health threat are thought to be linked to one's motivation to either adopt or avoid certain behaviors. Specifically, the construct of threat appraisal is theorized to capture one's held beliefs about a health threat (e.g., consequences of falling such as pain, and injury or loss of independence), and its association with negative emotions (e.g., concerns, worry, fear, or

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

anxiety; [15]). The concept of concerns about falling has been explicitly linked to the construct of threat appraisal in prior research in the context of physical activity in older adults [16,17]. Further, both the protection motivation theory [13] and common sense model [14] posit a stronger and positive relationship between threat appraisal (e.g., concerns about falling) and people's intention toward a given behavior (e.g., physical activity) for people who believe in the effectiveness of that behavior in preventing the threat (e.g., engaging in balance and strengthening exercise is an effective strategy to prevent injurious falls) and in their capabilities in engaging in that behavior (e.g., self-efficacy for engaging in balance and strengthening exercise). This perspective is also consistent with the conceptual framework describing the origination and consequences of worries about falling by Ellmers et al. [18], which specifies perception of control over one's concerns about falling as a key factor determining whether or not concerns about falling motivate positive and protective changes in behavior.

According to the affect and health behavior framework, concerns about falling could be linked to the concept of incidental affect [10]. Incidental affect refers to how one feels throughout the day outside the context of the target behavior. According to this perspective, concerns about falling can positively influence physical activity, but only if one expects that engaging in physical activity will contribute to alleviating their concerns about falling. Otherwise, concerns about falling will negatively influence physical activity. In contrast, concerns about falling can lead to excessive physical activity avoidance if people anticipate avoiding physical activity will help them cope with such concerns and protect them against potential harms from future falls.

Drawing on this same theoretical framework, concerns about falling could also be linked to the concept of affectively charged motives [10]. Affectively charged motives represent a

category of motives that arise from the feelings experienced while performing a given behavior. According to this perspective, concerns about falling can reflect a more intense emotion, such as fear or anxiety, that would drive one to disengage from physical activity experiences that previously have been associated with negative emotions. This perspective is also consistent with the model of fear of falling, falls efficacy and anxiety [9], and the fear-avoidance model of falling and functional disability [11]. One important implication of this perspective is that the influence of concerns about falling on physical activity can be highly contextual. If past experiences of physical activity have been unpleasant because one fell while doing an activity – leading one to experience pain, an injury, or a loss of independence – concerns about falling can prompt people to either avoid all kinds of physical activities, the specific activity associated with the fall, or the performance of physical activity in the specific context in which the fall occurred (e.g., avoiding the performance of physical activity under poor weather conditions, such as walking on an icy sidewalks).

In summary, there is theoretical evidence in support of moderation, whereby the size or sign of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity depend on another factor, called a moderator variable. These potential moderators are specified in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Hypothesized moderators of the of the relationship between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior

Moderator	Theoretical framework Theoretical construct linked to the concept of concerns about falling	Sign or size of effect ¹
Beliefs about consequences i.e., the belief that physical activity is an effective strategy for preventing falls	Social cognitive framework Threat appraisal	Positive
Beliefs about capabilities i.e., the belief that one can organize, execute, and engage in physical activity despite the presence of barriers	Social cognitive framework Threat appraisal	Positive
Beliefs about consequences i.e., the belief that physical activity will help relieve concerns about falling	Affect and health behavior framework Incidental affect	Positive
Beliefs about consequences i.e., the belief that avoiding physical activity will help relieve concerns about falling and protect from future falls	Affect and health behavior framework Incidental affect	Negative (stronger)
History of falls within context i.e., the experience of a fall while doing physical activity and the context in which that fall occurred	Affect and health behavior framework Affectively charged motives	Negative (stronger)

¹The association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior is typically assumed to be negative.

Previous Knowledge Syntheses

Findings from prior knowledge syntheses provide converging evidence in support of a negative association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior [2,3,5,7,19–21]. Ramsey et al. [2] calculated the median Pearson correlation coefficient quantifying the strength of the association between fear of falling and daily steps ($r = -0.21$) and daily minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity ($r = -0.24$) among older adults (≥ 60 years). Using benchmarking methods outlined by Wright et al. [22], these estimates indicate that older adults who are fearful of falling would typically take 321 fewer steps per day (or 2247 steps/week) and spent 12.6 minutes less in moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity per day (or 88.2 minutes/week) compared to those who are not fearful.

Despite evidence that the size or sign of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior can depend on another factor, most prior knowledge syntheses merely assumed that concerns about falling uniformly influence that behavior across populations and contexts. There are few notable exceptions, however. First, Beart et al. [7] hypothesized that the negative influence of concerns about falling on physical activity might be stronger as people age, especially among people aged 80 years and over. Second, Rider et al. [8] hypothesized that Parkinson's disease-specific symptoms and disabilities could moderate the impact of concerns about falling on physical activity behavior such that the negative influence of concerns about falling on physical activity would be stronger when people have increased walking difficulties, hyperkinesia, rigidity, freezing of gait, or impaired balance. Lastly, both systematic reviews of the qualitative literature by Franco et al. [5] and Meridith et al. [3] concluded that for many older adults (≥ 60 years), the influence of concerns about falling on physical activity participation was negative but depended on one's prior falls history or context. A history of falls could strengthen

1
2
3 210 the negative influence of concerns about falling on physical activity [5], whereas concerns about
4
5 211 falling could promote engagement in certain types of exercise when performed with the overall
6
7
8 212 goal of improving physical functioning or reducing risk of future falls [3].
9

10 213 Moreover, most prior knowledge syntheses only included studies that sampled older
11
12 214 adults (≥ 60 years; [2–5,7,23,24]. Although insightful, the generalizability of their findings to
13
14 215 other populations for which concerns about falling and fall prevention and management have
15
16 216 important clinical implications cannot be inferred. Notably, one narrative knowledge synthesis
17
18 217 [21] concluded that there is a “probable negative association” between fear of falling and
19
20 218 physical activity behavior among people who had a transient ischemic attack or stroke (Table 1;
21
22 219 p. 62). Rider et al. [8] performed a scoping review of studies examining the association between
23
24 220 fear of falling and activity avoidance among people with Parkinson’s disease and reported that
25
26 221 concerns about falling “emerged with a strong association with avoidance behavior” (p. 12).
27
28 222 Based on the findings from two studies, Streber et al. [20] performed a systematic review of
29
30 223 factors related to physical activity in persons with multiple sclerosis and concluded that falls-
31
32 224 related efficacy (higher levels of falls-related efficacy reflects lower levels of concerns about
33
34 225 falling) was “consistently positively associated with physical activity [in persons with multiple
35
36 226 sclerosis] but was less frequently examined” (Table 3, p. 639).
37
38
39
40
41

42 227 Finally, although some knowledge syntheses specifically focused on the concept of
43
44 228 physical activity [2,3,19–21], others were based on a broad conceptualization of the concepts
45
46 229 “activity restriction,” “activity avoidance”, or “activity level” [4,8,23,24]. These concepts
47
48 230 typically encompass a wide range of activity-related outcomes such as engagement in activities
49
50 231 of daily living, motor skills or mobility assessments, engagement in social activities, church
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

attendance, and physical activity. As a result, it is difficult to delineate the findings that pertain specifically to physical activity from other activities or behaviors.

Scoping Review Objectives

We propose to conduct a scoping review to map the research pertaining to the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior in adult populations, with an eye on the availability of empirical evidence of moderation. A preliminary search for existing scoping review reporting on evidence of moderation for the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior in adult populations (≥ 18 years) revealed that none exist [date of the search: May 11, 2023; electronic database searched: CINAHL (EBSCO interface), EMBASE (Elsevier interface), PubMed, PsycINFO (EBSCO interface), and SPORTDiscus (EBSCO interface)]. The main research questions that framed the proposed scoping review are:

- 1- What literature exists on evidence of moderation of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations (specifically, how often studies have empirically examined moderators of this association)?
- 2- What range of evidence there is, with respect to research methodology and study design used, from empirical studies that have examined or reported on at least one moderator of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations?
- 3- Which factors have been identified as a moderator of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations?

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

This scoping review protocol was developed following guidance of the scoping review framework proposed by the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis [25,26]. The reporting of this scoping review protocol follows the reporting guidelines for scoping review protocols [25], and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

is consistent with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P; [27]). An adapted version of the PRISMA-ScR checklist based on the reporting guidelines for scoping review protocols [25] is provided in online supplementary appendix 1.

We will conduct the proposed scoping review in accordance with the scoping review framework outlined by the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis [26,28]. The reporting of the proposed scoping review will follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR; [29]). Any deviations to the protocol, along with their respective justification, will be reported in the final scoping review report.

Eligibility Criteria

Participants

Studies that report on samples with a mean age ≥ 18 years will be included for review. Studies that have drawn on samples of either recreational or professional athletes, and people who were unable to engage in physical activity will be excluded.

Concepts

Several facets closely related to the concept of concerns about falling were examined in prior research [6], including fear of falling and falls efficacy [9,11,15]. Fear of falling refers to a lasting concern about falling (e.g., feeling more anxious, fearful, or worried), whereas falls efficacy refers to the perceived capability in keeping balance or in preventing falls while performing various activities of daily living (e.g., going up or down stairs, walking up or down a slope). While concerns about falling may arise because of a fall, such concerns can also exist without a prior history of falling. Although there exists a variety of terms related to the description

of the psychological (anticipated or actual) effects of a fall, the 2022 World Falls Guidelines for falls prevention and management for older adults recommend the use of the term concerns about falling [1].

Physical activity is an umbrella term used to describe any human movement produced by the contraction of skeletal muscles that raises energy expenditure above resting metabolic rate (i.e., 1 Metabolic Equivalent of Task; MET [30]. Four main domains or types of activity have been identified: leisure-time physical activity, work- or school-related activity; household, domestic, or self-care activities; and activity for transport from place to place [31]. In addition to frequency and type of activity, physical activity behavior is also characterized by its duration (e.g., minutes/week), intensity (e.g., light, moderate, and vigorous), and mode (e.g., aerobic, muscle strengthening, and bone strengthening activities). The concept of physical activity is inclusive of the concepts of exercise and sport. Exercise refers to physical activity that is planned, structured, and repetitive for the purpose of enhancing or maintaining physical fitness and health [30]. Sport refers to physical activity that is rule governed, structured, competitive, and involves gross motor movement characterized by physical strategy, prowess, and chance [32]. However, the concept of physical activity does not encompass the concept of sedentary behavior [31]. Sedentary behaviors are defined as any waking behaviors characterized by an energy expenditure ≤ 1.5 METs, while in a sitting, reclining, or lying posture [33].

Types of evidence sources

The proposed scoping review will draw upon data from studies that have used a qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methodological approach. Irrespective of the methodological approach, we will include studies that have used cross-sectional, longitudinal, quasi-experimental and experimental design. Knowledge synthesis of any types, conference abstracts,

1
2
3 301 commentaries, editorials, study protocols, thesis and dissertation, books and book chapters and
4
5 302 case studies will be excluded.
6
7
8 303 Search Strategy
9
10 304 The search strategy was developed was developed by the review team, which includes a
11
12 305 database expert and health sciences information specialist. The health sciences information
13
14 306 specialist and database expert implemented and executed an initial electronic databases
15
16
17 307 (coverage period) search strategy for CINAHL (EBSCO interface; 1976 – present), EMBASE
18
19 308 (Elsevier interface; 1947 – present), PsycINFO (EBSCO interface; 1887 – present), PubMed
20
21 309 (1946 – present), and SPORTDiscus (EBSCO interface; 1930 – present). For all databases,
22
23
24 310 search terms tapping on both the concept of concerns about falling and physical activity were
25
26 311 used. Because the population of interest for this scoping review is the adult populations (≥ 18
27
28 312 years), no age filters were used in any of the databases. Additionally, we used database-specific
29
30
31 313 Index or Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms when available. The free text search terms
32
33 314 remained constant across all databases, searching across title, abstract, and when available,
34
35 315 keyword fields. We updated the database-specific terms for each database, where available, but
36
37
38 316 used the same key concepts across all the databases. We used filters for resource types (i.e.,
39
40 317 Academic Journals) in two of the EBSCO databases (SPORTDiscus and PsycINFO) because of
41
42 318 the indexing of periodicals in EBSCO. We will not use this option for CINAHL because the
43
44
45 319 filter was experiencing technical difficulties when pilot-test searches were run. No date or
46
47 320 language filters were used. Full details of an example electronic search for PubMed are presented
48
49 321 in Table 2.
50
51 322
52
53
54 323

Table 2: Example of database search for PubMed

1. "Fear"[MeSH Terms] OR "Avoidance Learning"[MeSH Terms] OR "Self Efficacy"[MeSH Terms]
2. "fear"[Title/Abstract] OR "fears"[Title/Abstract] OR "concern"[Title/Abstract] OR "concerns"[Title/Abstract] OR "confidence"[Title/Abstract] OR "accidental"[Title/Abstract] OR "efficacy"[Title/Abstract] OR "beliefs"[Title/Abstract] OR "avoidance"[Title/Abstract] OR "confident"[Title/Abstract] OR "threat"[Title/Abstract] OR "threats"[Title/Abstract] OR "afraid"[Title/Abstract] OR "worry"[Title/Abstract] OR "worries"[Title/Abstract] OR "worried"[Title/Abstract] OR "fearful"[Title/Abstract] OR "frightened"[Title/Abstract] OR "concerned"[Title/Abstract] OR "post fall syndrome"[Title/Abstract] OR "ptophobia"[Title/Abstract] OR "scared"[Title/Abstract]
3. #1 OR #2
4. "Accidental Falls"[Mesh]
5. "falling"[Title/Abstract] OR "falls"[Title/Abstract] OR "fall"[Title/Abstract] OR "balance"[Title/Abstract]
6. #4 OR #5
7. "Activities of Daily Living"[MeSH Terms] OR "Exercise"[MeSH Terms] OR "Walking"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sports"[MeSH Terms]
8. "exercise"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical activity"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical fitness"[Title/Abstract] OR "step count"[Title/Abstract] OR "walking"[Title/Abstract] OR "mobility"[Title/Abstract]
9. "Activity"[Title/Abstract] OR "activities"[Title/Abstract]
10. "Daily living"[Title/Abstract] OR "level"[Title/Abstract] OR "levels"[Title/Abstract] OR "avoidance"[Title/Abstract] OR "intensity"[Title/Abstract] OR "restricted"[Title/Abstract]
11. #9 AND #10
12. #7 OR #8 OR #11
13. #3 AND #6 AND #12

To identify additional studies, two reviewers will independently perform a hand search of the reference lists for all included studies for review and relevant knowledge syntheses [2–

5,7,8,19–21,23,24]. Lastly, we will perform a citing reference search for all included studies using Web of Science. The results of the search will be reported in a PRISMA-ScR flow-chart [29].

Studies written in any language will be included. Title and abstract of any potential studies that are reported in a language other than English will be initially translated using Google Translate. The full text will be translated by a qualified translator if it meets the inclusion criteria at that stage. It is worth noting that at least one member of the review team has high proficiency in English, French, and Korean. We will place no constraints on the publishing year of the studies. We will use Covidence, a web-based software platform, to manage the retrieved citation records (Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia).

Source of Evidence Selection

We ran an initial electronic databases search on May 23, 2022, which yield a total of 24,359 records (*k*). We will update the electronic databases search before formally implementing our final, complete search strategy. We will not use any automation tools for study selection.

Screening of Titles and Abstracts

Given the high number of identified records through our initial electronic citation search (*k* = 24,359) and the related time and cost constraints associated with their screening, we assembled a team of six reviewers that will single-screen titles and abstracts using an over-inclusive approach. Specifically, a given record will be retained and considered for full-text examination if there is insufficient information to conclude with certainty its exclusion. The specific exclusion criteria considered at this stage were: conference abstract, review article, case report/series, not human research, ineligible age group (< 18 years), not reporting on either the

concept of physical activity or the concept of concern about falling. We used a two-step process for pilot-testing the titles and abstracts screening procedure. First, a random sample of 100 records from our initial search were selected and independently screened for eligibility by two review members. The decisions were compared, and discrepancies among the two reviewers were resolved by discussion. At the end of this first step, the reviewers disagreed on only two studies, and both reviewers agreed to exclude both after discussion. Second, another random sample of 100 records was selected and independently screened for eligibility by four reviewers. Then one of the reviewers involved in the first step described above met with the four reviewers to provide training and discuss screening decisions. Upon pilot-testing the process of screening titles and abstract and given the number of records to screen, the review team decided that all titles and abstracts would be screened by a single reviewer, one of the six involved in pilot-testing titles and abstracts screening procedure. The single screening of the titles and abstracts can yield high sensitivity (98% - 100%) when certain exclusion criteria are used – such as conference abstract, review article, case report/series, not human research, ineligible age group (< 18 years) [34] – and is acceptable at this stage of the selection process [34,35].

Full-Text Examination

We will retrieve the full text of the records selected for inclusion at the titles and abstracts screening stage. Two reviewers will independently assess the eligibility of each article. Multiple articles reporting on the same study and written by the same authors group will be gathered and scrutinized to ensure that only unique study, rather than each article or duplication study, represents the unit of interest in the scoping review. When necessary for the making of a selection decision, we will contact the authors of the articles for unpublished information. The decisions to include an article will be compared between the two reviewers, and discrepancies

1
2
3 374 between reviewers will be resolved by discussion. When no consensus can be reached, a third
4
5 375 reviewer will help resolve the discrepancy. Moreover, any relevant retraction statements and
6
7
8 376 errata for information for each included article will be examined to exclude data from studies
9
10 377 that are fraudulent or studies that include errors. We will report reasons for exclusion of full-text
11
12 378 articles that do not meet the eligibility criteria in a supplementary document in the scoping
13
14
15 379 review.

16
17 380 **Data extraction**

18
19 381 Prior to data extraction, two reviewers will independently pilot-test a purpose-built data
20
21 382 extraction sheet with three randomly selected records. An initial version of the purpose-built data
22
23 383 extraction sheet is provided in online supplementary appendix 2. Reviewers will collect
24
25 384 information about the characteristics of the study (i.e., authors, year of publication,
26
27
28 385 origin/country of origin, aims/purposes), population and sample (i.e., sample size, mean age and
29
30 386 range, percentage of women/female, race/ethnicity characteristics, health status, and settings –
31
32 387 e.g., community, nursing home, medical facilities), the concept of concerns about falling (e.g.,
33
34 388 measurement instrument used and facet measured), and the concept of physical activity (e.g.,
35
36 389 measurement instrument used and facet measured). Reviewers will extract relevant information
37
38 390 regarding all types of physical activity – all physical activity measurement metrics (e.g.,
39
40 391 frequency, duration, volume, number of steps, arbitrary activity units) will be considered, as well
41
42 392 as the measurement by means of device-based (e.g., accelerometer) and self-report (e.g.,
43
44 393 questionnaires) instruments. For each study included, we will collect findings pertaining to
45
46 394 evidence of moderation. Specifically, we will identify if a moderating factor was investigated
47
48
49 395 (yes/no), specify the theoretical approach underlying the investigation (if any), and
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

methodological approaches for investigating moderator effect (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods), the results pertaining to moderation, and the main conclusion of the study.

It is expected that the data extraction sheet will be refined and revised following the pilot-testing of the data extraction process. After pilot-testing of the data extraction sheet, we will hold a meeting with all scoping review authors to discuss all aspect of the revised version of the data extraction sheet and agree on its final version. Then, two reviewers will independently extract data from all included studies, compare results, and resolve any discrepancies through discussion. We will contact the study authors for clarification on unreported data item. When no consensus on reported data items can be reached, we will contact the study authors to help resolve the discrepancy. We will hold bi-weekly meetings throughout the data extraction process to discuss progress and monitor whether the data extraction sheet is capturing all the essential information to properly answer the research questions.

Data analysis and presentation of results

Primary study and sample characteristics will be reported for descriptive purposes in a summary table. We plan to use iconography to display the different types and number of samples drawn by the included studies. Moreover, we plan on using a waffle chart to illustrate the type of research methodology used within the included studies.

We will analyze the data descriptively, and report frequency count and percentage of studies investigating and reporting on evidence of moderation. Further, data will be charted, categorized, and summarized by mapping the data pertaining to the evidence for and against moderation to each of the hypothesized moderating factors outlined in Table 1. This will be applied to all studies, irrespective of the methodological approach or study design. Prior to mapping the evidence of moderation, the review authors will familiarize themselves with the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

419 data by reading and understanding all the included studies for review and understanding the
420 relevance of the data in relation to the main scoping review question. Result of this qualitative
421 synthesis will be presented using a tree graph to display the moderating factor(s) investigated by
422 the included studies, and a ratio showing the number of time evidence for moderation was
423 reported by the total number of investigations.

424 We will perform a narrative synthesis of the findings to highlight similarities and
425 differences both within and across studies by examining the convergence and divergence in
426 findings across qualitative and quantitative methodological approach, the concepts of concerns
427 about falling and physical activity behavior, and sample characteristics.

428 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION PLAN**

429 The [Information withheld for peer-review] University Human Research
430 Protection Program determined that the proposed scoping review does not qualify as Human
431 Subjects Research under federal human subjects research regulations (IRB-2023-1656).

432 The results of this proposed scoping review will be disseminated through various means.
433 First, will disseminate the study findings through a peer-reviewed scientific journal and
434 presentation at a scientific conference. Second, will disseminate the findings in the form of a 1-
435 page summary, in plain language, via written briefs or e-newsletters to Extension Program
436 leaders, part of a nationwide Cooperative Extension network. We also plan to present posters or
437 e-posters at the national Health Extension annual conference. Extension Program and community
438 leaders attend training sessions during this conference. They represent an important group of
439 end-users as many of them deliver to members of their community evidence-based programs to
440 reduce concerns about falling and the promote of physical activity (e.g., *A Matter of Balance*,
441 *Stepping On, Fit & Strong!*) with the overall objective of preventing and managing falls.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All listed authors have contributed and will continue to contribute meaningfully to the conduct and reporting of proposed scoping review. [redacted] conceived the proposed review [Information withheld for peer-review]. [redacted] developed the search strategy, and [redacted] [Information withheld for peer-review] ran the initial electronic databases. [redacted] [redacted] [Information withheld for peer-review], are the six title and abstract reviewers. [redacted] [Information withheld for peer-review] is an Extension Specialist, with experience in delivering programs to reduce concerns about falling and promote physical activity to midlife and older adults, who will provide insights on the usefulness of the scoping review findings to practitioners. In addition, [redacted] [Information withheld for peer-review] will help identify language barriers in the reporting of the scoping review results. All authors read the final protocol manuscript and revised it for content; all approved the final version.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

1. Montero-Odasso M, Van Der Velde N, Martin FC, Petrovic M, Tan MP, Ryg J, et al. World guidelines for falls prevention and management for older adults: A global initiative. *Age Ageing*. 2022;51:1–36. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afac205

2. Ramsey KA, Zhou W, Rojer AGM, Reijnierse EM, Maier AB. Associations of objectively measured physical activity and sedentary behaviour with fall-related outcomes in older adults: A systematic review. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2022;65. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2021.101571

3. Meredith SJ, Cox NJ, Ibrahim K, Higson J, McNiff J, Mitchell S, et al. Factors that influence older adults’ participation in physical activity: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Age Ageing*. 2023;52:1–15. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afad145

4. Schepens S, Sen A, Painter JA, Murphy SL. Relationship between fall-related efficacy and activity engagement in community-dwelling older adults: A meta-analytic review. *Am J Occup Ther*. 2012;66:137–48. doi: 10.5014/ajot.2012.001156

5. Franco MR, Tong A, Howard K, Sherrington C, Ferreira PH, Pinto RZ, et al. Older people’s perspectives on participation in physical activity: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative literature. *Br J Sports Med*. 2015;49:1268–76. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2014-094015

6. Ellmers TJ, Freiburger E, Hauer K, Hogan DB, McGarrigle L, Lim ML, et al. Why should clinical practitioners ask about their patients’ concerns about falling? *Age Ageing*. 2023;52:afad057. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afad057

- 482 7. Baert V, Gorus E, Mets T, Geerts C, Bautmans I. Motivators and barriers for physical
 483 activity in the oldest old: A systematic review. *Ageing Res Rev.* 2011;10(4):464–74. doi:
 484 10.1016/j.arr.2011.04.001
- 485 8. Rider J V, Longhurst JK, Lekhak N, Young DL, Landers MR. Fear of falling avoidance
 486 behavior assessment and intervention in Parkinson's Disease: A scoping review. *Res Rev*
 487 *Parkinsonism.* 2022;12:1–17. doi: 10.2147/JPRLS.S350890
- 488 9. Adamczewska N, Nyman SR. A new approach to fear of falls from connections with the
 489 posttraumatic stress disorder literature. *Gerontol Geriatr Med.* 2018;4:2333721418796238.
 490 doi: 10.1177/2333721418796238
- 491 10. Stevens CJ, Baldwin AS, Bryan AD, Conner M, Rhodes RE, Williams DM. Affective
 492 determinants of physical activity: A conceptual framework and narrative review. *Front*
 493 *Psychol.* 2020;11:3366. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.568331
- 494 11. Peeters G, Bennett M, Donoghue OA, Kennelly S, Kenny RA. Understanding the
 495 aetiology of fear of falling from the perspective of a fear-avoidance model – A narrative
 496 review. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2020;79:101862. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101862
- 497 12. Rosenstock IM. The health belief model and preventive health behavior. *Health Educ*
 498 *Behav.* 1977;2:354–86. doi: 10.1177/109019817400200405
- 499 13. Maddux JE, Rogers RW. Protection motivation and self-efficacy: A revised theory of fear
 500 appeals and attitude change. *J Exp Soc Psychol.* 1983;19:469–79. doi: 10.1016/0022-
 501 1031(83)90023-9
- 502 14. Leventhal H, Diefenbach M, Leventhal EA, Lowenstein G, Rachman J, Rodin J, et al.
 503 *Illness Cognition: Using common sense to understand treatment adherence and affect*
 504 *cognition interactions. Cognit Ther Res.* 1992;16:143–63. doi: 10.1007/BF01173486

1
2
3 505 15. Hadjistavropoulos T, Delbaere K, Fitzgerald TD. Reconceptualizing the role of fear of
4
5 506 falling and balance confidence in fall risk. 2010;23:3–23. doi: 10.1177/0898264310378039
6
7
8 507 16. Kaushal N, Preissner C, Charles K, Knäuper B. Differences and similarities of physical
9
10 508 activity determinants between older adults who have and have not experienced a fall:
11
12 509 Testing an extended health belief model. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2021; 92:104247. doi:
13
14 510 10.1016/j.archger.2020.104247
15
16
17 511 17. Preissner CE, Kaushal N, Charles K, Knäuper B. A protection motivation theory approach
18
19 512 to understanding how fear of falling affects physical activity determinants in older adults.
20
21 513 J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci. 2023;78:30-39. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbac105.
22
23
24 514 18. Ellmers TJ, Wilson MR, Norris M, Young WR. Protective or harmful? A qualitative
25
26 515 exploration of older people’s perceptions of worries about falling. Age Ageing.
27
28 516 2022;51:1–10. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afac067
29
30
31 517 19. Hamer O, Larkin D, Relph N, Dey P. Fear-related barriers to physical activity among
32
33 518 adults with overweight and obesity: A narrative synthesis scoping review. Obes Rev.
34
35 519 2021;22:e13307. doi: 10.1111/obr.13307.
36
37
38 520 20. Streber R, Peters S, Pfeifer K. Systematic review of correlates and determinants of
39
40 521 physical activity in persons with Multiple Sclerosis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil.
41
42 522 2016;97:633-645.e29. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2015.11.020.
43
44
45 523 21. Prior PL, Suskin N. Exercise for stroke prevention. Stroke Vasc Neurol. 2018;3:59-68.
46
47 524 doi: 10.1136/svn-2018-000155.
48
49 525 22. Wright CE, Rhodes RE, Ruggiero EW, Sheeran P. Benchmarking the effectiveness of
50
51 526 interventions to promote physical activity: A metasynthesis. Health Psychol.
52
53 527 2021;40:811–21. doi: 10.1037/hea0001118.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-083234 on 20 December 2024. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 11, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES). Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

23. Hughes CC, Kneebone II, Jones F, Brady B, Pachana NA, Oude Voshaar RC. A theoretical and empirical review of psychological factors associated with falls-related psychological concerns in community-dwelling older people. *Int Psychogeriatr*. 2015;27:1071–87. doi: 10.1017/S1041610214002701.
24. Scheffer AC, Schuurmans MJ, Van dijk N, Van der hooft T, De rooij SE. Fear of falling: Measurement strategy, prevalence, risk factors and consequences among older persons. *Age Ageing*. 2008;37:19-24. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afm169.
25. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JB Evid Synth*. 2022;20(4):953–68. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242.
26. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C., McInerney P., Munn Z., Tricco A., Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E., Munn Z., editors. *JB Manual for Evidence Synthesis* [internet]. Adelaide; 2020.
27. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4:1. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
28. Pollock D, Peters MDJ, Khalil H, McInerney P, Alexander L, Tricco AC, et al. Recommendations for the extraction, analysis, and presentation of results in scoping reviews. *JB Evid Synth*. 2023;21:520–32. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-22-00123.
29. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;169:467–73. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.

1
2
3 550 30. Caspersen CJ, Powell KE, Christenson GM. Physical activity, exercise and physical
4
5 551 fitness: Definitions and distinctions for health-related research. Public Health Rep.
6
7 552 1985;100(2):126–31.
8
9
10 553 31. Pettee Gabriel KK, Morrow JR, Woolsey ALT. Framework for Physical Activity as a
11
12 554 Complex and Multidimensional Behavior. J Phys Act Health. 2012;9:S11–8. doi:
13
14 555 10.1123/jpah.9.s1.s11.
15
16
17 556 32. Rejeski WJ, Brawley LR. Defining the Boundaries of Sport Psychology. Sport Psychol.
18
19 557 1988;2(3):231–42. doi: 10.1123/tsp.2.3.231
20
21
22 558 33. Tremblay M. Letter to the editor: standardized use of the terms “sedentary” and
23
24 559 “sedentary behaviours.” Appl Physiol Nutr Metab. 2012;37:540–2. doi: 10.1139/h2012-
25
26 560 024.
27
28 561 34. Nama N, Hennawy M, Barrowman N, O’Hearn K, Sampson M, McNally JD. Successful
29
30 562 incorporation of single reviewer assessments during systematic review screening:
31
32 563 Development and validation of sensitivity and work-saved of an algorithm that considers
33
34 564 exclusion criteria and count. Syst Rev. 2021;10:1–10. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01632-6.
35
36
37 565 35. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Featherstone R, Littlewood A, Metzendorf M-I, et al.
38
39 566 Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J,
40
41 567 Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic
42
43 568 Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated October 2023). Cochrane, 2023. Available
44
45 569 from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
46
47
48
49 570
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Online Supplementary File 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist adapted for scoping review protocol¹

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	5-12
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	12
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	Non applicable
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	13-15;17

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Information sources ¹	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	15-16
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	15-16
Selection of sources of evidence ²	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	17-19
Data charting process ³	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	19-20; Appendix 2
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	19-20; Appendix 2
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence ⁴	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	Not applicable
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	20-21
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	22

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

¹Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

²A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

³The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley [1] and Levac et al. [2] and the JBI guidance [3-5] refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

⁴The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

¹Adapted from Tricco et al. [6].

REFERENCES

- 1- Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *Int. J. Soc. Res. Methodol.* 2005;8:19–32. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616
- 2- Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: Advancing the methodology. *Implement Sci.* 2010;5:1–9. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-69
- 3- Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JBI Evid Synth.* 2022;20:953–68. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242.
- 4- Peters M., Godfrey C., McInerney P., Munn Z., Tricco A., Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E., Munn Z., editors. *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. Adelaide; 2020.
- 5- Pollock D, Peters MDJ, Khalil H, McInerney P, Alexander L, Tricco AC, et al. Recommendations for the extraction, analysis, and presentation of results in scoping reviews. *JBI Evid Synth.* 2023;21:520–32. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-22-00123
- 6- Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169:467–73. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.

Online Supplementary File 2: Purpose-built data extraction sheet

Source of evidence (Authors, year)
Country
Methodology: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods
Study design: cross-sectional, longitudinal, quasi-experimental, or experimental
Sample Age: Sample mean age and/or age range (years) Biological sex: Percentage of female Race/ethnicity: Percentage of White Health status and/or setting
Theory: Name of the theory (if any)
Concept of concerns about falling Facet measured: Fear of falling or fall efficacy Measurement instrument used: Name of the instrument (if any)
Concept of physical activity Domain or type of physical activity measured: Leisure-time physical activity, work- or school-related activity, household, domestic, or self-care activities, activity for transport from place to place Characteristics of physical activity: Frequency, Intensity, Mode Mode of assessment: Self-report or device-based Measurement instrument used: Name of the instrument (if any)
Main findings pertaining to the relationship between concerns about falling and physical activity

Moderation investigation:
Yes/no
Theoretical rationale for the investigation and hypotheses (if any)
Description of how evidence of moderation was examined
Main findings pertaining to moderation

BMJ Open

Uncovering the boundary conditions of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations: A scoping review protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-083234.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Sep-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Amireault, Steve; Purdue University, Health & Kinesiology Reed, Jason; Purdue University, Libraries and School of Information Studies Kerschner, Reese; Purdue University, Psychological Sciences Chadwell, Emilie; Purdue University, School of Biomedical Engineering Roh, Heesoo; Purdue University, Health and Kinesiology Jakob, Emily; Purdue University, Health and Kinesiology Muller, Kelsie; Purdue University, Human Development and Family Science
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Sports and exercise medicine
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, Systematic Review, Behavior, Stress, Psychological

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Uncovering the boundary conditions of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations: A scoping review protocol

Steve Amireault
Department of Health & Kinesiology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Jason Brian Reed
Libraries and School of Information Studies
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Reese Colby Kerschner
Department of Psychological Sciences
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Emilie Ann Chadwell
School of Biomedical Engineering
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Heesoo Roh
Department of Health & Kinesiology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Emily Ryan Jakob
Department of Health & Kinesiology
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Kelsie Jo Muller
Department of Human Development and Family Science
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907
USA

Word count: 4223 words

Author Note

Steve Amireault  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3372-2555>

Jason B. Reed  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6712-9413>

Kelsie J. Muller  <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5160-7274>

Correspondence for this article should be addressed to Steve Amireault, Department of Health and Kinesiology, Purdue University, 800 W. Stadium Ave., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA. Phone: 765-496-0568. Email: samireau@purdue.edu

For peer review only

1

2

3

4

55

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Despite evidence of variation in how concerns about falling influence physical activity, many of the currently available knowledge syntheses merely assume that this relationship is uniform across populations and contexts. Therefore, we propose a scoping review protocol to guide a summary of the body work that has examined the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations, with an eye on the availability of empirical evidence of moderation. *Methods and analyses:* Studies reporting on both the concepts of concerns about falling and physical activity among samples with a mean age ≥ 18 years will be included. Five electronic databases will be searched. We will conduct a hand search of the reference lists for all included studies and relevant knowledge syntheses and perform a citing reference search for all included studies using Web of Science. A team of six reviewers will single-screen titles and abstracts. Two reviewers will independently assess the eligibility of each study based on a full-text examination. Results will be presented using a tree graph to display the moderating factor(s) investigated and a ratio showing the number of time evidence for moderation was examined by the total number of investigations. *Ethics and dissemination:* The university Human Research Protection Program determined that the proposed scoping review does not qualify as Human Subjects Research under federal human subjects research regulations (IRB-2023-1656). Results will be published in a peer-review journal and in the form of a 1-page summary for Extension Program leaders, part of a nationwide Cooperative Extension network.

Key words: accidental falls, effect modifier, exercise, fear, health behavior.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- The proposed scoping review will include both qualitative and quantitative studies, providing a more complete picture of the availability of empirical evidence of moderation.
- The electronic database search was designed and pilot-tested to ensure high sensitivity and reliability while balancing time and cost constraints.
- We will analyze data by mapping the empirical evidence of moderation to theory-derived moderation hypotheses.
- Given that an assessment of risk of bias of the studies included in the proposed review will not be conducted, the specific clinical and policy implications of the proposed review may be limited.

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation and reduction of concerns about falling and the promotion of physical activity are two fundamental aspects of fall prevention and management [1]. Although regular engagement in physical activity and adherence to multicomponent physical activity programs can reduce concerns about falling and prevent falls, concerns about falling may represent for many a barrier to physical activity participation [2–5]. This is an important public health issue because both fallers and non-fallers in various adult populations are concerned about falling, and such concerns can interfere with participation in various activities of daily living and reduce quality of life. Ultimately, concerns about falling may increase the risk of future falls and care dependency, which can both be further heightened by physical inactivity [1].

Concerns about falling tend to be negatively associated with physical activity participation. However, concerns about falling may not uniformly influence physical activity behavior across populations and contexts [6]. For instance, concerns about falling may have a stronger negative influence on physical activity participation among older adults, people with disease-specific symptoms and disabilities, or people with a history of falls [5,7,8]. Moreover, theoretical [9–11] and qualitative [3] evidence indicate that concerns about falling could positively influence physical activity in certain contexts.

In this article, we propose a scoping review protocol to guide a summary of the body of work that has examined the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations (age ≥ 18 years), with an eye on the availability of empirical evidence of moderation, also known as effect modification. In the context of the proposed scoping review, moderation represents the variation in the degree to which concerns about falling relate to physical activity as a function of another factor, called a moderator variable. Specifically, a

moderator is a variable that changes the direction (sign) or magnitude (size) of the relation between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior. We expect the findings of the proposed scoping review to make a significant contribution to the literature by encouraging researchers to specify variables as moderators of the relation between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior at the onset of their studies and make sampling and measurement related decisions that would enable them to perform more sensitive moderation analyses. It is also expected that these findings will help researchers to provide a more compelling rationale for the a priori planning and conduct of subgroup and meta-regression analyses of future meta-analyses. Ultimately, the proposed scoping review is expected to provide new insights that could help practitioners and researchers determine more precisely for whom and when concerns about falling should be considered for promoting physical activity more effectively in the context of fall prevention and management.

Rationale

According to the social cognitive framework, concerns about falling could be linked to the construct of beliefs [12,13] or representations [14] about a health threat. Beliefs or representations about a health threat are thought to be linked to one's motivation to either adopt or avoid certain behaviors. Specifically, the construct of threat appraisal is theorized to capture one's held beliefs about a health threat (e.g., consequences of falling such as pain, injury or loss of independence), and its association with negative emotions (e.g., concerns, worry, fear, or anxiety; [15]). The concept of concerns about falling has been explicitly linked to the construct of threat appraisal in prior research in the context of physical activity in older adults [16,17]. Further, both the protection motivation theory [13] and common sense model [14] posit a stronger and positive relationship between threat appraisal (e.g., concerns about falling) and

people's intention toward a given behavior (e.g., physical activity) for people who believe in the effectiveness of that behavior in preventing the threat (e.g., engaging in balance and strengthening exercise is an effective strategy to prevent injurious falls) and in their capabilities in engaging in that behavior (e.g., self-efficacy for engaging in balance and strengthening exercise). This perspective is also consistent with the conceptual framework describing the origination and consequences of worries about falling by Ellmers et al. [18], which specifies perception of control over one's concerns about falling as a key factor determining whether concerns about falling motivate positive and protective changes in behavior.

According to the affect and health behavior framework, concerns about falling could be linked to the concept of incidental affect [10]. Incidental affect refers to how one feels throughout the day outside the context of the target behavior. According to this perspective, concerns about falling can positively influence physical activity, but only if one expects that engaging in physical activity will contribute to alleviating their concerns about falling. Otherwise, concerns about falling will negatively influence physical activity. In contrast, concerns about falling can lead to excessive physical activity avoidance if people anticipate avoiding physical activity will help them cope with such concerns and protect them against potential harms from future falls.

Drawing on this same theoretical framework, concerns about falling could also be linked to the concept of affectively charged motives [10]. Affectively charged motives represent a category of motives that arise from the feelings experienced while performing a given behavior. According to this perspective, concerns about falling can reflect a more intense emotion, such as fear or anxiety, that would drive one to disengage from physical activity experiences that previously have been associated with negative emotions. This perspective is also consistent with

the model of fear of falling, falls efficacy and anxiety [9], and the fear-avoidance model of falling and functional disability [11]. One important implication of this perspective is that the influence of concerns about falling on physical activity can be highly contextual. If past experiences of physical activity have been unpleasant because one fell while doing an activity – leading one to experience pain, an injury, or a loss of independence – concerns about falling can prompt people to either avoid all kinds of physical activities, the specific activity associated with the fall, or the performance of physical activity in the specific context in which the fall occurred (e.g., avoiding the performance of physical activity under poor weather conditions, such as walking on an icy sidewalk).

Findings from prior knowledge syntheses provide converging evidence in support of a negative association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior [2,3,5,7,19–21]. Ramsey et al. [2] calculated the median Pearson correlation coefficient quantifying the strength of the association between fear of falling and daily steps ($r = -0.21$) and daily minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity ($r = -0.24$) among older adults (≥ 60 years). Using benchmarking methods outlined by Wright et al. [22], these estimates indicate that older adults who are fearful of falling would typically take 321 fewer steps per day (or 2247 steps/week) and spent 12.6 minutes less in moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity per day (or 88.2 minutes/week) compared to those who are not fearful.

Despite evidence that the size or sign of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior can depend on another factor, most prior knowledge syntheses merely assumed that concerns about falling uniformly influence that behavior across populations and contexts. There are few notable exceptions, however. First, Beart et al. [7] hypothesized that the negative influence of concerns about falling on physical activity might be stronger as people

age, especially among people aged 80 years and over. Second, Rider et al. [8] hypothesized that Parkinson's disease-specific symptoms and disabilities could moderate the impact of concerns about falling on physical activity behavior such that the negative influence of concerns about falling on physical activity would be stronger when people have increased walking difficulties, hyperkinesia, rigidity, freezing of gait, or impaired balance. Lastly, both systematic reviews of the qualitative literature by Franco et al. [5] and Meridith et al. [3] concluded that for many older adults (≥ 60 years), the influence of concerns about falling on physical activity participation was negative but depended on one's prior falls history or context. A history of falls could strengthen the negative influence of concerns about falling on physical activity [5], whereas concerns about falling could promote engagement in certain types of exercise when performed with the overall goal of improving physical functioning or reducing risk of future falls [3]. Lastly, there is empirical evidence indicating that women (compared to men) may show a greater tendency to restrict their activities to protect themselves against potential harms from future falls [23,24].

In summary, there is theoretical evidence and hypotheses in support of moderation, whereby the direction (sign) or magnitude (size) of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity may depend on another factor, called a moderator variable. These potential moderators are specified in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Hypothesized moderators of the of the relation between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior

Moderator	Sign and size of the effect modification
Age	
▪ For people who are older (relative to younger people), especially for those aged 80 years and over.	Sign: Negative Size: Larger
Beliefs about capabilities	
▪ When people hold the belief that they can organize, execute, and engage in physical activity despite the presence of barriers.	Sign: Positive
Beliefs about consequences	
▪ When people hold the belief that physical activity is an effective strategy for preventing falls.	Sign: Positive
▪ When people hold the belief that physical activity will help them relieve their concerns about falling.	Sign: Positive
▪ When people hold the belief that avoiding physical activity will help them reduce their concerns about falling and protect them from future falls.	Sign: Negative Size: Larger
Biological sex / gender	
▪ For women (compared to men)	Sign: Negative Size: Larger
Disease-specific symptoms and disabilities	
▪ For people with disease-specific symptoms or a disability	Sign: Negative Size: Larger
History of falls (within context)	
▪ When past experiences of physical activity have been unpleasant because one fell while doing an activity.	Sign: Negative Size: Larger

Prior Knowledge Syntheses

Most prior knowledge syntheses only included studies that sampled older adults (≥ 60 years; [2–5,7,25,26]. Although insightful, the generalizability of their findings to other populations for which concerns about falling and fall prevention and management have important clinical implications cannot be inferred. Notably, one narrative knowledge synthesis [21] concluded that there is a “probable negative association” between fear of falling and physical activity behavior among people who had a transient ischemic attack or stroke (Table 1; p. 62). Rider et al. [8] performed a scoping review of studies examining the association between fear of falling and activity avoidance among people with Parkinson’s disease and reported that concerns about falling “emerged with a strong association with avoidance behavior” (p. 12). Based on the findings from two studies, Streber et al. [20] performed a systematic review of factors related to physical activity in persons with multiple sclerosis and concluded that falls-related efficacy (higher levels of falls-related efficacy reflects lower levels of concerns about falling) was “consistently positively associated with physical activity [in persons with multiple sclerosis] but was less frequently examined” (p. 639).

Moreover, although some knowledge syntheses specifically focused on the concept of physical activity [2,3,19–21], others were based on a broad conceptualization of the concepts “activity restriction,” “activity avoidance”, or “activity level” [4,8,25,26]. These concepts typically encompass a wide range of activity-related outcomes such as engagement in activities of daily living, motor skills or mobility assessments, engagement in social activities, church attendance, and physical activity. As a result, it is difficult to delineate the findings that pertain specifically to physical activity from other activities or behaviors.

Scoping Review Objectives

We propose to conduct a scoping review to map the research pertaining to the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior in adult populations, with an eye on the availability of empirical evidence of moderation. A preliminary search for existing scoping review reporting on evidence of moderation for the association between concerns about falling and physical activity behavior in adult populations (≥ 18 years) revealed that none exist [date of the search: May 11, 2023; electronic database searched: CINAHL (EBSCO interface), EMBASE (Elsevier interface), PubMed, PsycINFO (EBSCO interface), and SPORTDiscus (EBSCO interface)]. The primary research question of the proposed scoping review is: What literature exists on evidence of moderation of the association between concerns about falling and physical activity in adult populations (age ≥ 18 years)? We propose two sub questions:

- 1- What range of evidence there is within the sources of evidence identified for the primary research question with respect to research methodology and selected attributes of the research design?
- 2- Which factors have been identified as a moderator within the sources of evidence identified for the primary research question?

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

This scoping review protocol was developed following guidance of the scoping review framework proposed by the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis [27,28]. The reporting of this scoping review protocol follows the reporting guidelines for scoping review protocols [27], and is consistent with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P; [29]). An adapted version of the PRISMA-ScR checklist based on the reporting guidelines for scoping review protocols [27] is provided in online supplementary appendix 1.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

We will conduct the proposed scoping review in accordance with the scoping review framework outlined by the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis [28,30]. The reporting of the proposed scoping review will follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR; [31]). Any deviations to the protocol, along with their respective justification, will be reported in the final scoping review report.

Eligibility Criteria

Participants

Studies that report on samples with a mean age ≥ 18 years will be included for review. Studies that have drawn on samples of either recreational or professional athletes, and people who were unable to engage in physical activity will be excluded.

Concepts

Concerns about falling. Several facets closely related to the concept of concerns about falling were examined in prior research [6], including fear of falling and falls efficacy [9,11,15]. Fear of falling refers to a more intense, lasting concern about falling (e.g., feeling more anxious, fearful, or worried), whereas falls efficacy refers to the perceived capability in keeping balance or in preventing falls while performing various activities of daily living (e.g., going up or down stairs, walking up or down a slope). While concerns about falling may arise because of a fall, such concerns can also exist without a prior history of falling. Although there exists a variety of terms related to the description of the psychological (anticipated or actual) effects of a fall, the 2022 World Falls Guidelines for falls prevention and management for older adults recommend the use of the term concerns about falling [1].

Physical activity. Physical activity is an umbrella term used to describe any human movement produced by the contraction of skeletal muscles that raises energy expenditure above resting metabolic rate (i.e., 1 Metabolic Equivalent of Task; MET [32]. Four main domains or types of activity have been identified: leisure-time physical activity, work- or school-related activity; household, domestic, or self-care activities; and activity for transport from place to place [33]. In addition to frequency and type of activity, physical activity behavior is also characterized by its duration (e.g., minutes/week), intensity (e.g., light, moderate, and vigorous), and mode (e.g., aerobic, muscle strengthening, and bone strengthening activities). The concept of physical activity is inclusive of the concepts of exercise and sport. Exercise refers to physical activity that is planned, structured, and repetitive for the purpose of enhancing or maintaining physical fitness and health [32]. Sport refers to physical activity that is rule governed, structured, competitive, and involves gross motor movement characterized by physical strategy, prowess, and chance [34]. However, the concept of physical activity does not encompass the concept of sedentary behavior [33]. Sedentary behaviors are defined as any waking behaviors characterized by an energy expenditure ≤ 1.5 METs, while in a sitting, reclining, or lying posture [35].

Types of evidence sources

The proposed scoping review will draw upon data from studies that have used a qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methodological approach. Irrespective of the methodological approach, we will include studies that have used cross-sectional, longitudinal, quasi-experimental and experimental design. Knowledge synthesis of any types, conference abstracts, commentaries, editorials, study protocols, thesis and dissertation, books and book chapters and case studies will be excluded.

Search Strategy

1
2
3 301 The search strategy was developed was developed by the review team, which includes a
4
5 302 database expert and health sciences information specialist. The health sciences information
6
7 303 specialist and database expert implemented and executed an initial electronic databases
8
9
10 304 (coverage period) search strategy for CINAHL (EBSCO interface; 1976 – present), EMBASE
11
12 305 (Elsevier interface; 1947 – present), PsycINFO (EBSCO interface; 1887 – present), PubMed
13
14 306 (1946 – present), and SPORTDiscus (EBSCO interface; 1930 – present). For all databases,
15
16 307 search terms tapping on both the concept of concerns about falling and physical activity were
17
18 308 used. Because the population of interest for this scoping review is the adult populations (≥ 18
19
20 309 years), no age filters were used in any of the databases. Additionally, we used database-specific
21
22 310 Index or Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms when available. The free text search terms
23
24 311 remained constant across all databases, searching across title, abstract, and when available,
25
26 312 keyword fields. We updated the database-specific terms for each database, where available, but
27
28 313 used the same key concepts across all the databases. We used filters for resource types (i.e.,
29
30 314 Academic Journals) in two of the EBSCO databases (SPORTDiscus and PsycINFO) because of
31
32 315 the indexing of periodicals in EBSCO. We will not use this option for CINAHL because the
33
34 316 filter was experiencing technical difficulties when pilot-test searches were run. No date or
35
36 317 language filters were used. Full details of an example electronic search for PubMed are presented
37
38 318 in Table 2.

39
40
41
42
43 319
44
45 320
46
47 321
48
49 322
50
51 323
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2: Example of database search for PubMed

1. "Fear"[MeSH Terms] OR "Avoidance Learning"[MeSH Terms] OR "Self Efficacy"[MeSH Terms]
2. "fear"[Title/Abstract] OR "fears"[Title/Abstract] OR "concern"[Title/Abstract] OR "concerns"[Title/Abstract] OR "confidence"[Title/Abstract] OR "accidental"[Title/Abstract] OR "efficacy"[Title/Abstract] OR "beliefs"[Title/Abstract] OR "avoidance"[Title/Abstract] OR "confident"[Title/Abstract] OR "threat"[Title/Abstract] OR "threats"[Title/Abstract] OR "afraid"[Title/Abstract] OR "worry"[Title/Abstract] OR "worries"[Title/Abstract] OR "worried"[Title/Abstract] OR "fearful"[Title/Abstract] OR "frightened"[Title/Abstract] OR "concerned"[Title/Abstract] OR "post fall syndrome"[Title/Abstract] OR "ptophobia"[Title/Abstract] OR "scared"[Title/Abstract]
3. #1 OR #2
4. "Accidental Falls"[Mesh]
5. "falling"[Title/Abstract] OR "falls"[Title/Abstract] OR "fall"[Title/Abstract] OR "balance"[Title/Abstract]
6. #4 OR #5
7. "Activities of Daily Living"[MeSH Terms] OR "Exercise"[MeSH Terms] OR "Walking"[MeSH Terms] OR "Sports"[MeSH Terms]
8. "exercise"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical activity"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical fitness"[Title/Abstract] OR "step count"[Title/Abstract] OR "walking"[Title/Abstract] OR "mobility"[Title/Abstract]
9. "Activity"[Title/Abstract] OR "activities"[Title/Abstract]
10. "Daily living"[Title/Abstract] OR "level"[Title/Abstract] OR "levels"[Title/Abstract] OR "avoidance"[Title/Abstract] OR "intensity"[Title/Abstract] OR "restricted"[Title/Abstract]
11. #9 AND #10
12. #7 OR #8 OR #11
13. #3 AND #6 AND #12

To identify additional studies, two reviewers will independently perform a hand search of the reference lists for all included studies for review and relevant knowledge syntheses [2–

5,7,8,19–21,25,26]. Lastly, we will perform a citing reference search for all included studies using Web of Science. The results of the search will be reported in a PRISMA-ScR flow-chart [31].

Studies written in any language will be included. Title and abstract of any potential studies that are reported in a language other than English will be initially translated using Google Translate. The full text will be translated by a qualified translator if it meets the inclusion criteria at that stage. It is worth noting that at least one member of the review team has high proficiency in English, French, and Korean. We will place no constraints on the publishing year of the studies. We will use Covidence, a web-based software platform, to manage the retrieved citation records (Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia).

Source of Evidence Selection

We ran an initial electronic databases search on May 23, 2022, which yield a total of 24,359 records (*k*). We will update the electronic databases search before formally implementing our final, complete search strategy. We will not use any automation tools for study selection.

Screening of Titles and Abstracts

Given the high number of identified records through our initial electronic citation search (*k* = 24,359) and the related time and cost constraints associated with their screening, we assembled a team of six reviewers that will single-screen titles and abstracts using an over-inclusive approach. Specifically, a given record will be retained and considered for full-text examination if there is insufficient information to conclude with certainty its exclusion. The specific exclusion criteria considered at this stage were: conference abstract, review article, case report/series, not human research, ineligible age group (< 18 years), not reporting on either the

concept of physical activity or the concept of concern about falling. We used a two-step process for pilot-testing the titles and abstracts screening procedure. First, a random sample of 100 records from our initial search were selected and independently screened for eligibility by two review members. The decisions were compared, and discrepancies among the two reviewers were resolved by discussion. At the end of this first step, the reviewers disagreed on only two studies, and both reviewers agreed to exclude both after discussion. Second, another random sample of 100 records was selected and independently screened for eligibility by four reviewers. Then one of the reviewers involved in the first step described above met with the four reviewers to provide training and discuss screening decisions. Upon pilot-testing the process of screening titles and abstract and given the number of records to screen, the review team decided that all titles and abstracts would be screened by a single reviewer, one the six involved in pilot-testing titles and abstracts screening procedure. The single screening of the titles and abstracts can yield high sensitivity (98% - 100%) when certain exclusion criteria are used – such as conference abstract, review article, case report/series, not human research, ineligible age group (< 18 years) [36] – and is acceptable at this stage of the selection process [36,37].

Full-Text Examination

We will retrieve the full text of the records selected for inclusion at the titles and abstracts screening stage. Two reviewers will independently assess the eligibility of each article. Multiple articles reporting on the same study and written by the same authors group will be gathered and scrutinized to ensure that only unique study, rather than each article or duplication study, represents the unit of interest in the scoping review. When necessary for the making of a selection decision, we will contact the authors of the articles for unpublished information. The decisions to include an article will be compared between the two reviewers, and discrepancies

1
2
3 374 between reviewers will be resolved by discussion. When no consensus can be reached, a third
4
5 375 reviewer will help resolve the discrepancy. Moreover, any relevant retraction statements and
6
7 376 errata for information for each included article will be examined to exclude data from studies
8
9
10 377 that are fraudulent or studies that include errors. We will report reasons for exclusion of full-text
11
12 378 articles that do not meet the eligibility criteria in a supplementary document in the scoping
13
14
15 379 review.

16
17 380 **Data extraction**

18
19 381 Prior to data extraction, two reviewers will independently pilot-test a purpose-built data
20
21 382 extraction sheet with three randomly selected records. An initial version of the purpose-built data
22
23 383 extraction sheet is provided in online supplementary appendix 2. Reviewers will collect
24
25 384 information about the characteristics of the study (i.e., authors, year of publication,
26
27 385 origin/country of origin, aims/purposes), population and sample (i.e., sample size, mean age and
28
29 386 range, percentage of women/female, race/ethnicity characteristics, health status, and settings –
30
31 387 e.g., community, nursing home, medical facilities), the concept of concerns about falling (e.g.,
32
33 388 measurement instrument used and facet measured), and the concept of physical activity (e.g.,
34
35 389 measurement instrument used and facet measured). Reviewers will extract relevant information
36
37 390 regarding all types of physical activity – all physical activity measurement metrics (e.g.,
38
39 391 frequency, duration, volume, number of steps, arbitrary activity units) will be considered, as well
40
41 392 as the measurement by means of device-based (e.g., accelerometer) and self-report (e.g.,
42
43 393 questionnaires) instruments. For each study included, we will collect findings pertaining to
44
45 394 evidence of moderation. Specifically, we will identify if a moderating factor was investigated
46
47 395 (yes/no), specify the theoretical approach underlying the investigation (if any), and
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

methodological approaches for investigating moderator effect (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods), the results pertaining to moderation, and the main conclusion of the study.

It is expected that the data extraction sheet will be refined and revised following the pilot-testing of the data extraction process. After pilot-testing of the data extraction sheet, we will hold a meeting with all scoping review authors to discuss all aspect of the revised version of the data extraction sheet and agree on its final version. Then, two reviewers will independently extract data from all included studies, compare results, and resolve any discrepancies through discussion. We will contact the study authors for clarification on unreported data item. When no consensus on reported data items can be reached, we will contact the study authors to help resolve the discrepancy. We will hold bi-weekly meetings throughout the data extraction process to discuss progress and monitor whether the data extraction sheet is capturing all the essential information to properly answer the research questions.

Data analysis and presentation of results

Primary study and sample characteristics will be reported for descriptive purposes in a summary table. We plan to use iconography to display the different types and number of samples drawn by the included studies. Moreover, we plan on using a waffle chart to illustrate the type of research methodology used within the included studies (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods).

We will analyze the data descriptively, and report frequency count and percentage of studies investigating and reporting on evidence of moderation. Further, data will be charted, categorized, and summarized by mapping the data pertaining to the evidence for and against moderation to each of the hypothesized moderators outlined in Table 1. This will be applied to all studies, irrespective of the methodological approach or research design. Prior to mapping the evidence of moderation, the review authors will familiarize themselves with the data by reading

1
2
3 420 and understanding all the included studies for review and understanding the relevance of the data
4
5 421 in relation to the main scoping review question. Result of this qualitative synthesis will be
6
7
8 422 presented using a tree graph to display the moderating factor(s) investigated by the included
9
10 423 studies, and a ratio showing the number of time evidence for moderation was reported by the
11
12 424 total number of investigations.

14
15 425 We will perform a narrative synthesis of the findings to highlight similarities and
16
17 426 differences both within and across studies by examining the convergence and divergence in
18
19 427 findings across methodological approach, the concepts of concerns about falling and physical
20
21 428 activity behavior, and sample characteristics.

23
24 429 **Patient and public involvement**

25
26 430 Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or
27
28 431 dissemination plans of our research.

30
31 432 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION PLAN**

32
33 433 The Purdue University Human Research Protection Program determined that the
34
35 434 proposed scoping review does not qualify as Human Subjects Research under federal human
36
37 435 subjects research regulations (IRB-2023-1656).

38
39 436 The results of this proposed scoping review will be disseminated through various means.
40
41 437 First, will disseminate the study findings through a peer-reviewed scientific journal and
42
43 438 presentation at a scientific conference. Second, will disseminate the findings in the form of a 1-
44
45 439 page summary, in plain language, via written briefs or e-newsletters to Extension Program
46
47 440 leaders, part of a nationwide Cooperative Extension network. We also plan to present posters or
48
49 441 e-posters at the national Health Extension annual conference. Extension Program and community
50
51 442 leaders attend training sessions during this conference. They represent an important group of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

end-users as many of them deliver to members of their community evidence-based programs to reduce concerns about falling and the promote of physical activity (e.g., *A Matter of Balance*, *Stepping On*, *Fit & Strong!*) with the overall objective of preventing and managing falls.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All listed authors have contributed and will continue to contribute meaningfully to the conduct and reporting of proposed scoping review. S.A. and J.B.R. conceived the proposed review. S.A. and J.B.R. developed the search strategy, and J.B.R. ran the initial electronic databases. S.A., E.A.C, E.R.J, H.R., R.C.K., and J.B.R., are the six title and abstract reviewers. K.J.M. is an Extension Specialist, with experience in delivering programs to reduce concerns about falling and promote physical activity to midlife and older adults, who will provide insights on the usefulness of the scoping review findings to practitioners. In addition, K.J.M. will help identify language barriers in the reporting of the scoping review results. All authors read the final protocol manuscript and revised it for content; all approved the final version. S.A. is responsible for the overall content as guarantor.

FUNDING STATEMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

1. Montero-Odasso M, Van Der Velde N, Martin FC, Petrovic M, Tan MP, Ryg J, et al. World guidelines for falls prevention and management for older adults: A global initiative. *Age Ageing*. 2022;51:1–36. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afac205

2. Ramsey KA, Zhou W, Rojer AGM, Reijnierse EM, Maier AB. Associations of objectively measured physical activity and sedentary behaviour with fall-related outcomes in older adults: A systematic review. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med*. 2022;65. doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2021.101571

3. Meredith SJ, Cox NJ, Ibrahim K, Higson J, McNiff J, Mitchell S, et al. Factors that influence older adults’ participation in physical activity: A systematic review of qualitative studies. *Age Ageing*. 2023;52:1–15. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afad145

4. Schepens S, Sen A, Painter JA, Murphy SL. Relationship between fall-related efficacy and activity engagement in community-dwelling older adults: A meta-analytic review. *Am J Occup Ther*. 2012;66:137–48. doi: 10.5014/ajot.2012.001156

5. Franco MR, Tong A, Howard K, Sherrington C, Ferreira PH, Pinto RZ, et al. Older people’s perspectives on participation in physical activity: A systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative literature. *Br J Sports Med*. 2015;49:1268–76. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2014-094015

6. Ellmers TJ, Freiburger E, Hauer K, Hogan DB, McGarrigle L, Lim ML, et al. Why should clinical practitioners ask about their patients’ concerns about falling? *Age Ageing*. 2023;52:afad057. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afad057

- 485 7. Baert V, Gorus E, Mets T, Geerts C, Bautmans I. Motivators and barriers for physical
 486 activity in the oldest old: A systematic review. *Ageing Res Rev.* 2011;10(4):464–74. doi:
 487 10.1016/j.arr.2011.04.001
- 488 8. Rider J V, Longhurst JK, Lekhak N, Young DL, Landers MR. Fear of falling avoidance
 489 behavior assessment and intervention in Parkinson's Disease: A scoping review. *Res Rev*
 490 *Parkinsonism.* 2022;12:1–17. doi: 10.2147/JPRLS.S350890
- 491 9. Adamczewska N, Nyman SR. A new approach to fear of falls from connections with the
 492 posttraumatic stress disorder literature. *Gerontol Geriatr Med.* 2018;4:2333721418796238.
 493 doi: 10.1177/2333721418796238
- 494 10. Stevens CJ, Baldwin AS, Bryan AD, Conner M, Rhodes RE, Williams DM. Affective
 495 determinants of physical activity: A conceptual framework and narrative review. *Front*
 496 *Psychol.* 2020;11:3366. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.568331
- 497 11. Peeters G, Bennett M, Donoghue OA, Kennelly S, Kenny RA. Understanding the
 498 aetiology of fear of falling from the perspective of a fear-avoidance model – A narrative
 499 review. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2020;79:101862. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101862
- 500 12. Rosenstock IM. The health belief model and preventive health behavior. *Health Educ*
 501 *Behav.* 1977;2:354–86. doi: 10.1177/109019817400200405
- 502 13. Maddux JE, Rogers RW. Protection motivation and self-efficacy: A revised theory of fear
 503 appeals and attitude change. *J Exp Soc Psychol.* 1983;19:469–79. doi: 10.1016/0022-
 504 1031(83)90023-9
- 505 14. Leventhal H, Diefenbach M, Leventhal EA, Lowenstein G, Rachman J, Rodin J, et al.
 506 *Illness Cognition: Using common sense to understand treatment adherence and affect*
 507 *cognition interactions. Cognit Ther Res.* 1992;16:143–63. doi: 10.1007/BF01173486

1
2
3 508 15. Hadjistavropoulos T, Delbaere K, Fitzgerald TD. Reconceptualizing the role of fear of
4
5 509 falling and balance confidence in fall risk. 2010;23:3–23. doi: 10.1177/0898264310378039
6
7
8 510 16. Kaushal N, Preissner C, Charles K, Knäuper B. Differences and similarities of physical
9
10 511 activity determinants between older adults who have and have not experienced a fall:
11
12 512 Testing an extended health belief model. Arch Gerontol Geriatr. 2021; 92:104247. doi:
13
14 513 10.1016/j.archger.2020.104247
15
16
17 514 17. Preissner CE, Kaushal N, Charles K, Knäuper B. A protection motivation theory approach
18
19 515 to understanding how fear of falling affects physical activity determinants in older adults.
20
21 516 J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci. 2023;78:30-39. doi: 10.1093/geronb/gbac105.
22
23
24 517 18. Ellmers TJ, Wilson MR, Norris M, Young WR. Protective or harmful? A qualitative
25
26 518 exploration of older people’s perceptions of worries about falling. Age Ageing.
27
28 519 2022;51:1–10. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afac067
29
30
31 520 19. Hamer O, Larkin D, Relph N, Dey P. Fear-related barriers to physical activity among
32
33 521 adults with overweight and obesity: A narrative synthesis scoping review. Obes Rev.
34
35 522 2021;22:e13307. doi: 10.1111/obr.13307.
36
37
38 523 20. Streber R, Peters S, Pfeifer K. Systematic review of correlates and determinants of
39
40 524 physical activity in persons with Multiple Sclerosis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil.
41
42 525 2016;97:633-645.e29. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2015.11.020.
43
44
45 526 21. Prior PL, Suskin N. Exercise for stroke prevention. Stroke Vasc Neurol. 2018;3:59-68.
46
47 527 doi: 10.1136/svn-2018-000155.
48
49 528 22. Wright CE, Rhodes RE, Ruggiero EW, Sheeran P. Benchmarking the effectiveness of
50
51 529 interventions to promote physical activity: A metasynthesis. Health Psychol.
52
53 530 2021;40:811–21. doi: 10.1037/hea0001118.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 531 23. Pittig A, Wong AHK, Glück VM, Boschet JM. Avoidance and its bi-directional
532 relationship with conditioned fear: Mechanisms, moderators, and clinical implications.
533 Behav Res Ther. 2020;126:103550. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2020.103550
- 534 24. Tay PKC, Chan A, Tan PJ, Wong CH. Sex differences in perceptions toward falls among
535 older adults living in the community in Singapore. J Aging Health. 2020;32(10):1355–62.
536 doi:10.1177/0898264320925972
- 537 25. Hughes CC, Kneebone II, Jones F, Brady B, Pachana NA, Oude Voshaar RC. A
538 theoretical and empirical review of psychological factors associated with falls-related
539 psychological concerns in community-dwelling older people. Int Psychogeriatr.
540 2015;27:1071–87. doi: 10.1017/S1041610214002701.
- 541 26. Scheffer AC, Schuurmans MJ, Van dijk N, Van der hooft T, De rooij SE. Fear of falling:
542 Measurement strategy, prevalence, risk factors and consequences among older persons.
543 Age Ageing. 2008;37:19-24. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afm169.
- 544 27. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. Best practice
545 guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. JBI Evid
546 Synth. 2022;20(4):953–68. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242.
- 547 28. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C., McInerney P., Munn Z., Tricco A., Khalil H. Chapter 11:
548 Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E., Munn Z., editors. JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis
549 [internet]. Adelaide; 2020.
- 550 29. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
551 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
552 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4:1. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1

1
2
3 553 30. Pollock D, Peters MDJ, Khalil H, McInerney P, Alexander L, Tricco AC, et al.
4
5 554 Recommendations for the extraction, analysis, and presentation of results in scoping
6
7 555 reviews. JBI Evid Synth. 2023;21:520–32. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-22-00123.
8
9
10 556 31. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA
11
12 557 extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. Ann Intern
13
14 558 Med. 2018;169:467–73. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.
15
16
17 559 32. Caspersen CJ, Powell KE, Christenson GM. Physical activity, exercise and physical
18
19 560 fitness: Definitions and distinctions for health-related research. Public Health Rep.
20
21 561 1985;100(2):126–31.
22
23
24 562 33. Pettee Gabriel KK, Morrow JR, Woolsey ALT. Framework for Physical Activity as a
25
26 563 Complex and Multidimensional Behavior. J Phys Act Health. 2012;9:S11–8. doi:
27
28 564 10.1123/jpah.9.s1.s11.
29
30
31 565 34. Rejeski WJ, Brawley LR. Defining the Boundaries of Sport Psychology. Sport Psychol.
32
33 566 1988;2(3):231–42. doi: 10.1123/tsp.2.3.231
34
35 567 35. Tremblay M. Letter to the editor: standardized use of the terms “sedentary” and
36
37 568 “sedentary behaviours.” Appl Physiol Nutr Metab. 2012;37:540–2. doi: 10.1139/h2012-
38
39 569 024.
40
41
42 570 36. Nama N, Hennawy M, Barrowman N, O’Hearn K, Sampson M, McNally JD. Successful
43
44 571 incorporation of single reviewer assessments during systematic review screening:
45
46 572 Development and validation of sensitivity and work-saved of an algorithm that considers
47
48 573 exclusion criteria and count. Syst Rev. 2021;10:1–10. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01632-6.
49
50
51 574 37. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Featherstone R, Littlewood A, Metzendorf M-I, et al.
52
53 575 Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

576 Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic
577 Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated October 2023). Cochrane, 2023. Available
578 from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

579

For peer review only

Online Supplementary File 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist adapted for scoping review protocol¹

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	5-12
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	12
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	Non applicable
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	13-15;17

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Information sources ¹	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	15-16
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	15-16
Selection of sources of evidence ²	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	17-19
Data charting process ³	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	19-20; Appendix 2
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	19-20; Appendix 2
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence ⁴	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	Not applicable
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	20-21
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	22

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

¹Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

²A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

³The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley [1] and Levac et al. [2] and the JBI guidance [3-5] refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

⁴The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

¹Adapted from Tricco et al. [6].

REFERENCES

1- Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *Int. J. Soc. Res. Methodol.* 2005;8:19–32. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616

2- Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: Advancing the methodology. *Implement Sci.* 2010;5:1–9. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-69

3- Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JBI Evid Synth.* 2022;20:953–68. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242.

4- Peters M., Godfrey C., McInerney P., Munn Z., Tricco A., Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E., Munn Z., editors. *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. Adelaide; 2020.

5- Pollock D, Peters MDJ, Khalil H, McInerney P, Alexander L, Tricco AC, et al. Recommendations for the extraction, analysis, and presentation of results in scoping reviews. *JBI Evid Synth.* 2023;21:520–32. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-22-00123

6- Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169:467–73. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.

Online Supplementary File 2: Purpose-built data extraction sheet

Source of evidence (Authors, year)
Country
Methodology: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods
Study design: cross-sectional, longitudinal, quasi-experimental, or experimental
Sample Age: Sample mean age and/or age range (years) Biological sex: Percentage of female Race/ethnicity: Percentage of White Health status and/or setting
Theory: Name of the theory (if any)
Concept of concerns about falling Facet measured: Fear of falling or fall efficacy Measurement instrument used: Name of the instrument (if any)
Concept of physical activity Domain or type of physical activity measured: Leisure-time physical activity, work- or school-related activity, household, domestic, or self-care activities, activity for transport from place to place Characteristics of physical activity: Frequency, Intensity, Mode Mode of assessment: Self-report or device-based Measurement instrument used: Name of the instrument (if any)
Main findings pertaining to the relationship between concerns about falling and physical activity

Moderation investigation: Yes/no Theoretical rationale for the investigation and hypotheses (if any) Description of how evidence of moderation was examined Main findings pertaining to moderation