INTRODUCTION
Diabetes affects nearly 20.8 million people in the US.1
Greater than 50% of these people have diabetic peripheral neuropathy (DPN).2
Peripheral neuropathy increases fall risk,3,4
• Somatosensory changes of the peripheral nerves.
• Results in gait and balance problems.

There are a myriad of fall risk assessment tools used to determine fall risk.
• Many have been validated for older adults5 and other diagnoses, including stroke6, Parkinson’s disease7 and vestibular disorders8.
• None have been validated for people with DPN.

No research has specifically identified risk factors for falls in people with DPN.

Aim 1 Compare the validity of selected fall risk assessment tools for people with DPN.
Aim 2 Identify risk factors for falls in people with DPN.

METHODS (continued)
Fall History Assessment:
METHODS
Participants: 36 persons (21 male, 15 female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusion Criteria:
• 40 - 65 years old
• Have diabetic peripheral neuropathy
• Able to walk without person-assistance

Exclusion Criteria:
• Untreated major depression
• Uncorrected visual deficits
• Other integumentary, musculoskeletal, neurological or vestibular problems that might influence fall risk

METHODS
Fall History Assessment:
• Fall definition given to participant: Coming to rest unintentionally on the ground or other level, not as hazard.9
• Asked if have fallen, how many times and to describe circumstances surrounding each fall.
• If unable to describe, fall not counted.
• Faller = 2 or more falls in the previous year
• NonFaller ≤ 2 falls in the previous year

Fall Risk Assessment (FRA) Tools:
1) Functional Reach Test (FRT)10
• 5 times (last 3 scored, mean used for data analysis)
2) Timed Up and Go (TUG)11
• 3 times (last 2 scored, mean used for data analysis)
3) Berg Balance Scale (BBS)12
• 14 static and dynamic balance tasks
• Each item scored 0 to 4, maximum score = 56
4) Dynamic Gait Index (DGI)13
• 8 walking tasks
• Each item scored 0 to 3, maximum score = 24

Other Outcome Measures:
Sex, Age, BMI, Beck Depression Inventory II, Quality of Life Questionnaire Diabetic Neuropathy Version, Pain ratings, SAFFE (Survey of Activities and Fear of Falling in the Elderly), PASE (Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly), HbA1c, Michigan Neuropathy Screening Instrument, Assistive Device Score, Ankle ROM, Ankle Strength, Ankle Proprioception, and Tibial, Peroneal and Sural nerve conduction studies.

Statistical Analysis:
Aim 1 Validity Comparison
• Sensitivity: proportion of Fallers identified by the FRA tools as having fall risk
• Specificity: proportion of NonFallers identified by the FRA tools as NOT having fall risk
• ROC curve analysis to determine modified cut-off scores

Aim 2 Identify Risk Factors
• Independent Samples t-test
• Logistic Regression (Dependent Variable = Fall Status) with significant variables from t-test

RESULTS
Aim 1 Validity Comparison
Fallers (n = 10), NonFallers (n = 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Traditional Cut-off Scores</th>
<th>Modified Cut-off Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRT</td>
<td>≤ 25.4</td>
<td>≤ 32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUG</td>
<td>≥ 13.5</td>
<td>≥ 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>≤ 32.5</td>
<td>0.90 / 0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGI</td>
<td>≤ 19</td>
<td>0.90 / 0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of Sensitivity and Specificity using the Modified versus Traditional cut-off scores for the FRT, TUG, BBS and DGI.

Aim 2 Identify Risk Factors
Differences between Fallers and NonFallers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASE</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFFE</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION
Aim 1 Validity Comparison
Using traditional cut-off scores none of the FRA tools would be clinically useful due to poor sensitivity.
Modified cut-off scores greatly increased sensitivity of these tools (between 2- and 9-fold) while only moderately reducing specificity.

Aim 2 Identify Risk Factors
Of all outcome measures, the PASE best explained the difference between Fallers and NonFallers.

- A 1-point ↓ in the PASE score = 1.8% ↑ in the odds of being a Faller.

Physical activity is touted as important for people with diabetes; this idea is supported as it relates to fall risk in people with DPN.

SUMMARY
This was the first study to compare validity of 4 commonly used fall risk assessment tools in people with DPN. The TUG and DGI demonstrated the greatest validity using modified cut-off scores and may be useful components of a comprehensive fall risk assessment program. Physical activity level, as measured by the PASE, appears to significantly contribute to faller status in people with DPN.

Additional studies that are prospective in nature and use larger, more heterogeneous samples of people with DPN need to be conducted to confirm and expand on these new but preliminary findings.

REFERENCES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
We would like to thank Dr. Patricia Pont, Dr. Wen Liu, Dr. Jonathan Mabon and Dr. Marahill Pio for their service on Stephen Jernigan’s dissertation committee. Laura Herbelin for her assistance with data collection and North Kansas City Hospital for recruitment assistance. This project is supported in part by the University of Kansas Medical Center GCRC grant M01 RR 023940 and Kansas Partners in Progress.