

Journal of Experimental and Clinical Medicine https://dergipark.org.tr/omujecm

Research Article

.



J Exp Clin Med 2021; 38(4): 445-450 **doi:** 10.52142/omujecm.38.4.8

Can we prevent falls in older individuals?

Savaş SEZİK 💿

Division of Emergency Medicine, Ödemiş State Hospital, İzmir, Turkey

Received: 01.03.2021 • Accepted/Published Online: 04.03.2021	٠	Final Version: 30.08.2021
--	---	---------------------------

Abstract

Falls are a major public health problem globally. Each year, 2.8 million elderly people (defined as those aged \geq 65) are treated in emergency departments for fall injuries. A questionnaire containing 15 questions, prepared by researchers, was provided to patients who visited the emergency department due to falls and were aged \geq 65. Patients who had fallen on the ground were included in the study group and were categorized using the following criteria: age, gender, education, socioeconomic status, life spots, falling location, chronic illnesses, previous falling episodes, cause of falls, medications used, hospital procedures undergone and the outcome of those procedures. A questionnaire was given to 159 patients that visited our emergency department as a result off all. When those patients that did not respond to the questionnaires, those who had high falls, and those who did not remember their traumas were excluded, there were 119 remaining. There were 83 female participants (69.7%) and 79.87 (SD, 7.98) were participants in the study. In our study, 21 (17.6%) patients were identified as having had previous falls. Age, gender, education status, living environment, number of drugs used, diseases and p values were compared according to old operative emoticons: 0.434, 0.855, 0.607, 0.502, 0.778, 0.324and 0.384, and there are no significant statistical differences between them. Despite the challenges mentioned above, educating people about the benefits of healthy ageing, and taking preventive measures will likely help to reduce negative outcomes in the future.

Keywords: accidental falls, aged, emergency service, healthy aging

1. Introduction

Falls are a major public health problem globally. Approximately 28%–35% of people aged >65 fall each year, increasing to 32%-42% for those with >70 years of age (1). Each year, 2.8 million elderly people (defined as those aged \geq 65) are treated in emergency departments for fall injuries (2). Falls lead to 20%-30% of mild to severe injuries and are the underlying cause of 10%-15% of all emergency department visits. More than 50% of injury-related hospitalizations relate to elderly people (1). The major underlying causes for fall-related hospital admissions are hip fractures, traumatic brain injuries and upper limb injuries (1). According to data published in 2015 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in the United States (US), falls are the leading cause of fatal and non-fatal injuries among elderly people (2). The financial cost off all-related injuries are substantial. The average cost to the health system per fall injury in Finland and Australia is \$3,611 and \$1,049 respectively, regarding elderly people. Direct medical costs totalled \$616.5 million for fatal injuries and \$30.3 billion for non-fatal injuries in 2012, rising to \$637.5 million and \$31.3 billion, respectively, in 2015 (3). In 2004, the economic burden of injury in Canada was estimated at \$19.8 billion, and the direct costs associated with falls among elderly people in Canada were estimated at over \$2 billion. The cost of falls for Canadian seniors (per capita) was 3.7 times greater than that of individuals between the ages of 25 and 64 (4).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study groups

A questionnaire containing 15 questions, prepared by researchers, was provided to patients who visited the emergency department due to falls and were aged ≥ 65 . Patients that responded to their questionnaire inappropriately or had fallen from a great height, and therefore, did not remember their traumas were separated from the study group. Patients who had fallen on the ground were included in the study group and were categorized using the following criteria: Age, gender, education, socioeconomic status, life spots, fall location, chronic illnesses, previous falling episodes, cause of falls, medications used, hospital procedures undergone and the outcome of those procedures. In the descriptive study, participants' demographics and responses to the scale questionnaire were objectively analysed. The clinical research protocol of this study was reviewed and approved by the Non-Interventional Clinical Studies Institutional Review Board of Katip Celebi University Izmir, Turkey (Ethical Committee Number: 8, 21.01.2016).

2.3. Statistical analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 20.0 program was used for statistical analysis of the data. In the data analysis, both explanatory and generic statistical methods were used to obtain the results. The demographic characteristics of the participants were analysed, and frequency distributions were established. The t-test was used to examine the relationship between the two groups of variables. A p value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant for all outcomes.

3. Results

A questionnaire was given to 159 patients that visited our emergency department because of all. When those patients that did not respond to the questionnaires, those who had high falls, and those who did not remember their traumas were excluded, there were 119 remaining. There were 83 female participants (69.7%) and 79.87 (SD, 7.98) were participants in the study. The demographic data of participants are shown in Table 1. A total of 91 participants (76.5%) were determined to have fallen at home. Detailed examinations according to fall location are given in Table 2. Only 21 (17.6%) of the participating patients indicated that they had fallen before, and only one of these had received medical support.

Table 1. Demographic data of participants

Table 1. Demographic data of participants								
	Male	Female	Total					
Study population	36 (30.3%)	83 (69.7%)	119 (100)					
Age mean (SD)	76.97 (7.83)	81.13 (7.73)	79.87 (7.96)					
Who lives with								
Alone	6	23	29 (24.4)					
With his wife	24	16	40 (33.6)					
With crowded family	6	43	49 (41.2)					
With caregiver	0	1	1 (0.8)					
Educational status								
Illiterate	7	64	71 (59.7)					
Literate	12	4	16 (13.4)					
Elementary school	16	15	30 (25.2)					
Middle school	1	0	1 (0.8)					
High school	1	0	1 (0.8)					

SD, standard deviation

Table 2. Evaluation according to fall places

Fall from floor	Male	Female	Total (%)
Dwelling	21	70	91 (75.8)
Street	11	3	14 (12.5)
Garden	1	8	9 (7.5)
Mosque	1	0	1 (0.8)
Workplace	2	2	4 (3.3)
Dwelling fall	Male	Female	Total (%)
Toilet	2	14	16 (17.5)
Bathroom	0	7	7 (0.7))
Room	19	48	67 (73.6)
Kitchen	0	1	1 (0.1)

Information on the hospital process for each of the participants is given in Table 3. Our participants: 51 patients (42.5%) 1-3, 19 patients (15.8%) 4–5 and 29 patients (24.2%) using six or more drugs. Nineteen patients (15.8%) did not use any medication, and three patients (2.5%) used irregular or unknown drugs. One of the 19 medication-free patients had suffered vision loss, one had dementia and two had previously been operated on due to suffering a femur fracture. There were 14 patients with no diagnosed diseases or drug use.

Table 3. Information about the hospital process

Imagination	Participant (%)
Yes	117 (98.3)
No	2 (1.7)
Consultation	
Yes	85 (71.4)
No	34 (28.6)
Diagnosis	
Hip fracture	54 (45.4)
Soft tissue injury	38 (31.9)
Other*	18 (15.1)
Radius fracture	6 (5)
Pelvic fracture	3 (2.5)
Hospital outcome	
Admission	61 (51.3)
Discharge	56 (47.1)
Treatment rejection	2 (1.7)

Table 4. History of previous fall

Table 4. History of previous fall								
Sex	Previo	Total (%)						
	Yes (%)	No (%)						
Male	6 (5.0)	30 (25.2)	36 (30.3)					
Female	15 (12.6)	68 (57.1)	83 (69.7)					
Age	4 (2, 2)	14(11.7)	19 (15 1)					
65-69 70-70	4 (3.3)	14 (11.7)	18 (15.1)					
70-79 80-89	4 (3.3) 8 (6.7)	29 (24.3) 47 (39.4)	33 (27.7) 55 (46.2)					
90 and above	5 (4.2)	8 (6.7)	13 (10.9)					
Educational status	5 (4.2)	8 (0.7)	15 (10.7)					
Illiterate	12 (10.0)	59 (49.5)	71 (59.6)					
Literate	2 (1.6)	14 (11.7)	16 (13.4)					
Elementary school	5 (4.2)	25 21.0)	30 (25.2)					
Middle school	1 (0.8)	0	1 (0.8)					
High school	1 (0.8)	0	1 (0.8)					
Who lives with								
Alone	5 (4.2)	24 (20.1)	29 (24.3)					
With his wife	9 (7.5)	31 (26.0)	40 (33.6)					
With crowded family	7 (5.8)	42 (35.2)	49 (41.1)					
With caregiver	0	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)					
Number of drug								
1-3	9 (7.5)	43 (36.1)	52 (43.6)					
4-5	3 (2.5)	16 (13.4)	19 (15.9)					
6 and above	5 (4.2)	24 (20.1)	29 (24.3)					
No	4 (3.3)	15 (12.6)	19 (15.9)					
Chronic disease								
Osteoporosis	6 (5.0)	15 (12.6)	21 (17.6)					
Gonarthrosis	2 (1.6)	15 (12.6)	17 (14.2)					
Osteoarthritis	0	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)					
Defect of vision	0	5 (4.2)	5 (4.2)					
Arrhythmia	1 (0.8)	8 (6.7)	9 (7.5)					
Epilepsy	1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)	3 (2.5)					
Vertigo	1 (0.8)	9 (7.5)	10 (8.4)					
Ht	10 (8.4)	29 (24.3)	39 (32.7)					
SVD	2 (1.6)	9 (7.5)	11 (9.2)					
DM	8 (6.7)	18 (15.1)	26 (21.8)					
CAD	0	6 (5.0)	6 (5.0)					
Anemia	1 (0.8)	7 (5.8)	8 (6.7)					
Hypothyroidism	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)					
Cancer	0	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)					
CHF	0	3 (2.5)	3 (2.5)					
Alzheimer	0	14 (11.7)	14 (11.7)					
Previous operation								
Yes	3 (2.5)	8 (6.7)	11 (9.3)					
No	18 (15.1)	90 (75.6)	108 (90.7)					

In our study, 21 (17.6%) patients were identified as having had previous falls. The number of illnesses and drug use of these patients are given in Table 4. Age, gender, education status, living environment, number of drugs used, diseases and p values were compared according to old operative emoticons: 0.434, 0.855, 0.607, 0.502, 0.778, 0.324and 0.384, and there are no significant statistical differences between them (Tables 5 and 6).

 Table 5. Comparison of previous fall history in terms of drug use, disease, and previous operation

Previous fall	Drug use	Ν	%	Т	Μ	SD	t	р
	1-3	9	42.9	21	2.19	1.209		
X 7	4-5	3	14.3					
Yes	6 and above	5	23.8					
	0	4	19.0				202	
	1-3	43	43.9		2.11		.283	.778
N	4-5	16	16.3	00		1 1 2 0		
No	6 and above	24	24.5	98		1.139		
	0	15	15.3					
	Disease							
	No	12	57.1					
Yes	Osteoporosis. gonartrosis. Artritis	7	33.3					
	Visually	0	0.0	21	.6667	1.064		
	Arrhythmia	1	4.8					
	Epilepsy	1	4.8					
	Vertigo	0	0.0				.990	.324
	No	54	55.1					
	Osteoporosis. gonartrosis. Artritis	22	22.4	98	1.0102	1.509		
No	Visually	5	5.1					
	Arrhythmia	8	8.2					
	Epilepsy	2	2.0					
	Vertigo	7	7.1					
	Previous operation							
**	Yes	3	14.3	21	1.86	.359		
Yes	No	18	85.7				.874	.384
No	Yes	8	8.2	98	1.92	.275		
	No	90	91.8					

 Table 6. Comparison of previous fall history in terms of age, sex, education and living space

Previous fullAgeNPMM <th></th> <th>education a</th> <th>na nv</th> <th>ing spa</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>		education a	na nv	ing spa					
80 and under419Yes70-7941080-8953.8.3.8.69 and above52.9.2.469 and above1414.370-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.92.470-792.92.42.470-792.92.42.470-792.92.42.470-792.92.42.470-797.83.33.4707.03.333.4707.03.33.4711.41.43711.41.43711.41.43721.61.4732.52.51.61.41.43741.41.43752.52.51.61.41.43741.41.43741.41.43741.41.43752.52.51.61.41.43762.52.51.7	Previo		Ν	%	Т	М	SD	t	Z
Yes80-89838.1 30.1212.661.06		69 and	4	19					
80-89838.190 and 400 eres523.8	V	70-79	4	19	0.1	2.00	1.00		
above 69 and under52.3.8 (14) (14) (14)	Yes	80-89	8	38.1	21	2.66	1.06		
69 and under1414.370-792929.680-89474890 and above88.290 and above88.2190 and above88.2188.21.71.46390 and above1571.4211.71.46311571.4211.71.46311571.4211.69.4651650.6981.69.465111257.1.463.465111257.1.463.465111257.1.463.465111257.1.465.466113.3.4.44311414.3.443.443111.43.45.466111.43.45111.43.45111.65.466111.43.45111.65.46611.466.466111.43.45111.65.46611.466.46611.45.466111.43.46611.466.46611.466.46611.466.46611 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>5</td><td>23.8</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>705</td><td rowspan="4">.434</td></td<>			5	23.8				705	.434
No 80-89 47 48 98 2.50 .84 .84 90 and above 8 8.2 2.50 .84			14	14.3		2.50	.84	.785	
80-89 90 and above4748 90 and above88.280 	No	70-79	29	29.6	08				
above 8 8.2 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 1.71 4.63 $_{183}$ $_{184}$ $_{183}$ $_{160}$ $_{100}$ $_{100}$ <t< td=""><td>NU</td><td>80-89</td><td>47</td><td>48</td><td>90</td></t<>	NU	80-89	47	48	90				
YesMale628.6211.714634.834.834.85NoMale3030.6981.691.691.83855NoFemale6869.4981.69.463.85Female1257.1.463.85.85Male1257.1.463.863.863YesElementary School733.3.171.463.863Middle School00.00.0.864.864.864Middle School00.0.864.863.863NoElementary School2525.5.863.863Middle School00.0.863.863.863NoElementary School523.8.863.863Middle School00.0.863.863.863NoHinhis School942.9.843.863With Caregiver With Caregiver733.3.87.863NoAlone2424.5.863.863With Caregiver733.3.88.863.863NoMithis3131.6.88.863With Caregiver3131.6.88.863.863NoMithis3131.6.88.88NoMithis3131.6.88.88NoMithis3131.6.88			8	8.2					
Yes Name 1 10 21 1.71 .463 .463 No Male 30 30.6 98 1.69 .465 .183 .855 No Male 30 30.6 98 1.69 .465 .183 .855 No Education 2 57.1 98 1.69 .465 .183 .855 Yes Elementary school 7 33.3 21 1.76 .944 .945 .944 .945 .944		Sex							
Female1571.471	V	Male	6	28.6	21	1.51	462		
Male 30 30.6 98 1.69 .465 Female 68 69.4 98 1.69 .465 Education Education 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1</th1<>	res	Female	15	71.4	21	1./1	.403	102	
Female 68 69.4 68 69.4 <	N	Male	30	30.6	00	1.00		.183	.855
Illiterate 12 57.1 2 57.1 67.1	INO	Female	68	69.4	98	1.09	.403		
Literate 2 9.5 Yes Literate 7 33.3 21 1.76 944 944 Yes High school 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 High school 0 0.0		Education							
		Illiterate	12	57.1					.607
Yes school 7 53.3 21 1.76 .944 Middle 0 0.0 0.0 .516 .607 High school 0 0.0 0.0 .516 .607 Illiterate 14 14.3 .516 .607 Literate 14 14.3 .516 .607 Middle 0 0.0 .673 .516 Middle 0 0.0 .516 .607 Middle 0 0.0 .673 .516 Middle 0 0.0 .673 .502 Middle 9 42.9 .516 .673 With 0 0.0 .673 .502 Yes Alone 5 23.8 .2.43 1.207 Yes Alone 5 23.8 .41 .673 .673 Yes Alone 24 24.5 .41 .673 .673 No Alone 24 24.5 .63 .673 .502 With 0 <		Literate	2	9.5					
11:5 school 0 0.0 1.10 1.944 1.41	Var		7	33.3	21	1 76	.944		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } High school & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline \ High school & 14 & 14.3 \\ \hline \ Literate & 14 & 14.3 \\ \hline \ Literate & 14 & 14.3 \\ \hline \ \ Literate & 14 & 14.3 \\ \hline \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	1 05	Middle			21	1.76			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			0	0.0					
No Elementary school 25 25.5 98 1.65 .863 $IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII$		-	59	60.2				.516	
No school 23 23.3 98 1.65 .863 Middle school 0 0.0 0.0 1.65 .863 High school 0 0.0 0.0 1.65 .863 Living space Space 1.65 .863 Ves Alone 5 23.8 23.8 24.9 24.9 24.3 1.207 .502 Yes Alone 7 33.3 21 2.43 1.207 .673 .502 Yes Alone 24 24.5 24.33 1.207 .673 .502 No Alone 24 24.5 24.3 1.207 .673 .502 No Alone 24 24.5 24.5 26.3 1.271 No Mith his wife 31 31.6 98 2.63 1.271 Nursing 0 0.0 98 2.63 1.271 .673 .502		Literate	14	14.3			.863		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Middle & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline High school & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline High school & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline High school & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Space \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ Space \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ Yes \\ \hline \\ \\ Yes \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ Yes \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ With his \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	No		25	25.5	98	1.65			
Living space Living space Alone 5 23.8 Alone 5 23.8 With his wife 9 42.9 With caregiver 0 0.0 With caregiver 0 0.0 With crowded 7 33.3 Mursing home 0 0.0 Nursing home 0 0.0 Alone 24 24.5 With ic caregiver 31 31.6 With caregiver 0 0.0 With caregiver 0 0.0 No 2.63 1.271		Middle	0	0.0	20				
space Alone 5 23.8 Alone 5 23.8 With his 9 42.9 Alone 21 2.43 1.207 Yes With caregiver 0 0.0 21 2.43 1.207 With crowded 7 33.3 21 2.43 1.207 .673 .502 Mursing home 0 0.0 98 2.63 1.271 .673 .502 No Mith caregiver 0 0.0 98 2.63 1.271 No With crowded 43 43.9 98 2.63 1.271		High school	0	0.0					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$									
wife 9 42.9 Wife 0 0.0 With caregiver 0 0.0 With crowded 7 33.3 Nursing home 0 0.0 Nursing home 0 0.0 Alone 24 24.5 With caregiver 31 31.6 With caregiver 0 0.0 With caregiver 0 0.0 With caregiver 0 0.0 With crowded family 43 43.9 Nursing hoursing 0 0.0			5	23.8		2.43	1.207	.673	.502
Yes Caregiver With crowded family 0 0.0 21 2.43 1.207 With crowded home 7 33.3 21 2.43 1.207 Nursing home 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Alone 24 24.5 24.5 .673 .502 With his wife 31 31.6 98 2.63 1.271 No Caregiver With crowded family 0 0.0 98 2.63 1.271			9	42.9					
$\begin{array}{c c} crowded \\ family \\ \hline Nursing \\ home \\ \hline \\ Nome \\ \hline \\ Alone \\ Alone \\ 24 \\ 24.5 \\ \hline \\ With \\ his \\ wife \\ \hline \\ With \\ caregiver \\ \hline \\ With \\ caregiver \\ \hline \\ With \\ crowded \\ Ham \\ 43 \\ 43.9 \\ \hline \\ Nursing \\ \hline \\ Nursing \\ \hline \\ 0 \\ 0.0 \\ \hline \\ 98 \\ 2.63 \\ 1.271 \\ \hline 1.271 \\ \hline 1.271 \\ \hline \\ 1.271 \\ \hline 1.271 \\ \hline 1.271 \\ 1$	Yes	caregiver	0	0.0	21				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline Nursing home & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Alone & 24 & 24.5 \\ \hline \\ Alone & 24 & 24.5 \\ \hline \\ With his wife & 31 & 31.6 \\ \hline \\ With caregiver & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline \\ With crowded & 43 & 43.9 \\ \hline \\ Nursing & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ Nursing & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ $		crowded	7	33.3	21				
$No = \begin{bmatrix} Alone & 24 & 24.5 \\ With his \\ wife & 31 & 31.6 \\ With \\ caregiver & 0 & 0.0 \\ With \\ crowded \\ family \\ Nursing \\ Nursing \\ 0 & 0.0 \end{bmatrix} 98 = 2.63 = 1.271$		Nursing	0	0.0					
No $\begin{array}{c ccc} wife & 31 & 31.6 \\ \hline With & 0 & 0.0 \\ \hline With & crowded & 43 & 43.9 \\ \hline Mursing & 0 & 0.0 \end{array}$ 98 2.63 1.271	No	Alone	24	24.5	98		1.271		
No caregiver 0 0.0 98 2.63 1.271 With crowded 43 43.9 43.9 1.271 1.271 Nursing 0 0.0 0.0 1.271 1.271			31	31.6					
crowded 43 43.9 family Nursing 0 0.0		caregiver	0	0.0		2.63			
Nursing 0 0.0		crowded	43	43.9					
		Nursing	0	0.0					

4. Discussion

Ninety-one of our participants (75.8%) were at home when they suffered their fall. In the study entitled Seniors' Falls in Canada: Second Report, it was reported that 50% of falls by individuals aged 65 or over occurred in the home and 17% took place in a residential institution. Rao states that one half to two thirds of falls occur in or around the patient's home (5). Masud et al. stated that 65% of women and 44% of men fell in their place of residence (6). Cambell et al. stated that falls are most common in the house and in oftenly used rooms (7). According to this study, it is evident that, of all the rooms in the house, the bedroom has the lowest frequency of falls, and the frequency of falls in bathrooms and toilets are also low. We found that falls at home often occur in the living room, as this is where the patients spent most of their time. Even if we accept that all falls in bathrooms and toilets occur on wet ground, it is evident from this study that the elderly mostly do not fall on wet ground, as the occurrence of these types of falls is much less than in other rooms frequently used. The environmental factors contributing to falls, as stated by Rubenstein et al. (8) included wet floors, bad lighting, and inconvenient bed height; however, these factors do not feature highly on the list of reasons for falls in our study. Rubenstein et al. also stated that the three most common causes off all in elderly patients were: accidents and environment-related factors; gait and balance disorders; and weakness, dizziness, and vertigo. Our studies found the above to be true.

In previous studies, having a history of falls was a risk factor for falling in the elderly. In the study by Rubenstein et al., it was reported that having a history of falls increased the future risk of falling three-fold. A study by Lord et al. showed that 67.7% of 341 participants did not fall during follow-up, and 39.3% had fallen at least once (9). In research by Talarska et al., 506 individuals were studied. Of these, 131 people were considered to tend to fall, according to set criteria, and it was found that 98 of those had already fallen at least once. The remaining 375 individuals were considered not to tend to fall, and it was found that 79 of those had previously fallen. In that study, therefore, 177 of the 506 participants had previously fallen, which is approximately 34% (10). In our study, however, only 21 of the participants (17.6%) had previously fallen; therefore, having a history of falls was not a serious risk factor in our experience.

Tinetti et al. concluded in their study that a multiple-riskfactor intervention strategy resulted in a significant reduction in the risk of falling among elderly persons in the community (11). In their study, patients with risk factors were evaluated; however, our study includes patients with no risk factors. In addition, our study has shown that, despite uncontrolled studies reporting the potential effects of intervention strategies on falls, preventive measures have not proven to be effective in controlled trials to date. These negative results were either too high or too low for a risk of falling because they were not intensive enough. Alternatively, falls among elderly persons may not be preventable (11). Prevention strategies should center around education, training, creating safe environments, prioritising fall-related research and establishing effective policies to reduce risk. As falling risk factors of elderly individuals; (three times), muscle weakness (four times), history of falls and walking-balance disorders (three times), use of assistive devices, vision problems, arthritis, decrease in daily activities, depression, cognitive disorders and over 80 years of age, colleagues pointed out that the balance and gait deficits in their collections in 2010 increased modestly (12). A systematic review found no evidence that refer to vision correction in older people being effective in reducing the numbers of people falling (13). The exercise program was not significantly reduced (14). In the present study, it was found that psychotropic medication significantly reduced the risk of falling, but the medication withdrawal was slow and difficult for the patient. Although some evidence supports the use of home environment assessment and intervention as a strategy to reduce falls, there are mixed reports (15). As regards the use of specific education for the elderly as a preventive measure, there is little evidence of any benefit; however, Duckham et al. did not affect bone mineral density in their randomized controlled trials (16). In a study conducted by Nilsonet al.in Sweden, (17) younger elderly (aged 65–79) were found to have a lower rate of fall-related injuries compared to the previous decade, whereas there was an increase in such incidents in the elderly (aged 80 or older), especially in males. Their study shows that elderly seniors in Sweden are increasingly hospitalized with fewer serious injuries, although more research is needed to fully understand the reasons for the differences between the sexes and different age groups. The change in nature of injuries is important to understand and to include in the future planning of health care and fall prevention.

The greatest challenge to developing countries regarding the prevention of falls in the elderly is the lack of relevant epidemiological data. In developed countries, the greatest challenge is the lack of information on the effectiveness of fall-prevention strategies. In a study in Canada, the issue is summarized as follows: "The research literature on risk factors for falls and on best practices in falls prevention reveals several research gaps (18). There is a lack of knowledge around the efficacy of falls prevention practices for subpopulations of Canadian seniors". In addition, there are several strategies that have been taken to reduce the risk of falling-related injuries among the elderly, but racial, socioeconomic and population disparities have created a knowledge gap and may limit generalizability (19).

In a 2012 report by the World Health Organization (WHO), risk factors for falling and falling injuries of elderly individuals were evaluated under four main headings: biological, socioeconomic, environmental, and behavioral. Biological risk factors, such as age, gender, race, chronic illnesses and decreases in physical cognition and affective

capacity seem to be unchangeable. In underdeveloped or developing countries, it is difficult to improve socioeconomic risk factors as they require material resources that may not be available. When we look at the environmental risk factors, we do not see the environmental factors mostly in the foreground because we deal only with ground depletions relative to our work. According to this report and our study results, the main factors that can be improved are the behavioral risk factors. These potential improvements include increased physical activity, healthy nutrition, proper and controlled regulation of medical treatments, and avoiding actions that could cause a fall. The preventive activities listed by the WHO include the following:

- Screening the living environment for risks;
- · Clinical interventions to identify risk factors;
- Treatment of low blood pressure;
- Vitamin D and calcium supplementation;
- Treatment of correctable visual impairment;
- · Home assessment and environment modification;
- Prescription of assistive devices to address physical and sensory impairments; and
- Muscle strengthening and balance retraining, incorporating fall prevention education and tai chi-type exercises or dynamic balance and strength training.

These items are discussed in terms of the socio-economic structures of countries, attitudes and behaviors of elderly individuals and their living environments. In Turkey, the greatest obstacles to the successful prevention of falls in the elderly are the lack of available care centers, the individual's desire to stay in their home, and the lack of financial resources to purchase the required equipment. These are perhaps the most common problems in all developing countries. There are also other obstacles, resulting from regional differences.

In conclusion, according to data from the CDC, there were 46 million people aged 65 or older in the US in 2014, with 29 million falls in that year. The elderly population is predicted to increase by 62% to 74 million by 2030, with a 68% increase in falls to 49 million. These data show that, despite all the preventive actions taken, it is not possible to prevent falls in elderly people (21). Despite the challenges mentioned above, educating people about the benefits of healthy ageing, and taking preventive measures will likely help to reduce negative outcomes in the future.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding

None.

References

- WHO Global Report on Falls Prevention in Older Age [Internet]. 2007. (date of access 19.10.2019) Available from: https://extranet.who.int/agefriendlyworld/wpcontent/uploads/201 4/06/WHo-Global-report-on-falls-prevention-in-older-age.pdf.
- 2. Bergen G, Stevens MR, Burns ER. Falls and Fall Injuries Among

Adults Aged \geq 65 Years - United States, 2014. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2016 Sep 23;65(37):993-998. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6537a2.

- Burns ER, Stevens JA, Lee R. The direct costs of fatal and nonfatal falls among older adults - United States. J Safety Res. 2016; 58:99-103. doi: 10.1016/j.jsr.2016.05.001.
- 4. Public Health Agency of Canada. Seniors' falls in Canada: second report [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): Public Health Agency of Canada; 2014 [cited 2014 Apr 4]. Available from: https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/phac-aspc/migration/phacaspc/seniors-aines/publications/public/injury blessure/seniors_falls-chutes_aines/assets/pdf/seniors_fallschutes_aines-eng.pdf
- 5. Rao SS. Prevention of falls in older patients. Am Fam Physician. 2005; 72(1):81-8. PMID: 16035686.
- Masud T, Morris RO. Epidemiology of falls. Age Ageing. 2001; 30 Suppl 4:3-7. doi: 10.1093/ageing/30.suppl_4.3.
- Campbell AJ, Borrie MJ, Spears GF, Jackson SL, Brown JS, Fitzgerald JL. Circumstances, and consequences of falls experienced by a community population 70 years and over during a prospective study. Age Ageing. 1990 Mar;19(2):136-41. doi: 10.1093/ageing/19.2.136.
- Rubenstein LZ, Josephson KR. The epidemiology of falls and syncope. Clin Geriatr Med. 2002 May;18(2):141-58. doi: 10.1016/s0749-0690(02)00002-2.
- **9.** Lord SR, Ward JA, Williams P, Anstey KJ. Physiological factors associated with falls in older community-dwelling women. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1994; 42(10):1110-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415. 1994.tb06218. x.
- 10. Talarska D, Strugała M, Szewczyczak M, Tobis S, Michalak M, Wróblewska I, et al. Is independence of older adults safe considering the risk of falls? BMC Geriatr. 2017 Mar 14;17(1):66. doi: 10.1186/s12877-017-0461-0.
- 11. Tinetti ME, Baker DI, McAvay G, Claus EB, Garrett P, Gottschalk M, et al. A multifactorial intervention to reduce the risk of falling among elderly people living in the community. N Engl J Med. 1994; 331(13):821-7. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199409293311301.
- **12.** Muir SW, Berg K, Chesworth B, Klar N, Speechley M. Quantifying the magnitude of risk for balance impairment on falls in community-dwelling older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2010; 63(4):389-406. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.010.
- Gillespie LD, Robertson MC, Gillespie WJ, Sherrington C, Gates S, et al. Interventions for preventing falls in older people living in the community. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012 Sep 12;2012(9):CD007146. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007146.pub3.
- 14. Campbell AJ, Robertson MC, Gardner MM, Norton RN, Buchner DM. Psychotropic medication withdrawal and a homebased exercise program to prevent falls: a randomized, controlled trial. J Am Geriatr Soc. 1999 Jul;47(7):850-3. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-5415. 1999.tb03843. x.
- 15. Kenny RAM, Rubenstein LZ, Tinetti ME, Brewer K, Cameron KA, Capezuti EA, et al. Summary of the Updated American Geriatrics Society/British Geriatrics Society Clinical Practice Guideline for Prevention of Falls in Older Persons. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2010; 59: 148-57.
- 16. Duckham RL, Masud T, Taylor R, Kendrick D, Carpenter H, Iliffe S, et al. Randomised controlled trial of the effectiveness of community group and home-based falls prevention exercise programmes on bone health in older people: the ProAct65+ bone study. Age Ageing. 2015; 44(4):573-9. doi:

10.1093/ageing/afv055.

- 17. Nilson F, Moniruzzaman S, Andersson R. Fall-related fracture trends among elderly in Sweden--exoring transitions among hospitalized cases. J Safety Res. 2013; 45:141-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jsr.2012.10.014.
- Stinchcombe A, Kuran N, Powell S. Report summary. Seniors' Falls in Canada: Second Report: key highlights. Chronic Dis Inj Can. 2014; 34(2-3):171-4. English, French. PMID: 24991781.
- 19. Crandall M, Duncan T, Mallat A, Greene W, Violano P, Christmas AB, et al. Prevention of fall-related injuries in the elderly: An Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma practice management guideline. J Trauma Acute Care Surg.

2016; 81(1):196-206. doi: 10.1097/TA.000000000001025.

- 20. Centers for disease control and prevention. 10 leading causes of injury deaths by age group highlighting unintentional injury deaths, United States-2015. [Internet]. 2015. (date of access 19.10.2019). Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/injury/images/lccharts/leading_causes_of_i njury_deaths_unintentional_injury_2015_1050w760h.gif.
- **21.** Centers for disease control and prevention. Older adults fall. [Internet]. 2018. (date of access 19.10.2019). Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/homeandrecreationalsafety/falls/adultfalls.h tml.