

Individual exercise programs (general population)

Health Care: Falls Prevention for Older Adults

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2018. Literature review updated February 2018.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

Program Description: Individual exercise programs for falls prevention consist of a standardized program of exercise or an individually tailored plan. Programs included in this analysis prescribe home-based exercises, such as walking or balance and strength training. Exercise instructions are delivered through manuals or video game equipment. Programs typically included phone calls from a program provider to support adherence. Program length ranged from 4 to 11 months. Expected exercise frequency was up to six sessions weekly, with variable adherence by participants.

This meta-analysis includes only interventions delivered to community-dwelling older adults. It excludes interventions delivered to participants with a high risk of falling. We analyze individual exercise programs for community-dwelling older adults at high risk separately.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$76	Benefit to cost ratio	\$1.02
Participants	\$10	Benefits minus costs	\$7
Others	\$12	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$180	benefits greater than the costs	50 %
Total benefits	\$278		
Net program cost	(\$271)		
Benefits minus cost	\$7		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2017). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: ¹	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Health care associated with falls	\$10	\$76	\$12	\$38	\$137
Mortality associated with falls	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$278	\$278
Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$137)	(\$137)
Totals	\$10	\$76	\$12	\$180	\$278

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$267	2016	Present value of net program costs (in 2017 dollars)	(\$271)
Comparison costs	\$0	2016	Cost range (+ or -)	50 %

Per-participant cost estimates are based on weighted average costs in the included studies. We estimate staff hours including home visits, transportation, telephone contacts, and mailings. We assume initial home visits lasted one hour; additional home visits lasted 20 minutes; home visits required 30 minutes of travel time; follow-up phone calls lasted 20 minutes on average; and a mailing to 200 study participants required two hours of a secretary's time. We also include the cost of weights, instruction manuals, and audiovisual equipment provided for home use. We use 2016 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics information (retrieved March 2018) to estimate Washington State mean wages for fitness instructors and medical secretaries. We increase wages by a factor of 1.441 to account for the cost of employee benefits.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the “break-even” point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects											
Outcomes measured	Treatment age	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
				First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated			ES	p-value
				ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age		
Falls [†]	74	2	205	0.749	0.212	74	1.000	0.000	75	0.749	0.284

[†]The effect size for this outcome indicates an incidence rate ratio (IRR), not a standardized mean difference effect size. An IRR less than one indicates a lower rate of the outcome in the treatment group relative to the comparison group; an IRR greater than one indicates a higher rate of the outcome. The treatment n for this outcome represents person-years.

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

Gschwind, Y.J., Eichberg, S., Ejupi, A., de Rosario, H., Kroll, M., Marston, H.R., . . . Delbaere, K., (2015). ICT-based system to predict and prevent falls (iStoppFalls): Results from an international multicenter randomized controlled trial. *European Review of Aging and Physical Activity*, 12(1), 10.

Voukelatos, A., Merom, D., Sherrington, C., Rissel, C., Cumming, R.G., & Lord, S.R. (2015). The impact of a home-based walking programme on falls in older people: the Easy Steps randomised controlled trial. *Age and ageing*, 44(3), 377-383.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 04-23-2019



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP’s mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.