SUBGROUP: > 1000m						
Outcome (n: AT,CT,UPT)	INTERVENTION				Difference among groups	
	AT	СТ	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$	
POMA (0-28)						
T0 (5, 7, 13)	$16.4 \pm 3.1$	$15.14 \pm 2.4$	$16.6 \pm 3.5$	$0.608^{a}$	0.044	
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$18.8 \pm 1.5$	$19.0 \pm 2.4$	$19.4 \pm 3.0$	$0.780^{b}$	0.023	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	18.5± 3.9	$19.6 \pm 4.5$	$20.4 \pm 3.3$	$0.686^{b}$	0.041	
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$20.7 \pm 5.8$	$22.8 \pm 4.7$	$25.1 \pm 2.1$	0.119 <sup>b</sup>	0.298	
EMS (0-20)						
T0 (5, 7, 13)	$12.6 \pm 3.1$	$10.6 \pm 2.6$	$11.5 \pm 3.9$	0.613 <sup>a</sup>	0.044	
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$14.2 \pm 3.3$	16.6 ± 1.6	$16.4 \pm 2.5$	$0.102^{b}$	0.196	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$15.8 \pm 3.2$	$15.6 \pm 3.2$	$17.6 \pm 2.5$	$0.315^{b}$	0.121	
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$17.3 \pm 4.6$	$17.4 \pm 2.4$	$17.9 \pm 2.0$	$0.859^{b}$	0.018	
TUG (s)						
T1 (5, 7, 13)	32.4 (17.8-37.5)	21.6 (14.5-48.9)	21.9 (14.5-36.5)	0.504 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	23.2 (15.4-27.3)	23.8 (15.1-37.9)	22.2 (10.4-34.1)	$0.580^{c}$	-	
FAC (0-5)						
T0 (5, 7, 13)	2.0 (2.0-3.0)	2.0 (2.0-4.0)	2.0 (2.0-4.0)	$0.570^{c}$	-	
ΔT1 (5, 7, 13)	1.0 (1.0-2.0)	2.0 (1.0-2.0)	1.0 (-1.0-2.0)	0.304 <sup>c</sup>	-	
ΔT2 (4, 7, 11)	1.0 (1.0-2.0)	2.0 (0.0-2.0)	1.0 (0.0-2.0)	0.829°	-	
ΔT3 (3, 5, 8)	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	0.943 <sup>c</sup>	-	
Walking speed (m/s)	·					
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$0.58 \pm 0.25$	$0.69 \pm 0.25$	$0.67 \pm 0.17$	0.661 <sup>a</sup>	0.037	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$0.69 \pm 0.14$	$0.67 \pm 0.22$	$0.75 \pm 0.22$	$0.724^{a}$	0.033	
NEADL (0-66)						
T0 (5, 7, 13)	$52.4 \pm 3.4$	$50.4 \pm 13.5$	$54.1 \pm 6.9$	0.681 <sup>a</sup>	0.034	
T2 (47, 11)	$31.9 \pm 20.9$	$29.6 \pm 17.0$	$34.8 \pm 16.8$	$0.962^{b}$	0.004	
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$41.0 \pm 19.2$	$40.6 \pm 16.6$	$46.1 \pm 9.8$	$0.863^{b}$	0.024	

Measures related to mobility, walking and daily functioning in the adaptability treadmill (AT) group, conventional treadmill (CT) group and usual physical therapy (UPT) group at baseline (T0), directly after (T1), four weeks after (T2) and 12 months (T3) after the intervention. *P* values for group differences were obtained using <sup>a</sup> One-Way ANOVA, <sup>b</sup> ANCOVA with baseline performance as covariate and <sup>c</sup>Kruskal-Wallis test.

	SUB	GROUP: < 1000m			
Outcome (n: AT,CT,UPT)	INTERVENTION			Difference among groups	
	AT	CT	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$
POMA (0-28)					
T0 (14, 10, 8)	$15.2 \pm 2.9$	$15.9 \pm 3.8$	$14.0 \pm 5.3$	$0.589^{a}$	0.036
T1 (14, 10, 8)	$19.6 \pm 2.3^*$	20.1 ± 1.7 *	$17.3 \pm 4.1$	$0.086^{b}$	0.160
T2 (13, 10, 6)	$20.8 \pm 1.5$	$21.4 \pm 3.2$	$17.8 \pm 4.2$	$0.116^{b}$	0.158
T3 (5, 7, 6)	$23.4 \pm 2.3$	$24.1 \pm 2.5$ *	$20.3 \pm 3.6$	$0.059^{b}$	0.333
EMS (0-20)					
T0 (14, 10, 8)	$10.7 \pm 3.9$	$11.4 \pm 3.8$	$9.5 \pm 3.2$	$0.558^{a}$	0.039
T1 (14, 10, 8)	$15.6 \pm 1.9$ *	$16.4 \pm 1.6^*$	$13.3 \pm 3.4$	$0.033^{b}$	0.216
T2 (13, 10, 6)	$16.3 \pm 2.5$	$16.8 \pm 1.8$	$14.0 \pm 4.1$	$0.244^{b}$	0.107
T3 (5, 7, 6)	$17.0 \pm 1.9$	$18.6 \pm 1.3$	$17.2 \pm 2.1$	$0.207^{b}$	0.202
TUG (s)					
T1 (14, 10, 8)	25.8 (13.5-60.7)	24.6 (13.6-37.7)	27.2 (13.3-79.9)	0.571 <sup>c</sup>	-
T2 (13, 10, 6)	19.3 (11.9-49.3)	20.3 (10.4-88.9)	27.9 (12.9-42.2)	$0.839^{c}$	-
FAC (0-5)					
T0 (14, 10, 8)	2.5 (2.0-4.0) †	2.0 (2.0-2.0)	2.0 (2.0-3.0)	0.014 <sup>c</sup>	-
ΔT1 (14, 10, 8)	1.0 (0.0-2.0) ††	2.0 (2.0-2.0)**	1.0 (0.0-2.0)	$0.010^{c}$	-
ΔT2 (13, 10, 6)	1.0 (0.0-2.0) ††	2.0 (2.0-3.0)	1.5 (0.0-3.0)	0.021 <sup>c</sup>	-
$\Delta$ T3 (5, 7, 6)	1.0 (0.0-3.0)	2.0 (2.0-3.0)	2.0 (2.0-3.0)	$0.148^{c}$	-
Walking speed (m/s)					
T1 (14, 10, 8)	$0.67 \pm 0.22$	$0.78 \pm 0.25$	$0.56 \pm 0.25$	$0.149^{a}$	0.123
T2 (13, 10, 6)	$0.75 \pm 0.22$	$0.75 \pm 0.28$	$0.67 \pm 0.31$	$0.757^{a}$	0.021
NEADL (0-66)					
T0 (13, 10, 8)	$41.0 \pm 9.5$	$36.9 \pm 10.1$	$42.3 \pm 12.6$	$0.518^{a}$	0.046
T2 (13, 10, 6)	$32.4 \pm 15.8^{\dagger}$	$42.1 \pm 12.2^{**}$	$30.8 \pm 23.1$	$0.006^{b}$	0.336
T3 (5, 7, 6)	$44.0 \pm 7.1$	$43.0 \pm 9.1$	$39.7 \pm 13.5$	$0.355^{b}$	0.137

Measures related to mobility, walking and daily functioning in the adaptability treadmill (AT) group, conventional treadmill (CT) group and usual physical therapy (UPT) group at baseline (T0), directly after (T1), four weeks after (T2) and 12 months (T3) after the intervention. *P* values for group differences were obtained using <sup>a</sup> One-Way ANOVA, <sup>b</sup> ANCOVA with baseline performance as covariate and <sup>c</sup>Kruskal-Wallis test.

Significant group effects are presented in bold (p<0.05). Post-hoc tests:

<sup>\*\*</sup> Significantly different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.01)

<sup>\*</sup> Trend towards different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.05)

<sup>††</sup> Significantly different from conventional treadmill training (CT) (p<0.01)

<sup>†</sup> Trend towards different from conventional treadmill training (CT) (p<0.05)

	SUI	BGROUP: > 1000m				
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION				Difference among groups	
	AT	CT	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$	
Obstacle effect (%)						
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$-20.4 \pm 13.8$	$-17.1 \pm 10.7$	$-27.7 \pm 15.4$	0.258 <sup>a</sup>	0.116	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$-27.0 \pm 7.0$	$-23.5 \pm 10.6$	$-21.2 \pm 10.6$	0.623 <sup>a</sup>	0.049	
Obstacle success rate (%)						
T1 (5, 7, 13)	100.0 (66.7-100.0)	83.3 (0.0-100.0)	83.3 (0.0-100.0)	0.403 <sup>b</sup>	-	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	100.0 (66.7-100.0)	100.0 (33.3-100.0)	86.4(33.3-100.0)	0.931 <sup>b</sup>	-	
DTE- walking speed (%)	·					
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$-18.0 \pm 26.0$	$-28.6 \pm 21.1$	$-37.7 \pm 10.1$	0.109 <sup>a</sup>	0.182	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$-24.3 \pm 28.6$	$-38.0 \pm 18.9$	$-24.6 \pm 17.2$	0.353 <sup>a</sup>	0.104	
DTE- subtractions (%)						
T1 (5, 7, 13)	4.8 (-100.0-48.7)	0.0 (-30.1-26.8)	-0.2 (-29.7-48.0)	0.941 <sup>b</sup>	-	
T2 (4, 7, 11)	-14.1(-100.0-36.4)	0 (-12.9-59.7)	9.4 (-46.0-677.9)	0.641 <sup>b</sup>	-	

Measures related to obstacle avoidance performance and dual-task effects (DTE) in the adaptability treadmill (AT) group, conventional treadmill (CT) group and usual physical therapy (UPT) group directly after (T1) and four weeks after (T2) intervention. P values for group differences were obtained using  $^a$  One-Way ANOVA and  $^b$  Kruskal-Wallis test.

	SUB	GROUP: < 1000M				
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION				Difference among groups	
	AT	СТ	UPT	P value	Effect size (η <sub>p</sub> <sup>2</sup> )	
Obstacle effect (%)						
T1 (14, 10, 8)	$-17.1 \pm 10.2$	-23.9 ± 11.1	$-18.9 \pm 11.5$	$0.330^{a}$	0.074	
T2 (13, 10, 6)	-19.8 ± 10.1	$-25.0 \pm 13.6$	-22.4 ± 17.4	$0.637^{a}$	0.034	
Obstacle success rate (%)						
T1 (14, 10, 8)	100.0 (16.7-100.0)	100.0 (50.0-100.0)	75.0(0.0-100.0)	$0.198^{b}$	-	
T2 (13, 10, 6)	100.0 (33.3-100.0)	91.7 (16.7-100.0)	91.7 (66.7-100.0)	0.696 <sup>b</sup>	-	
DTE- walking speed (%)	·					
T1 (13, 10, 8)	$-22.8 \pm 15.3$ †	-41.0 ± 15.7 *	-22.2 ± 18.6	0.023 <sup>a</sup>	0.237	
T2 (12, 10, 6)	-22.4 ± 13.1	-28.1 ± 16.1 *	-11.1 ± 7.4	$0.067^{a}$	0.195	
DTE- subtractions (%)						
T1 (12, 10, 8)	5.1 (-100.0-208.0)	2.0 (-62.8-55.6)	-22.1 (-100.0-58.8)	$0.488^{b}$	-	
T2 (12, 10, 6)	-3.9 (-100.0-120.2)	20.8 (-26.2-77.3)	-10.9 (-100.0-31.3)	$0.256^{b}$	-	

Measures related to obstacle avoidance performance and dual-task effects (DTE) in the adaptability treadmill (AT) group, conventional treadmill (CT) group and usual physical therapy (UPT) group directly after (T1) and four weeks after (T2) intervention. P values for group differences were obtained using <sup>a</sup> One-Way ANOVA and <sup>b</sup> Kruskal-Wallis test. Significant group effects are presented in bold (p<0.05). Post-hoc tests:

<sup>\*</sup> Trend towards different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.05)

<sup>†</sup> Trend towards different from conventional treadmill training (CT) (p<0.05)

		SUBGROUP: > 10001	m		
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION			Difference among groups	
	AT	CT	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$
FES-I (20-80)					
T0 (5, 7, 13)	$40.6 \pm 7.1$	$49.6 \pm 12.7$	$45.5 \pm 16.5$	0.565 <sup>a</sup>	0.051
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$50.4 \pm 21.1^{* \dagger \dagger}$	$31.9 \pm 12.0$	$34.5 \pm 11.2$	$0.015^{b}$	0.331
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$53.0 \pm 15.3$ *†	$36.6 \pm 11.7$	$34.7 \pm 12.6$	$0.057^{\rm b}$	0.273
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$43.3 \pm 21.5$ *	$28.8 \pm 5.8$	$24.8 \pm 3.5$	0.046 <sup>b</sup>	0.401
VAS (0-100)					
T0 (5, 7, 13)	$71.5 \pm 14.8$	$72.9 \pm 18.3$	$62.7 \pm 18.7$	0.418 <sup>a</sup>	0.076
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$85.0 \pm 15.0$	$75.6 \pm 19.7$	$78.1 \pm 17.8$	$0.667^{\rm b}$	0.038
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$87.3 \pm 11.7$	$75.7 \pm 13.7$	82.1 ± 15.3	$0.337^{b}$	0.114
T3 (3, 5, 7)	$66.7 \pm 15.3$	$83.7 \pm 13.7$	$76.4 \pm 12.5$	0.129 <sup>b</sup>	0.311
HOOS-Q (0-100)					
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$40.6 \pm 23.7$	$50.0 \pm 24.5$	$55.7 \pm 23.8$	$0.565^{a}$	0.058
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$62.5 \pm 33.1$	$78.8 \pm 25.6$	$83.6 \pm 18.0$	$0.432^{a}$	0.121
TMTa (s)					
T0 (5, 7, 13)	76.2 (48.8-148.0)	101.6 (50.8-127.0)	105.0 (49.0-177.0)	$0.436^{c}$	-
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$75.1 \pm 32.0$	$96.5 \pm 54.0$	$80.5 \pm 36.8$	$0.358^{b}$	0.093
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$59.4 \pm 20.0$	$116.9 \pm 85.7^*$	$64.3 \pm 20.6$	$0.092^{b}$	0.233
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$62.1 \pm 4.7$	$81.5 \pm 52.5$	$84.1 \pm 40.5$	$0.958^{b}$	0.007
TMTb (s)					
T0 (5, 7, 13)	182.0 (100.0-300.0)	300.0 (110.8-300.0)	247.0 (80.0-300.0)	0.213 <sup>c</sup>	-
T1 (5, 7, 13)	$188.3 \pm 94.9$	$236.7 \pm 75.7$	$193.2 \pm 81.1$	$0.653^{b}$	0.040
T2 (4, 7, 11)	$177.0 \pm 89.1$	$219.6 \pm 82.5$	$189.4 \pm 90.3$	$0.895^{\rm b}$	0.012
T3 (3, 5, 8)	$212.3 \pm 92.1$	$193.8 \pm 86.3$	$215.0 \pm 92.9$	$0.348^{b}$	0.161

Measures related to fear of falling and general health in the adaptability treadmill (AT) group, conventional treadmill (CT) group and usual physical therapy (UPT) group at baseline (T0), directly after (T1), four weeks after (T2) and 12 months (T3) after the intervention. P values for group differences were obtained using a One-Way ANOVA, <sup>b</sup> ANCOVA with baseline performance as covariate and <sup>c</sup> Kruskal-Wallis test. Significant group effects are presented in bold (p<0.05). Post-hoc tests:

<sup>\*</sup> Trend towards different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.05)

<sup>††</sup> Significantly different from conventional treadmill training (CT) (p<0.01)

<sup>†</sup> Trend towards different from conventional treadmill training (CT) (p<0.05)

		SUBGROUP: < 1000ı	n		
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION			Difference among groups	
	AT	CT	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$
FES-I (20-80)					
T0 (14, 10, 8)	$46.1 \pm 13.6$	$41.3 \pm 12.7$	$48.1 \pm 12.4$	0.514 <sup>a</sup>	0.045
T1 (14, 10, 8)	$41.9 \pm 13.8$	$39.3 \pm 14.5$	$48.8 \pm 17.1$	$0.586^{b}$	0.037
T2 (13, 10, 6)	$38.5 \pm 12.7$	$38.9 \pm 16.5$	$47.5 \pm 22.4$	$0.497^{b}$	0.054
T3 (5, 7, 6)	$24.6 \pm 6.1$	$28.4 \pm 6.5$	$31.2 \pm 8.1$	0.491 <sup>b</sup>	0.097
VAS (0-100)					
T0 (14, 10, 8)	$58.5 \pm 18.6$	$64.3 \pm 19.4$	$57.1 \pm 25.1$	$0.718^{a}$	0.023
T1 (13, 10, 8)	$79.2 \pm 16.7$	$84.2 \pm 12.5$	$73.3 \pm 14.4$	$0.382^{b}$	0.069
T2 (13, 10, 6)	$78.8 \pm 20.0$	$84.6 \pm 15.1$	$65.5 \pm 13.6$	$0.152^{b}$	0.140
T3 (5, 7, 6)	$85.0 \pm 15.8$	$82.3 \pm 10.6$	79.1 ± 13.0	$0.796^{b}$	0.032
HOOS-Q (0-100)					
T2 (13, 10, 6)	59.1 ± 31.3	$62.5 \pm 22.4$	$40.6 \pm 8.6$	0.235 <sup>a</sup>	0.105
T3 (5, 7, 6)	$85.0 \pm 14.4$	$64.3 \pm 21.0$	$71.9 \pm 20.4$	0.217 <sup>a</sup>	0.184
TMTa (s)					
T0 (14, 10, 8)	98.5 (41.0-262.0)	98.0 (47.2-164.0)	75.0 (27.0-300)	0.643°	-
T1 (14, 10, 8)	$93.7 \pm 45.2$	$74.3 \pm 20.7$	$95.8 \pm 85.5$	$0.223^{b}$	0.102
T2 (12, 10, 6)	$85.3 \pm 42.5$	$84.5 \pm 60.2$	$92.2 \pm 79.6$	0.966 <sup>b</sup>	0.003
T3 (5, 7, 6)	53.6 ± 18.5 *	$80.6 \pm 34.9$	$84.2 \pm 44.4$	$0.056^{b}$	0.338
TMTb (s)					
T0 (13, 10, 8)	299.0 (112.0-300.0)	231.0 (82.6-300.0)	200.0 (93.0-300.0)	0.797 <sup>c</sup>	-
T1 (13,10, 8)	$228.7 \pm 86.4$	$194.6 \pm 79.3$	$212.6 \pm 102.8$	$0.418^{b}$	0.063
T2 (11, 10, 6)	$205.7 \pm 93.4$	$198.2 \pm 86.3$	$195.4 \pm 115.1$	$0.917^{b}$	0.007
T3 (4, 7, 6)	$191.7 \pm 79.5$	$209.2 \pm 100.0$	$196.9 \pm 105.2$	$0.477^{b}$	0.108

Measures related to fear of falling and general health in the adaptability treadmill (AT) group, conventional treadmill (CT) group and usual physical therapy (UPT) group at baseline (T0), directly after (T1), four weeks after (T2) and 12 months (T3) after the intervention. *P* values for group differences were obtained using <sup>a</sup> One-Way ANOVA, <sup>b</sup> ANCOVA with baseline performance as covariate and <sup>c</sup> Kruskal-Wallis test.

<sup>\*</sup> Post-hoc test showed a trend towards different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.05)

SUBGROUP: > 1000m

	AT (n=4)	CT (n=7)	UPT (n=10)
Number of falls	1	0	9
Observation time, person-years	4.0	6.6	9.6
Fall incidence rate, falls/person-years	0.25	0.0	0.92
Number (%) of fallers	1 (25.0)	0 (0)	5 (50.0)
Incidence rate ratio (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.27(0.03– 2.9, <i>p</i> =0.281)	-	
Relative risk (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.50 (0.08- 3.0, <i>p</i> =0.580)	- (p=0.04)	

Abbreviations. AT: adaptability treadmill, CT: conventional treadmill, UPT: usual physical therapy, CI: confidence interval.

SUBGROUP: < 1000m

	AT	СТ	UPT
	(n=10)	(n=9)	(n=6)
Number of falls	10	11	11
Observation time, person-years	9.5	8.6	5.9
Fall incidence rate, falls/person-years	1.04	1.39	1.91
Number (%) of fallers	3 (30.0)	5 (55.6)	4(66.7)
Incidence rate ratio (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.55(0.14– 2.06, <i>p</i> =0.371)	0.73 (0.19-2.75, <i>p</i> =0.640)	
Relative risk (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.45 (0.15-1.36, <i>p</i> =0.302)	0.83 (0.37-1.88, <i>p</i> =1.000)	

Abbreviations. AT: adaptability treadmill, CT: conventional treadmill, UPT: usual physical therapy, CI: confidence interval.