SUBGROUP: ABLE TO PERFORM TMTb						
Outcome (n: AT,CT,UPT)		Difference among groups				
	AT	СТ	UPT	<i>P</i> value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$	
POMA (0-28)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	$16.0 \pm 2.5$	$15.6\pm3.3$	$17.1 \pm 3.4$	$0.448^{a}$	0.046	
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$19.7\pm2.4$	$19.8\pm2.2$	$20.1\pm2.2$	0.925 <sup>b</sup>	0.005	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$20.7\pm1.9$	$21.5\pm3.5$	$20.8\pm2.9$	$0.478^{b}$	0.051	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$23.2 \pm 1.7$	$24.6\pm2.6$	$24.1\pm2.4$	0.314 <sup>b</sup>	0.104	
EMS (0-20)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	$11.7 \pm 3.7$	$11.4 \pm 3.9$	$11.7 \pm 3.6$	0.969 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$15.3 \pm 2.6$	$16.2 \pm 1.7$	$16.1 \pm 2.3$	0.517 <sup>b</sup>	0.039	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$16.1 \pm 2.7$	$16.7 \pm 1.9$	$17.7 \pm 2.3$	0.192 <sup>b</sup>	0.111	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$17.8 \pm 2.3$	$18.8 \pm 1.0$	$18.1 \pm 2.2$	0.582 <sup>b</sup>	0.059	
TUG (s)						
T1 (11, 11, 15)	20.6 (13.5 -60.7)	18.4 (13.6-48.9)	21.5 (13.3-36.5)	0.997 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	16.2 (11.9-49.3)	16.4 (10.4-88.9)	15.6 (10.4-34.1)	$0.860^{\circ}$	-	
FAC (0-5)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	3.0 (2.0-4.0) <sup>†</sup>	2 (2.0-3.0)*	2.0 (2.0-4.0)	0.060 <sup>c</sup>	-	
ΔT1 (11, 11, 15)	1.0 (0.0-2.0) <sup>††</sup>	2 (1.0-2.0)**	1.0 (-1.0-2.0)	0.009 <sup>c</sup>	-	
ΔΤ2 (9, 11, 12)	1.0 (0.0-2.0) <sup>††</sup>	2 (1.0-3.0)*	1.0 (0.0-3.0)	0.009 <sup>c</sup>	-	
ΔΤ3 (6, 8, 11)	1.5 (1.0-3.0)	2 (1.0-3.0)	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	0.617 <sup>c</sup>	-	
Walking speed (m/s)						
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$0.69 \pm 0.25$	$0.75\pm0.28$	$0.69 \pm 0.14$	0.792 <sup>a</sup>	0.014	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$0.78\pm0.25$	$0.78\pm0.31$	$0.81 \pm 0.22$	0.894 <sup>a</sup>	0.008	
NEADL (0-66)						
T0 (10, 11, 15)	$47.3 \pm 9.3$	$42.3 \pm 11.2^{*}$	$52.1 \pm 11.2$	0.084 <sup>a</sup>	0.139	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$39.2 \pm 16.2$	$42.5 \pm 11.4$	$39.5 \pm 17.5$	0.265 <sup>b</sup>	0.090	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$48.3\pm5.0$	$45.8 \pm 4.9$	$46.2 \pm 11.0$	0.329 <sup>b</sup>	0.100	

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:

- \*\* Significantly different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.01)
- \* Trend towards different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p < 0.05)

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

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

SUBGROUP: UNABLE TO PERFORM TMTb						
Outcome (n: AT,CT,UPT)	INTERVENTION				Difference among groups	
	AT	СТ	UPT	<i>P</i> value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$	
POMA (0-28)						
T0 (7, 6, 6)	$14.1 \pm 3.0$	$15.5 \pm 3.4$	$11.8\pm4.4$	0.236 <sup>a</sup>	0.165	
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$18.7\pm1.7^*$	$19.3 \pm 1.8^{*}$	$14.8\pm3.6$	0.035 <sup>b</sup>	0.361	
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$19.4\pm2.9$	$19.2 \pm 4.1$	$16.2 \pm 3.8$	0.647 <sup>b</sup>	0.060	
T3 (1, 4, 3)	$14.0 \pm$ -	$21.5 \pm 4.4$	$19.3\pm5.5$	$0.270^{b}$	0.480	
EMS (0-20)						
T0 (7, 6, 6)	$9.7 \pm 3.4$	$10.5 \pm 2.0$	$8.3 \pm 3.0$	0.436 <sup>a</sup>	0.099	
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$15.0 \pm 2.0$	$17.0 \pm 1.3$	$12.8\pm4.1$	$0.110^{b}$	0.255	
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$15.9 \pm 2.5$	$15.5 \pm 3.3$	$13.0 \pm 3.9$	0.474 <sup>b</sup>	0.101	
T3 (1, 4, 3)	12 ± -	$16.8 \pm 2.5$	$15.7 \pm 2.1$	0.371 <sup>b</sup>	0.391	
TUG (s)						
T1 (7, 6, 6)	26.5 (25.7-37.5)	23.9 (18.6-34.7)	42.7 (21.9-79.9)	0.182 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T2 (7, 6, 5)	25.7 (18.9-27.4)*	26.2 (17.0-37.1)	39.8 (24.1-42.2)	0.069 <sup>c</sup>	-	
FAC (0-5)						
T0 (7, 6, 6)	2.0 (2.0-3.0)	2.0 (2.0-4.0)	2.0 (2.0-2.0)	0.423 <sup>c</sup>	-	
$\Delta T1(7, 6, 6))$	2.0 (1.0-2.0)	2.0 (1.0-2.0)	1.5 (0.0-2.0)	0.416 <sup>c</sup>	-	
$\Delta T2 (7, 6, 5)$	2.0 (1.0-2.0)	2.0 (0.0-2.0)	2.0 (0.0-2.0)	0.839 <sup>c</sup>	-	
ΔT3 (1, 4, 3)	2.0 ( - )	2.0 (1.0-3.0)	2.0 (2.0-2.0)	1.000 <sup>c</sup>	-	
Walking speed (m/s)						
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$0.56\pm0.08$	$0.75 \pm 0.17^{*}$	$0.47\pm0.22$	<b>0.031</b> <sup>a</sup>	0.352	
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$0.67 \pm 0.11^{*}$	$0.61\pm0.08$	$0.47\pm0.17$	$0.068^{a}$	0.302	
NEADL (0-66)						
T0 (7, 6, 6)	$40.0\pm10.0$	$42.8 \pm 17.4$	$43.3\pm7.7$	0.869 <sup>a</sup>	0.017	
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$21.3 \pm 11.2$	$26.8\pm17.2$	$18.8\pm12.9$	0.657 <sup>b</sup>	0.058	
T3 (1, 4, 3)	19.0 ± -	$34.5 \pm 19.2$	$33.0\pm7.5$	0.390 <sup>b</sup>	0.375	

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:

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

	SUBGROUP: A	BLE TO PERFORM	[ ТМТЬ			
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION				Difference among groups	
	AT	СТ	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$	
<b>Obstacle effect (%)</b>						
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$-18.1 \pm 11.8$	$-20.5 \pm 10.1$	$-22.0 \pm 10.2$	0.662 <sup>a</sup>	0.024	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$-21.0 \pm 9.5$	$-23.7 \pm 13.2$	$-21.5 \pm 8.9$	$0.822^{a}$	0.013	
<b>Obstacle success rate (%)</b>						
T1 (11, 11, 15)	100.0 (16.7-100.0)	100.0 (0.0-100.0)	83.3 (33.3-100.0)	0.639 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	100.0 (33.3-100.0)	100.0 (16.7-100.0)	100.0 (33.3-100.0)	0.868 <sup>c</sup>	-	
DTE- walking speed (%)						
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$-27.3 \pm 18.4$	$-36.7 \pm 17.5$	$-32.8 \pm 13.6$	0.411 <sup>a</sup>	0.051	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$-29.4 \pm 15.0$	$-29.7 \pm 18.3$	$-18.6 \pm 15.2$	$0.200^{a}$	0.105	
DTE- subtractions (%)						
T1 (11, 11, 15)	29.0 (-33.9-208.0)	-6.2 (-62.8-55.6)	-4.8 (-43.3-48.0)	0.278 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	6.35 (-27.7-120.2)	20.0 (-16.0-58.4)	18.6 (-46.0-678.0)	0.849 <sup>c</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 <sup>a</sup> One-Way ANOVA and <sup>b</sup> Kruskal-Wallis test.

	SUBGROUP: UN	ABLE TO PERFOR	М ТМТЬ						
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION				INTERVENTION			fference ng groups	
	AT	СТ	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$				
<b>Obstacle effect (%)</b>									
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$-19.4 \pm 10.3$	$-22.0 \pm 13.9$	$-30.3 \pm 22.0$	0.463	0.092				
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$-23.0 \pm 11.1$	$-25.6 \pm 11.0$	$-22.0 \pm 21.1$	0.914	0.012				
<b>Obstacle success rate (%)</b>									
T1 (7, 6, 6)	100.0 (50.0-100.0)*	83.3 (50.0-100.0)*	41.7 (0.0-83.3)	0.031	-				
T2 (7, 6, 5)	100.0 (50.0-100.0)	91.7 (33.3-100.0)	83.3 (66.7-100.0)	0.832	-				
DTE- walking speed (%)									
T1 (6, 6, 6)	$-12.9 \pm 15.7$	$-34.6 \pm 20.1$	$-29.2 \pm 20.9$	0.176	0.207				
T2 (6, 6, 5)	$-15.2 \pm 18.2$	$-36.8 \pm 16.3$	$-22.8 \pm 18.2$	0.133	0.251				
<b>DTE-</b> subtractions (%)									
T1 (5, 6, 6)	-14.3 (-100.0-11.8)	11.6 (-22.7-54.7)	-6.0 (-100.0-58.8)	0.374	-				
T2 (6, 6, 5)	-43.9 (-100.0-0.0) *	-3.7 (-26.2-77.3)**	-41.1 (-100.026.8)	0.020	-				

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:

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

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

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

SUBGROUP: ABLE TO PERFORM TMTb						
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION			Difference among groups		
	AT	СТ	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$	
FES-I (20-80)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	$42.6 \pm 11.0$	$43.9 \pm 13.6$	$47.4 \pm 14.2$	0.631 <sup>a</sup>	0.027	
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$40.7\pm16.0$	$39.4 \pm 14.5$	$35.7 \pm 13.1$	0.268 <sup>b</sup>	0.077	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$38.1 \pm 15.0$	$38.2 \pm 16.7$	$30.9\pm10.8$	0.166 <sup>b</sup>	0.120	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$27.7 \pm 9.3$	$28.6 \pm 6.0$	$26.7\pm7.2$	0.722 <sup>b</sup>	0.031	
VAS (0-100)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	$62.5 \pm 14.8$	$66.2 \pm 19.4$	$62.8 \pm 16.7$	0.843 <sup>a</sup>	0.010	
T1 (10, 11, 15)	84.0 ± 19.0)	$85.4 \pm 10.7$	$73.0 \pm 14.5$	0.076 <sup>b</sup>	0.148	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$83.2 \pm 18.7$	$84.2 \pm 16.1$	$80.4 \pm 12.8$	0.903 <sup>b</sup>	0.007	
T3 (6, 8, 10)	$82.5 \pm 15.4$	85.7 ± 11.6	$78.5 \pm 13.8$	0.524 <sup>b</sup>	0.063	
HOOS-Q (0-100)						
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$59.7 \pm 30.6$	$59.7 \pm 24.9$	$54.7 \pm 19.8$	0.861 <sup>a</sup>	0.010	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$71.9 \pm 25.5$	$68.8\pm20.0$	77.3 ±20.2	$0.688^{a}$	0.033	
TMTa (s)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	85.0 (41.0-148.0)	79.3 (47.2-122.0)	80.0 (27.0-175.0)	0.975 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$68.2 \pm 26.7$	$70.2 \pm 24.2$	$62.3 \pm 23.2$	0.413 <sup>b</sup>	0.052	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$56.6\pm20.8$	$68.1 \pm 27.3$	$54.3 \pm 17.6$	0.193 <sup>b</sup>	0.111	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$54.6 \pm 16.9$	$65.7 \pm 27.5$	$69.4 \pm 26.1$	0.724 <sup>b</sup>	0.030	
TMTb (s)						
T0 (11, 11, 15)	162.0 (100.0-299.0)	200.0 (82.6-295.5)	181.0 (80.0-290.0)	0.566 <sup>c</sup>	-	
T1 (11, 11, 15)	$172.1 \pm 82.5$	$174.4 \pm 65.8$	$160.9 \pm 71.6$	0.539 <sup>b</sup>	0.037	
T2 (9, 11, 12)	$132.9 \pm 46.5$	$167.8 \pm 69.6$	$153.3\pm86.8$	0.961 <sup>b</sup>	0.003	
T3 (6, 8, 11)	$184.0\pm70.9$	$181.2 \pm 88.3$	$182.0 \pm 91.6$	0.389 <sup>b</sup>	0.086	

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.

SUBGROUP: UNABLE TO PERFORM TMTb							
Outcome (n: AT, CT, UPT)	INTERVENTION				Difference among groups		
	AT	СТ	UPT	P value	Effect size $(\eta_p^2)$		
FES-I (20-80)							
T0 (7, 6, 6)	$48.0 \pm 15.3$	$46.2 \pm 12.9$	$44.3 \pm 17.4$	0.912 <sup>a</sup>	0.011		
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$50.6 \pm 15.7$ <sup>†</sup>	$30.5 \pm 10.8$ *	$50.7 \pm 15.4$	0.029 <sup>b</sup>	0.376		
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$48.7 \pm 11.9$	$37.5 \pm 10.1^{**}$	$59.2 \pm 12.6$	0.029 <sup>b</sup>	0.398		
T3 (1, 4, 3)	$65.0\pm$ - $^{**,  \dagger\dagger}$	$28.5\pm 6.8$	$30.3 \pm 2.1$	0.005 <sup>b</sup>	0.924		
VAS (0-100)							
T0 (7, 6, 6)	$58.4 \pm 23.7$	$70.8 \pm 19.3$	$55.0 \pm 30.4$	0.519 <sup>a</sup>	0.079		
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$75.7 \pm 11.7$	$71.8 \pm 20.9$	84.6 ± 19.3	$0.487^{b}$	0.091		
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$75.7 \pm 19.0$	$75.0 \pm 11.0$	$66.4 \pm 21.4$	0.739 <sup>b</sup>	0.042		
T3 (1, 4, 3)	$50.0 \pm$ -	$77.3 \pm 10.0$	$75.0 \pm 5.0$	0.121 <sup>b</sup>	0.653		
HOOS-Q (0-100)							
T2 (7, 6, 5)	$42.9 \pm 26.6$	$53.1 \pm 21.9$	$40.0 \pm 21.5$	0.625 <sup>a</sup>	0.061		
T3 (1, 4, 3)	$100.0\pm$ -	$73.4 \pm 31.6$	$83.3\pm18.0$	$0.682^{a}$	0.142		
TMTa (s)							
T0 (7, 6, 6)	114.0 (76.2-262.0)	120.5 (96.0-164.0)	143.0 (100.0-300.0)	$0.257^{c}$	-		
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$127.6 \pm 35.6$	$107.6 \pm 49.2$	$146.4\pm78.5$	0.781 <sup>b</sup>	0.032		
T2 (6, 6, 5)	$118.6 \pm 28.7$	$152.4 \pm 95.9$	$121.9 \pm 69.6$	$0.404^{b}$	0.130		
T3 (1, 4, 3)	$64.4 \pm$ -	$111.4 \pm 50.0$	$138.1\pm41.0$	0.879 <sup>b</sup>	0.062		
TMTb (s)							
T0 (7, 6, 6)	>300	>300)	>300	-	-		
T1 (7, 6, 6)	$288.6\pm30.1$	$280.7\pm47.4$	$300.0\pm0.0$	0.590 <sup>b</sup>	0.064		
T2 (6, 6, 5)	$295.9 \pm 10.1$	$278.8\pm52.0$	$283.2\pm37.7$	0.722 <sup>b</sup>	0.045		
T3 (1, 4, 3)	$300.0 \pm$ -	$246.0\pm90.8$	$300.0\pm0.0$	0.589 <sup>b</sup>	0.191		

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.

Significant group effects are presented in bold (p<0.05). Post-hoc tests: \*\* Significantly different from usual physical therapy (UPT) (p<0.01)

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

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

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

## SUBGROUP: ABLE TO PERFORM TMTb

	AT (n=8)	CT (n=10)	UPT (n=12)
Number of falls	7	3	9
Observation time, person-years	8	9.9	11.9
Fall incidence rate, falls/person-years	0.88	0.30	0.75
Number (%) of fallers	2 (25.0)	3 (30.0)	6 (50.0)
Incidence rate ratio (95% CI), relative to UPT	1.16 (0.31–4.41, <i>p</i> =0.824)	0.40 (0.09- 1.90, <i>p</i> =0.250)	
Relative risk (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.50 (0.013-1.89, <i>p</i> =0.373)	0.60 (0.20-1.81, <i>p</i> =0.415)	

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

## SUBGROUP: UNABLE TO PERFORM TMTb

	AT (n=5)	CT (n=6)	UPT (n=4)
Number of falls	4	8	11
Observation time, person-years	4.5	5.2	3.6
Fall incidence rate, falls/person-years	0.88	1.65	2.96
Number (%) of fallers	2 (40.0)	2 (33.3)	3 (75.0)
Incidence rate ratio (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.30 (0.05–1.70, <i>p</i> =0.171)	0.56 (0.12-2.66, <i>p</i> =0.463)	
Relative risk (95% CI), relative to UPT	0.53 (0.16-1.80, <i>p</i> =0.524)	0.44 (0.13-1.58, <i>p</i> =0.524)	

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