van der Niet O, Reinders-Messelink H, Bongers R, Bouwsma H, van der Sluis C Department of Rehabilitation, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen

## The i-LIMB hand and the DMC plus hand compared: A case report

Prosthetics and Orthotics International, June 2010; 34(2): 216-220

roducts	DMC plus hand vs iLIMB					
Major Findings	With DMC plus hand compared to i-LIMB (Touch Bionics):					
	<ul> <li>→ Grip strength is higher for DMC plus hand than for i-LIMB hand in all 5 positions measured.</li> <li>→ Index of Functionality (SHAP score) was 30% higher for DMC hand.</li> <li>→ The DCM plus hand offers more power and robustness, when compared i-LIMB.</li> </ul>					
	Index	of Function	nality (IoF) for D	CM plus hand ar	nd i-LIMB	
	80					
	<del>آ</del> س <sup>70</sup>					
	e) 60					
	07 Juli					
	04 Puctio					
	of FL 30					
	ě 20					
	 10					
	0					
		DC	M nlus hand	i-LIME	hand	

Index of Functionality (IoF) was calculated after Southampton Hand Assessment Procedure (SHAP) test was performed with DCM plus and i-LIMB hand. IoF is a number that provides an overall assessment of hand function.

Subjects: Previous: Amputation causes: Mean age: Mean time since amputation:		1 unilateral wrist disarticulation of dominant left side Dynamic Mode Control hand (DMC plus hand) trauma 45 years 4 years			
Case report:					
DMC plus hand	ollection	iLIMB hand	ollection		
2 years	data c	4 weeks accommodation	data c		
	Previous: Amputation causes: Mean age: Mean time since amputation Case report: DMC plus hand 2 years	Previous: Dynar Amputation causes: traum Mean age: 45 yea Mean time since amputation: 4 year Case report: DMC plus hand	Previous: Dynamic Mode Control hand (DMC Amputation causes: trauma Mean age: 45 years Mean time since amputation: 4 years Case report: DMC plus hand 2 years iLIMB hand 4 weeks accommodation		

Patient was fitted with DMC plus hand and a passive wrist rotator for two years. Afterwards patient received an i-LIMB hand with a rigid wrist and had 4 weeks of accommodation period. A series of tests were performed with both prosthetic hands.

## Results

Body Function	Activity	Participation Others			
Mechanics Pain	Grip patterns / Manual force dexterity	Activities of daily living (ADL)	Satisfaction and Quality of life (QoL)	Training 1 a	lechnical Aspect
Category	Outcomes	Results for DM	MC plus hand	l vs iLIMB	Sig.*
Grip patterns /force	Grip and pinch strength (dynamometer and a pinch meter)	Grip strength is higher for DMC plus hand than for i-LIMB hand in all 5 positions measured.			an +
		Lateral and tip pinch strength were not appli- cable for DMC plus hand.			
		Strength of tripod pinch was higher with DMC plus hand than with i-LIMB hand.			
	Southampton Hand Assessment Procedure (SHAP)	SHAP score with the DMC plus hand was higher than the score with the i-LIMB.			+
	Visual analogue scale (VAS)	DMC plus hand was less reliable in holding objects.			-
		DMC plus hand was valued for its strength.			+
		DMC hand was valued for its robustness.			+
Activities of daily living Assessment of Capacity for Myoelectric Control (ACMS)		The Capacity of Myoelectric Control is well above average for both devices: 2.6 logits for the i-LIMB hand and 2.47 logits for the DMC plus hand.			
Satisfaction	Trinity Amputation and Prosthesis Experience Scales (TAPES)	The patient was less satisfied with DMC plus hand.			
	Orthotics and Prosthetics Users' Survey (OPUS)	S The OPUS functional status was similar for both prosthesis (29 for the i-LIMB hand and 3 for the DMC plus hand, respectively).			0 30

Author's Conclusion "In this case report we could not establish a clear functional advantage of the i-LIMB compared to the DMC-hand. The i-LIMB hand has a higher reliability when holding objects but has less strength and robustness. Thus, dependent on the users' needs, patients should opt for an i-LIMB hand or a more conventional DMC plus hand. Moreover, future innovations of prosthetic hands should take the limitations of the i-LIMB hand into account." (van der Niet et al. 2010)

© 2014, Otto Bock HealthCare Products GmbH ("Otto Bock"), All Rights Reserved. This article contains copyrighted material. Wherever possible we give full recognition to the authors. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material according to Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107 of US Copyright Law. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner. All trademarks, copyrights, or other intellectual property used or referenced herein are the property of their respective owners. The information presented here is in summary form only and intended to provide broad knowledge of products offered. You should consult your physician before purchasing any product(s). Otto Bock disclaims any liability related from medical decisions made based on this article summary.