| Reference    | Belter JT, Segil JL, Dollar AM, Weir RF<br>Yale University, Department of Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science, New<br>Haven<br><b>Mechanical design and performance</b><br><b>specifications of anthropomorphic prosthetic</b><br><b>hands: A review</b><br>Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development 2011; 10:0188 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Products     | Michelangelo hand (Otto Bock)<br>Vincent hand (Vincent Systems)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | iLimb hand (Touch Bionics)<br>iLimb Pulse (Touch Bionics)<br>Bebionic hand (RSL Steeper)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | Bebionic hand v2 (RSL Steeper)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | <ul> <li>hands</li> <li>→ Michelangelo advantage is in the low number of actuators with transmissions that allow all functional grasping postures</li> <li>Distribution of hand weight compared with amount of grip force of the hand in grasp configuration</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | 120 Sensor Hand   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | 100   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | € 80 Michelangelo   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | 60 BeBionic   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | ······································  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | 20 ILIMD  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|              | 0 100 200 300 400 500 600<br>weight (g)l  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Population   | Subjects: no subject (technical comparison)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Study Design | Compare various prostheses in technical aspects   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Results

| Body Function     |      | Activity                               | Activity  |  |  | Others                                   |                     |
|-------------------|------|--|---|--|--|--|---------------------|
| Mechanics         | Pain | Grip patterns /<br>force               | Manual<br>dexterity   | Activities of<br>daily living<br>(ADL)   | Satisfaction<br>and Quality of<br>life (QoL)   | Training                                 | Technical<br>aspect |
| Category Outcomes |      |  | Results forSig.*Michelangelo hand (Otto Bock)Vincent hand (Vincent Systems)iLimb hand (Touch Bionics)iLimb Pulse (Touch Bionics)Bebionic hand (RSL Steeper)Bebionic hand v2 (RSL Steeper) |  |  |  |                     |
| Technical aspects |      | Thumb desig<br>matics (autho<br>tions) | Thumb design and kine-<br>matics (authors sugges-<br>tions)   |  | Weight of the prosthesis (including mecha-<br>nism, glove, electronics, etc.) should be below<br>500 g. Michelangelo's weight is 420g, while all<br>other prosthesis are heavier. Therefore only<br>Michelangelo is fulfilling this criterion. |  |                     |
|                   |      |  |   | Simple and robust finger kinematic designs are preferred. All listed prostheses are fulfilling this criterion. |  |  |                     |
|                   |      |  |   | Powered adduction of the thumb. All listed prostheses are fulfilling this criterion.                           |  |  | 0                   |
|                   |      |  |   | The use of brushless motors instead of brushed motors. All listed prostheses are ful-filling this criterion.   |  |  | 0                   |
|                   |      |  |   | A maximum p<br>during palma<br>Michelangelo  | inch force at the<br>r prehension. F<br>o.   | e finger tip of 65<br>ulfilled only with | δN +                |
|                   |      |  |   |  | 230°/s should be achieved by a high-<br>performing prosthesis, while 115°/s is a mini-<br>mal acceptable speed.  |  |                     |
|                   |      |  |   | Compliance i<br>prosthetic ha<br>ways.   | n the mechanic<br>nd can be achie  | al design of a<br>eved in various        | n.a.                |
| + 1.00            | (0)  |  |   | /  |  |  |                     |

\* no difference (0), positive trend (+), negative trend (-), significant (++/--), not applicable (n.a.)

## Author's Conclusion

"The rules of thumb listed here focus on the mechanical design criteria that the authors are confident in prescribing as a universal opinion, and therefore not all mechanical design criteria discussed earlier in this study are addressed. However, the list provides a thorough foundation upon which mechanical designers of prosthetic hands can reference." (Belter et al. 2011)

© 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.