Harmony vs other socket systems

Pistoning

**Major Findings**

- A better fit of the socket is achieved during walking compared to a suction socket system
  - Pistoning of the liner decreased by 80%
  - Pistoning of the tibia decreased by 18%
- A better fit of the socket is achieved during weighting and unweighting the prosthesis compared to pin suspension system
  - Pistoning decreased by 83%

**Decreased pistoning with VASS**

For mean displacements of the liner and tibia from the socket, the unloaded conditions were subtracted from the loaded conditions. Vacuum-assisted socket system (VASS) was compared to suction socket system (SSS). (Board et al 2001)

**Clinical Relevance**

Good socket fit results in comfort of the amputee, health of the skin and the effective transfer of forces from the residual limb to the socket, such that the amputee has better control over the prosthesis and can perform daily activities without damaging tissue or experiencing pain.

**Summary**

A better socket fit is achieved with VASS compared to a suction socket system, measured by reduced liner displacement (80% lower) and tibia displacement (18% lower) relative to the socket (Board et al 2001). Also Klute et al (2011) showed that the changes of distance between the prosthesis and the residual limb was decreased with VASS (1 mm) compared to the pin suspension system (6 mm). Therefore, a better fit is maintained with a vacuum condition.

A study investigating the effect of different socket types in combination with electronic VASS on transfemoral amputees, showed, that the vertical movement tended to be decreased by 44% with brimless compared to ischial ramus containment (IRC) socket design (Kahle & Highsmith 2014).
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