The Conventional Non-Articulated SACH or a Multiaxial Prosthetic Foot for Hypomobile Transtibial Amputees? A Clinical Comparison on Mobility, Balance, and Quality of Life.


**Major Findings**

With 1M10 Adjust compared to SACH:

- **Self selected walking speed is higher**
  - Level walking speed: 6% increase
  - Stairs walking time: up: 13% decrease, down: 15% increase

- **Ambulatory skills and balance improve significantly**
  - LCI-5 score: +9%
  - BBS score: +8%

- **Satisfaction with the prosthesis is significantly higher**
  - Improvements in all domains
  - Statistical significant improvement: ambulation, residual limb health, utility, well-being

**Reduced time to negotiate stairs and ramps**

The time needed to traverse stairs or a ramp was measured. The stairs were 2 meters wide containing 12 steps. The ramp had a length of 28 meters with a slope of 10 degrees.
Population
Subjects: 20 transtibial amputees
Previous prosthesis: SACH (solid ankle cushion heel) foot
Amputation causes: vascular disease (65%), trauma (30%), neoplasia (5%)
Mean age: 66.7 ± 6.7 years
Mean time since amputation: 9.8 ± 13.5 years
MFCL: K2 (95%), K1 (5%) (5%)

Study Design
Interventional, pre- to post-test design:

After fitting with 1M10 Adjust, subjects had an acclimatisation time of 4 weeks to get familiar with the new prosthesis.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Results for 1M10 Adjust</th>
<th>Sig.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level walking</td>
<td>6 Minute Walking Test</td>
<td>The self selected walking speed was significantly higher (+6%).</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UGS (Upright Gait Stability)</td>
<td>Despite a higher walking speed the subjects gait was more stable.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>SAI (Stair Assessment Index)</td>
<td>Going up and down stairs was performed significantly faster (up +13%, down +15%) and with an improved walking quality.</td>
<td>&lt;Sig.&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps, Hills</td>
<td>HAI (Hill Assessment Index)</td>
<td>Going up and down a ramp was performed with a significantly improved walking quality. The performance time did improve, but did not reach a significant level.</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>BBS (Berg Balance Scale)</td>
<td>The median BBS Score increased by 8%, indicating a significantly improved balance.</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity, Mobility, Activities of Daily Living (ADLs)</td>
<td>LCI-5 (Locomotor Capability Index)</td>
<td>The LCI-5 score increased significantly (+9%), indicating improved ambulatory skills.</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference, Satisfaction, Quality of Life (QoL)</td>
<td>PEQ (Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire)</td>
<td>Significant improvements were found in the domains ambulation, residual limb health, utility and well-being.</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Author's Conclusion
“To identify the most proper prosthesis and improve user efficiency and safety, it is important to study the effect of different feet on a specific category of amputees. This paper fills an important gap in the literature as, to the best of our knowledge,
there are no similar studies about the considered prosthetic feet for low-activity users with so wide a range of clinical evaluations. After the replacement of the SACH with a multiaxial foot, patients have maintained the same level of stability and perceived safety, while presenting a significant albeit slight improvement in some important clinical aspects of TTAs’ daily living, as overall mobility, balance, general comfort, and the perceived satisfaction with their own prosthesis. Our findings demonstrate that a multiaxial foot represents an alternative solution with respect to the conventional SACH in the prescription of prosthetic feet for hypomobile TTAs. Thus, the range of prosthetic devices available to practitioners involved in amputee rehabilitation is increased, therefore allowing them to select the most appropriate solution for each specific subject based on their clinical experience.” (Paradisi et al. 2015)