C-Leg Clinical Research Summary.

Level walking as well as

walking on uneven surfaces

were rated as improved by 58% of the users compared to their previous prosthesis (94% previous C-Leg version)

Smoother and easier gait

was noted as a major

benefit of C-Leg

by 45% of the users

37% of practitioners ranked

gait pattern improvement to be a major benefit of C-Leg

Effort of walking

was rated as decreased by 59% of all users with C-Leg compared to their previous prosthesis

68% of low mobility patients were able to

reduce their walking effort

when wearing C-Leg compared to a mechanical knee³

Walking was rated more harmonic

by 73% of all users with C-Leg compared to their previous prosthesis

90% of low mobility patients improved in a variety of walking speeds

> with C-Leg compared to mechanical knees⁵

Activating Intuitive Stance

97% of the users experienced the Intuitive Stance Function was useful

Patient falls reduced by

64% with c-Leg compared to a mechanical knee²

Swing phase control

was rated as more consistent with C-Leg compared to other microprocessor knees8

C-Leg 4 has the highest recorded

safety of all assessed MPKs9

50% of low mobility patients

improved their mobility level

when wearing C-Leg4

In a study evaluating 1200 C-Leg patients an overall relief of the sound leg

was seen in 95% of patients⁶

94% of patients reported to be very satisfied or satisfied with C-Leg 4 with no patients reported as unsatisfied1

The walking speeds

of **bilateral** knee disarticulation patients **improved by 73%** with C-Leg when compared to a mechanical knee⁷

56% of C-Leg patients are less dependent on hand rails

during ramp descent compared to other microprocessor knees10

Standing on slopes **comfort** while standing

and perceived safety while standing were rated as improved by 70% of all patients with C-Leg1

References:

- 1. Wismer, N., Mileusnic, M., Sreckovic, I., & Hahn, A. (2016). First results on next generation C-Leg. Poster presentation at OTWorld, Leipzig, Germany.
- 2. Kahle, J. T., Highsmith, M. J., & Hubbard, S. L. (2008). Comparison of nonmicro-processor knee mechanism versus C-Leg on Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire, stumbles, falls, walking tests, stair descent, and knee preference. The Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, 45(1), 1–14.
- 3. Wetz, H. H., Hafkemeyer, U., & Drerup, B. (2005). Einfluss des C-Leg-Kniegelenk-Passteiles der Fa. Otto Bock auf die Versorgungsqualität Oberschenkelamputierter. Der Orthopäde, 34(4), 298–319. doi:10.1007/s00132-005-0783-z.
- 4. Hafner, B. J., & Smith, D. G. (2009). Differences in function and safety between Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 and -3 transferoral amputees and influence of prosthetic knee joint control. The Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, 46(3), 417–433.
- 5. Drerup, B., Wetz, H. H., Bitterle, K., & Schmidt, R. (2008). Langzeitergebnisse mit dem C-Leg Ergebnisse einer retrospektiven Studie: Long Term Results with the C-Leg Results of a Retrospective Study. Orthopädie-Technik, 3, 169–174.
- 6. Hahn, A. & Lang, M. (2015). Effects of Mobility Grade, Age and Etiology on func-tional benefit and safety of subjects evaluated in over 1200 C-Leg trial fittings in Germany. JPO Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics, 27(3), 86–94.
- 7. Perry, J. B. J. M., Newsam, C. J., & Conley, P. (2004). Energy expenditure and gait characteristics of a bilateral amputee walking with C-leg prostheses compared with stubby and conventional articulating prostheses. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 85(10), 1711–1717.
- 8. Thiele, J., Westebbe, B., Bellmann, M., & Kraft, M. (2014). Designs and performance of microprocessor-controlled knee joints. Biomedizinische Technik/Biomedical Engineering, 59(1). doi:10.1515/bmt-2013-0069
- 9. Blumentritt, S., & Bellmann, M. (2010). Potenzielle Sicherheit von aktuellen nichtmikroprozessorund mikroprozessorgesteuerten Prothesenkniegelenken. Orthopadie-Technik, 11(10), 788-799.
- 10. Bellmann, M., Schmalz, T., & Blumentritt, S. (2010). Comparative biomechanical analysis of current microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee joints. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 91(4), 644–652. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2009.12.014