Clinical Evidence for use of the Ottobock C-Leg Summary

About the C-Leg

- A microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee (MCK) made by Otto Bock Co.
- Controls stance and swing phase and adjusts to the requirements of the prosthesis wearer at a rate of fifty times per second.

Clinical Research/ Evidence

Safety

- Significant reduction in:
 - o stumbles (1-3)
 - semi-controlled falls (1)
 - number and frequency of falls (1-4)
- Subjectively improved balance (4-6)

Energy Efficiency

- Increased energy efficiency (7, 8)
- Significant reduction in:
 - normal oxygen cost (9)
 - post-activity heart rate (10)

Cost Effectiveness

- C-Leg is cost effective from a societal perspective* and healthcare economy* and provides a positive quality of life year (QALY) gain (11-13)
- * societal perspective-
- * healthcare economy-

References

1. Hafner BJ, Willingham LL, Buell NC, Allyn KJ, Smith DG. Evaluation of function, performance, and preference as transfemoral amputees transition from mechanical to microprocessor control of the prosthetic knee. Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. 2007;88(2):207-17.

2. Kahle JT, Highsmith MJ, Hubbard SL, Kahle JT, Highsmith MJ, Hubbard SL. Comparison of nonmicroprocessor knee mechanism versus C-Leg on Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire, stumbles, falls, walking tests, stair descent, and knee preference. Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development. 2008;45(1):1-14. PubMed PMID: 18566922.

3. Hafner BJ, Smith DG. Differences in function and safety between Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 and -3 transfemoral amputees and influence of prosthetic knee joint control. Journal of rehabilitation research and development. 2009;46(3):417-33. Epub 2009/08/14. PubMed PMID: 19675993.

4. Berry D, Olson MD, Larntz K. Perceived stability, function, and satisfaction among transfemoral amputees using microprocessor and nonmicroprocessor controlled prosthetic knees: a multicenter survey. Journal of Prosthetics & Orthotics (JPO). 2009;21(1):32-42.

5. Stevens PM, Carson R. Case Report: Using the Activities-Specific Balance Confidence Scale to Quantify the Impact of Prosthetic Knee Choice on Balance Confidence. JPO: Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics. 2007;19(4):114-6 10.1097/JPO.0b013e31815711a3.

6. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, Iverson BK, McCrady SK, Padgett DJ, et al. Gait and balance of transfemoral amputees using passive mechanical and microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. Gait & posture. 2007;26(4):489-93.

7. Schmalz T, Blumentritt S, Marx B, Schmalz T, Blumentritt S, Marx B. Biomechanical analysis of stair ambulation in lower limb amputees. Gait & Posture. 2007;25(2):267-78. PubMed PMID: 16725325.

8. Seymour R, Engbretson B, Kott K, Ordway N, Brooks G, Crannell J, et al. Comparison between the C-leg microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee and non-microprocessor control prosthetic knees: a preliminary study of energy expenditure, obstacle course performance, and quality of life survey. Prosthetics & Orthotics International. 2007;31(1):51-61. PubMed PMID: 17365885.

9. Perry J, Burnfield JM, Newsam CJ, Conley P. 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 & Rehabilitation. 2004;85(10):1711-7.

10. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Fox JL, Shaw KL. Decreased heart rate in a geriatric client after physical therapy intervention and accommodation with the C-leg. Journal of Prosthetics & Orthotics (JPO). 2009;21(1):43-7.

11. Brodtkorb TH, Henriksson M, Johannesen-Munk K, Thidell F. Cost-effectiveness of Cleg compared with non-microprocessor-controlled knees: a modeling approach. Archives of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation. 2008;89(1):24-30.

12. Gerzeli S, Torbica A, Fattore G, Gerzeli S, Torbica A, Fattore G. Cost utility analysis of knee prosthesis with complete microprocessor control (C-leg) compared with mechanical technology in trans-femoral amputees. European Journal of Health Economics. 2009;10(1): 47-55. PubMed PMID: 18379831.

13. Seelen HAM, Hemmen B, Schmeets AJ, Ament AJHA, Evers SMAA. Costs and consequences of a prosthesis with an electronically stance and swing phase controlled knee joint. Technology and Disability. 2009;21(1):25-34. doi: 10.3233/TAD-2009-0269.