

EchelonVT

EchelonVT combines the technology of Echelon hydraulic ankle with the design principles of the TT Pro adaptor, building on the success and benefits gained from both to improve the user experience. The damped behaviour of Echelon enhanced user comfort and health by reducing the loading rates and forces acting on the prosthetic socket and residual limb skin. With the addition of axial and torsional compliance, provided by the VT element, interface pressures and shear forces at the socket-residuum interface are reduced yet further, protecting the skin of the residual limb and allowing the user to achieve an enhanced performance without fear of injury.

Improvements in Clinical Outcomes using Echelon compared to ESR feet

Improvement in **SAFETY**

- Reduced risk of tripping and falls
 - Increased minimum toe clearance during swing phase^{1,2}
- Improving standing balance on a slope
 - 24-25% reduction in mean inter-limb centre-of-pressure root mean square (COP RMS)³

Improvement in **ENERGY CONSUMPTION**

- Reduced energy expenditure during walking
 - Mean 11.8% reduction in energy use on level ground, across all walking speeds⁴
 - Mean 20.2% reduction in energy use on slopes, across all gradients⁴
 - Mean 8.3% faster walking speed for the same amount of effort⁴

Improvement in **MOBILITY**

- Improved gait performance
 - Faster self-selected walking speed^{2,5-7}
 - Higher PLUS-M scores than FlexFoot and FlexWalk style feet⁸
- Improved ground compliance when walking on slopes
 - Increased plantarflexion peak during level walking, fast level walking and cambered walking⁹
 - Increased dorsiflexion peak during level walking, fast level walking and cambered walking⁹
- Less of a prosthetic “dead spot” during gait
 - Reduced aggregate negative COP displacement⁵
 - Centre-of-pressure passes anterior to the shank statistically significantly earlier in stance⁵
 - Increased minimum instantaneous COM velocity during prosthetic-limb single support phase⁵
 - Reduced peak negative COP velocity⁷
 - Reduced COP posterior travel distance⁷
- Improved ground compliance when walking on slopes
 - Increased plantarflexion range during slope descent¹⁰
 - Increased dorsiflexion range during slope ascent¹⁰

Improvement in RESIDUAL LIMB HEALTH

- Helps protect vulnerable residual limb tissue, reducing likelihood of damage
 - Reduced peak stresses on residual limb¹¹
 - Reduced stress RMS on residual limb¹¹
 - Reduced loading rates on residual limb¹¹

Improvement in LOADING SYMMETRY

- Greater contribution of prosthetic limb to support during walking
 - Increased residual knee negative work⁶
- Reduced reliance on sound limb for support during walking
 - Reduced intact limb peak hip flexion moment⁶
 - Reduced intact limb peak dorsiflexion moment⁶
 - Reduced intact ankle negative work and total work⁶
 - Reduced intact limb total joint work⁶
- Better symmetry of loading between prosthetic and sound limbs during standing on a slope
 - Degree of asymmetry closer to zero for 5/5 amputees³
- Reduced residual and sound joint moments during standing of a slope
 - Significant reductions in both prosthetic and sound support moments¹²
- Less pressure on the sole of the contralateral foot
 - Peak plantar-pressure¹³
- Improved gait symmetry
 - Reduced stance phase timing asymmetry¹⁴

Improvement in USER SATISFACTION

- Patient reported outcome measures indicate improvements
 - Mean improvement across all Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire domains¹⁵
 - Bilateral patients showed highest mean improvement in satisfaction¹⁵
- Subjective user preference for hydraulic ankle
 - 13/13 participants preferred hydraulic ankle¹³

Improvements in Clinical Outcomes using shock-absorbing pylon/torque absorber compared to rigid pylon**Improvement in SAFETY**

- Reduced back pain during twisting movements e.g. golf swings¹⁶

Improvement in MOBILITY

- Reduced compensatory knee flexion at loading response¹⁷
- No reduction in step activity¹⁸
- Blatchford torsion adaptors match the able-bodied rotational range¹⁹

Improvement in RESIDUAL LIMB HEALTH

- Reduced loading rate on prosthetic limb²⁰, particularly at fast walking speeds²¹
- Users feel less pressure on their residual limb²²

Improvement in **USER SATISFACTION**

- Patient preference, citing improved comfort, smoothness of gait and easier stairs descent²⁰

References

1. Riveras M, Ravera E, Ewins D, Shaheen AF, Catalfamo-Formento P. Minimum toe clearance and tripping probability in people with unilateral transtibial amputation walking on ramps with different prosthetic designs. *Gait & Posture*. 2020 Sep 1;81:41-8.
2. Johnson L, De Asha AR, Munjal R, et al. Toe clearance when walking in people with unilateral transtibial amputation: effects of passive hydraulic ankle. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2014; 51: 429.
3. McGrath M, Laszczak P, Zahedi S, et al. Microprocessor knees with “standing support” and articulating, hydraulic ankles improve balance control and inter-limb loading during quiet standing. *J Rehabil Assist Technol Eng* 2018; 5: 2055668318795396.
4. Askew GN, McFarlane LA, Minetti AE, et al. Energy cost of ambulation in trans-tibial amputees using a dynamic-response foot with hydraulic versus rigid ‘ankle’: insights from body centre of mass dynamics. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil* 2019; 16: 39.
5. De Asha AR, Munjal R, Kulkarni J, et al. Impact on the biomechanics of overground gait of using an ‘Echelon’hydraulic ankle–foot device in unilateral trans-tibial and trans-femoral amputees. *Clin Biomech* 2014; 29: 728–734.
6. De Asha AR, Munjal R, Kulkarni J, et al. Walking speed related joint kinetic alterations in trans-tibial amputees: impact of hydraulic ‘ankle’ damping. *J Neuroengineering Rehabil* 2013; 10: 1.
7. De Asha AR, Johnson L, Munjal R, et al. Attenuation of centre-of-pressure trajectory fluctuations under the prosthetic foot when using an articulating hydraulic ankle attachment compared to fixed attachment. *Clin Biomech* 2013; 28: 218–224.
8. Wurdeman SR, Stevens PM, Campbell JH. Mobility analysis of Amputees (MAAT 5): Impact of five common prosthetic ankle-foot categories for individuals with diabetic/dysvascular amputation. *J Rehabil Assist Technol Eng* 2019; 6: 2055668318820784.
9. Bai X, Ewins D, Crocombe AD, et al. Kinematic and biomimetic assessment of a hydraulic ankle/foot in level ground and camber walking. *PLOS ONE* 2017; 12: e0180836.
10. Bai X, Ewins D, Crocombe AD, et al. A biomechanical assessment of hydraulic ankle-foot devices with and without micro-processor control during slope ambulation in trans-femoral amputees. *PLOS ONE* 2018; 13: e0205093.
11. Portnoy S, Kristal A, Gefen A, et al. Outdoor dynamic subject-specific evaluation of

- internal stresses in the residual limb: hydraulic energy-stored prosthetic foot compared to conventional energy-stored prosthetic feet. *Gait Posture* 2012; 35: 121–125.
12. McGrath M, Davies KC, Laszczak P, et al. The influence of hydraulic ankles and microprocessor-control on the biomechanics of trans-tibial amputees during quiet standing on a 5° slope. *Can Prosthet Orthot J*; 2.
 13. Moore R. Effect of a Prosthetic Foot with a Hydraulic Ankle Unit on the Contralateral Foot Peak Plantar Pressures in Individuals with Unilateral Amputation. *JPO J Prosthet Orthot* 2018; 30: 165–70.
 14. Moore R. Effect on Stance Phase Timing Asymmetry in Individuals with Amputation Using Hydraulic Ankle Units. *JPO J Prosthet Orthot* 2016; 28: 44–48.
 15. Sedki I, Moore R. Patient evaluation of the Echelon foot using the Seattle Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2013; 37: 250–254.
 16. Rogers JP, Strike SC, Wallace ES. The effect of prosthetic torsional stiffness on the golf swing kinematics of a left and a right-sided trans-tibial amputee. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2004; 28: 121–131.
 17. Berge JS, Czerniecki JM, Klute GK. Efficacy of shock-absorbing versus rigid pylons for impact reduction in transtibial amputees based on laboratory, field, and outcome metrics. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2005; 42: 795.
 18. Klute GK, Berge JS, Orendurff MS, et al. Prosthetic intervention effects on activity of lower-extremity amputees. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2006; 87: 717–722.
 19. Flick KC, Orendurff MS, Berge JS, et al. Comparison of human turning gait with the mechanical performance of lower limb prosthetic transverse rotation adapters. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2005; 29: 73–81.
 20. Gard SA, Konz RJ. The effect of a shock-absorbing pylon on the gait of persons with unilateral transtibial amputation. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2003; 40: 109–124.
 21. Boutwell E, Stine R, Gard S. Shock absorption during transtibial amputee gait: Does longitudinal prosthetic stiffness play a role? *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2017; 41: 178–185.
 22. Adderson JA, Parker KE, Macleod DA, et al. Effect of a shock-absorbing pylon on transmission of heel strike forces during the gait of people with unilateral trans-tibial amputations: a pilot study. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2007; 31: 384–393.