

REHAB. ENGINEERING CENTER
TERRACE LEVEL
1224 W. MAIN STREET

Autumn 1965

Artificial Limbs

*A Review of
Current Developments*

COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETICS
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETIC-
ORTHOTIC EDUCATION

COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Division of Engineering and Industrial Research

- Herbert Eftman, *Chairman*; Professor of Anatomy, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, 630 West 168th St., New York, N. Y. 10032
- Colin A. McLaurin, *Vice Chairman*; Prosthetic Research and Training Program, Ontario Crippled Children's Centre, 350 Rumsey Rd., Toronto 17, Ontario, Canada
- George T. Aitken, M.D. (Orthopaedic Surgeon, Mary Free Bed Guild Children's Hospital), College Avenue Medical Building, 50 College Ave., S.E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49503
- Robert L. Bennett, M.D., Executive Director, Georgia Warm Springs Foundation, Warm Springs, Ga. 31830
- John Lyman, Head, Biotechnology Laboratory, Department of Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024
- Robert W. Mann, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. 02139
- James B. Reswick (Professor of Engineering), Director, Engineering Design Center, Case Institute of Technology, University Circle, Cleveland, Ohio 44106
- Charles W. Rosenquist, Columbus Orthopaedic Appliance Company, 588 Gay St. W., Columbus, Ohio 43222
- Robert G. Thompson, M.D. (Associate Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Northwestern University), Suite 600, 737 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60611
- Bert R. Titus (Assistant Professor of Orthotics and Prosthetics), Director, Department of Prosthetic and Orthopaedic Appliances, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, N. C. 27706

STAFF

- A. Bennett Wilson, Jr., Executive Director
Hector W. Kay, Assistant Executive Director
James R. Kingham, Staff Editor
Enid N. Partin, Administrative Assistant

COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETIC-ORTHOTIC EDUCATION

Division of Medical Sciences

- Roy M. Hoover, M.D., *Chairman*; Medical Director, Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center, Fishersville, Va.
- J. Hamilton Allan, M.D., Chairman, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of Virginia Medical School, Charlottesville, Va.
- Charles O. Bechtol, M.D., Chief, Division of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of California Medical Center, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024
- William M. Bernstock, Assistant Chief, Research and Development Division, Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service, Veterans Administration, 252 Seventh Ave., New York, N. Y. 10001
- Clinton L. Compere, M.D. (Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery, Northwestern University Medical School), Suite 600, 737 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60611
- William J. Erdman, II, M.D., Chairman, Department of Physical Medicine, University of Pennsylvania Medical School, 3400 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Geneva R. Johnson, Director, Physical Therapy Curriculum, Western Reserve University, 11418 Bellflower Rd., Cleveland, Ohio 44106
- C. Leslie Mitchell, M.D., Chairman, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, Mich.
- Alvin L. Mulenburg, President, Mulenburg Artificial Limb Company, 3900 LaBranch St., Houston, Tex.
- Herbert E. Pedersen, M.D., Chairman, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Wayne State University Medical School, 1401 Rivard St., Detroit, Mich.
- Jacquelin Perry, M.D., Orthopaedic Surgeon, Rancho Los Amigos Hospital, 7601 East Imperial Highway, Downey, Calif.
- Ruth A. Robinson, Colonel, Army Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army (Ret.), 1325A Worcester Rd., Framingham, Mass.
- Charles W. Rosenquist, Columbus Orthopaedic Appliance Company, 588 Gay St. W., Columbus, Ohio 43222
- Charles D. Shields, M.D., Executive Director, Georgetown University Hospital, 3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W., Washington, D. C.
- Walter A. L. Thompson, M.D., Chairman, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, New York University Medical Center, 342 East 26th St., New York, N. Y.

STAFF

- Harold W. Glattly, M.D., Executive Secretary
Barbara R. Friz, Staff Officer
Jean E. Perrin, Administrative Assistant

Artificial Limbs

VOL. 9

AUTUMN 1965

NO. 2

Prepared for the
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
under the cognizance of the
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL'S
COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF ENGINEERING AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH
and
COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETIC-ORTHOTIC EDUCATION
DIVISION OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
2101 Constitution Ave. Washington, D. C. 20418

Artificial Limbs is a publication prepared under the cognizance of the Committee on Prosthetics Research and Development and the Committee on Prosthetic-Orthotic Education, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, issued twice a year, in the spring and in the autumn, in partial fulfillment of Veterans Administration Contract V1005M-1914, and Vocational Rehabilitation Administration Contracts SAV-1041-66 and 65-73. Copyright© 1966 by the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. Quoting and reprinting are freely permitted, providing appropriate credit is given. The opinions expressed by contributors are their own and are not necessarily those of either of the committees. Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 55-7710.

Liaison with interested Government agencies is maintained through Arthur J. Lesser, M.D., Deputy Director, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Eugene F. Murphy, Chief, Research and Development Division, Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service, Veterans Administration; and J. Warren Perry, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Eugene F. Murphy, Chief, Research and Development Division, Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service, Veterans Administration, 252 Seventh Ave., New York, N. Y. 10001

Herbert Eftman, Professor of Anatomy, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, 630 West 168th St., New York, N. Y. 10032

William J. Erdman, II, M.D., Chairman, Department of Physical Medicine, University of Pennsylvania Medical School, 3400 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.

CONTENTS

THE SCORE

Eugene F. Murphy 1

THE MÜNSTER-TYPE BELOW-ELBOW SOCKET, A FABRICATION TECHNIQUE

Hector W. Kay, Kevin A. Cody, George Hartmann, and Dominick E. Casella 4

SPECIAL EQUIPMENT AND AIDS FOR THE YOUNG BILATERAL AMPUTEE

Liesl Friedmann 26

REVIEW OF VISUAL AIDS FOR PROSTHETICS AND ORTHOTICS 34

L'ATTELLE MONOTUBULAIRE

A review by Ralph Luskin 44

LATE SEQUELAE OF AMPUTATION

A summary by Barbara R. Friz 46

NEWS AND NOTES 48

COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE ON PROSTHETIC-ORTHOTIC EDUCATION

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

2101 Constitution Ave.

Washington, D. C. 20418



The Score

EUGENE F. MURPHY, PH.D.¹

THE past twenty years of the Artificial Limb Program comprise predominantly a series of wins, a few losses, and some ties awaiting replays. Participants, coaches, and managers in this prolonged struggle against nature and ignorance have enjoyed some spectacular seasons, but they also have endured grueling practice and frustrating defeats.

Wide interest in artificial limbs accompanies major wars. Ancient armorers made cleverly articulated limbs. The Napoleonic and Crimean Wars stimulated active development in Europe. The American Civil War led to numerous private inventions of prostheses. During World War I vigorous and systematic programs were conducted on both sides. These ended soon after the war, partly because of inflation and other disturbances, and partly because of confidence that limbs had been substantially improved. Everywhere there was a return to "normalcy," but the general impression that amputations are infrequent in peacetime is erroneous. Dr. Glattly's recent survey (*Artificial Limbs*, Spring 1963) corroborates the claim that for a variety of reasons very substantial numbers of civilians face this major operation in peacetime.

In World War II both the Army and the Navy of the United States set up large amputation centers to provide definitive surgery, artificial limbs, and other rehabilitation. Both Services introduced some new materials and mechanisms. To combat severe shortages they used prefabricated, standardized parts and division of labor for fitting and assembling instead of the slow, painstaking custom craftsmanship in very small shops typical of the American limb industry. Dramatic successes occurred. Nevertheless, Service Centers, amputees, commercial limb shops, and, increasingly, the general public were made conscious of the severe limitations of even the best prostheses.

The Surgeon General of the Army, therefore, called a conference in January 1945 which was supposed to agree upon the best available prosthetic components. The principal conclusion was that *none* of the available limbs was really adequate, so research was needed.

The Surgeon General then asked the National Research Council to set up a committee to conduct a research and development program. The resulting

¹ Member, Editorial Board, *Artificial Limbs*; Chief, Research and Development Division, Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Service, Veterans Administration, 252 Seventh Ave., New York, N. Y. 10001.

committee and its descendants have had a variety of designations, membership, organizational structures, and sponsors. Originally the work was supported by the wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development, then by the Army. The Veterans Administration, for many years the sole sponsor of contractual research in prosthetics, still continues important support, but in recent years various agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have assumed major financial responsibility.

When the original Committee on Prosthetic Devices asked its surgeons to appraise the artificial limbs available in the summer of 1945, the two chief demands to its engineers were for development of a functional artificial hand that looked normal and for stance-phase stability for above-knee artificial legs, presumably from a lock released during swing phase. Patent files and technical literature were littered with descriptions of inadequate attempts by several generations of inventors.

The surgeons' demands reflected a primary conception of the Committee's role to concentrate on *devices*, susceptible to engineering design. In an era when many orthopaedists still were active in military amputation centers and physical medicine was only emerging, the surgeons were not yet concerned with development of new surgical techniques or with prosthetics education.

Neither were the surgeons primarily concerned with fitting, though its importance was realized. The second subcontract of the Committee, to develop further a saucer socket for the hip-disarticulation case, was with the Research Institute Foundation, a tiny laboratory which had been set up by the Artificial Limb Manufacturers Association. (This project incidentally initiated a number of ideas which later and independently were developed vigorously at larger laboratories.) Both Committee and limb industry a score of years ago considered the fitting of limbs to be a handicraft, often a sculpture-like art, learned by long experience but scarcely susceptible to systematic research.

German studies of alignment principles in World War I had relatively little immediate impact on American practices. Alignment of the above-knee prosthesis in 1945 typically placed the artificial foot far out under the head of the femur "so the amputee would not fall over to the amputated side" and made the axis of the socket bore vertical "so as not to give in to flexion contracture." Thus, while standing on the prosthesis, the amputee leaned against his pelvic band and mechanical hip joint, stressing them severely, in an effort to shift his center of gravity nearer to the foot. Likewise, after exhausting the possibilities of lordosis and unsymmetrical gait in an effort to control a free knee joint after maximum hyperextension of a slightly flexed stump in a straight socket, the recent amputee demanded a mechanical knee lock; a stiff heel bumper or a "long" prosthetic step (caused by inadequate knee friction) only increased instability at heel contact and made the demand for a knee lock more insistent.

The early years of the Artificial Limb Program were dramatic, in some senses wasteful, yet in others very fruitful. Some efforts were lost, but unquestionably