



Clinical Evaluation Summary

CES CPI F02

College Park - Tribute Foot

Warranty period - 18 Months

(6 Months Foot shell)

Weight Limit - 100kg

This summary has been compiled from the results of a number of returned Clinical Evaluation forms, completed by both prosthetists and patients, and shown in an abbreviated form overleaf. It is an attempt to give an overview of the product based on our experience to date and needs to be read in conjunction with the product literature supplied by the manufacturer.

Evaluation Summary

Interestingly, all the evaluation patients found the Tribute foot more responsive than those they had been using and that it made it easier to ascend an incline. The weight of the foot was commented on by one patient, it being significantly better than the Multiflex foot and ankle, especially in the smaller sizes, though the difference decreases as the size increases. The only problem with the finished cosmesis seems to have been the lack of a split toe option and the edge of the foot shell showing through the cover. All the prosthetists found some small problems with aligning the foot with the foot shell on, but that it was more difficult to remove the foot shell, make the adjustment and then replace it. Adjusting the stride control was less of a problem, until a full cosmesis was fitted. Obtaining a good function and alignment was reasonably simple. Changing the foot rubbers was easy once the foot shell had been removed, but it was not found necessary to adjust more than the stride control and the only time the foot rubbers were changed they were then changed back to the original set up.

Indications

Sigam mobility grade C to F
College Park activity level low to moderate
Daily activity or specific activity involving ascending and descending inclines
The ability to easily adjust the foot action as the patient's gait changes

Contraindication

Mobility or activity levels outside those specified
Patients over 100kg

Evaluation Patients

Patient Details

Patient 1	Transtibial	69kg	37 year old male	Butcher	CPI low/mod	Sigam F
Patient 2	Transtibial	83kg	55 year old male	Retired	CPI low	Sigam Db
Patient 3	Transtibial	74kg	72 year old male	Retired	CPI low	Sigam Dd
Patient 4	Transtibial	40kg	68 year old female	Retired	CPI low	Sigam Dd
Patient 5	Transtibial	61kg	42 year old female	None	CPI low	Sigam F
Patient 6	Transtibial	80kg	60 year old male	Driving Examiner	CPI low/mod	Sigam F

Evaluation Result



Current Prescription

Patient 1	Blatchfords Multiflex foot & ankle
Patient 2	Otto Bock 1D10
Patient 3	Blatchfords Multiflex foot & ankle
Patient 4	Otto Bock 1D10
Patient 5	Quantum Truestep
Patient 6	Quantum Truestep

Prosthetist's Comments

Patient 1 - The prosthetist found it slightly difficult to apply the foot-shell and scored it -1 for ease of adjustment (with the foot shell on). The ease of achieving a cosmetic appearance scored 0.

Patient 2 - The prosthetist scored ease of alignment 5, ease of adjustment 1, ease of achieving a satisfactory cosmetic appearance -2.

Patient 3 - The squared edge of the foot shell showing through the cover. Ease of achieving cosmetic appearance scored 4, ease of alignment 3, ease of adjustment 3 and durability 5.

Patient 4 - Ease of alignment and adjustment scored at -1 (in comparison with 1D10 Dynamic SACH).

Patient 5 - Ease of understanding instructions was scored at 3, ease of alignment 5, ease of adjustment 4, ease of obtaining an acceptable cosmetic appearance 4 and durability 5.

Patient 6 - This prosthetist scored ease of understanding the instructions at 3, ease of alignment 5, ease of adjustment 4, ease of obtaining a good cosmetic appearance 4 and durability 5.

Patient's Comments

Patient 1 - The patient scored his current foot at -3, but stated that the new foot was "very springy". He scored the affect on cosmetic appearance 0, but the overall effectiveness of the new foot +3.

Patient 2 - In comparison with previous component he scored the Tribute 2, but after 3 weeks increased it to 5. He found it much easier to go up slopes, felt more natural - "could feel the foot moving". He stated that it has improved his quality of life - "less pain and greater mobility".

Patient 3 - This patient rated all factors 4 to 5, finding that it improved manoeuvrability. The comparative weight advantage felt greater than anticipated (considering the actual weight is only slightly better).

Patient 4 - Her initial reaction was restrained, but she felt an immediate improvement in balance and momentum. Her elation at the ease with which she could walk up a slope, previously almost impossible, made it hard to make a reasoned judgement. She scored it 5 on all factors other than cosmesis where a split toe would have been preferred to allow Skinergy to be used with sandals. She has found it has made rail journeys easier and only uses a stick on uneven ground.

Patient 5 - She rated the Tribute at 3 as a comparison with her previous foot, but scored the overall effectiveness of the foot as 4.

Patient 6 - Rated at 4 as a comparison with previous foot, he then scored the overall effectiveness of the Tribute foot as 5, commenting on the ease of negotiating hills and slopes.

For almost 100 years, we have broken boundaries in healthcare to create fundamental, positive turning points that enhance lives. Contact us today on customerservice@steepergroup.com to find out more about our products and services.