

Mini BladeXT

Mini BladeXT is a paediatric energy-storing-and-return prosthetic foot, which uses a C-shaped e-carbon blade foot spring with a sole plate to efficiently absorb energy during weight bearing and return it during off-loading, in order to aid propulsion. It is a scaled down version of the highly-successful adult BladeXT. The C-shaped blade maximises the energy return, while the sole plate aids stability and change of direction movements. The sole plate also reduces the possibility of hyperextension injuries and helps wearers to decelerate, especially down slopes when devices without a sole plate would slip. The split-toe design permits medial-lateral slope compliance.

Clinical Outcomes using e-carbon feet

Much research confirms the substantial equivalency of all energy-storing and return feet, including Blatchford e-carbon feet¹.

With respect to **SAFETY**

- High mean radius of curvature for Esprit-style e-carbon feet²: “The larger the radius of curvature, the more stable is the foot”

With respect to **MOBILITY**

- Allow variable running speeds³
- Increased self-selected walking speed⁴
- Elite-style e-carbon feet (L code VL5987) or VT units demonstrate the second highest mobility levels, behind only microprocessor feet⁵

With respect to **LOADING SYMMETRY**

- Users demonstrate confidence in prosthetic loading during high activity⁶
- Improved prosthetic push-off work compared to SACH feet⁷
- Increased prosthetic positive work done⁴

With respect to **USER SATISFACTION**

- High degree of user satisfaction, particularly with high activity users⁸

References

1. Crimin A, McGarry A, Harris EJ, et al. The effect that energy storage and return feet have on the propulsion of the body: A pilot study. *Proc Inst Mech Eng [H]* 2014; 228: 908–915.
2. Curtze C, Hof AL, van Keeken HG, et al. Comparative roll-over analysis of prosthetic feet. *J Biomech* 2009; 42: 1746–1753.
3. Strike SC, Arcone D, Orendurff M. Running at submaximal speeds, the role of the intact and prosthetic limbs for trans-tibial amputees. *Gait Posture* 2018; 62: 327–332.
4. Ray SF, Wurdeman SR, Takahashi KZ. Prosthetic energy return during walking increases after 3 weeks of adaptation to a new device. *J Neuroengineering Rehabil* 2018; 15: 6.
5. 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.

6. Haber CK, Ritchie LJ, Strike SC. Dynamic elastic response prostheses alter approach angles and ground reaction forces but not leg stiffness during a start-stop task. *Hum Mov Sci* 2018; 58: 337–346.

7. Rock CG, Wurdeman SR, Stergiou N, Takahashi KZ. Stride-to-stride fluctuations in transtibial amputees are not affected by changes in push-off mechanics from using different prostheses. *PloS one*. 2018;13(10).

8. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Miro RM, et al. Differences in Military Obstacle Course Performance Between Three Energy-Storing and Shock-Adapting Prosthetic Feet in High-Functioning Transtibial Amputees: A Double-Blind, Randomized Control Trial. *Mil Med* 2016; 181: 45–54.