



Toward standardized methods for prosthetic socket mechanical testing

Alex Dickinson¹ , Eric Nickel² , Stefania Fatone³ , Francesca Gariboldi⁴ , Joshua Steer^{1,5} , Andrea Giovanni Cutti⁶ , Jeffrey Erenstone⁷ , Saeed Zahedi⁸  and AOPA Socket Guidance Workgroup

Prosthetic sockets serve as the link between the patient and their prosthesis, yet no common guidelines exist to test their mechanical strength. Without standardized test methods, the socket structural properties remain largely unknown.¹ Therefore, practice has evolved toward a reliance on the addition of reinforcement until safety is assured, essentially overfabricating the socket.

Overfabrication has several downsides. These may include economic and environmental costs because of greater material usage, and discomfort and functional impairment because of increased weight, rigidity, and heat retention. Finally, reliance on prior experience may escalate the risk of failure when experimenting with new materials and fabrication methods, such as volume-adjustable sockets and 3D printing, for which our existing knowledge base for safe fabrication may not apply.

International regulatory frameworks are moving toward a requirement for socket testing. The current European Medical Device Regulation (2017/745) requires documenting the expected performance of custom-made medical devices, such as sockets, in strength and fatigue durability.² In the United States, because of the rise of 3D printing in orthotics and prosthetics, the Food and Drug Administration is also considering closer alignment between the regulatory oversight for prosthetic devices and other similar medical devices, as well as with the European Medical Device Regulation.³

In an effort to meet the emerging regulatory requirements and support innovators, the “AOPA Socket Guidance Workgroup” was formed in 2020, to provide the prosthetic community with evidence-based clinical best practices and methods in the field of prosthetic socket structural analysis. The Workgroup includes expert representatives of the clinical community; the International Organization

for Standards/Technical Committee 168 (Prosthetics & Orthotics) Workgroup 3 (Testing); major manufacturers of engineered components; commercial providers of prosthetic sockets and/or socket materials; and both academic and government researchers from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Europe.

As a first activity, we set out to study the knowledge gaps regarding the requirements for such structural tests, beginning with transtibial devices. The results of this study will be published in a discussion paper entitled, “Mechanical testing of transtibial prosthetic sockets: a discussion paper from the American Orthotic & Prosthetic Association Socket Guidance Workgroup.” In brief, we identified knowledge gaps in 4 domains:

1. shape and composition of a mock residual limb, required to support and generate *in vivo* representative loading within the socket;
2. prosthetic socket coordinate systems and alignment;
3. components and requirements of test specimens; and
4. test conditions, loading parameters, and acceptance criteria.

The discussion paper describes these knowledge gaps in detail and recommends potential solution approaches based on literature review, group consensus around existing knowledge, or the formation of new study groups.

Our intent is for the recommendations arising from the discussion paper to spur the community (researchers in the clinic, academia, industry and funders) to fill these knowledge gaps. Arising matters of expert consensus should be coordinated through the community’s organizations such as the American Orthotic & Prosthetic Association, the International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics, and the International Organization for Standards; this paper will provide guidance for any researcher who wishes to propose studies to address these gaps.

Author contribution

All authors and Workgroup members were responsible for conceptualization. A.D. was responsible for writing—original draft. E.N., S.F., F.G., J.S., A.G.C., J.E., and S.Z. were responsible for writing—review and editing.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors disclosed no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This study was funded by Innovate UK (10014827; J.S., A.D.); Royal Academy of Engineering (EF1819\8\24; J.S.; RF/130; A.D.); The Alan Turing Institute, United Kingdom (UKRI EP/N510129/1;

¹Faculty of Engineering & Physical Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom

²Minneapolis VA Health Care System, US Department of Veterans Affairs, Minneapolis, MN, USA

³Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

⁴Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Padua, Padua (PD), Italy

⁵Radii Devices Ltd, Bristol, United Kingdom

⁶INAIL Prosthetic Center, Vigorso di Budrio (BO), Italy

⁷Performance Orthopedic Design, LLC, Lake Placid, NY, USA

⁸Blatchford, Basingstoke, United Kingdom

Corresponding author:

Jeffrey Erenstone, Performance Orthopedic Design, LLC, Lake Placid, NY 12946-1614.
Email: erenstone@gmail.com.

A list of the AOPA Socket Guidance Workgroup is included in Appendix 1.

Associate Editor: XXX

Copyright © 2023 International Society for Prosthetics and Orthotics

DOI: 10.1097/PXR.0000000000000221

A.D.); and VA-DoD Joint Incentive Funds (E.N.). For all other authors, no sources of funding were declared.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in the article are the authors' and do not reflect the views of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the US Government.

Acknowledgments









The AOPA Socket Guidance Workgroup kindly acknowledges the ISO/TC 168 (Prosthetics and Orthotics) WG3 (Testing) for their comments during the preparation of this manuscript. The Workgroup also acknowledges Susannah Engdahl for her commitment as Workgroup Manager, Jeffrey Erenstone for leading the Workgroup activities as Chair, and Joe McTernan for the support to the Workgroup.

Appendix 1. The AOPA Socket Guidance Workgroup

The AOPA Socket Guidance Workgroup includes Gary Berke, MS, CP, FAAOP, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; Berke Prosthetics & Orthotics, San Mateo, CA, USA; Medical Creations, Denver, CO, USA. James Colvin, MSBME, WillowWood Global LLC, Mt. Sterling, OH, USA. Andrea Giovanni Cutti, MEng, PhD, CPO, INAIL Prosthetic Center, Vigorso di Budrio (BO), Italy. Drew Davis, BS, Minneapolis VA Health Care System, US Department of Veterans Affairs, Minneapolis, MN, USA. Alex Dickinson, MEng, PhD, Faculty of Engineering & Physical Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom. Susannah Engdahl, PhD, American Orthotic & Prosthetic Association, Alexandria, VA, USA. Jeffrey Erenstone, CPO, Performance Orthopedic Design, LLC, Lake Placid, NY, USA. Stefania Fatone, BPO (Hons), PhD, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA. Francesca Gariboldi, MEng, Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Padua, Padua (PD), Italy. Samuel Hale, BSME, MSPO, Fillauer Companies Inc, Chattanooga, TN, USA. Charles King, CP, Arusha Control Inc, Cumberland, MD, USA; O&P Virtual Library, Digital Resource Foundation for the Orthotics & Prosthetics Community, Gainesville, FL, USA. Glenn K. Klute, PhD, Department of Veterans Affairs, CiMB, Seattle, WA, USA; Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA. William Layman, Department of Veterans Affairs, Hamilton, OH, USA. Giovanni Milandri, PhD, Department of

Bioengineering, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom. Eric Nickel, MS, Minneapolis VA Health Care System, US Department of Veterans Affairs, Minneapolis, MN, USA. Lonnie Nolt, MSME, WillowWood Global LLC, Mt. Sterling, OH, USA. Seth O'Brien, BA, CP, FAAOP(D), Otto Bock Patient Care, Phoenix, AZ, USA; American Academy of Orthotists & Prosthetists (AAOP), Falls Church, VA, USA. Nicola Petrone, MEng, PhD, Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Padua, Padua (PD), Italy. Jim Remley, BSME, Otto Bock Health Care, Salt Lake City, UT, USA. Joshua Steer, BEng, PhD, Radian Devices Ltd, Bristol, United Kingdom; Faculty of Engineering & Physical Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom. Gregorio Teti, MEng, CPO, INAIL Prosthetic Center, Vigorso di Budrio (BO), Italy. Adan Vazquez, MEd, CP/LP, Department of Prosthetics and Orthotics, Alabama State University, Montgomery, AL, USA. Ashlie White, MA, Amputee Coalition, Washington, DC, USA. Brent Wright, BS, CPO, EastPoint Prosthetics & Orthotics Inc, Greater Raleigh Area, NC, USA. Lewis "Tres" Wright III, BS, CP, Medical Creations Inc, Denver, CO, USA. Shane R. Wurdeman, PhD, CP, FAAOP(D), Hanger Inc, Austin, TX, USA. Saeed Zahedi, PhD, FREng, Blatchford, Basingstoke, United Kingdom.

ORCID iDs

A. Dickinson:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9647-1944>
 E. Nickel:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5529-5729>
 S. Fatone:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5802-035X>
 F. Gariboldi:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6951-6820>
 J. Steer:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6288-1347>
 A.G. Cutti:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1301-4757>
 J. Erenstone:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1015-9616>
 S. Zahedi:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6959-632X>

Supplemental material

No supplemental digital content is available in this article.

References

- Gariboldi F, Pasquarelli D and Cutti AG. Structural testing of lower-limb prosthetic sockets: a systematic review. *Med Eng Phys* 2022; 99: 103742.
- Official Journal of the European Union. *Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2017 on Medical Devices, Amending Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 and Repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC and 93/42/EE*. 2017. Available at: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2017/745/oj>. Accessed January 4, 2023.
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA). *Technical Considerations for Additive Manufactured Medical Devices Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff*. 2017. Available at: <http://www.regulations.gov>. Accessed January 9, 2023.