

C-Leg + Kenevo. Clinically proven.

With over 100,000 fittings to date, C-Leg is the most widely used and studied microprocessor-controlled knee (MPK) in the market. The legacy continues with Kenevo. Both clinically proven to be safer and improve quality of life for users around the globe.

- **Up to 80%**
reduction in falls ⁽¹⁻⁷⁾
- **Up to 65%**
reduction in users with injurious falls,
C-Leg was the best of the 4 MPKs tested ⁽⁸⁾
- **Up to 50%**
chance to improve mobility from
K2 to K3 ^(1, 2, 6, 7)
- **Up to 38%**
higher downhill/slope-descent
walking speed ^(2, 4, 7, 9)
- **Up to 25%**
higher overground walking speed ^(1, 2, 9)
- **Up to 20%**
higher walking speed on uneven ground ^(2, 6, 10)

Statistics above are for MPKs vs non-MPKs

675 of the total 704 patients (96%) were treated with Ottobock-MPKs (K2 studies)

Out of over 100 MPK studies with K3 patients, over 80% were conducted with Ottobock MPKs



References.

1. Hahn A, Bueschges S, Prager M, Kannenberg A. The effect of microprocessor controlled exo-prosthetic knees on limited community ambulators: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Disabil Rehabil* 2021 Oct 25:1-19. [Download link.](#)
2. Kannenberg A, Zacharias B, Pröbsting E. Benefits of microprocessor prosthetic knees to limited community ambulators: A systematic review. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2014;51(10):1469-1495.
3. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Bongiorno DR, Sutton BS, Groer S, Kaufman KR. Safety, energy efficiency, and cost efficacy of the C-leg for transfemoral amputees. *Prosth Orthot Int* 2010;34(4):362-377. [Download link.](#)
4. Hafner BJ, Smith DG. Differences in function and safety between Medicare Functional Classification Level-2 and -3 transfemoral amputees and influence of prosthetic knee joint control. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2009;46(3):417-434.
5. Blumentritt S, Schmalz T, Jarasch R. The safety of C-leg: Biomechanical tests. *J Prosthet Orthot* 2009;21(1):2-17. [Download link.](#)
6. Kahle JT, Highsmith MJ, Hubbard SL. Comparison of Non-microprocessor Knee Mechanism versus C-Leg on Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire, Stumbles, Falls, Walking Tests, Stair Descent, and Knee Preference; *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2008;45(1):1-14.
7. Hafner BJ, Willingham LL, Buell NC, Allyn KJ, Smith DG: Evaluation of Function, Performance, and Preference as Transfemoral Amputees Transition from Mechanical to Microprocessor Control of the Prosthetic Knee. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2007;88(2):207-217. [Download link.](#)
8. Campbell JH, Stevens PM, Wurdeman SR. OASIS I. Retrospective analysis of four different microprocessor knee types. *Journal Rehabil Assist Technol Eng* 2020;7: 1-10. [Download link.](#)
9. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Miro RM, Mengelkoch, MJ. Ramp descent performance with the C-leg and interrater reliability of the Hill Assessment Index. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2013;37(5):362-368. [Download link.](#)
10. Seymour R, Engbretson B, Kott K, Ordway N, Brooks G, Crannell J, Hickernell E, Wheller K. Comparison between the C-leg(R) microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee and non-microprocessor control prosthetic knees: A preliminary study of energy expenditure, obstacle course performance, and quality of life survey. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2007;31(1):51 – 61. [Download link.](#)

Please note that some studies require a subscription to a 3rd party provider.

For more information and additional download options, please visit us at:

US: <http://shop.ottobock.us/clinical-evidence>

CA: <http://shop.ottobock.ca/clinical-evidence>