

## Variables Affecting Amputees' Reaction to the Artificial Limbs in the Kingdom of Jordan

Mezyed Al adwan\*, Yahya Najjar, Maha Hdaib and Monadel khateeb

Al balqa Applied University/ Zarqa University College, Jordan

\*Corresponding Author: Mezyed Al adwan, Assistant Professor, Al balqa Applied University/ Zarqa University College, Jordan.

Received: October 20, 2016; Published: November 16, 2016

### Abstract

**Background:** Amputee reaction to artificial limb is an important issue faces amputated individuals and the team who delivers services to these individuals. Although some individuals using artificial limb accept it, some others don't. There are several factors that may make it difficult to accept the artificial limb for a long time.

**Aim:** The aim of this study is to investigate some variables associate with reaction to prosthesis, the relationship between these variables, and the quality of response to the artificial limb by some amputees who own an artificial limb.

**Method:** Data were collected through self-administered questionnaire developed by the researcher, validated by a group of expertise from the University of Jordan, and then handed to individuals with amputation who visited artificial limb centers in Jordan.

**Results:** There are different levels of relationships between the studied variables (gender, age, site of amputation, level of amputation, and type of prosthesis) and reaction to prosthesis. There is a correlation between age and reaction to the prosthesis ( $r = 0.44$ ) ( $p < 0.001$ ) and there is a strong positive relationship between the type of prosthesis and the reaction of the amputee to the prosthesis ( $r = 0.99$ ) ( $p < 0.001$ ). A negative relationship is found between, site of amputation, and level of amputation ( $r = -0.39, -0.01, \text{ and } -0.30$ ) respectively.

**Conclusion:** There are several factors that affect the reaction to prosthesis. Some variables affect the relationship positively such as tenderness and level of amputation, and some others affect the relation negatively such as age and the location of amputation.

**Keywords:** Variables; Amputee; Artificial Limb; Reaction to Prosthesis

### Introduction

The artificial limb (AL) is a type of prosthesis which replaces a missing extremity. Its' use is determined by the extent of an amputation, and its location. It is used by the amputee to achieve a variety of purposes including overcoming the cause of amputation, cosmetic purposes, functional and social purposes [1].

Generally, (ALs) are of four types. transtibial, transfemoral, transradial and transhumeral [2].

A transtibial artificial replaces the missing part below the knee. Patients with transtibial amputation are usually able to regain normal movement compared to those with transfemoral amputation, because those with transtibial have amputation below the knee and they still may use it compared to those with transfemoral amputation who do not have a knee [2]. Individuals with transfemoral artificial usually face difficulties regaining normal movement as they need 80% more energy to walk compared to a normal person with two normal legs. This is because of the complexities of limb movement that are associated with the knee movement (Jame V, *et al.* (2005)).

The transradial artificial limb replaces an arm missing below the elbow. There are two types available. The first one is a cable operated limb, which works by attaching a harness and cable around the opposite shoulder of the damaged arm. The other type is a myoelectric arm and it works by sensing via electrodes while the muscles in the upper arm moves, causing an artificial hand to open or close.

The transhumeral artificial limb replaces the part of the arm that is missing above the elbow. Transhumeral amputees face some of the same problems as transfemoral amputees, due to the similar complexities associated with the movement of the elbow.

Previous studies have defined the reaction to the artificial limb as avoidance - acceptance, or a non-use or minimal use versus use or maximal use of the artificial limb which has been fitted to the individual and examined the question of rejecting the artificial limb among wearers [3].

Wilson Jr [4] observed that the acceptance rate of artificial limbs is low. Some factors that have been detected are function capabilities and technical difficulties of the artificial limb. In other words, the problems are presented in joints and the poor fitting of the artificial limb to the stump (residual limb).

Phillips, *et al.* [5] stated that some of their patients do not actually use their limbs in their daily activities. Others reported that their artificial limbs remain in the closet because it causes discomfort. Some previous studies reported a high rate of abandonment of upper artificial limb compare with the lower limb. This proves the importance of the artificial limb in transportation and movement. Also, abundance is usually in favor of heaviness of the artificial limb [6,7].

Mckenzie [8] stated that the rejection rate by unilateral upper limb amputee is too high for complacency and it was much worse than for both upper limb amputees. His view based on the development of one handedness which removes the functional need for the artificial limb, lack of sufficient training or skill in using the artificial limb, poor comfort of the prosthesis, the unnatural look or profile of the artificial limb, and the reaction the wearer gets from other people.

None of the previous researchers provided figures which demonstrated the extent of rejection, but Herbert., *et al.* [9] provided such a measure for that. In their study, they were indirectly concerned with the problem of rejection, they were evaluating a clinical rehabilitation program for amputees. Their measure of rejection was a simple count of the number of individuals using different kinds of artificial limb, and one of their categories happened to be none (prosthesis not used at all). In their study, thirty-eight (38) of the participants surveyed were between one and twelve years of age after receiving artificial limb. It was reported that (26.3%) of the participants indicated that they did not use it. This response demonstrated the existence of a problem, but over all a lack of research into rejection and particularly into the factors behind failure to use artificial limb.

A study by Wagner, *et al.* [10] consisted of children and young adults aged between 2 and 20 years with unilateral congenital transverse forearm total deficiency (UCTFTD) and their parents were tested for satisfaction, quality of life, and function. (34%) of those tested had chosen not to wear an artificial limb. The children and their parents were asked the following open-ended question: "What are the reasons for not wearing prosthesis?" and were allowed to give more than one response. It was reported that (53%) of those who responded to the question stated that they did not wear the prosthesis because it did not help function, and 49% reported they stopped wearing it because the prosthesis was uncomfortable. Currently, upper-extremity prosthetic management for children with UCTFTD is controversial issue, with some clinicians advocating the need for prostheses to accomplish bilateral hand tasks, particularly in the scheme of normal development. Responses from children who do not wear prosthesis may aid practitioners in re-evaluating the prosthetic role and potentially improve prosthetic options.

A study conducted by McFarland, *et al.* [11] on artificial limb satisfaction among wounded service members and veterans with unilateral upper-limb loss has been conducted on 47 participants from the Vietnam conflict and 50 from Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom (OIF/ OEF) with combat-associated major unilateral upper-limb loss. Upper-limb prosthetic devices were used by

70% of the Vietnam group and 76% of the OIF/OEF group. Mechanical/body powered upper-limb devices were favored by the Vietnam group, while a combination of myoelectric/hybrid and mechanical/body-powered devices were favored by the OIF/OEF group. Upper-limb devices were completely abandoned in 30% of the Vietnam and 22% of the OIF/OEF groups. Abandonment rate was more frequent for transhumeral and more proximal levels (42%) of Vietnam and 40% of (OIF/OEF) than more distal limb-loss levels. Upper-limb prostheses were rejected because of dissatisfaction with the device by significantly fewer (23%) members of the Vietnam group than the OIF/OEF group (45%) ( $p < 0.001$ ).

The most common reasons for rejection included pain, poor comfort, and lack of functionality. A significant paradigm shift has been noted in the OIF/OEF group, who use a greater number and diversity of upper-limb prostheses than the Vietnam group.

A review article presented an analytical and comparative survey of upper artificial limb acceptance and abandonment as documented over 25 years (Elaine, *et al.* (2006)) detailing areas of consumer dissatisfaction and ongoing technological advancements.

English-language articles were identified in a research of Ovid, PubMed, and ISI Web of Science (1980 until February 2006) for key words upper limb and prosthesis. These articles focused on upper limb prostheses and addressed variables as factors associated with abandonment. Rejection rates, functional analyses patterns of wear; and consumer satisfaction, were extracted with the exclusion of those detailing tools for outcome measurement, case studies, and medical procedures. Approximately (200) articles were included in the review process with 40 providing rates of prosthesis rejection. Quantitative measures of population characteristics, study methodology, and prostheses in use were extracted from each article. The mean rejection rates of (45%) and (35%) were observed in the literature for body-powered and electric prostheses respectively in children, whereas the rejection among adults was significantly low for both body-powered (26%) and electric (23%). As for the non-wearers, the average incidences were similar for pediatric (16%) and adult (20%) populations.

A study by Gailey, *et al.* [12] on rehabilitation goals following major combat associated limb loss in World War II and the Vietnam War focused on treatment of the injury and a return to civilian life. The goal for Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation Enduring Freedom (OIF/OEF) service members was to restore function to the greatest possible degree and, if they desire, return them to Active Duty by providing them with extensive rehabilitation services and a variety of prosthetic devices. The study determines the usefulness of these diverse types of prosthetic devices for restoring functional capability and documents prosthesis use and satisfaction. The researchers compare service members and veterans with major combat-associated unilateral lower-limb loss: (178) from the Vietnam war and (172) from OIF/OEF conflicts. Of survey participants with unilateral lower-limb loss, (84%) of the Vietnam group and (94%) of the OIF/OEF group currently use at least one prosthetic device. Reasons for rejection varied by type of device, but common reasons were pain, prosthesis too heavy, and poor fit. Abandonment is infrequent (11%) Vietnam group, (4%) (OIF/OEF group). Future efforts should aim to improve prosthetic-device design, decrease pain, and improve quality of life for these veterans and service member.

Østlie, *et al.* [13] estimated the rates of primary and secondary prosthesis rejection in acquired major upper-limb amputees (ULAs), to describe the most frequently reported reasons for rejection and estimate the influence of background factors on the risk of rejection.

Primary prosthesis rejection was found in (4.5%), whereas (13.4%) had discontinued artificial limb use. The main reasons reported for primary non-wear were perceived lack of need and discrepancies between perceived need and the prostheses available. The main reasons reported for secondary prosthesis rejection were dissatisfaction with prosthetic comfort, function and control. Primary prosthesis rejection was more likely in adult ULAs with proximal amputations, while the Secondary prosthesis rejection was observed in women with proximal ULAs.

Østlie, *et al.* [13] recommends that clinicians should be aware of the increased risk of rejection in proximal ULAs, elderly ULAs and in women. Emphasizing individual needs will probably facilitate successful prosthetic fitting. Improved prosthesis quality and individualized prosthetic training may increase long-term prosthesis use.

A study conducted by Nichols., *et al.* [14] on 50 children with multiple congenital limb deformities who had been under continuous care for prosthetic management and general rehabilitation for four years. The study reported that children have poor recorded acceptance for the upper-limb conventional prosthesis. Of those fitted before the age of two years (14) children fitted with bilateral prosthesis rejected the prosthesis in nine occasions (64%), whereas acceptance was recorded in five cases (36%). However, it was difficult to assess correctly whether a child of this age has accepted or rejected the prosthesis, as the observer's judgment is likely to be very subjective. Also, it was noted that after the age of two years conventional prosthesis was totally rejected.

Thirty-nine powered upper-limb prostheses were fitted on 13 children, and were rejected on 27 occasions. The acceptance rate of the powered –powered upper-limb was (25%) in children under the age of four years, and (38%) in children over the age of four years. Acceptance increased considerably when the powered hand was introduced. However partial rejection or acceptance) occurs for (50%) in children over 2 years of age.

Seventeen (17) lower limb prosthetic appliances have been fitted on eight children, 13 of these were accepted, one partially rejected, and only three totally. Ultimately, lower extremity prostheses were accepted. Acceptance and partial acceptance were clearly related to increasing age. In the study, it has been found the commonest cause for rejection was the mechanically inefficiency of the prosthesis (76%) and the next second common cause of rejection was the child's preference for using his or her residual limb. In few cases the lack of parents or child cooperation was a major reason for rejection.

Male patients using an upper Artificial limb following amputation described themes of psychosocial and functional adjustment to minimize sense of deference. It was facilitated by participants' artificial limb and their positive coping style. Within this, participants identified the personal meanings of their artificial limb and highlighted the term of its use. The minimization of their sense of difference resulted in participants regaining a sense of worth [15].

Hermansson., *et al.* [16] studied psychosocial adjustment in Swedish children with upper- limb reduction deficiency and myoelectric prosthetic hand. Children with upper-limb reduction deficiency and myoelectric prosthetic hand showed social competence, behavioral, and emotional similar to Swedish standardized norms. However, withdrawn behavior was significantly higher in all children, social competence was significantly lower in girls, and social activities were significantly lower in older children with upper limb reduction deficiency. There was a significant difference between prosthetic use groups. Non- users had significantly more delinquent behavior problems than full- time users. There was an interaction between gender and prosthetic use in their effects on competence and behavior/ emotional problem, yielding two contrasting patterns.

A qualitative analysis of living with an Osseo integrated prosthetic limb by Lundberg., *et al.* [17] showed that all participants described living with OI- prosthesis as revolutionary change. Preliminary thematic analysis revealed that factors such as self- image, social, physical and practical concerns, the meaning attributed to and the acceptance of the amputation and support among others were important to adjustment process [18].

The Psychological adjustment to adult individuals with amputation who use prosthesis in the lower limb was studied by Atherton, [19]. Psychological Adjustment Scale of Trinity and Amputation and Prosthesis Experience Scale, hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, The Self Consciousness and the Appearance Schemas Inventory were used. By using conservative cuff scores, the prevalence of anxiety and depression was 29.9 and 13.4%, respectively. Appearance- related beliefs were associated with both distress and psychological adjustment to difficulties. Public and not private self-consciousness was associated with distress and psychosocial adjustment difficulties.

Seventy Australian upper limb amputees responded to detailed postal questionnaire asking how often they wore their prosthesis and their level of satisfaction with both their prostheses and their functional abilities. It was reported that (56%) of amputees wore their limb once in a while, or never. Prostheses were most often worn all the time for work and social activities. The amount of time amputees wore

their prostheses was moderately associated with their level of satisfaction with their prostheses. The association between the amount of time the amputees wore their prostheses and their level of satisfaction with their functional abilities was very low. Their prostheses were rated as fair or not acceptable by (64%) of amputee. Sweating was rated as not acceptable by (55%). This may be a significant contributing factor to the low prosthetic use. The amputees who did not wear prostheses did not have any greater satisfaction with their ability to do the tasks they want to do than the amputees who wore prostheses [20].

The rates of rejection exhibited a wide range of variance, because of heterogeneity of the samples, and the methodology differences between the studies [20].

Future research should focus on controlled multifactor studies, adopting standardized outcome measures in order to promote comprehensive understanding of the factors affecting artificial limb use and abandonment. An enhanced understanding of these factors is needed to optimize prescription practices, guide design efforts, and the demand for evidence-based measures of intervention and rehabilitation.

### Research Questions

After reviewing literatures related to the research subject, the following questions were formulated for the present study.

1. Is there a rejection problem in the population under the study? And if so, what is the extension of this problem?

This question involves defining a measure of rejection, identifying levels of use among the research sample according to this measure, and identifying high and low users of artificial limb.

2. What are the variables that affect the level of reaction to the artificial limb?

### Research variables

The research variables involve two sorts:

**Independent variables:** Which include Age, gender, level of amputation, kind of artificial limb, direction of amputation, site of amputation.

For the purpose of the study, these variables are subdivided as follow: Age groups (10 - 20years, 21 - 30 years, 31 - 39 yrs, 40 - 49 years, 50 - 59 years, 60 - 69 years, 70 - 80 years), Gender (male, female), Level of amputation (lower extremity and Upper extremity), Direction of amputation (right, left), site of amputation (below knee, above knee, below elbow, above elbow). Type of artificial limb (cosmetic, body- Powered, Myoelectric)

**Dependent variable:** Which includes the reaction to the artificial limb and it is measured by four levels on the scale (strongly acceptable, acceptable, strongly unacceptable, unacceptable, and poorly unacceptable).

### Definition of research terms

**Amputee reaction:** It is defined as the response of amputee to artificial limb as it measured with the research tool.

**Amputee:** An individual who lost part or all of his or her limb whether it is in the upper or lower limb due to any cause.

**Artificial limb (prosthesis):** It is a special unit compensates the normal extremity function, whether it is on the upper part or lower part.

### Methodology

#### Sample

The research sample was selected conveniently from the community of the research which included all the amputated individuals (Pa-

tients) who attend the Royal Medical Services and the centers managed by the Ministry of health in Kingdom of Jordan during the date of the research which are around 1000 individuals; the sample consisted of (168) participants of both genders, age between 10 - 78 years old. Selected randomly from the community research during the date of the data collection (3/8/2015 to 30/10/2015).

### Settings

**Community research:** All amputated patients attended Farah Rehabilitation Center / Royal Medical Services (650 individuals) and public hospitals/ rehabilitation centers in Jordan (350 individuals) during the period from 3/8/2015 to 30/10/2015.

### Data collection

Data was collected by using a special tool constructed by the researchers and validated by 10 experts related to the field. The tool consists of two sections. Section one about general information and section two consists of one statement related to acceptance level (acceptance, unacceptance, poorly acceptance and highly acceptance of prosthesis..., etc.). The tool was handed to 200 participants (178 were returned, and 10 of them were excluded due to incomplete information).

### Data analysis

To achieve the purposes of the study, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 21 was used to analyze data (Descriptive statistics (mean and Sd.), correlation, and independent samples t-test).

### Results

Analyzing data revealed that amputation is more common among male ( $n = 98$ ) (58.3%) than female ( $n = 70$ ) (41.7%). Upper limb amputation forms (67.3%), ( $n = 113$ ) while lower limb amputation forms (32.7%), ( $n = 55$ ). According to the level of amputation data indicates that 11.9% ( $n = 20$ ) are with above knee amputation, 29.8% ( $n = 50$ ) are with below knee amputation, 23.8% ( $n = 40$ ) have above elbow amputation, and 34.5% ( $n = 71$ ) have below elbow amputation.

The highest percentage of amputation is among age group 21 - 30 years (19%) while the lowest percentage is among elderly people (14%). As for the side of amputation, 77.4% are of right-sided amputation ( $n = 130$ ) and 22.6% are of left-sided amputation ( $n = 38$ ).

According to the type of artificial limb, (80) participants wear cosmetic prosthesis (47.6%), (28.6%) of the recipients wear body power prosthesis ( $n = 48$ ), and (40) recipients wear myoelectric prosthesis (23.8%).

Analyzing the participants responses to the statement to the prosthesis) were, 25% of the participants did not accept the prosthesis ( $n = 42$ ), six (3.8%) of participants answered they accepted poorly, (37) participants (22%) answered they accepted the prosthesis, while (47) participants (28.0%) answered that they highly accepted their prosthesis.

When using Spearman correlation coefficient to analyze the relationship between gender, age, site of amputation, level of amputation, location of amputation and type of prosthesis wore by the participants, the results were as follow:

1. Participants responses show a significant a positive correlation ( $r = 0.40$ ) ( $p < 0.001$ ) between amputee reaction to the prosthesis and gender:
2. Participant responses indicate a significant negative correlation ( $r = -0.39$ ) ( $p < 0.001$ ) between reaction to the prosthesis and age related to the age group below 40 years.
3. Participants responses show no correlation between site of amputation and amputee reaction to prosthesis ( $p > 0.05$ )

- 4. Participants responses show appositive correlation between level of amputation and reaction to prosthesis related to amputation below knee amputation (p = 0.014).
- 5. Participants responses show a negative correlation between location of amputation and amputee reaction to prosthesis (p < 0.001) related to right limb.
- 6. Participants responses indicated a significant positive correlation between amputee reaction to prosthesis and the type of prosthesis (p < 0.001), related to myoelectric and body-powered artificial limbs (Table 1).

Variables	Spearman's r	p
Gender	0.40	< 0.001*
Age	-0.39	< 0.001*
Site	-0.01	0.89
Level	0.19	0.014*
Location	-0.30	< 0.001*
Type of Artificial limb	0.94	< 0.001*

**Table 1:** Correlations of independent variables with amputee reaction.

\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 α level

As for the differences between males and female in reaction to amputee prosthesis, there has been a significant difference in favor of females (p < 0.05). With regard to the differences among age groups in reaction to amputee prosthesis, there has been a significant difference in favor of age group below 40 years (p < 0.05). As for the differences among sites of amputation in reaction to amputee prosthesis, there has been no significant difference among sites of amputation (p > 0.05). Regarding the differences among levels of amputation in reaction to amputee prosthesis, there has been no significant difference among the levels of amputation (p > 0.05). As for the differences among location of amputation in reaction to amputee prosthesis, there has been a significant difference in favor of who have prosthesis in the right limbs (p < 0.05). As for the differences among types of prosthesis in reaction to amputee prosthesis, there has been a significant difference in favor of who have Body powered and Myoelectric limb (p < 0.05) (Tables 2 & 3).

Independent variable	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Gender: M	98	3.12	0.80
F	70	2.21	1.28
Age: 40 or more	130	2.70	1.11
Less than 40	38	2.80	1.14
Site of amputation: Upper	113	2.75	1.11
Lower	55	2.72	1.14
Level of amputation: Above and below elbow	148	2.7	1.12
Above and below knee	20	2.8	1.18
Location of amputation: Right	130	2.9	1.06

left	38	2.1	1.11
Type of prosthesis:			
Body powered	48	1.9	0.4
Myoelectric	40	1.7	0.39
Cosmetic	80	2.8	0.00

**Table 2:** Independent variables statistics regarding reaction to amputee prosthesis (N = 168).

Variables	t	p
Gender	-5.23	< 0.001*
Age	-6.82	< 0.001*
Site	0.14	0.89
Level	1.95	0.053
Location	3.88	< 0.001*
Type of artificial limb	41.15	< 0.001*

**Table 3:** t-test results for independent variables regarding difference in amputee reaction (N = 168).

\* correlation is significant at 0.05  $\alpha$  level

According to table 4 females are more common than males in the sample.

Sex	Mean	N	SD
M	2.2	70	1.3
F	3.1	80	0.80
Total	2.7	168	1.12

**Table 4:** Means and SD for tenderness regarding reaction to artificial limbs.

Table 5 shows that the individuals in the age group (21 - 40) are the highest group in the degree of acceptance the artificial limb.

Age gp	Mean	N	SD
0-20	2.81	38	0.86
21-40	3.22	81	0.96
41-60	1.89	27	1.01
> 60	1.9	22	1.12
Total	2.7	168	1.12

**Table 5:** Means and SD for age gps regarding reaction to artificial limbs.

No remarkable difference in the mean between acceptances of artificial limb related to the site of the amputation among the individuals using prosthesis (Table 6).

The level of acceptance among individuals with amputation below the elbow is higher than the other levels of amputation (3.17) and slightly similar among the others with amputees using artificial limbs (Table 7).



Site	Mean	N	SD
Upper	2.8	113	1.11
Lower	2.7	55	1.14
Total	2.7	168	1.12

**Table 6:** Means and SD for site of amputation regarding reaction to artificial limbs.

Level	Mean	N	SD
AK	2.9	20	1.2
BK	2.4	50	1.2
AE	2.4	40	1.3
BE	3.17	58	0.75

**Table 7:** Means and SD for level of amputation regarding reaction to artificial limbs.

*\*Above Knee (AK), Below Knee (BK), Above Elbow (AE), Below Elbow (BE)*

The level of acceptance among individuals with right limb amputation is higher than those with left limb amputation (Table 8).

Location	Mean	N	SD
RL	2.9	130	1.06
LL	2.1	38	1.11
Total	2.7	168	1.12

**Table 8:** Means and SD for location of amputation regarding reaction to artificial limbs.

*\*Right Limb (RL), Left Limb (LL)*

The level of acceptance among individuals using myoelectric is the highest (3.9) and acceptance of those using cosmetic is the lowest (Table 9).

Type of prosthesis	M	N	SD
ME	1.0	40	0.00
CT	2.9	80	0.32
BP	3.9	48	0.28
Total	2.9	168	1.12

**Table 9:** Means and SD for type of prosthesis regarding reaction to artificial limbs.

*Myo electric (ME), Cosmetic, (CT) Body- Powered (BP)*

### Discussion

Reaction to prosthesis is an individualized problem that is controlled by many factors such as age, sex, type of prosthesis, experience, rehabilitation program, type of work performed by the prosthesis, level of amputation, site of amputation, and the social situation.

In the recent study, the result revealed some variable associated with the reaction to the prosthesis.

The study revealed that females are highly reactive positively than males. This result is congruent with the study by Hermansson., *et al.* [16] in which they found that there was an interaction between gender and prosthetic use in their effect on competence and behavior/emotional problem.

The study indicates similar rates of acceptance among those with upper and lower artificial limb, however the previous studies reported a high rate of rejection among individuals with upper artificial limb [6,7]. Ultimately, lower extremity prostheses were accepted [14].

Previous studies also say that the individuals rejected the prosthesis due to uncomfotability and artificial limb functioning [10]. This result is also confirmed by the study conducted by Mc Ferland., *et al.* [11]. As for the present study, the comfotability and the function characteristics of the artificial limb are associated with its type (cosmetic, body –power, or myoelectric) artificial limb. And this is emphasized by the result of the study by Mc Farl., *et al.* [11] which indicated that Vietnam war amputees are more rejected than those who are injured in Iraqi War. This result may explained by the involution in artificial limbs.

The present study indicates that the individuals with myoelectric artificial limbs are the most accepting for the artificial limb and this result is parallel with the result of the study conducted by [21] which is more functional than the other types of artificial limbs. Elaine., *et al.* (2008) found that mean rejection rates of (45%) and (35%) were observed in the literature for body-powered and electric prostheses respectively in pediatric populations. Significantly lower rates of rejection for both body-powered (26%) and electric (23%) devices were observed in adult populations while the average incidence of non-wear was similar for pediatric (16%) and adult (20%) populations.

In the present study, young individuals of age group (20 - 40years) accepted the artificial limb more than that of age group (0 - 20 years). This result is similar to the previous study done by Nicolas., *et al.* [14] which stated that acceptance and partial acceptance were clearly related to increasing age.

Nichols., *et al.* [14] also reported that children have poor recorded acceptance for upper-limb conventional prosthesis. Of those fitted before the age of 4 years, (14) children fitted with bilateral prosthesis rejected the prosthesis in nine occasions (64%), whereas acceptance was recorded in five cases (36%), but it was difficult to assess correctly whether a child of this age has accepted or rejected the prosthesis, as the observer's judgment is likely to be very subjective. Also, it was noted that after the age of two years, conventional prosthesis was totally rejected.

Finally, many studies have indicated that the rate of acceptance or rejection is associated with delivering rehabilitation and training programs [22-24].

### Recommendations

Health care team should be aware of the increased risk of rejection in prosthesis among individuals using artificial limbs. Emphasizing individual needs will probably facilitate successful prosthetic fitting. Improved prosthesis quality and individualized prosthetic training may increase long-term prosthesis use. Further studies on the effect of prosthetic training and of the reasons for rejection of different prosthetic types are suggested. In addition, the author recommends for further studies about the factors which affect the recipient reaction to prosthesis such as level of education, social and economic status, and the culture. Investigation is also needed regarding the inferential statistics analysis within the same independent variable (gender, age, the weight of the limb... etc).

According to the study, the sample analysis reveals high frequencies for the male than female in general and this needs to re-test the sample according to the gender. In the future, the researchers should take into their consideration the homogeneity of the sample. Gender should be 50% female and 50% male and the age group should be equalized or specific age group is needed. Also, the study needs to involve all sites and levels of amputation and types of prosthesis in equalized sample size.

### **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

#### **Disclosure of potential conflicts of interest**

No conflict of interest was to be found in this research study.

#### **Research involving human participants and/or animals**

The participants in the study are human beings, but the nature of study was descriptive correlation and no clinical trials have been conducted on the participants.

#### **Informed consent**

Consent to Act as a Participant in a Research Study.

**Title of the study:** Variables Affecting the Amputees Reaction to the Artificial Limb.

#### **Why is this research being done?**

This research is being done to explore the reaction of amputees to the artificial limb. This will help those people adaptation to their individual needs and it guide show to manufacture artificial limbs to get the best of their advantages.

#### **Who is being asked to take part in this research study? Why are you selected?**

Any individual with amputation who has an artificial limb took part of this study, and they will be selected to explore their reaction to the artificial limb.

#### **What procedure will be performed for the research purpose?**

Participants were asked to answer questions of the research tool.

#### **What are the possible risks, side effects, and discomforts of this research study?**

There are no possible risks, side effects, or discomforts that may be experienced by the participants, except that embarrassment may be experienced by some participants during filling the questionnaire.

#### **What are the possible benefits of this research study?**

There is no direct benefit from participating in this research study, but help people who manufacture artificial limb and health team in their job with this group of people.

#### **If I agreed to take part in this research study, will I be told of any new risks that may be found during the course of the study?**

There are no potential risks that may develop during the course of the study.

#### **Will my insurance provider or I be charged for the cost of any procedures performed as part of this research study?**

There is no cost expected to make a burden on both insurance provider and the participant.

#### **Who will know about my participation in this research study?**

Nobody will know about your participation in the research study, except your caring institution or your employer.

**Is my participation in this research study voluntary?**

Yes, you are voluntarily asked to take part in the research study.

**May I withdraw at any time during the study without any consequences to me?**

Yes, you have the right to withdraw at any time during the study without any consequences resulting from your withdrawal.

**How my confidentiality will be protected?**

All information obtained from you will be held by the principal investigator in a locked cabinet and limiting access to them on only need-to-know basis. All electronic information will be kept on the researcher personal computer.

**How can I reach the investigator if I want to ask questions?**

The principal investigator can be contacted via the email address or mobile phone provided above.

**How can I access the results of the study?**

The results of this study will be held by the principal investigator, and the electronic library of the Al-Balqa'aApplied University.

**Voluntary consent statement**

All of the above has been explained to me and all of my current questions have been answered. I understand that I am encouraged to ask questions about any aspect of this research study during the course of this study, and that such future questions will be answered by the researcher listed on the first page of this form. By signing this form, I agree to participate in this research study. A copy of this consent form will be given to me.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Person Obtaining Consent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Role in Research Study

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Bibliogarchy**

1. Michelle M., *et al.* "Orthotic and Prosthetic in rehabilitation, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed". *Elsevier* (2013).
2. Katherine Ott., *et al.* "Artificial Parts, Practical Lives- Modern Histories of prosthesis". *Newyork university Press USA* (2002).
3. Burroughs S F and Brook J A. "Patterns of acceptance and rejection of upper limb prostheses". *Orthotics and Prosthetics* 39.2 (1985): 40-47.
4. Wilson Jr A B. "Some observations on upper extremity prosthetics". *Murdoch, G. Prosthetic and Orthotic Practice. London, Edward Arnold Publishers* (1970).
5. Phillips S., *et al.* "Development and quality of use for Upper Extremity prosthesis". *RESNA Annual Conference* (2012).
6. Biddiss E A and Chau T T. "Upper limb prosthesis use and abandonment: a survey of the last 25 years". *Prosthetics and Orthotics International* 31.3 (2007): 236-257.

7. Biddiss E A and Chau T T. "Multivariate prediction of upper limb prosthesis acceptance or rejection". *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology* 3.4 (2008): 181-192.
8. Mckenzie DS. "Functional replacement of the upper extremity today, In G Murdoch (Ed)". *Prosthetic and Orthotic Practice* London 5.1 (1970): 363- 376.
9. Herberts P, *et al.* "Rehabilitation of unilateral below-elbow amputees with myoelectric prostheses". *Scandinavian Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine* 12.3 (1979): 123-128.
10. Wagner L V, *et al.* "Reasons for prosthetic rejection by children with unilateral congenital transverse forearm total deficiency". *Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics* 19.2 (2007): 51-54.
11. Mc Farland L, *et al.* "Unilateral upper-limb loss: satisfaction and prosthetic-device use in veterans and service members from Vietnam and OIF/OEF conflicts". *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development* 47.4 (2010): 299-316.
12. Gailey R, *et al.* "Unilateral lower-limb loss: Prosthetic device use and functional outcomes in service members from Vietnam war and OIF/OEF conflicts". *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development* 47.4 (2010): 317-331.
13. Østlie K, *et al.* "Prosthesis rejection in acquired major upper-limb amputees: a population-based survey". *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology* 7.4 (2012): 294-303.
14. Nichols P J, *et al.* "The acceptance and rejection of prostheses by children with multiple congenital limb deformities". *Artificial Limbs* 12.1 (1968): 1-13.
15. Saradjian A, *et al.* "The experience of men using an upper limb prosthesis following amputation: positive coping and minimizing feeling different". *Disability & Rehabilitation* 30.11 (2008): 871-883.
16. Hermansson L, *et al.* "Psychosocial adjustment in Swedish children with upper-limb reduction deficiency and a myoelectric prosthetic hand". *Acta Paediatrica* 94.4 (2005): 479-488.
17. Lundberg M, *et al.* "My prosthesis as a part of me: a qualitative analysis of living with an osseointegrated prosthetic limb". *Prosthetics and Orthotics International* 35.2 (2011): 207-214.
18. Gallagher P and Maclachlan M. "Adjustment to an artificial limb: a qualitative perspective". *Journal of Health Psychology* 6.1 (2001): 85-100.
19. Atherton R and Robertson N. "Psychological adjustment to lower limb amputation amongst prosthesis users". *Disability & Rehabilitation* 28.19 (2009): 1201-1209.
20. Davidson J. "A survey of the satisfaction of upper limb amputees with their prostheses, their lifestyles, and their abilities". *Journal of Hand Therapy* 15.1 (2002): 62-70.
21. Lusardi MM, *et al.* "Orthotics & Prosthetics Rehabilitation, 3<sup>rd</sup>ed". Elsevier Saunders (2012).
22. McNeill I F and Wilson J S P. "The problems of limb replacement". *British Journal of Surgery* 57.5 (1970): 365-377.
23. Pezzin L E, *et al.* "Use and satisfaction with prosthetic limb devices and related services". *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 85.5 (2004): 723-729.
24. Smeltzer S C, *et al.* "Brunner & Suddarth's textbook of Medical Surgical Nursing. 11<sup>th</sup>ed". Lippincott Williams & Wilkins (2008).

### Volume 4 Issue 4 November 2016

© All rights reserved by Mezyed Al adwan., *et al.*