|| ISSN(online): 2589-8698 || ISSN(print): 2589-868X ||
International Journal of Medical and Biomedical Studies
Available Online at www.ijmbs.info
NLM (National Library of Medicine ID: 101738825)
Index Copernicus Value 2019: 79.34
Original Research Article
Volume 5, Issue 1; January: 2021; Page No. 394-396

TO COMPARE PARAMETERS OF GAIT & VERTICAL GROUND REACTION FORCES WITH NORMAL HEALTHY AGE & GENDER OF CLUB FOOT CHILDREN.

Dr. Manish Sharma[1] & Dr. Rishi Gupta[2]
[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Amaltas Institute of Medical Sciences, Dewas, M.P.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Index Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Indore, M.P.

Article Info: Received 03 December 2020; Accepted 19 January 2021
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32553/ijmbs.v5i1.1817
Corresponding author: Dr. Rishi Gupta
Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.

Abstract

Background & Method: Study was conducted at Department of Orthopedics, Index Medical College Hospital and Research Center, Indore, M.P. Patients with past treatment of CTEV are generally followed up until skeletal development at our emergency clinic at CTEV facility. Patients between ages of 6 and 12 years who had past traditionalist or careful treatment for CTEV and were not anticipating any further treatment and with plantigrade feet (pirani score<1) were welcome to take an interest in the examination. A sum of 33 patients were enlisted successively through the center and educated assent for support in the investigation was acquired from their folks or their overseers. The neighborhood morals council allowed endorsement for the investigation.

Result: All the times are reduced in both unilateral and bilateral cases except double support time which is increased in bilateral cases. Step time parameters of normal limb of unilateral CTEV are also abnormal showing that they may have compensated for the insufficient motion of the club foot. In both unilateral and bilateral club foot, force distribution is mainly along the lateral border of foot. Forces over MLF, MLM and MLR are increased. This shows that the child puts most of the weight on lateral border of foot.

Conclusion: Revision surgery in clubfeet should only be done when the problem or deformity has become unacceptably symptomatic producing functional problems and pain. It should always be remembered that repeated surgery will always produce additional stiffness within the foot and further loss of power. Thus there should be objective methods of assessment of function in treated club foot. Early methods like radiology and clinical evaluation have limitations. Gait analysis is the new emerging method in objectively assessing the functional outcome. This study showed that gait analysis including kinematics and dynamics of walking can be used to quantify gait pattern characteristics and may be helpful in evaluation and further development of treatment of patients with clubfoot.

Keywords: gait, club foot, children & age.

Introduction

The strolling design in a gathering of nine grown-up male subjects who had gotten early concentrated treatment for inborn clubfoot was assessed and contrasted with the strolling design in a benchmark group of 15 grown-up sound male subjects. All subjects were shot with a five-camera video framework as they strolled across two power plates[1]. A three-dimensional opposite elements approach was utilized to figure normal joint points, minutes, force, and work. The outcomes showed that there were no distinctions in the joint points between the two gatherings. The general examples of the joint minutes were practically the same in the two gatherings. Be that as it may, examination uncovered a more modest lower leg joint second and bigger knee and hip joint minutes in those with clubfoot. It was reasoned that the bigger knee and hip joint minutes filled in as pay for the more modest lower leg second. The diminished lower leg second and work created about the lower leg joint in the clubfeet might actually be attributable to more fragile plantar flexors. All in all, walk examination can be a significant device while assessing treatment for clubfoot. In any case, further examination is expected to decide if the higher hip and knee joint minutes saw in subjects with clubfoot may prompt the advancement of knee or hip joint pathologies[2].

Clubfoot is a hard deformation described by reversal, adduction, and equinus that regularly require careful intercession. This investigation surveyed the stride energy and kinematics of youngsters with one-sided and those with respective clubfoot, contrasting them and age-and sex coordinated with typical (control) kids. Patient fulfillment likewise was inspected utilizing a poll, and muscle strength was assessed at the lower leg and knee[3]. In assessing the kinematics, note that deviations happened at the lower leg of kids with clubfoot. Contrasts in kinematics and energy at the hip and knee between typical youngsters and those with clubfoot came about because of absence of movement at the lower leg. Moreover, the strength of lower leg plantarflexors was frail, which decreased plantarflexion during push-off. This limited movement may have been brought about by lingering hard deformations and muscle snugness coming about because of the first condition that added to muscle firmness during gait[4].

Material & Method

Study was conducted at Department of Orthopedics, Index Medical College Hospital and Research Center, Indore,

M.P. from Dec 2017 to Nov 2018 Patients with past treatment of CTEV are generally followed up until skeletal development at our emergency clinic at CTEV facility. Patients between ages of 6 and 12 years who had past traditionalist or careful treatment for CTEV and were not anticipating any further treatment and with plantigrade feet (pirani score<1) were welcome to take an interest in the examination. A sum of 33 patients were enlisted successively through the center and educated assent for support in the investigation was acquired from their folks or their overseers. The neighborhood morals council allowed endorsement for the investigation.

Each subject was made to wrap a ultraflex unit around the midsection and a couple of CDG shoes of inexact size was put by walking. The subjects were then given 2 minutes of acclimation time. After the acquaintance time the subject were made to stroll at common speed straight on a ten meter hallway. Information was then taken for 20 seconds. The recorded information was then moved to processor by interface links. Information investigation was done from fifth to fifteenth second of walk as it should address regular step design.

Results

Table 1: Comparison of step time parameters of affected limb of unilateral CTEV with control group

Step Time Parameter	Control (mean)(sec)	Unilateral (mean)(sec)	't'
Single Support Time	0.34	0.318	4.80
Double Support Time	0.131	0.121	0.43
Stance Time	0.660	0.599	2.71
Step Time	0.708	0.459	2.77
Single swing Time	0.416	0.363	2.14

All the times are reduced in both unilateral and bilateral cases except double support time which is increased in bilateral cases. Step time parameters of normal limb of unilateral CTEV are also abnormal showing that they may have compensated for the insufficient motion of the club foot.

Vertical ground reaction forces

Table 2: Comparison of VERTICAL GROUND REACTION FORCES over each sensor of more affected limb of bilateral CTEV group with unilateral CTEV & Control group

Sensors	Control (mean) (N)	Unilateral (mean) (N)	't'	Bilateral (mean) (N)	't'
Toe	55	17.5	4.73	13	2.94
MMF	44	22	4.88	25	4.08
MLF	40.5	55	5.78	50	9.39
MMM	42	19.5	2.25	24	1.97
MLM	15	93	8.58	107	4.41
MMR	51.5	7.5	2.19	8	4.31
MLR	62.5	98.5	2.99	87	2.26
Heel	22	14	4.59	17	2.49

In both unilateral and bilateral club foot, force distribution is mainly along the lateral border of foot. Forces over MLF, MLM and MLR are increased. This shows that the child puts most of the weight on lateral border of foot.

Discussion

Davies et al [5] examined kids with treated CTEV (both one-sided and respective) and contrasted them and typical and age-coordinated with kids. They discovered powerless lower leg plantar flexors and a diminished scope of development of the lower leg. Besides, they identified strange minutes around the knees and hips which they credited to the anomalies of the lower leg and foot.

Term of mid position stage was expanded in both one-sided and respective club foot bunch when contrasted with controls. This shows that patient faces trouble in keeping up equilibrium and takes additional time in settling the influenced foot on ground.

In our examination appropriation of ground response powers more than 8 sensors was recorded during stride. Powers were for the most part dispersed along the horizontal line of the foot. Davis et al [6] tracked down that sidelong ground response powers in kids with clubfoot was more prominent than that of typical youngsters. Aronson and puskarich [7] discovered expanded pressure along the fifth metatarsal while Widhe and Berggren [8] showed a shift towards the horizontal. Every one of these discoveries show a potential remaining reversal disfigurement of the foot, which causes parallel boundary strolling. Front ground response power was discovered to be feeble which suggests absence of push off that is frail plantar flexor action.

Conclusion

Revision surgery in clubfeet should only be done when the problem or deformity has become unacceptably symptomatic producing functional problems and pain. It should always be remembered that repeated surgery will always produce additional stiffness within the foot and further loss of power. Thus there should be objective methods of assessment of function in treated club foot. Early methods like radiology and clinical evaluation have limitations. Gait analysis is the new emerging method in objectively assessing the functional outcome. This study showed that gait analysis including kinematics and dynamics of walking can be used to quantify gait pattern characteristics and may be helpful in evaluation and further development of treatment of patients with clubfoot.

References

1. HH Muratl, C Da, G Yavuzer, L Çeleb. Gait characterstics of patients with bilateral club feet following posteromedial release.
2. Asperheim MS, Moore C, Carroll NC, Dias L. Evaluation of residual clubfoot deformities using gait analysis. J Pediatr Orthop B 1995;4:4954.

3. Karol LA, Concha MC, Johnston CE. Gait analysis and muscle strength in children with surgically treated clubfeet. J Pediatr Orthop 1997;17:790-5.
4. Alkajaer T, Pedersen EN, Simonsen EB. Evaluation of the walking pattern in clubfoot patients who received early intensive treatment. J Pediatr Orthop 2000;20:642-7.
5. Davies TC, Kiefer G, Zernicke RF. Kinematics and kinetics of the hip, knee and ankle of children with clubfoot after posteromedial release. J Pediatr Orthop 2001 ;21:366-71.
6. Davis RB, DeLuca PA. Clinical gait analysis: current methods and future directions. In: Harris G, Smith P, eds. Human motion analysis: current applications and future directions. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE Press, 1996:17-42.
7. Aronson J, Puskarich CL. Deformity and disability from treated clubfoot. J Pediatr Orthop 1990; 10:109-19.
8. Widhe T. Bergrenn L. Gait analysis and dynamic foot pressure in assessment of treated clubfoot. Foot Ankle 1994;15:1986-90.