



Rebuttal to McAleer J. Mobility redux: Post-World War II prosthetics and functional aids for veterans, 1945 to 2010. J Rehabil Res Dev. 2011;48(2):vii–xvi.

[\[PMID: 21480083\]](#)

[DOI:10.1682/JRRD.2010.11.0222.](#)

Available from:

<http://www.rehab.research.va.gov/jour/11/482/pdf/mcaleergsted.pdf>

Dear Editor:

This letter addresses the following sentence in the “Mobility redux: Post-World War II prosthetics and func-

tional aids for veterans, 1945 to 2010” editorial that appeared in *JRRD*, Volume 48, Number 2. The sentence on page xv, second column: “Early testing and rigorous subject feedback clearly showed that DEKA II’s first active socket design was not what patients wanted or needed.” is not accurate. There is evidence in the historical literature on problematic prosthetic sockets. However, user response to the interface design introduced as part of the DEKA Arm System in collaboration with prosthetists at Biodesigns, Inc (Santa Monica, California) and Next Step Orthotics and Prosthet-

ics, Inc (Manchester, New Hampshire) has been quite favorable.

It would be accurate to say “Early testing and rigorous subject feedback clearly showed that the active socket design used as part of the DEKA Arm System offers significant benefits and was positively received by research subjects.”

Sincerely,

Stewart M. Coulter, PhD

Program Manager, DEKA Integrated Solutions, Manchester, NH
603-669-5139