

1 **Open-source 3D Printable Forearm Crutch**

2 Maryam Mottaghi 1, Morgan Woods 1, Laura Danier 2, Anita So 3, Jacob M. Reeves 3 and
3 Joshua M. Pearce 3,4*

4 1. Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Western University, London, Canada

5 2. Faculty of Health Sciences, Western University, London, ON N6A 3K7, Canada

6 3. Thompson Centre for Engineering Leadership and Innovation, Western University, London,
7 ON N6G 0N1, Canada

8 4. Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, Ivey Business School, Western University,
9 London, ON N6A 5B9, Canada

10 *corresponding: joshua.pearce@uwo.ca

11 mmottagh@uwo.ca , mwoods52@uwo.ca, ldanier@uwo.ca , jreeves5@uwo.ca, aso44@uwo.ca

12 **Abstract**

13 Although there has been considerable progress in distributed manufacturing of open-source
14 designs for mobility aids, there is a notable lack of affordable, open-source crutches. Crutches
15 are a vital tool for many individuals with mobility impairments, yet the high costs limit
16 accessibility. Even more, they are in short supply in regions undergoing conflict. The goal of this
17 study is to address this need by leveraging the principles of free and open-source hardware and
18 the capabilities of digital distributed manufacturing to create a low-cost, functional crutch that
19 can be easily produced and customized locally using inexpensive desktop 3D printers. All the
20 design files are open-source, and the design process incorporated load-bearing tests using a
21 hydraulic actuator under static loading conditions to meet the ISO 11334-1:2007 standard for
22 walking aids. The open-source forearm crutch developed in this study not only surpasses the
23 requirements of the ISO method for load capacity ($1,516.3 \pm 169.9$ N, which is 51.6% percent
24 above needs), weighs a fraction of comparable commercial systems (0.612 kg or 27%% of
25 proprietary devices), and is customizable, but also offers a highly cost-effective solution; costing
26 CAD \$36 in material, which is less than all equivalent crutches on the open market. If recycled
27 plastic is used, the material cost of the crutch could be further reduced to under CAD \$13,
28 making it much more accessible.

29 **1. Introduction**

30 Mobility-related disabilities currently impact over 10% of the adult population globally [1,2],
31 with projections only expected to rise dramatically as the population ages [3]. Conditions such as

32 arthritis, chronic back pain, and injuries from accidents contribute to the increased need for
33 mobility aids, particularly among older adults [3]. By 2060, nearly a quarter of the U.S.
34 population will be 65 years or older [4]. Addressing the related challenges expected to be faced
35 by those with mobility impairments requires attention. These challenges are not only physical but
36 also economic, as many individuals, especially in less developed regions or those living in
37 poverty, struggle to afford the adaptive mobility aids they require for daily living [5].

38 Commercial mobility aids, such as crutches, canes, walkers, and wheelchairs, are available on
39 the market, but acquiring them can be challenging for many individuals due to their high costs
40 [6]. For instance, proprietary forearm crutches can range in price from CAD\$36.66 to
41 CAD\$315.00 making them unaffordable for individuals on restricted incomes or without
42 extended health coverage (Table 1). Individuals with disabilities face a higher risk of
43 unemployment, which in turn increases their likelihood of living in poverty [7]. This economic
44 vulnerability makes it even more difficult for them to afford essential mobility aids [7].
45 Additionally, this lack of access to essential mobility aids not only makes individuals with
46 disabilities dependent on others but also increases social inequalities, as those without the
47 financial means are further impacted.

48 Table 1. List of price and source of commercial crutches.

Name of the Product	Price (CAD\$)	Source (Date accessed October 16, 2024)
Folding Crutch	\$36.66	https://www.amazon.ca/Disabled-Portable-Adjustable-Underarm-Telescopic/dp/B08J2JCDGB/
Forearm Crutches	\$47.70	https://www.walmart.com/ip/Medline-Walking-Forearm-Crutches-Lightweight-Aluminum-250lb-Weight-Capacity-1-Pair/22790105
PEPE - Crutches	\$59.99	https://www.amazon.ca/PEPE-Crutches-Forearm-Aluminum-Adjustable/dp/B07DPQ2S2F/
Forearm Crutches	\$99.99	https://www.amazon.ca/HEALTHBAZAAR-Crutches-Fashionable-Ergonomic-Handgrips/dp/B0CPHSWZB8/
ORTONYX Forearm Crutches with Adjustable Support	\$161.76	https://www.amazon.ca/ORTONYX-Adjustable-Ergonomic-Comfortable-Lightweight/dp/B07C1QXN12/
Ergonomic Forearm Crutches	\$315.00	https://www.amazon.ca/Ergobaum®-Ergoactives-Ergonomic-Forearm-Crutches/dp/B00LGZ43E2/

49 Digital distributed manufacturing offers a promising method for addressing these challenges [8–
50 10]. Additive manufacturing, which is facilitated by Computer Numerical Control (CNC) tools
51 like 3D printers, has the potential to drastically reduce the cost of consumer goods, including
52 adaptive mobility aids [11]. The transformation of 3D printing technology from a tool for

53 creating prototypes to a widely accessible method for producing usable goods has opened up new
54 possibilities for manufacturing affordable products locally [12,13]. This technology has been
55 adopted by local businesses [11][14,15], chain stores [16], makerspaces [17–19], fablabs [20],
56 and even public libraries[21–23], which makes production more accessible and allows for the
57 customization of products to fit individual needs [24].

58 The proliferation of free and open-source hardware (FOSH) has further expedited this revolution
59 [25]. The open-source movement, which began in software development, has evolved into a
60 powerful framework for hardware innovation [26]. The release of self-replicating rapid
61 prototyper (RepRap) designs allowed 3D printers to produce many of their own components,
62 which significantly reduced their costs [27–29]. Today, there are millions of 3D printable FOSH
63 designs available [30], which provide consumers with the opportunity to create customized
64 products at a fraction of the cost of commercial products [31].

65 Adaptive aids are particularly well-suited to benefit from the open-source model, because of the
66 advantages of customization and relatively high-markup on such products [32]. For example, a
67 low-cost open-source walker has already been developed [11]. This open-source walker is
68 constructed from readily available materials and 3D printed joints which together meet the
69 weight requirements for most users up to 187.1 ± 29.3 kg while reducing walker costs and mass
70 compared to commercial alternatives [11].


71 Despite the advances in open-source mobility aids, there remains a critical gap in the availability
72 of affordable, open-source forearm crutches. Forearm crutches are a vital tool for many
73 individuals with mobility impairments, yet the high cost and lack of customization options in
74 commercial products can be challenging. The development of an open-source crutch that is both
75 affordable and customizable could transform the lives of countless individuals and offer them
76 greater independence in mobility. This paper aims to address this need by leveraging the
77 principles of FOSH and the capabilities of digital distributed manufacturing to create a low-cost,
78 forearm crutch that can be easily produced and customized locally. Specifically, low-cost open-
79 source desktop 3D printing is used to manufacture bespoke components. The design process
80 incorporated repetitive testing to ensure that the crutch could meet standardized load-bearing
81 requirements. For load-bearing tests, mechanical tests were performed using an MTS hydraulic
82 actuator with a capacity of 250 kN under static loading conditions. The crutch was subjected to
83 the static load capacity requirements outlined in the ISO 11334-1:2007 standard for walking aids.
84 This standard specifies that crutches must support a load of $1000 \text{ N} \pm 2\%$ which simulates a user
85 mass of 100 kg, without breaking or deforming for a specified duration of 10 seconds.

86 **2. Materials and Methods**

87 **2.1. Crutch Design**

88 Following the evaluation of various commercially available crutches, an initial design concept
89 for an open-source forearm crutch was designed in Onshape CAD software (Onshape 1.157,
90 Cambridge, MA, USA) [33] using 3D printed joints in combination with commercially available
91 hardwood dowels. Solid, cylindrical hardwood dowels were selected as the primary structural
92 components due to their sustainability, ease of availability in standard sizes across hardware
93 stores in North America, and compatibility with the 3D printed joints. Hardwood was chosen not
94 only for its renewable and biodegradable properties but also for its potential to be recycled and
95 composted. Furthermore, a study comparing the carbon footprint of wood and aluminum—a
96 common structural material for mobility aids—revealed that wood generates approximately one-
97 fourth of the carbon emissions compared with aluminum in the context of window frames [34]. It
98 is important to note that the strength of the crutch will vary depending on the specific type of
99 wood used, as hardwood can encompass a variety of types such as basswood, beech, maple, or
100 oak, and softwoods include types such as cedar, pine, or spruce [35]. For the present
101 investigation hardwood dowel was chosen, though the specific source is commercially
102 unspecified.


103 This open-source forearm crutch design incorporates several features inspired by existing
104 commercially available devices. Notably, the handle and cuff are integrated into a single 3D
105 printed part (Figure 1). In accordance with the ISO 11334-1:2007 standard, the handle is
106 ergonomically shaped to align with the handgrip support line to ensure that the user's hand and
107 wrist is in a comfortable position during use. The arm section length, located above the rear
108 handgrip reference point, features a non-horizontal forearm support (cuff) that secures the
109 forearm in position and prevents lateral movement. The arm section length (a), cuff internal
110 depth (x), width (y) (Figure 2a), and height (z) (Figure 2b) can be tailored to provide comfortable
111 support for the forearm (Figure 2c). The diameter of the cuff is configured as a variable in the
112 CAD file to allow for easy customization. Since wood is a renewable material that can be easily
113 recycled and composted, a standardized wooden dowel with a solid, circular cross-section and
114 diameter of 22.3 mm (7/8" standard hardwood dowel) was selected for the leg section [36]. The
115 dowels are available in standard sizes in North America and could be slotted directly into the
116 solid 3D printed forearm handle and cuff. To better facilitate the connection between the leg
117 section and the 3D printed handle, a TPU washer (Figure 3a) was placed between the wooden
118 dowel and 3D printed components. This washer offered both shock absorption and tolerance
119 between the potentially unparallel surfaces of the cut dowel surface and 3D print to ensure the
120 load was more evenly transferred through the dowel to the 3D printed handle. Similarly, a TPU
121 handle grip (Figure 3b) was modeled and 3D printed to slide onto the handle to further promote
122 user comfort.



123

124
125

Figure 1. Dimensional measurements of assembled crutch. a) length of forearm 227 mm, l) length of leg section 794 mm.




126

127

128

129

Figure 2. Forearm design a) top view, featuring (x) cuff depth and (y) cuff width; b) right view; c) isometric view.



130

131

Figure 3. Design of a) washer (TPU-85A), b) handle grip (TPU-85A).

132

133


134

135

136

The leg section, located below the rear handgrip reference point, ends with a tip designed to ensure stable contact with the ground. The leg section length (l), as was the arm section length (a), are adjustable and can be customized to accommodate users of various heights (Figure 1). The foot tip (Figure 4) is constructed from the assembly of a foot cushion (Figure 4a), foot base (Figure 4b), foot living joint (Figure 4c), and ankle body (Figure 4d). The assembly of the

137 foot tip is shown in Figure 4e. All 3D printed connections are secured to the wooden dowel using
138 #6 x 5/8" flat head wood screws to ensure stability.



139
140 Figure 4. Design of a) foot cushion (TPU-85A), b) foot base (PETG), c) foot living joint (TPU-85A), d)
141 ankle body (PETG), and e) assembled foot tip.

142 2.2. Overview of 3D Printing and Wood Dowel Part Sizing

143 All 3D printed components were produced using Polymaker PETG filament [37], or Ninja Flex
144 TPU 85A [38], with printing performed on open-source RepRap-class 3D printers, either the
145 LulzBot TAZ Workhorse [39], or Prusa i3 Mk3S (Prusa, Prague, Czech Republic) [40]. Each of
146 which was equipped with a 0.6 mm nozzle. An index of the 3D printed parts, including their
147 names and quantities, are detailed in Table 2. The slicing parameters used for both PETG and
148 TPU are outlined in Table 3.

149 Table 2. Bill of materials for 3D printed components

Name	Number of Parts
One-piece forearm	1
Handle Grip	1
Washer	2
Foot cushion	1
Foot	1
Foot living joint	1
Ankle body	1


150

Table 3. Slicing parameters for PETG and TPU 85A filaments.

Slicing Parameter	PETG Value	TPU 85A Value
Layer Height	0.6 mm	0.15
Wall Count	4	2
Infill Density	99%	30%
Infill Pattern	Gyroid	Gyroid
Printing Temperature	230 °C	238 °C
Bed Temperature	85 °C	50 °C

151
152
153
154

To address the complex geometries of the parts, each component was strategically oriented on the print bed to reduce alignment with potential fracture planes and to decrease filament usage by reducing the need for support structures. Support structures are necessary for some overhangs, as illustrated in Figure 5.



155

156
157

Figure 5. Orientation of the 3D printed one-piece forearm (blue) on the print bed with support locations (green)

158
159
160
161


The height of the forearm crutch is indicated from the handgrip to the floor, with an adjustable range of 740 to 890 mm [41]. To ensure the crutch design targeted the worst-case loading scenario with a higher chance of buckling and more severe failure, the wooden dowel was cut to 794 mm, which resulted in a distance from the handgrip to the floor of 890 mm. This ensured the

162 wrist location matches the tallest crutch specifications. Once the tallest case was validated, the
163 height could be further customized based on the length between the user's hand and the ground
164 with certainty of loading capability.

165 2.3. Mechanical Testing

166 To ensure the crutch can safely withstand regular use, compressive mechanical testing was
167 conducted to determine the load required to cause failure. The methods used were adapted from
168 the “Static loading” criteria outlined in Section 5.6 of ISO 11334-1:2007. According to this
169 standard, crutches must support a vertical load of 1000 N \pm 2% without breaking or deforming
170 under a user mass of 100 kg for a specified duration of 10 seconds. To provide additional
171 insights into the failure mode of the design and observe any potential weak points, each crutch
172 was subsequently loaded to its breaking point after the 1000 N static loading criteria was
173 achieved.

174 To simulate the real-world usage of the crutch under static loading conditions, an open-source
175 test jig was developed based on the Section 5.6 of ISO 11334-1:2007 as well as previous
176 investigations [42,43]. The testing jig included a simulated forearm, 3D printed simulated elbow,
177 the testing jig body which interfaced with the hydraulic press, and a 3D printed simulated hand
178 as shown in Figure 6. These components were fabricated and assembled to mimic anatomical
179 structure and movement, and to adhere to the appropriate measurement relationships outlined in
180 ISO 11334-1:2007. The loading force was applied through the testing jig body where it was
181 transferred through the back of the forearm cuff and into the handle through the elbow and wrist
182 joints respectively. These swivel joints and contact points aimed to replicate the user's natural
183 posture. The swiveling joint that transferred the load to the simulated elbow was positioned just
184 below the cuff, while the simulated forearm rested along the cuff support line and was hinged to
185 the simulated hand. The hand was clamped to the handgrip only at the far end of the handle grip
186 to ensure no restraint or reinforcement could affect the test. The crutch remained free to flex,
187 rotate, and pivot in all directions to simulate realistic motion. The swiveling joint allowed a
188 minimum of 15° of pivot in all directions, while the forearm-hand hinge provided free forward
189 and backward movement, as well as a minimum of 4° of lateral motion.



190

191

Figure 6: Mechanical testing jig and forearm crutch mounted in the hydraulic press.

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

Five prototype crutches were tested, and the results were recorded using an MTS hydraulic actuator with a capacity of 250 kN and a stroke length of 150 mm which was capable of operating in both force-controlled and displacement-controlled modes. Force-displacement curves were generated and analyzed to determine the maximum load the crutch could endure before failure. Failure was defined as the point at which the force began to decrease with continued displacement, which indicates the fracturing of either the wooden dowel or the 3D printed components. The stiffness of each crutch was also calculated in Newtons per millimeter (N/mm) by fitting a trendline to the linear region of the force-displacement curves.

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208


209

The crutch was secured in the universal testing machine, and a vertical force was applied at a controlled rate of 50 mm/min. This rate was selected to ensure the 1000N threshold was achieved in approximately 30 seconds as the standard called for a rate that facilitated 1000N after a minimum of 2 seconds. Throughout testing, no slipping occurred between the foot tip and the ground or between the simulated elbow and testing jig body. The load point was positioned to mimic the force exerted by a user pressing down on the crutch with their hand, in accordance with ISO 11334-1:2007, which specified the requirements and testing methods for walking aids used by individuals with mobility impairments. To improve accuracy, the testing machine was customized with a 3D printed elbow adapter, designed to simulate the user's elbow. The jig was used to adjust the height of the tester and ensure precise alignment between the machine head

210 and the elbow adapter during testing. The load was gradually increased at 50 mm/min until
211 reaching 1000 N, at which point it was held constant for 10 seconds, before it proceeded at the
212 same rate to failure. This process was repeated across all five of the crutch samples that were
213 fabricated.

214 3. Results and Discussion


215 All components of the crutch were successfully 3D printed, and support materials were removed
216 using needle nose pliers where applicable. The single piece 3D printed forearm crutch is shown
217 in Figure 7 and the 3D printed foot components are shown in Figure 8 with the supports
218 removed. The fully assembled crutch is depicted in Figure 9a and the crutch is shown in use in
219 Figure 9b and Figure 9c.



220

221

Figure 7. 3D printed Forearm (PETG) a) front view, b) top view, c) side view.



222

223

224

Figure 8. 3D printed a) Handle Grip, b) Foot cushion, c) Foot, d) Foot living joint, e) Foot body, f) Washer, and g) Assembled Foot tip



225

226

227


Figure 9. a) Assembled crutch, b and c) Two crutches in use

228 The load-displacement results of the five crutches are plotted in Figure 10. All crutches not only
229 achieved the 1000N load prescribed by ISO 11334-1:2007 for the required duration of 10s, they
230 proceeded to fail at loads more than 39% higher than the specified limit. The maximum
231 compressive loads recorded for the five crutches tested were 1,852.8 N, 1,419.3 N, 1,459.6 N,
232 1,396.1 N, and 1,453.8 N, with an average of $1,516.32 \pm 169.9$ N. The failure loads were
233 associated with vertical displacements that ranged from 29.5 mm to 37.9 mm, which result in an
234 average displacement of 32.5 ± 3.2 mm. To determine the mass that the crutches can support, the
235 compressive failure loads were converted to equivalent mass values using Newton's second law:

$$236 \quad F=m \cdot g \quad (1)$$

237 where F is the force (N), m is the mass (kg), and g is the acceleration due to gravity (9.81 m/s^2).
238 The corresponding mass values were calculated as 188.9 kg (416.4 lbs), 144.7 kg (319 lbs),
239 148.8 kg (320 lbs), 142.3 kg (313.7 lbs), and 148.2 kg (326.7 lbs), respectively, with an average
240 of 154.6 ± 17.3 kg (340.8 ± 38.1 lbs). It is important to note that ISO 11334-1:2007 also suggests
241 additional consideration for dynamic loading conditions, such as walking or climbing stairs.
242 Forearm crutches are generally used two at a time with both in contact with the ground
243 simultaneously, therefore the mass of a person using them can be divided by two. To ensure
244 safety under these dynamic conditions, however, a safety factor of 2 is recommended. These two
245 values cancel. Thus, using a safety factor of 2, the body weights the crutches can safely
246 accommodate for dynamic use ranges from 142.3 kg (313.7 lbs) to 188.9 kg (416.4 lbs), with an
247 average of 154.6 ± 17.3 kg (340.8 ± 38.1 lbs). It should be noted that this is conservative because
248 it is unusual for a user's full bodyweight to be placed on the crutches. Typically, users will
249 support some of their bodyweight with their legs as well - though this will vary depending on the
250 individual's capabilities. The results also show that the maximum load capacity exceeded the test
251 threshold of 1,000 N, which confirms that the crutches are designed to withstand significantly
252 greater loads than typically expected during normal use or by the average user. This indicates
253 that the crutches not only meet, but also surpass the required safety standards for effective
254 performance according to these criteria. The videos of the tests are included in the Open Science
255 Framework repository for the project [44].

256



257

258

Figure 10. Compressive load vs displacement for the one-piece forearm crutch.

259

260

261

262

263

264

When assessing the failure modes for each of the crutches, it was observed that four crutches failed at the dowel due to bending (Test 1, Test 2, Test 4, and Test 5), while the 3D printed parts remained intact. The remaining study (Test 3, the orange filament) failed at the dowel-crutch attachment point. This failure point could indicate a point where wall thickness could be increased in future crutch designs to improve strength; particularly if stronger woods can be used for the dowel component. These failure modes are summarized below in Figure 11.



265

266

Figure 11. failure points for each of the 2 types of failure.

267

268

269

270

Table 4 summarizes the results of the 3D printed parts including mass, cost and manufacturing time. These results indicate that the most substantial time and material demand for this fabrication process is on the one-piece forearm component which takes approximately 25.4 hours to fabricate.

271

Table 4. 3D printed parts weight, price, and time breakdown.

PETG Parts *	Quantity	Weight/Part (g)	Total Weight (g)	Cost (CAD)	Time
One-piece forearm	1	424	424	10.26	1 d 1 h 26 min
Ankle body	1	33	33	0.79	2 h 25 min
Foot	1	24	24	0.58	2 h 24 min
Total of PETG		481	481	15.03	
TPU Parts **					
Handle Grip	1	60	60	1.45	6 h 43 min
Washer	1	1	1	0.02	00 h 06 min


Foot cushion	1	32	32	0.77	2 h 49 min
Foot living joint	1	33	33	0.79	2 h 57 min
Total of TPU		126	126	8.36	
Total of PETG and TPU		607	607	23.40	
*Cost is calculated based on a 1 kg Polymaker PETG Filament spool priced at CAD \$27.99 CAD + HST. ** Cost is calculated based on a 0.5 kg NinjaFlex TPU 85A Filament spool priced at CAD \$52.77+ HST.					

272 The costs of the open-source crutch are summarized in Table 5. The total material cost of the
 273 open-source crutch is CAD \$35.38. The 3D printed plastic represents approximately 66% of the
 274 total cost.

275 Table 5. Cost calculation of the open-source crutch.

Material	Weight (g)	Cost (CAD)	Source
Screws	4.8	3	https://www.amazon.ca/Button-Socket-Stainless-Machine-IMSCREWS/dp/B08RZ3HTCV
22.4 mm (7/8in) Wood Dowel	0.18	8.98	https://www.homedepot.ca/product/alexandria-moulding-hardwood-dowel-7-8-in-x-48-in-brown/1000115273
Commercial PETG	457	14.45	https://ca.polymaker.com/products/polylyte-petg
Commercial TPU	150	8.94	https://ninjatek.com/shop/ninjaxflex/
Total	611.98	35.38	

276 The open-source crutch offers significant advantages in terms of load capacity, materials, weight,
 277 cost, and customization. During the mechanical test, the open-source crutch demonstrated an
 278 average capacity per crutch of $1,516.3 \pm 169.9$ N or 154.6 ± 17.3 kg (340.8 ± 38.1 lbs), which
 279 exceeds the ISO 11334-1:2007 standard of 1,000 N or 101.9 kg (224.65 lbs), and commercial
 280 peers with the reported capacity of 113.4 kg (250 lbs) [45]. This means the open source crutches
 281 are capable of safely supporting users with body weights higher than the average weight of
 282 Canadian men (86.4 kg) and women (72.1 kg) with a safety factor of 1.78 and 2.17, respectively
 283 [46]. It should be noted that since each crutch is supporting half of the total weight, the safety
 284 factor effectively doubles when two crutches are utilized. Therefore, the effective safety factor
 285 becomes 3.56 for men and 4.34 for women. This strength makes the open-source crutch suitable
 286 for a broad range of users. A plot of the single crutch capacity relative to the weight distributions
 287 of Canadian men and women is provided for consideration in Figure 12.



288

289 Figure 12. Gaussian distribution of masses of Canadian men and women in comparison to the average
290 weight a pair of crutches can support under dynamic conditions (154 kg) using a safety factor of 2.

291 Most commercial crutches are typically made of aluminum and plastic. Although these materials
292 provide durability, they also result in heavier products. For example, a similar commercial
293 forearm crutch made of aluminum and plastic weighs approximately 2.27 kg [47]. In contrast,
294 the open-source crutch weighs just 0.612 kg, which offers a weight reduction of approximately
295 73%, which promotes less labour-intensive use for long durations and promotes ease of crutch
296 transport.

297 Using 3D printed parts in the open-source crutch provides additional benefits, such as flexibility,
298 weight reduction, and the ability to customize the crutch to the user's specific needs. This is in
299 direct contrast with commercial crutches, which are generally mass-produced with limited
300 options for personalization. Additionally, the use of TPU thermoplastic feet and handle covers
301 improves shock absorption, which offers comfort during extended periods of use.

302 From an economic perspective, the open-source crutch is highly cost-effective, with a production
303 cost of just CAD \$35.38, which is lower than the commercial alternatives that offer similar
304 performance (see Table 1; it is less expensive than forearm crutches, but not cheap underarm
305 crutches). One way to decrease the cost of the crutch below that of all commercial alternatives is
306 to use distributed recycling and additive manufacturing (DRAM) [48,49]. In this model, local
307 waste plastic could be sourced individually [50] or at a community scale [51] and converted into
308 3D printing feedstocks [52]. DRAM manufacturing can reduce the cost of 3D printing materials
309 to USD\$0.025/kg [53]. As of now, the amount of 3D printing materials used is 607 g which
310 results in a cost of approximately CAD \$23.40 with commercial filament (USD \$16.85, based on
311 an exchange rate of 1 CAD\$ = 0.72 USD\$). With the implementation of DRAM manufacturing,
312 the material cost would be USD\$0.015 (CAD\$0.021). This reduction would correspond to an
313 overall decrease in the cost of the crutch equivalent to approximately CAD\$12.98. To effectively
314 use these materials, further testing would be needed to ensure the mechanical properties could be

315 maintained with recycled plastic despite the mechanical recycling process reducing material
316 strength.

317 Despite the benefits of the one-piece forearm crutch, it does have some limitations. One of the
318 main drawbacks is the high amount of plastic material required for 3D printing. While 3D
319 printing allows for customization and design flexibility, the large volume of this forearm crutch
320 and high infill demands a lot of material, which increases production time. Although, 3D printing
321 has an excellent ecological balance sheet, the greater the materials used, the greater the
322 environmental impact [54,55]. Additionally, the forearm piece is quite large, which makes it
323 challenging to print on smaller lower-cost desktop printers. As it is, a printer with a print bed of
324 300mm x 300mm was used to print the largest component. Another limitation is the lack of on-
325 the-go height adjustability. While the dowel can be sized to fit the user, the design does not allow
326 the users to easily modify the height while using it without replacing the dowel. It should also be
327 noted that in general, as seen in the results, the wood was the weakest component. In one case,
328 however, using a different color of filament caused the 3D printed component to fail first. It is
329 well established in the literature that different colors of filaments have different strengths [56].
330 This variance, however, still demonstrated large variations in safety factors within the design.

331 There are several areas of future work. First, the amount of printing could be reduced by making
332 the one-piece forearm out of two pieces. This would involve printing the handlebar and cuff as
333 separate components, which could then be connected by a secondary wooden dowel. By doing
334 so, the amount of plastic used would be reduced, the parts would be small enough to fit on a
335 wider range of 3D printers (e.g. very small desktop printers), and the overall print cycle time
336 would be reduced.

337 Another future direction could involve fabricating the entire crutch as a single 3D printed piece.
338 Although this would require more filament and specialized 3D printers, it would allow for
339 greater customization to meet the specific needs of users. Additionally, the development of a
340 crutch with an adjustable height is suggested. This would enable height changes during use,
341 making the crutch suitable for multiple users and would allow crutch manufacturers to stock pre-
342 assembled crutches that allow for minor variations to suit users at the time of purchase.

343 **Conclusions**

344 In conclusion, the open-source forearm crutch developed in this study not only surpasses
345 commercially available alternatives in terms of load capacity, weight, and customization, but
346 also offers a highly cost-effective solution. With an average load capacity of $1,516.3 \pm 169.9$ N,
347 a lightweight design (0.612 kg), and a total production cost of only CAD\$ 35.31 using virgin
348 plastic, it is accessible to a broad range of individuals. This is particularly important for people
349 with disabilities, who often face higher unemployment rates and financial challenges.
350 Additionally, 3D printing technology allows for distributed production, customization and
351 enhanced comfort. While the crutch has proven effective, future improvements could address
352 limitations such as the high plastic usage, print time and the fixed height of the design.

353 **4. Acknowledgements**

354 This work was supported by the Thompson Innovation Fund and the Frugal Biomedical
355 Program.

356 **5. Data availability**

357 All data and designs are available: <https://osf.io/4b89v/>

358 OSHA Certification UID is: CA000058

359 **6. References**

- 360 1. CDC. Disability Impacts All of Us Infographic | CDC. In: Centers for Disease Control and
361 Prevention [Internet]. 3 Jul 2024 [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available:
362 <https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/disabilityandhealth/infographic-disability-impacts-all.html>
- 363 2. Iezzoni L. When Walking Fails: Mobility Problems of Adults with Chronic Conditions.
364 University of California Press; 2003.
- 365 3. Iezzoni LI, McCarthy EP, Davis RB, Siebens H. Mobility difficulties are not only a
366 problem of old age. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2001;16: 235–243. doi:10.1046/j.1525-
367 1497.2001.016004235.x
- 368 4. Bureau UC. The U.S. Joins Other Countries With Large Aging Populations. In: Census.gov
369 [Internet]. [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available:
370 <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2018/03/graying-america.html>
- 371 5. Cubanski J, Orgera K, Damico A, Published TN. How Many Seniors Are Living in
372 Poverty? National and State Estimates Under the Official and Supplemental Poverty
373 Measures in 2016 - Issue Brief - 9166. In: KFF [Internet]. 2 Mar 2018 [cited 9 Aug 2024].
374 Available: [https://www.kff.org/report-section/how-many-seniors-are-living-in-poverty-
375 national-and-state-estimates-under-the-official-and-supplemental-poverty-measures-in-
376 2016-data-note/](https://www.kff.org/report-section/how-many-seniors-are-living-in-poverty-national-and-state-estimates-under-the-official-and-supplemental-poverty-measures-in-2016-data-note/)
- 377 6. World’s Poorest Nations Need International Support, Experts Tell Preparatory Committee,
378 as E-Commerce, Global Market Access Take Centre Stage | Meetings Coverage and Press
379 Releases. [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available: <https://press.un.org/en/2021/dev3440.doc.htm>
- 380 7. Where is it hardest to live in Europe with a disability? In: euronews [Internet]. 3 Apr 2024
381 [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available: [https://www.euronews.com/health/2024/04/02/where-is-it-
382 hardest-to-live-in-europe-as-a-person-with-a-disability](https://www.euronews.com/health/2024/04/02/where-is-it-hardest-to-live-in-europe-as-a-person-with-a-disability)
- 383 8. Rundle G. *A Revolution in the Making*. Simon and Schuster; 2014.
- 384 9. Gershenfeld N. *How to Make Almost Anything*. 91.
- 385 10. The third industrial revolution. *The Economist*. Available:
386 <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2012/04/21/the-third-industrial-revolution>. Accessed 9
387 Aug 2024.
- 388 11. So A, Reeves JM, Pearce JM. Open-Source Designs for Distributed Manufacturing of Low-
389 Cost Customized Walkers. *Inventions.* 2023;8: 79. doi:10.3390/inventions8030079
- 390 12. Anderson P, Sherman CA. A discussion of new business models for 3D printing. *Int J*
391 *Technol Mark.* 2007;2: 280–294. doi:10.1504/IJTMKT.2007.015205
- 392 13. Gwamuri J, Wittbrodt BT, Anzalone NC, Gwamuri J, Wittbrodt BT, Anzalone NC, et al.
393 Reversing the Trend of Large Scale and Centralization in Manufacturing: The Case of
394 Distributed Manufacturing of Customizable 3-D-Printable Self-Adjustable Glasses. 2014
395 [cited 9 Aug 2024]. doi:10.12924/cis2014.02010030

- 396 14. Gwamuri J, Wittbrodt BT, Anzalone NC, Pearce JM. Reversing the Trend of Large Scale
397 and Centralization in Manufacturing: The Case of Distributed Manufacturing of
398 Customizable 3-D-Printable Self-Adjustable Glasses. Rochester, NY; 2014. Available:
399 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3330068>
- 400 15. Laplume A, Anzalone GC, Pearce JM. Open-source, self-replicating 3-D printer factory for
401 small-business manufacturing. *Int J Adv Manuf Technol*. 2016;85: 633–642.
402 doi:10.1007/s00170-015-7970-9
- 403 16. Bogle A. Can UPS Help Make 3-D Printing Mainstream? *Slate*. 2 Aug 2013. Available:
404 [https://slate.com/technology/2013/08/ups-plans-to-test-3-d-printing-services-in-u-s-](https://slate.com/technology/2013/08/ups-plans-to-test-3-d-printing-services-in-u-s-stores.html)
405 [stores.html](https://slate.com/technology/2013/08/ups-plans-to-test-3-d-printing-services-in-u-s-stores.html). Accessed 9 Aug 2024.
- 406 17. Kantaros A, Diegel O, Piromalis D, Tsaramirsis G, Khadidos AO, Khadidos AO, et al. 3D
407 printing: Making an innovative technology widely accessible through makerspaces and
408 outsourced services. *Mater Today Proc*. 2022;49: 2712–2723.
409 doi:10.1016/j.matpr.2021.09.074
- 410 18. Seo-Zindy R, Heeks R. Researching the Emergence of 3D Printing, Makerspaces,
411 Hackerspaces and FabLabs in the Global South: A Scoping Review and Research Agenda
412 on Digital Innovation and Fabrication Networks. *Electron J Inf Syst Dev Ctries*. 2017;80:
413 1–24. doi:10.1002/j.1681-4835.2017.tb00589.x
- 414 19. Beltagui A, Sesis A, Stylos N. A bricolage perspective on democratising innovation: The
415 case of 3D printing in makerspaces. *Technol Forecast Soc Change*. 2021;163: 120453.
416 doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120453
- 417 20. Byard DJ, Woern AL, Oakley RB, Fiedler MJ, Snabes SL, Pearce JM. Green fab lab
418 applications of large-area waste polymer-based additive manufacturing. *Addit Manuf*.
419 2019;27: 515–525. doi:10.1016/j.addma.2019.03.006
- 420 21. Pryor S. Implementing a 3D Printing Service in an Academic Library. *J Libr Adm*.
421 2014;54: 1–10. doi:10.1080/01930826.2014.893110
- 422 22. Michele Moorefield-Lang H. Makers in the library: case studies of 3D printers and maker
423 spaces in library settings. *Libr Hi Tech*. 2014;32: 583–593. doi:10.1108/LHT-06-2014-
424 0056
- 425 23. Moorefield-Lang H. Change in the Making: Makerspaces and the Ever-Changing
426 Landscape of Libraries. *TechTrends*. 2015;59: 107–112. doi:10.1007/s11528-015-0860-z
- 427 24. Polymers for 3D Printing and Customized Additive Manufacturing | *Chemical Reviews*.
428 [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available: <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/full/10.1021/acs.chemrev.7b00074>
- 429 25. Oberloier S, Pearce JM. General Design Procedure for Free and Open-Source Hardware for
430 Scientific Equipment. *Designs*. 2018;2: 2. doi:10.3390/designs2010002

- 431 26. Weber S. The Success of Open Source. Harvard University Press; 2005.
432 doi:10.4159/9780674044999
- 433 27. Bowyer A. 3D Printing and Humanity's First Imperfect Replicator. 3D Print Addit Manuf.
434 2014;1: 4–5. doi:10.1089/3dp.2013.0003
- 435 28. Sells E, Bailard S, Smith Z, Bowyer A, Olliver V. RepRap: The Replicating Rapid
436 Prototyper: Maximizing Customizability by Breeding the Means of Production. Handbook
437 of Research in Mass Customization and Personalization. World Scientific Publishing
438 Company; 2009. pp. 568–580. doi:10.1142/9789814280280_0028
- 439 29. Jones R, Haufe P, Sells E, Irvani P, Olliver V, Palmer C, et al. RepRap – the replicating
440 rapid prototyper. Robotica. 2011;29: 177–191. doi:10.1017/S026357471000069X
- 441 30. Wittbrodt BT, Glover AG, Laureto J, Anzalone GC, Oppliger D, Irwin JL, et al. Life-cycle
442 economic analysis of distributed manufacturing with open-source 3-D printers.
443 Mechatronics. 2013;23: 713–726. doi:10.1016/j.mechatronics.2013.06.002
- 444 31. Technologies | Free Full-Text | Emergence of Home Manufacturing in the Developed
445 World: Return on Investment for Open-Source 3-D Printers. [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available:
446 <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7080/5/1/7>
- 447 32. Petersen EE, Pearce J. Emergence of Home Manufacturing in the Developed World: Return
448 on Investment for Open-Source 3-D Printers. Technologies. 2017;5: 7.
449 doi:10.3390/technologies5010007
- 450 33. Business O a PTC. Onshape | Product Development Platform. [cited 9 Aug 2024].
451 Available: <https://www.onshape.com/en/>
- 452 34. Sinha A, Kutnar A. Carbon Footprint versus Performance of Aluminum, Plastic, and Wood
453 Window Frames from Cradle to Gate. Buildings. 2012;2: 542–553.
454 doi:10.3390/buildings2040542
- 455 35. Hardwood vs Softwood - Difference and Comparison | Diffen. [cited 9 Aug 2024].
456 Available: https://www.diffen.com/difference/Hardwood_vs_Softwood
- 457 36. Alexandria Moulding Hardwood Dowel 7/8 In. x 48 In. Brown. In: The Home Depot
458 Canada [Internet]. [cited 23 Oct 2024]. Available:
459 [https://www.homedepot.ca/product/alexandria-moulding-hardwood-dowel-7-8-in-x-48-in-](https://www.homedepot.ca/product/alexandria-moulding-hardwood-dowel-7-8-in-x-48-in-brown/1000115273)
460 [brown/1000115273](https://www.homedepot.ca/product/alexandria-moulding-hardwood-dowel-7-8-in-x-48-in-brown/1000115273)
- 461 37. PolyLite™ PETG. In: Polymaker US [Internet]. [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available:
462 <https://us.polymaker.com/products/polylite-petg>
- 463 38. NinjaFlex 3D Printer Filament (85A) - NinjaTek. [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available:
464 <https://ninjatek.com/shop/ninjaflex/>

- 465 39. LulzBot TAZ Workhorse+ 3D Printer. In: LulzBot [Internet]. [cited 9 Aug 2024].
466 Available: [https://lulzbot.com/store/lulzbot-3d-printer-taz-workhorse-boxed-for-retail-na-](https://lulzbot.com/store/lulzbot-3d-printer-taz-workhorse-boxed-for-retail-na-kt-pr0064na?ref=10734)
467 [kt-pr0064na?ref=10734](https://lulzbot.com/store/lulzbot-3d-printer-taz-workhorse-boxed-for-retail-na-kt-pr0064na?ref=10734)
- 468 40. Original Prusa i3 MK3S+ | Original Prusa 3D printers directly from Josef Prusa. In:
469 Prusa3D by Josef Prusa [Internet]. [cited 9 Aug 2024]. Available:
470 <https://www.prusa3d.com/category/original-prusa-i3-mk3s/>
- 471 41. Crutches. In: Physiopedia [Internet]. 2024 [cited 25 Oct 2024]. Available:
472 <https://www.physio-pedia.com/Crutches>
- 473 42. BME_Stair_Assist_Bench_PreliminaryReport.pdf. Available:
474 [https://bmedesign.engr.wisc.edu/projects/f23/stair_assist_bench/file/view/d40f36b7-b947-](https://bmedesign.engr.wisc.edu/projects/f23/stair_assist_bench/file/view/d40f36b7-b947-4ecf-a8b1-25bafc5e5c21/BME_Stair_Assist_Bench_PreliminaryReport.pdf)
475 [4ecf-a8b1-25bafc5e5c21/BME_Stair_Assist_Bench_PreliminaryReport.pdf](https://bmedesign.engr.wisc.edu/projects/f23/stair_assist_bench/file/view/d40f36b7-b947-4ecf-a8b1-25bafc5e5c21/BME_Stair_Assist_Bench_PreliminaryReport.pdf)
- 476 43. BME_Step_by_Step_Final_Report.pdf. Available:
477 [https://bmedesign.engr.wisc.edu/projects/f23/stair_assist_bench/file/view/1b995ced-f94c-](https://bmedesign.engr.wisc.edu/projects/f23/stair_assist_bench/file/view/1b995ced-f94c-4b4e-996f-46f22fee0e77/BME_Step_by_Step_Final_Report.pdf)
478 [4b4e-996f-46f22fee0e77/BME_Step_by_Step_Final_Report.pdf](https://bmedesign.engr.wisc.edu/projects/f23/stair_assist_bench/file/view/1b995ced-f94c-4b4e-996f-46f22fee0e77/BME_Step_by_Step_Final_Report.pdf)
- 479 44. Pearce JM, Reeves J, So A, Woods M, Mottaghi M, Cert O. Open source crutch. 2024
480 [cited 21 Oct 2024]. Available: <https://osf.io/4b89v/>
- 481 45. Medline Walking Forearm Crutches, Lightweight Aluminum, 250lb Weight Capacity, 1
482 Pair. In: Walmart.com [Internet]. [cited 8 Oct 2024]. Available:
483 [https://www.walmart.com/ip/Medline-Walking-Forearm-Crutches-Lightweight-Aluminum-](https://www.walmart.com/ip/Medline-Walking-Forearm-Crutches-Lightweight-Aluminum-250lb-Weight-Capacity-1-Pair/22790105)
484 [250lb-Weight-Capacity-1-Pair/22790105](https://www.walmart.com/ip/Medline-Walking-Forearm-Crutches-Lightweight-Aluminum-250lb-Weight-Capacity-1-Pair/22790105)
- 485 46. Table 1 Mean height, weight, body mass index (BMI) and prevalence of obesity, by
486 collection method and sex, household population aged 18 to 79, Canada, 2008, 2007 to
487 2009, and 2005. [cited 8 Oct 2024]. Available: [https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-003-x/2011003/article/11533/tbl/tbl1-eng.htm)
488 [003-x/2011003/article/11533/tbl/tbl1-eng.htm](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-003-x/2011003/article/11533/tbl/tbl1-eng.htm)
- 489 47. HEALTHBAZAAR Forearm Crutches for Adults, Fashionable Elbow Crutches with
490 Ergonomic Handgrips - Stepless Adjustable Height - All Terrain Tip & Slip-Resistant Base
491 - Magnetic Grip... : Amazon.ca: Health & Personal Care. [cited 8 Oct 2024]. Available:
492 [https://www.amazon.ca/HEALTHBAZAAR-Crutches-Fashionable-Ergonomic-](https://www.amazon.ca/HEALTHBAZAAR-Crutches-Fashionable-Ergonomic-Handgrips/dp/B0CPHSWZB8/)
493 [Handgrips/dp/B0CPHSWZB8/](https://www.amazon.ca/HEALTHBAZAAR-Crutches-Fashionable-Ergonomic-Handgrips/dp/B0CPHSWZB8/)
- 494 48. Zhong S, Pearce JM. Tightening the loop on the circular economy: Coupled distributed
495 recycling and manufacturing with recyclebot and RepRap 3-D printing. *Resour Conserv*
496 *Recycl.* 2018;128: 48–58. doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.09.023
- 497 49. Dertinger SC, Gallup N, Tanikella NG, Grasso M, Vahid S, Foot PJS, et al. Technical
498 pathways for distributed recycling of polymer composites for distributed manufacturing:
499 Windshield wiper blades. *Resour Conserv Recycl.* 2020;157: 104810.
500 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104810

- 501 50. Baechler C, DeVuono M, Pearce JM. Distributed recycling of waste polymer into RepRap
502 feedstock. *Rapid Prototyp J.* 2013;19: 118–125. doi:10.1108/13552541311302978
- 503 51. Santander P, Cruz Sanchez FA, Boudaoud H, Camargo M. Closed loop supply chain
504 network for local and distributed plastic recycling for 3D printing: a MILP-based
505 optimization approach. *Resour Conserv Recycl.* 2020;154: 104531.
506 doi:10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104531
- 507 52. Cruz Sanchez FA, Boudaoud H, Camargo M, Pearce JM. Plastic recycling in additive
508 manufacturing: A systematic literature review and opportunities for the circular economy. *J*
509 *Clean Prod.* 2020;264: 121602. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121602
- 510 53. Woern AL, McCaslin JR, Pringle AM, Pearce JM. RepRapable Recyclebot: Open source 3-
511 D printable extruder for converting plastic to 3-D printing filament. *HardwareX.* 2018;4:
512 e00026. doi:10.1016/j.ohx.2018.e00026
- 513 54. Kreiger M, Pearce JM. Environmental Life Cycle Analysis of Distributed Three-
514 Dimensional Printing and Conventional Manufacturing of Polymer Products. *ACS Sustain*
515 *Chem Eng.* 2013;1: 1511–1519. doi:10.1021/sc400093k
- 516 55. Kreiger M, Pearce JM. Environmental Impacts of Distributed Manufacturing from 3-D
517 Printing of Polymer Components and Products. *MRS Online Proc Libr OPL.* 2013;1492:
518 85–90. doi:10.1557/opl.2013.319
- 519 56. Wittbrodt B, Pearce JM. The effects of PLA color on material properties of 3-D printed
520 components. *Addit Manuf.* 2015;8: 110–116. doi:10.1016/j.addma.2015.09.006
- 521