



1. VHA Prosthetic Clinical Management Program (PCMP). Clinical practice recommendations: microprocessor knees, 2004. See: Berry D. Microprocessor prosthetic knees. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am* 2006; 17:91-113.
2. Kirker S, Keymer S, Talbot J et al. An assessment of the intelligent knee prosthesis. *Clin Rehabil* 1996; 10(3):267-73.
3. Datta D, Howitt J. Conventional versus microchip controlled pneumatic swing phase control for trans-femoral amputees: user's verdict. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 1998; 22(2):129-35.
4. Buckley JG, Spence WD, Solomonidis SE. Energy cost of walking: comparison of "Intelligent Prosthesis" with conventional mechanism. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1997; 78(3):330-3.
5. Taylor MB, Clark E, Offord EA et al. A comparison of energy expenditure by a high level trans-femoral amputee using the Intelligent Prosthesis and conventionally damped prosthetic limbs. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 1996; 20(2):116-21.
6. Datta D, Heller B, Howitt J. A comparative evaluation of oxygen consumption and gait pattern in amputees using Intelligent Prostheses and conventionally damped knee swing-phase control. *Clin Rehabil* 2005; 19(4):398-403. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Office of Research and Development, Health Service Research and Development Service, Management Decision and Research Center, Technology Assessment Program. Computerized lower limb prosthesis. VA Technology Assessment Program Short Report No. 2. Boston, Mass: MDRC.
7. Hafner BJ, Willingham LL, Buell NC et al. Evaluation of function, performance, and preference as transfemoral amputees transition from mechanical to microprocessor control of the prosthetic knee. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2007; 88(2):207-17.
8. Orendurff MS, Segal AD, Klute GK et al. Gait efficiency using the C-Leg. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2006; 43(2):239-46.
9. Klute GK, Berge JS, Orendurff MS et al. Prosthetic intervention effects on activity of lower-extremity amputees. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2006; 87(5):717-22.
10. Williams RM, Turner AP, Orendurff M et al. Does having a computerized prosthetic knee influence cognitive performance during amputee walking? *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2006; 87(7):989-94.
11. Johansson JL, Sherrill DM, Riley PO et al. A clinical comparison of variable-damping and mechanically passive prosthetic knee devices. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 2005; 84(8):563-75.
12. Seymour R, Engbretson B, Kott K et al. Comparison between the C-leg(R) microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee and non-microprocessor control prosthetic knees: a preliminary study of energy expenditure, obstacle course performance, and quality of life survey. *Prosthet Orthot Int* 2007; 31(1):51-61.
13. Swanson E, Stube J, Edman P. Function and body image levels in individuals with transfemoral amputations using the C-Leg. *J Prosthet Orthot* 2005; 17(3): 80-4.

® is not a registered mark of this health plan.

[Back](#)