

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Comparative Effectiveness Research:

### Microprocessor Controlled versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms

#### C-Leg® versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Knees

1. Blumentritt S, Schmalz T, Jarasch R: Safety of C-Leg: Biomechanical Tests. *Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics*, 2009; 21(1): 2-17.
2. Highsmith MJ, Kahle JT, Fox JL, Shaw KL: Decreased Heart Rate in a Geriatric Client after Physical Therapy Intervention and Accommodation with the C-Leg. *Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics*, 2009; 21(1) 43-47.
3. Berry D, Olson MD, Larntz K: Perceived Stability, Function and Satisfaction among Transfemoral Amputees using Microprocessor and Non-microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knees: A Multicenter Study. *Journal of Prosthetics and Orthotics*, 2009; 21(1):32-42.
4. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, McCrady SK, Padgett DJ, Joyner MJ: Energy Expenditure and Activity Level of Transfemoral Amputees using Passive Mechanical and Microprocessor-controlled Prosthetic Knees. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 2008; 89(7):1380-1385.
5. Gerzeli S, Torbica A, Fattore G: Cost utility analysis of knee prosthesis with complete microprocessor control (C-leg) compared with mechanical technology in trans-femoral amputees. *European Journal of Health Economics*, 2008; (e-publication ahead of print).
6. Kahle JT, Highsmith MJ, Hubbard SL: Comparison of Non-microprocessor Knee Mechanism versus C-Leg on Prosthesis Evaluation Questionnaire, Stumbles, Falls, Walking Tests, Stair Descent, and Knee Preference. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*; 2008; 45 (1): 1-14.
7. Brodkorb TH, Henniksson M, Johanneson-Munk K, Thidell F: Cost-effectiveness of C-leg compared with non-microprocessor-controlled knees: a modeling approach. *Archives Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*; 2008 89(1): 24-30.
8. Kaufman KR, Levine JA, Brey RH, et al. Gait and Balance of transfemoral amputees using passive mechanical and microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knees. *Gait and Posture*. 2007; 26: 489-493
9. Seymour R, Engbretson B, Kott K, Ordway N, Brooks G, Crannell J, Hickernell E, Wheller K: Comparison between the C-leg(R)

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Comparative Effectiveness Research:

### Microprocessor Controlled versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms

- microprocessor-controlled prosthetic knee and non-microprocessor control prosthetic knees: A preliminary study of energy expenditure, obstacle course performance, and quality of life survey. *Prosthetics and Orthotics International* 2007; 31(1): 51 – 61.
10. Schmalz T, Blumentritt S, Marx B: Biomechanical Analysis of Stair Ambulation in Lower Limb Amputees. *Gait and Posture*. 2007; 25: 267-278.
  11. Hafner BJ, Willingham LL, Buell NC, Allyn KJ, Smith DG: Evaluation of Function, Performance, and Preference as Transfemoral Amputees Transition from Mechanical to Microprocessor Control of the Prosthetic Knee. *Archives Physical Medicine Rehabilitation*. 2007; 88(2): 207-17.
  12. Bunce DJ, Breakey JW: The Impact of C-Leg on the Physical and Psychological Adjustment to Transfemoral Amputation. *Journal of Prosthetics & Orthotics*. 2007; 19(1): 7-14.
  13. Segal AD, Orendurff MS, Klute GK, McDowell ML, Pecoraro JA, Shofer J, Czerniecki JM: Kinematic and Kinetic Comparisons of Transfemoral Amputee Gait using C-Leg and Mauch SNS Prosthetic Knees. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development*. 2006; 43(7): 857-870.
  14. Klute GK, et al: Prosthetic Intervention Effects on Activity of Lower Extremity Amputees. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2006; 87: 717-722.
  15. Williams RM et al: Does Having a Computerized Prosthetic Knee Influence Cognitive Performance during Amputee Walking? *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2006; 87: 989-994.
  16. Orendurff MS et al: Gait Efficiency Using the C-Leg. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*. 2006; 43(2):239-246.
  17. Wetz HH, Hafkemeyer U, Drerup B: The Influence of the C-Leg Knee-Shin System from the Otto Bock Company in the Care of Above-Knee Amputees: A Clinical-Biomechanical Study to Define Indications. *Orthopade*. 2005; 34(4):298, 300-314, 316-319.
  18. Perry J, et al: Energy Expenditure and Gait Characteristics of a Bilateral Amputee Walking with C-Leg Prostheses Compared with Stubby and

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Comparative Effectiveness Research:

### Microprocessor Controlled versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms

- Conventional Articulating Prostheses. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2004; 85: 1711-1717.
19. Schmalz T, et al: Energy Expenditure and Biomechanical Characteristics of Lower Limb Amputee Gait: Influence of Prosthetic Alignment and Different Prosthetic Components. *Gait and Posture*. 2003; 16: 255-263.
20. Stinus H: Biomechanics and Evaluation of the Microprocessor-Controlled C-Leg Exoprosthesis Knee Joint. *Z Orthop Ihre Grenzgeb*, 2000; 138(2): 278-282.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Comparative Effectiveness Research:

### Microprocessor Controlled versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms

#### C-Leg® versus other Microprocessor Controlled Knees

21. Chin T, et al: Comparison of Different Microprocessor Controlled Knee Joints on the Energy Consumption during Walking in Transfemoral Amputees: Intelligent Knee Prosthesis (IP) versus C-Leg. *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*. 2006 30(1): 73-80.
22. Johansson JL et al: A Clinical Comparison of Variable Damping and Mechanical Passive Prosthetic Knee Devices. *American Journal of Phys Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2005; 84: 563-575. (C-Leg® versus Rheo®)

#### Adaptive® versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Knees

23. Jepson F, Datta D, Harris I, Heller B, Howitt J, McLean J: A comparative evaluation of the Adaptive knee and Catech knee joints: a preliminary study. *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*. 2008; 32(1): 84-92.

#### Intelligent Prosthesis® versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Knees

24. Chin T, et al: Energy Expenditure during Walking in Amputees after Disarticulation of the Hip. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery (British)*. 2005; 87(1):117-119.
25. Datta D, et al: A Comparative Evaluation of Oxygen Consumption and Gait Pattern in Amputees Using Intelligent Prostheses and Conventionally Damped Knee Swing-Phase Control. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2005; 19: 398-403.
26. Chin T, et al: Effect of Intelligent Prosthesis on the Walking Ability of Young Transfemoral Amputees: Comparison of IP Users with Able-bodied People. *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2003; 82(6): 447-451.
27. Heller BW: A Pilot Study Comparing the Cognitive Demand of Walking for Transfemoral Amputees Using the Intelligent Prosthesis with that Using Conventionally Damping Knees. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2000; 14: 518-522.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Comparative Effectiveness Research:

#### Microprocessor Controlled versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms

28. Chin T, et al: The Efficacy of Physiological Cost Index Measurement of a Subject Walking with an Intelligent Prosthesis. *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*. 1999; 23(1):45-49.
29. Datta D, et al: Conventional Versus Microchip Controlled Pneumatic Swing Phase Control for Trans-Femoral Amputees: User's Verdict. *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*. 1998; 22(2): 129-135.
30. Buckley JG, et al: Energy Cost of Walking: Comparison of Intelligent Prosthesis with Conventional Mechanism. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 1997; 78: 330-333
31. Taylor MB, et al: A Comparison of Energy Expenditure by a High Level Trans-Femoral Amputee Using the Intelligent Prosthesis and Conventionally Damped Prosthetic Limbs. *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*. 1996; 20(2): 116-121.

#### Rheo® Knee versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Knees

32. Johansson JL et al: A Clinical Comparison of Variable Damping and Mechanical Passive Prosthetic Knee Devices. *American Journal of Phys Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2005; 84: 563-575.
33. Herr H, et al: User-Adaptive Control of a Magnetorheological Prosthetic Knee. *Industrial Robot*. 2003; 1: 42-55.

#### Review Publications

1. Fergason J: Clinical Application of Advanced Prosthetic Technology: An Update. *Journal of Trauma, Injury, Infection and Critical Care*. 2007; 62: S6.
2. Berry D: Microprocessor Prosthetic Knees. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*. 2006; 17: 91-113.
3. Collins DM et al: Review of Research on Prosthetic Devices for Lower Limb Extremity Amputation. *Critical Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*. 2006; 34(5): 379-438.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Comparative Effectiveness Research:

#### Microprocessor Controlled versus Non-Microprocessor Controlled Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms

4. Schaffer HM: Advances in Prosthetic Technology Provide More Options to Amputees. *Lippincott's Case Management*. 2006; 11(5): 282-283.
5. Flood KM et al: Limb Deficiency and Prosthetic Management. 2. Aging with Limb Loss. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2006; 87: S10-S14.
6. Esquenazi A: Amputation Rehabilitation and Prosthetic Restoration. From Surgery to Community Reintegration. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2004; 26(14/15): 831-836.
7. Michael JW: Modern Prosthetic Knee Mechanisms. *Clinical Orthopedics and Related Research*. 1999; 361: 39-47.