

Table 2. Summary of PEQ ambulation scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Mean 1 (SD)	Mean 2 (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20–39 yr; 47% 40–59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	68.5 (22.0)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU/ Kowloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive	269	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	63.1 (21.1)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	55.3 ± 3.1		
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	65.9 (18.0)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive	151	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4%HD	56.1 (range: 16–90)	28% F; 72% M			
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	77.1 (19.4)	79.4 (17.7)	0.451
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	PeLite vs. Alpha Liner Rectified vs.	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	78.6 (17.5)	71.6 (24.0)	0.414
Engsberg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	87.0 (14.3)	84.3 (20.6)	0.592
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range:30–57)	40% F; 60% M	60.1 (24.6)	65.4 (24.1)	0.122
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Mix of non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20–39 yr; 28% 40–59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	70.0 (13.5)	71.0 (18.7)	0.756
Miller W. <i>University of British Columbia</i>	Modified PEQ Mobility Scale <sup>a</sup>	60	72% TT; 28% TF	58.4 (15.5)	27% F; 73% M	78 (22)		

<sup>a</sup>0 to 10 ordinal scale substituted for visual analog format. Values scaled to match visual analog range.

Table 3. Summary of PEQ appearance scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20-39 yr; 47% 40-59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	73.3 (20.7)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU./Kowloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	281	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	73.4 (18.1)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	73.3 ± 2.4		
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	86.8 (2.6)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive. Japanese translation	114	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4%HD	56.1 (range: 16-90)	28% F; 72% M	62.0 919.1)		
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	80.1 (18.4)	79.7 (14.6)	0.374
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	PeLite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	78.7 (17.4)	84.7 (14.1)	0.094
Engsborg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	80.4 (12.5)	78.2 (12.9)	0.373
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30-57)	40% F; 60% M	57.4 (29.6)	65.2 (19.0)	0.192
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Various non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20-39 yr; 28% 40-59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	73.0 (15.9)	76.0 (17.8)	0.421

Table 4. Summary of PEQ frustration scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20-39 yr; 47% 40-59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	63.4 <sup>a</sup> (32.7)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU./Kowloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	281	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	75.0 (26.4)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	69.1 ± 4.0		
Trantowski-Farrrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	85.8 (26.2)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive. Japanese translation	147	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4%HD	56.1 (range: 16-90)	28% F; 72% M	62.8 (32.7)		
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	67.3 (31.1)	71.6 (24.4)	0.561
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	PeLite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	71.1 (34.0)	63.2 (27.1)	0.638
Engsberg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	83.0 (23.0)	74.6 (31.6)	0.210
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30-57)	40% F; 60% M	47.8 (24.1)	67.1 (29.5)	0.171
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Various non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20-39 yr; 28% 40-59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	75.0 (19.7)	73.0 (25.6)	0.783

<sup>a</sup>Complement of value reported in literature

Table 5. Summary of PEQ perceived response scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Mean 1 (SD)	Mean 2 (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. PRS	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20-39 yr; 47% 40 - 59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	90.6 (16.1)		
Boone DA. HKPU/ Kouloon Hospital	Descriptive	281	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	79.8 (18.8)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. Loyola University	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	86.6 ± 2.4		
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. Loyola Univ.	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	94.9 (4.83)		
Tobimatsu Y. Tohoku University	Descriptive	151	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4% HD	56.1 (range: 16-90)	28% F; 72% M			
Coleman KL. PRS	SACH vs. FlexWalk Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	89.2 (13.6)	93.6 (7.0)	0.028
Coleman KL. PRS	PeLite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	89.6 (13.5)	88.7 (13.1)	0.636
Engsberg J. Barnes Jewish Hospital	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	98.2 (3.1)	92.3 (13.4)	0.030
Kaufman K. Mayo Clinic	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30-57)	40% F; 60% M	88.8 (16.9)	90.36 (7.98)	0.868
Willingham L, Smith D. PRS	Various non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20-39; 28% 40-59; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	91.8 (13.5)	96.5 (3.8)	0.100

Table 6. Summary of PEQ residual limb health scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20–39 yr; 47% 40–59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	71.8 (23.3)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU/ Kowloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	279	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	70.9 (19.0)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	79.7 ± 2.3		
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	86.4 (8.9)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive. Japanese translation	145	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4% HD	56.1 (range: 16–90)	28% F; 72% M	58.9 (23.2)		
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	77.4 (15.5)	78.8 (15.4)	0.456
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	PeLite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	64.5 (23.1)	65.1 (19.8)	0.893
Engsberg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	74.5 (16.7)	76.0 (17.4)	0.693
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30–57)	40% F; 60% M	75.1 (20.0)	66.3 (25.6)	0.267
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Various non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	Mean = 48 yr; 44% 20–39 yr; 28% 40–59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	82.0 (12.8)	79.0 (15.2)	0.333

Table 7. Summary of PEQ social burden scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. PRS	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20-39 yr; 47% 40-59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	79.4 <sup>a</sup> (24.5)		
Boone DA. HKPU./Kowloon Hospital	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	246	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	76.6 (24.0)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. Loyola University	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	66.4 ± 4.0		
Trantowski-Farell, Pinzur M. Loyola University	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	78.9 (11.3)		
Tobimatsu Y. Tohoku University	Descriptive. Japanese translation	122	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4%HD	56.1 (range: 16-90)	28% F; 72% M	80.2 (17.3)		
Coleman KL. PRS	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	87.6 (19.4)	87.9 (15.0)	0.294
Coleman KL. PRS	PeLite vs. Alpha Liner Rectified vs.	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	82.0 (24.3)	82.1 (17.2)	0.970
Engsberg J. Barnes Jewish Hospital	Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	95.5 (8.9)	94.5 (7.3)	0.565
Kaufman K. Mayo Clinic	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30-57)	40% F; 60% M	79.3 (27.2)	85.7 (18.7)	0.412
Willingham L, Smith D. PRS	Various non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20-39 yr; 28% 40-59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	91.0 (10.0)	87.0 (14.9)	0.320

<sup>a</sup>Complement of value reported in literature.

Table 8. Summary of PEQ sounds scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20–39 yr; 47% 40–59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	62.7 (31.2)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU/ Kouloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	279	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	79.4 (24.2)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M			
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	97.2 (2.8)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive. Japanese translation	144	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4%HD	56.1 (range: 16–90)	28% F; 72% M	63.7 (31.4)		
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	72.9 (27.3)	67.2 (32.5)	0.256
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	Pelite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	72.8 (32.7)	63.4 (31.6)	0.340
Engsberg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	62.6 (29.2)	69.4 (25.2)	0.252
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30–57)	40% F; 60% M	46.1 (31.1)	64.1 (27.2)	0.072
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Various non- microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20–39 yr; 28% 40–59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	61.0 (23.2)	65.0 (26.2)	0.506

Table 9. Summary of PEQ utility scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20-39 yr; 47% 40-59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	72.0 (20.5)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU./Kouloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	281	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	75.0 (17.0)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	65.7 ± 2.9		
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	77.3 (18.4)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive. Japanese translation	146	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4% HD	56.1 (range: 16-90)	28% F; 72% M	57.5 (22.9)		
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	74.7 (17.6)	78.3 (17.2)	0.037
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	PelLite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	70.7 (23.7)	62.8 (25.4)	0.305
Engsberg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	79.7 (14.4)	79.2 (18.2)	0.903
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30-57)	40% F; 60% M	65.3 (23.0)	67.6 (19.5)	0.812
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Various non-microprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20-39 yr; 28% 40-59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	71.0 (14.0)	73.0 (21.4)	0.527

Table 10. Summary of PEQ well being scale results: Multiple studies

Investigator and Site	Study	N	Amputation	Age Mean (SD)	Gender	Condition 1 Mean (SD)	Condition 2 Mean (SD)	p Value
Legro MW. <i>PRS</i>	Descriptive: PEQ Validation	92	63% TT; 25% TF; 3% TK; 9% Symes	13% 20–39 yr; 47% 40–59 yr; 40% over 60 yr	14% F; 86% M	71.6 (24.4)		
Boone DA. <i>HKPU/ Kowloon Hospital</i>	Descriptive. Chinese translation.	281	66% TT; 25% TF; 3% Foot; 1% Bilat.; 3% TK; 1% Other	59.7 (15.9)	23% F; 77% M	71.9 (20.9)		
Harness N, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive	60	dysvascular TT (73% diabetes)	65.9 ± 1.4	23% F; 77% M	67 ± 3.2		
Trantowski-Farrell, Pinzur M. <i>Loyola University</i>	Descriptive: PEQ vs. 6-min walk	6	dysvascular TT	66.0 (11.4)	33% F; 67% M	79.0 (27.4)		
Tobimatsu Y. <i>Tohoku University</i>	Descriptive. Japanese translation	147	49% TT; 3% TK; 44% TF; 4% HD	56.1 (range: 16–90)	28% F; 72% M	66.7 (24.7)		
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	SACH vs. FlexWalk II Foot	32	TT	48.2 (11.4)	9% F; 91% M	82.6 (16.8)	83.4 (15.7)	0.509
Coleman KL. <i>PRS</i>	PelLite vs. Alpha Liner	13	TT	49.4 (9.6)	23% F; 77% M	82.4 (16.7)	80.5 (18.9)	0.791
Engsberg J. <i>Barnes Jewish Hospital</i>	Rectified vs. Unrectified Socket	27	TT	47 (10)	11% F; 89% M	87.3 (11.6)	88.5 (18.4)	0.731
Kaufman K. <i>Mayo Clinic</i>	Mauch vs. C-Leg	5	TF	43 (range: 30–57)	40% F; 60% M	75.4 (21.5)	80.4 (19.7)	0.213
Willingham L, Smith D. <i>PRS</i>	Various nonmicroprocessor knees vs. C-Leg	18	TF	mean = 48 yr; 44% 20–39 yr; 28% 40–59 yr; 28% > 60 yr	28% F; 72% M	75.0 (2.3)	75.0 (2.0)	0.644