Performance Evaluation of Lower Limb Exoskeletons: A Systematic Review

David Pinto-Fernandez[†*], Diego Torricelli[†*], Maria del Carmen Sanchez-Villamanan[†], Felix Aller[‡], Katja Mombaur[‡], Roberto Conti[§], Nicola Vitiello[¶], Juan C. Moreno[†], and Jose Luis Pons[‖**††]

*Equal Contribution. Corresponding e-mail: diego.torricelli@csic.es
†Neural Rehabilitation Group, Cajal Institute, Spanish Research Council, Madrid, Spain
‡Chair Optimization, Robotics and Biomechanics (ORB), Institute of Computer Engineering (ZITI),
Heidelberg University, Heidelberg, Germany
§IUVO S.R.L, Pontedera, Italy
¶The BioRobotics Institute, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pontedera, Italy
‖Scientific Chair, Legs & Walking AbilityLab, Shirley Ryan AbilityLab (formerly Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago), Chicago, USA
**Professor, Dept. of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Feinberg School of Medicine;
Dept. of Biomedical Engineering & Dept. of Mechanical Engineering,
McCormick School of Engineering, Northwestern University, Chicago, USA
††Professor, Cajal Institute, CSIC, Madrid, Spain

Abstract—**Benchmarks have long been used to verify and compare the readiness level of different technologies in many application domains. In the field of wearable robots, the lack of a recognized benchmarking methodology is one important impediment that may hamper the efficient translation of research prototypes into actual products. At the same time, an exponentially growing number of research studies are addressing the problem of quantifying the performance of robotic exoskeletons, resulting in a rich and highly heterogeneous picture of methods, variables and protocols. This review aims to organize this information, and identify the most promising performance indicators that can be converted into practical benchmarks. We focus our analysis on lower limb functions, including a wide spectrum of motor skills and performance indicators. We found that, in general, the evaluation of lower limb exoskeletons is still largely focused on straight walking, with poor coverage of most of the basic motor skills that make up the activities of daily life. Our analysis also reveals a clear bias towards generic kinematics and kinetic indicators, in spite of the metrics of human-robot interaction. Based on these results, we identify and discuss a number of promising research directions that may help the community to attain a comprehensive benchmarking methodology for robot-assisted locomotion more efficiently.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Wearable robots are experiencing an unprecedented era. Many research prototypes have been successfully turned into commercial products and are now facing a rapidly evolving market, characterized by diverse applications and needs. While the potential of wearable robotics technology is indisputable, demonstrating its value on a quantitative basis is challenging. Previous reviews have highlighted weaknesses and difficulties in providing reliable evidence of the clinical usefulness of these devices, possibly due to a lack of clear and rigorous evaluation methods [1], [2]. At the same time, the robotics community has demonstrated an increasing interest in benchmarking as a way to scientifically assess and compare the performance of exoskeletons [3]. However, no agreed methodology, best

practices or standards have been made formally available so far [4]. Currently, the principal approach to compare exoskeletons has been through competitions, such as Cybathlon [5]. The major drawback of competitions is that scores are usually based on very simple metrics, for example accomplishment of a task and/or time to completion, which can hardly be used to characterize the multiple aspects of exoskeleton performance. Fortunately, the scientific literature has produced hundreds of studies that focused, directly or indirectly, on the evaluation of exoskeletons, which has resulted in a multitude of available methods and variables. However, the great variability in procedures, experimental settings and metrics, makes these methods difficult to apply to other devices and environments, which impedes an objective comparison across systems. A unified and broadly applicable benchmarking methodology for performance evaluation of wearable robotic systems is therefore eagerly anticipated. In line with this objective, this review aims to identify and bring together the most promising methods, metrics and experimental procedures available in the literature to assess robotic-assisted motor skills. We focused on lower limb exoskeletons for gait assistance and rehabilitation, following on our previous efforts in the field of benchmarking bipedal locomotion [6]. We screened more than nine hundred papers which, after a careful selection process, resulted in a total of 187 relevant publications. We structured our analysis to address two main research questions:

- Which motor skills are considered when evaluating the functionality of a lower limb exoskeleton?
- Which variables and metrics are used to characterize performance?

Section II presents the literature search methodology, which includes the search query, the exclusion criteria, and the taxonomy used to classify results by motor skills and perfor-

mance indicators. Section III reports the results of our analysis and identifies the most relevant trends. In Section IV we present a critical analysis of the results, addressing the research questions posed and identifying the main drawbacks and the most promising future directions. A conclusion is provided in Section V.

II. METHODS

We obtained 923 titles from an initial search of the Scopus database using the following query string on paper title, keywords and abstract, on papers published between January 1989 and April 2018:

(locomot* OR gait* OR walk* OR "body transport*") AND (test* OR assess* OR measure* OR benchmark* OR evaluat* OR quantif*) AND ("wearable robot*" OR exoskelet* OR "powered ortho*")

After reading titles and abstracts, we excluded duplicated publications and those that met one or more of the following criteria: not related to wearable robots; not focused on testing locomotion performance; not including physical prototypes; restricted to testing perception abilities of the system; focused on brain computer interfaces (BCI); focused on clinical assessment. We added a further ten publications resulting from a further search of those scenarios that produced scarce results in the previous search, for example standing, balance, soft ground, irregular terrains, or slippery surfaces. After reading the full texts, we discarded a further 24 articles, resulting in a total of 187 papers. We classified the papers using a twofold taxonomy composed of motor skills and performance indicators (PIs), as shown in Figure 1. Motor skills have been grouped into the following three categories:

- Walking skills, which included walking on flat ground, treadmill, slopes, irregular terrains, soft ground, slippery surfaces, when pushed, backwards walking, overcoming obstacles, slalom or turning, ascending or descending stairs, and walking while bearing additional weight.
- Standing skills, which included standing on moving surfaces, on slopes, in the presence of pushes, and during manipulation.
- Other skills, which included lateral stepping, crouching or kneeling, sit-to-stand or stand-to-sit, and running.

PIs were clustered into:

- Goal-level variables, which included maximum speed or minimum time, distance achievable by the robot, stability, endurance, versatility and dependability.
- Kinematics/kinetics variables, which included spatiotemporal parameters, joint or limb kinematics and kinetics, symmetry, coordination and human likeness.
- Human-robot interaction variables, which included metabolic cost, ergonomics, comfort, muscle effort, interaction forces, cognitive effort and safety.

III. RESULTS

As shown in Figure 2, the number of publications has increased exponentially over the years. The number of motor skills and PIs considered also showed an increase, but with a linear trend. The distribution of the reviewed works across the different categories is presented in Figure 1.

A. Motor Skills

Flat ground walking. This is the most frequent motor skill in the literature, with 121 publications [7]–[112], [112]–[127]. Overall, these publications cover most of the PIs included in our taxonomy (see last column of Figure 1), of which the more relevant are kinetics, kinematics, spatiotemporal parameters and maximum speed and/or minimum time.

Walking on a treadmill. This is the second most popular motor skill in the literature, with 53 publications [10], [11], [13], [24], [58], [86], [103], [105], [109], [128]–[130], [130]–[170] and 15 different PIs covered, kinematics, kinetics and spatiotemporal parameters being the most used.

Walking on slopes. We found ten publications [58], [67], [75], [76], [79], [80], [94], [117], [171], [172] covering this motor skill, spanning eight different PIs, of which max. speed/ min. time, kinematics and metabolic cost had the highest prevalence.

Walking on irregular terrains. Only two publications, [76], [173], covered this motor skill. Kinematics, kinetics, max. speed/ min. time, distance and metabolic cost were the PIs considered.

Walking on soft ground. We found only two publications, [75], [80], which considered this scenario. The evaluation of this motor skill was based on goal-level PIs, including max. speed/ min. time, distance and versatility.

Walking during pushes. Only one publication [50] was found on this motor skill. Five PIs were assessed for this evaluation: max. speed/ min. time, versatility, kinematics, kinetics and ergonomics.

Backwards walking. Only one paper [127] was found on this skill, focusing on the assessment of human-robot interaction forces.

Obstacle avoidance. We found only two papers, [75], [80], that considered this scenario, with three goal-level PIs proposed: max. speed/ min. time, distance and versatility.

Slippery surface. Only two papers, [174], [175], focused on this motor skill. Three PIs were proposed for its evaluation; these were range of motion, angles and torques.

Slalom and/or turning. Four papers, [45], [75], [80], [117], evaluated locomotion involving turns, with a very heterogeneous set of PIs (see Figure 1 for details).

Ascending and/or descending stairs. With 13 publications, [20], [31], [32], [58], [67], [79], [97], [101], [117], [147], [176]–[178], this is the fifth most considered motor skill in this review. Seven PIs were proposed for its evaluation, the most frequent being kinematics, kinetics, spatiotemporal variables and versatility.

Weight bearing. Weight bearing is the fourth most covered motor skill, with 19 publications, [9], [20], [34], [51], [53],

Fig. 1. Taxonomic overview of the reviewed works. The size of each circle (and the number inside it) indicates the number of reviewed works covering a given motor skill (row) and PI (column). Bars on the right indicate the total number of publications covering the corresponding motor skill. Bars on the bottom indicate the number of publications that proposed or used the corresponding PI. The colours of the bars represent the three main categories of motor skills (walking, standing, others). The numbers in the last column indicate the number of PIs covered by each motor skill, and vice versa for the numbers in the last row.

[73], [128], [130], [146], [149], [153], [160], [164], [172], [179]–[184]. The most frequent PIs were kinetics, kinematics, maximum speed, spatiotemporal parameters, muscle effort and metabolic cost.

Standing on moving ground. We found three papers [175], [185], [186] covering this motor skill. The five PIs proposed belonged mainly to the kinematics/kinetics category.

Standing during manipulation. Three papers, [59], [75], [187], covered this motor skill, with six different PIs, the most relevant being max. speed/ min. time, and spatiotemporal PIs.

Standing during pushes. Only two papers, [186], [188], covered this motor skill, with four different PIs: kinematics,

kinetics, stability to external disturbances and muscle activation.

Standing on slopes. We only found one paper [75] that studied exoskeleton performance while standing on a slope. Two different goal-level PIs were presented: max. speed/min. time and distance.

Lateral stepping. We only found one paper [127] assessing this skill, which focused primarily on interaction forces.

Crouching and/or kneeling. Only one paper [73] assessed this skill, with two different PIs: versatility and comfort.

Sit-to-stand/stand-to-sit. Chair sitting and standing is the third most covered motor skill in this review, with 22 pub-

Fig. 2. Number of publications, motor tasks and PIs over time.

lications, [8], [21]–[23], [32], [35], [42], [44], [51], [58], [59], [73], [75], [80], [84], [96], [98], [99], [117], [123], [189], [190]. This skill was evaluated with a high variety of PIs (13), the most frequent being max. speed/ min. time, distance, comfort, versatility, spatiotemporal parameters and kinematics.

Running. We found four publications [104], [191]–[193] that assessed running while wearing an exoskeleton. Seven PIs were presented for this evaluation and the most relevant was kinetics.

B. Performance Indicators

Maximum speed/minimum time. This category refers to the minimum time the robot needed, or the maximum speed it achieved, to correctly perform a certain motor skill. It is one of the preferred metrics for performance evaluation in this review, with 72 appearances in papers, spanning 14 different motor skills. The most common specific PIs used in this category (see Figure 3) are patient's preferred speed, maximum walking speed and execution time, most of them calculated during clinical tests, such as the 10 Meter Walking Test (10MWT), the 6 Minute Walking Test (6MWT) and the Timed Up and Go (TUG) test.

Distance. The distance covered by the exoskeleton is frequently used when evaluating exoskeleton performance, with 32 occurrences in papers that covered ten different motor skills. We found that the 6MWT is the preferred PI in this category.

Stability to external disturbances. This category includes indicators such as deviations of the centre of gravity (COG), forefoot and rearfoot loading, length of motion path or confidence ellipse area. Stability was evaluated in six papers that considered the following scenarios: flat walking, weight bearing, standing on moving ground and during pushes, and sit-to-stand.

Endurance. This evaluation is generally requested to test the robot's ability to perform long periods of functioning or multiple cycles of work. We found seven publications

evaluating these aspects, which covered eight motor skills. The most frequent PIs considered here were power development per joint, joint stiffness and battery usage.

Versatility. Versatility is used to describe the exoskeleton's ability to cope with different motor skills in the same run. This aspect were considered in 14 publications that spanned 12 motor skills. The specific PIs used were step width adaptability and number of successful transitions between tasks.

Dependability. Dependability, defined here as the robots ability to operate without failures or decreased performance was mentioned in only one paper, focused on treadmill walking. We could not find any specific PI to measure this ability.

Spatiotemporal parameters. This category is the fifth most considered in literature, used in almost all walking skills, except for walking on uneven terrains and during pushes. We found 19 different PIs, the most frequent being cadence, walking speed, number of steps, step length, stride length and phase time.

Kinematics. Kinematic variables are used in almost half of the publications reviewed. These cover almost all motor skills, except for soft and slippery grounds, obstacle avoidance, standing during manipulation and crouching/kneeling. Among the PIs found, the most popular were joint angular trajectories, range of motion (ROM), speed and COM position.

Kinetics. The same considerations given for kinematics apply here. Fifteen different PIs have been proposed in this category. The most frequent were global torques, global forces, global power and ground reaction forces (GRF).

Symmetry. Symmetry has been evaluated in ten publications, most of them focusing on flat walking, and to a minor extent on standing. The main relevant PIs were GRF propulsion impulse and joint trajectory deviation.

Coordination. We found five publications on this aspect, four of them on flat walking and one on standing during manipulation. No specific PIs were proposed.

Human likeness. No paper explicitly mentioned this aspect.

Metabolic cost. This kind of measurement was found in 37 publications, most of them focusing on flat or treadmill walking, and to a minor extent on weight bearing or slope walking. Heart rate, blood lactate concentration, oxygen consumption, carbon dioxide production, metabolic power, biological power, work and calorimetry are the most frequent PIs.

Ergonomics. Ergonomics was considered in eight publications, most of them covering flat or treadmill walking, with sporadic applications to other motor skills (see Figure 1 for details). The main PIs used were human-robot relative position, interface displacements, anthropometric database percentiles, and adaptability to different height ranges.

Comfort. Comfort, defined here as the user's perception of the human-robot interaction, was covered by 20 publications, and mostly applied on flat ground walking and sit-to-stand/stand-to-sit skills. Among the ten PIs found, the most relevant were pain scales, clinical questionnaires, and user sense of comfort.

Muscle effort. This is the most common aspect employed for the assessment of human-robot interaction. It was covered

by 47 publications, half of them applied to flat walking, followed by treadmill walking, weight bearing, sit-to-stand and standing during pushes. Muscle effort is generally assessed by measuring electromyographic (EMG) activity, which is generally processed for posterior onset detection and muscle activity recognition. Also muscle alteration rates and the visual analogue scale of fatigue (VAS-F) have been found as indicators of muscle effort.

Interaction forces. We found ten publications covering this aspect. Seven of them covered flat ground walking, another two covered treadmill walking and sit-to-stand/stand-to-sit, and another one covered backwards and lateral stepping. Power delivered to the robot, interface transmitted forces and interaction forces were the only three PIs found in this category.

Cognitive effort. We found only one publication mentioning cognitive effort as a performance metric. It was applied to flat walking but no specific metric was found.

Safety. The evaluation of safety was proposed by eight publications. Seven different PIs were identified: number of falls, skin, spine and joint status after using the robot, blood pressure, heart rate and clinical questionnaires.

IV. DISCUSSION

We observed an increasing relevance of performance evaluation in the field of lower limb exoskeletons. This trend, visible in the exponential growth in the numbers of papers (see Figure 2) is, however, only in part accompanied by an increase in the range of motor skills and PIs that are studied, which show a more moderate increment. This, together with our taxonomic analysis summarized in Figure 1, demonstrates that the current evaluation methods for exoskeletons are still restricted to a small portion of the applicable motor skills and PIs. In the following sub-sections, we will consider in more detail the possible causes of this situation and point towards relevant future research directions.

A. Motor Skills

The number of papers focusing on flat ground and treadmill walking prevail by one order of magnitude over any other motor skill considered in our taxonomy. This fact is not surprising considering that straight walking is the primary functional requirement for lower limb exoskeletons, and that gait analysis has a long scientific history. However, in our opinion, the dominance of flat walking does not imply that the other motor skills are less relevant. The activities of daily living are composed of a rich repertoire of functions, which should be taken into account to demonstrate the feasibility of exoskeletons to operate in real environments. For instance, irregular terrains such as grass, stones, sand, carpets, gravel and holes, have been largely overlooked in the literature. The same has happened to many other motor skills, such as lateral stepping, crouching/kneeling, turning or standing. All these motor skills showed a prevalence lower than five publications each (less than 2% of the total). In particular, we found the shortage of tests on balance skills particularly alarming, since

	Performance Indicators	
Goal-level	**Max speed/ Min time:** Preferred walking speed, maximum walking speed, 5MWT, 6MWT, 10MWT, TUG.	
	Distance: 6MWT	
	Stability external disturbances: Length of motion path, confidence ellipse area, horizontal and vertical deviations of COG, percentage values of forefoot and rearfoot loading.	
	Endurance: Power developed at one joint, joint stiffness, endurance of battery.	
	Versatility: Transitions between tasks, step width adaptability.	
	Dependability: - N.A.	
Kinematics / kinetics	**Spatiotemporal:** Cadence, walking speed, number of steps/strides, step height/width/length, stride length, stride frequency, duty factor, asymmetry harmonic ratio, step/stride/phase/double support/single support/cycle time, relative duration between phases.	
	Kinematics: ROM, deviation from ROM, maximum joint angles, joint trajectories, joint/COM position, joint/COM velocities, joint accelerations.	
	Kinetics: Joint torque/force/power/work, peak torque/force/power, biological torques, global torque, global force, global work, global power, global force, frequency, GRF value, heel-contact force.	
	Symmetry: GRF propulsion impulse, joint trajectory deviation.	
	Coordination: - N.A.	
	Human likeness: - N.A.	
Human - robot interaction	**Metabolic cost:** Heart rate, blood lactate concentration, oxygen consumption, carbon dioxide production, metabolic power, biological power, work, calorimetry.	
	Ergonomics: Relative position between human and robot segments, interface displacements, anthropometric database percentiles, adaptabiliy to different height ranges.	
	Comfort: Pain, bowel and bladder function, skin irritation, redness, sore spots, spasticity, fatigue, questionnaires, transmitted forces.	
	Muscle effort: Muscle activation, EMG alteration, VAS fatigue.	
	Interaction forces: Power delivered to the robot, interface transmitted forces.	
	Cognitive effort: - N.A.	
	Safety: Number of falls, status of the skin, status of the spine and joints, blood pressure, pulse, questionnaires.	

Fig. 3. Overview of the performance indicators found on the reviewed works engaged in the three main categories. The number of works covering each PI is presented in brackets. CoG: Center of Gravity CoM: Center of Mass; 5MWT: Five Meter Walking Test; 6MWT: Six Minute Walking Test; 10MWT: Ten Meter Walking Test; TUG: Timed Up and Go.

balance is a crucial aspect of bipedal locomotion [194]. This may be explained by the fact that most exoskeletons still do not have active balance control. However, assuming that this ability will be implemented in future prototypes, we strongly believe that rigorous methodologies to evaluate standing and balance skills will be particularly beneficial.

A group of four motor skills received particular attention, after flat and treadmill walking. These are walking on slopes, stair ascending and descending, weight bearing and sit-to-stand/stand-to-sit. The interest in these motor skills can be explained by their prevalence in many application scenarios (e.g. clinical, domestic, industrial), which makes them essential for both rehabilitation and assistance purposes. Nevertheless, the proposed scenarios still fail to consider the entire spectrum of conditions, for example slope inclination, step height and chair typology. We believe that, in general, for the entire set of motor skills represented in Figure 1, the scientific community

will significantly benefit from comprehensive testbeds that reproduce and synthesize the variability of real ecological conditions. These testbeds should preferably be sensorized to allow direct measurement of the relevant variables, and be fully replicable, to allow direct comparison between labs and robotic solutions.

B. Performance Indicators

In the *goal-level* category, global time and distance are two very popular indicators. They are generally used as global descriptors of system performance, and are particularly useful during competition approaches for their simplicity and immediacy of use. In spite of these practical advantages, we consider them insufficient to validate or quantify the performance of an exoskeleton system. A PI that has been particularly disregarded in the literature is the stability against external disturbances. We consider that this aspect is very relevant, since external disturbances are often present in real life scenarios. We strongly encourage its evaluation and characterization in the future. Versatility and dependability are a further two aspects that have not yet been sufficiently addressed by the community. This may be explained by the fact that they are highly related to high readiness levels, still not achieved by most current prototypes. Another interpretation is that these concepts are still not formally defined in the field of wearable robots. This draws attention to the important problem of terminology, which should be addressed by the community in order to find common understanding on these aspects.

The *kinematics/kinetics* category is extremely popular in the assessment of exoskeletons. This is probably due to the the fact that these variables can be extracted from the sensors of the robot or estimated by standard motion capture systems. These PIs have the potential to grasp the entire complexity of limb dynamics but, on the other hand, the obtained results are often difficult to contrast and replicate due to the lack of common standard setups, data labelling or experimental protocols. In addition, we believe that appropriate benchmarking routines able to convert the temporal profiles from each joint into more discrete indicators will be tremendously useful for easy comparison across systems. Spatiotemporal parameters, by contrast, are a good example of standard metrics. They are able to grasp the main features of kinematic performance in basic locomotion tasks. Indeed, they would benefit from an appropriate combination with more complex kinematic and kinetic variables to fully characterize locomotion, in particular over complex terrains or in the presence of perturbations. Symmetry and coordination are two crucial aspects that are still poorly considered in the evaluation of exoskeleton performance. These aspects are highly relevant in the clinical field to evaluate the correctness of a patient's motion, and should therefore receive more attention in the future. The concept of human likeness, very relevant in other fields, for example humanoids or artificial intelligence, has not been considered by any of the reviewed works. We consider that this aspect would be beneficial for wearable robotics to quantify the similarity

between machine and human motion, an important requisite of symbiotic behaviour.

In the *human-robot interaction* category, metabolic cost is often referred to as the main descriptor of interaction performance. However, in our opinion, this PI should not be considered alone. There are many other complementary aspects that should be taken into account when evaluating human-robot interaction. For instance, EMG analysis is frequently used to quantify the effects of a robot on muscle fatigue. There are other approaches that consider muscle activity analysis to characterize interaction, for example the use of musculoskeletal models to estimate biological joint torques. These research directions are particularly promising, in our opinion. Comfort is another important and popular indicator of human-robot interaction. If acceptable levels of comfort are not achieved, the chances of the robot surviving in the market are low, irrespective of the level of technical readiness. Interaction forces, despite their great potential to quantify the physical interaction between human and robot, have been poorly considered when evaluating lower limb exoskeletons. In our opinion, studying the correlation between interaction forces and subjective variables of comfort, for example pain, will be particularly beneficial to the field. The aspect of cognitive effort, very relevant in the clinical field, has been particularly overlooked by the literature. The same applies to ergonomics. These aspects, together with comfort, are key human factors behind user acceptance of the technology and should be given the highest priority by the community.

Lastly, safety should be considered. This is a primary criterion for any wearable robot, due to the unavoidable physical contact between the human and the robot. If safety cannot be proved, any other levels of functional performance become irrelevant, at least from the market perspective. This aspect is significantly under-represented in the literature, and should be seriously addressed.

C. Limitations

This review includes papers from a wide variety of use cases, which may considerably differ in their interpretation of "good" performance. For instance, the clinical effect is likely to be the main concern in gait rehabilitation scenarios. In the military or industrial contexts, the metabolic cost or other usability factors may prevail. Stability and robustness could be dominant in the case of assistance to paralysed individuals. This review did not focus on this domain-specific perspective, which is nonetheless an important aspect that should be addressed in future analyses and research.

As a further limitation, we did not distinguish whether a given metric describes exoskeleton and/or human abilities. We limited ourselves to enumerating the objective means to quantify the bipedal performance of the "human plus exoskeleton" system, considered as one integrated entity. Future works focusing on unveiling the contributions of the machine and its pilot to a given behavioural performance are encouraged.

Two publications, [41], [45], covered some usability aspects that were not included in our list of PIs, such as donning

and doffing time, and time to change the battery. We consider that these aspects are relevant, and should be included in the human-robot interaction category.

V. Conclusions

This review revealed an exponential increase in the number of papers focused on the evaluation of robot-assisted locomotion, which demonstrates a growing interest from the scientific community in the benchmarking of exoskeleton performance. We found a great variability in the variables and experimental setups proposed. If on one side this lack of uniformity impedes the performance of direct comparisons across robots, on the other side, the rich pool of methods and tools here collected represents a solid scientific basis on which a benchmarking methodology can stand. Almost half of the papers reviewed focused on walking on flat ground or a treadmill, which highlights how the exoskeleton community is still very focused on basic locomotion skills. Other motor skills are receiving increasing attention but still cannot be considered to have reached the same level of maturity. Standing and balance skills have been greatly overlooked in the literature, together with other essential motor skills such as walking on irregular terrain or in the presence pushes, turning, and lateral stepping. We consider that it is extremely important to test all these functions to demonstrate high levels of readiness in out-of-the-lab environments. Among the performance indicators (PIs) considered, kinematic/kinetic metrics, together with simple indicators based on distance and time, were extremely popular. We observed a general trend towards human-robot interaction indicators when evaluating straight walking, but these indicators were poorly considered when assessing other motor skills. A more comprehensive application of these metrics would be beneficial in order to permit an appropriate comparison of exoskeletons across the different motor skills. In particular, the aspects related to symmetry, coordination, versatility, ergonomics, comfort and stability to external disturbances need to be explored more intensively to demonstrate the ability of a wearable robot to act symbiotically with the human. Lastly, safety, as a primary requirement of any assistive, rehabilitation or augmentation device, should also be taken into consideration more rigorously when evaluating exoskeleton prototypes.

The results of this review can be taken as a starting point for the development of a unified and standardized benchmarking scheme and drive the wearable robotic community to demonstrate that our robots can meet real market needs.

Aknowledgments

References

[1] V. Lajeunesse, C. Vincent, F. Routhier, E. Careau, and F. Michaud, "Exoskeletons' design and usefulness evidence according to a systematic review of lower limb exoskeletons used for functional mobility by people with spinal cord injury," *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, vol. 11, no. 7, pp. 535–547, oct 2016.

[2] M. P. Dijkers, K. G. Akers, S. Dieffenbach, and S. S. Galen, "Systematic Reviews of Clinical Benefits of Exoskeleton Use for Gait and Mobility in Neurologic Disorders: A Tertiary Study," *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, mar 2019.

[3] D. Torricelli, A. Del Ama, J. Gonzalez, J. Moreno, A. Gil, and J. Pons, "Benchmarking lower limb wearable robots: Emerging approaches and technologies," in *8th ACM International Conference on Pervasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments, PETRA 2015 - Proceedings*, 2015.

[4] Y. He, D. Eguren, T. P. Luu, and J. L. Contreras-Vidal, "Risk management and regulations for lower limb medical exoskeletons: a review," *Medical Devices: Evidence and Research*, vol. Volume 10, pp. 89–107, may 2017.

[5] R. Riener, "The Cybathlon promotes the development of assistive technology for people with physical disabilities," *Journal on NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 13*, p. 49, 2016.

[6] D. Torricelli, J. Gonzalez-Vargas, J. F. Veneman, K. Mombaur, N. Tsagarakis, A. J. Del-Ama, A. Gil-Agudo, J. C. Moreno, and J. L. Pons, "Benchmarking Bipedal Locomotion: A Unified Scheme for Humanoids, Wearable Robots, and Humans," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 103–115, sep 2015.

[7] D. R. Solomonow M., Baratta R., Beaudette P., Shoji H., "Gait performance of paraplegics ambulating with the reciprocating gait orthosis powered by electrical muscle stimulation," *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology - Proceedings*, vol. 11, p. 1013, 1989.

[8] J. D. Kong K., "Fuzzy control of a new tendon-driven exoskeletal power assistive device," *IEEE/ASME International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Mechatronics, AIM*, pp. 146–151, 2005.

[9] H. Kazerooni and R. Steger, "The Berkeley Lower Extremity Exoskeleton," *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, vol. 128, no. 1, p. 14, 2006.

[10] K. E. Gordon, G. S. Sawicki, and D. P. Ferris, "Mechanical performance of artificial pneumatic muscles to power an ankle-foot orthosis," *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 1832–1841, 2006.

[11] J. A. Norris, K. P. Granata, M. R. Mitros, E. M. Byrne, and A. P. Marsh, "Effect of augmented plantarflexion power on preferred walking speed and economy in young and older adults," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 620–627, apr 2007.

[12] S. Agrawal, S. Banala, A. Fattah, V. Sangwan, V. Krishnamoorthy, J. Scholz, and Hsu Wei-Li, "Assessment of Motion of a Swing Leg and Gait Rehabilitation With a Gravity Balancing Exoskeleton," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 410–420, sep 2007.

[13] E. H. Van Asseldonk, R. Ekkelenkamp, J. F. Veneman, F. C. T. Van der Helm, and H. van der Kooij, "Selective control of a subtask of walking in a robotic gait trainer(LOPES)," in *2007 IEEE 10th International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics*. IEEE, jun 2007, pp. 841–848.

[14] J.-H. Jung, N.-G. Lee, J.-H. You, and D.-C. Lee, "Validity and feasibility of intelligent Walkbot system," *Electronics Letters*, vol. 45, no. 20, p. 1016, 2009.

[15] T. A. Swift, K. A. Strausser, A. B. Zoss, and H. Kazerooni, "Control and Experimental Results for Post Stroke Gait Rehabilitation With a Prototype Mobile Medical Exoskeleton," in *ASME 2010 Dynamic Systems and Control Conference, Volume 1*. ASME, 2010, pp. 405–411.

[16] A. S.-L. Hung, Hongtao Guo, Wei-Hsin Liao, D. T.-P. Fong, and Kai-Ming Chan, "Experimental studies on kinematics and kinetics of walking with an assistive knee brace," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Information and Automation*. IEEE, jun 2011, pp. 45–50.

[17] P. D. Neuhaus, J. H. Noorden, T. J. Craig, T. Torres, J. Kirschbaum, and J. E. Pratt, "Design and evaluation of Mina: A robotic orthosis for paraplegics," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics*. IEEE, jun 2011, pp. 1–8.

[18] H. Kitamura, T. Kagawa, and Y. Uno, "A Method Preventing Backward Falling while Walking with a Wearable Robot," *IEEJ Transactions on Electronics, Information and Systems*, vol. 131, no. 11, pp. 2000–2008, 2011.

[19] K. A. Strausser, T. A. Swift, A. B. Zoss, H. Kazerooni, and B. C. Bennett, "Mobile Exoskeleton for Spinal Cord Injury: Development and Testing," in *ASME 2011 Dynamic Systems and Control Conference and*

Bath/ASME Symposium on Fluid Power and Motion Control, Volume 2. ASME, 2011, pp. 419–425.

[20] S. N. Yu, H. D. Lee, S. H. Lee, W. S. Kim, J. S. Han, and C. S. Han, "Design of an Under-Actuated Exoskeleton System for Walking Assist While Load Carrying," *Advanced Robotics*, vol. 26, no. 5-6, pp. 561–580, jan 2012.

[21] A. Esquenazi, M. Talaty, A. Packel, and M. Saulino, "The ReWalk Powered Exoskeleton to Restore Ambulatory Function to Individuals with Thoracic-Level Motor-Complete Spinal Cord Injury," *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*, vol. 91, no. 11, pp. 911–921, nov 2012.

[22] G. Zeilig, H. Weingarden, M. Zwecker, I. Dudkiewicz, A. Bloch, and A. Esquenazi, "Safety and tolerance of the ReWalk exoskeleton suit for ambulation by people with complete spinal cord injury: A pilot study," *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 96–101, mar 2012.

[23] D. Sanz-Merodio, M. Cestari, J. C. Arevalo, and E. Garcia, "A lower-limb exoskeleton for gait assistance in quadriplegia," in *2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO)*. IEEE, dec 2012, pp. 122–127.

[24] M. Hassan, H. Kadone, K. Suzuki, and Y. Sankai, "Wearable Gait Measurement System with an Instrumented Cane for Exoskeleton Control," *Sensors*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1705–1722, jan 2014.

[25] H. J. Kim W.S., Lee H.D., Lim D.H., Han C.S., "Development of a lower extremity exoskeleton system for walking assistance while load carrying," *Nature-Inspired Mobile Robotics: Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Climbing and Walking Robots and the Support Technologies for Mobile Machines, CLAWAR 2013*, pp. 35–42, 2013.

[26] M. Arazpour, M. A. Bani, and S. W. Hutchins, "Reciprocal gait orthoses and powered gait orthoses for walking by spinal cord injury patients," *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 14–21, feb 2013.

[27] M. Arazpour, M. A. Bani, A. Chitsazan, F. T. Ghomshe, R. V. Kashani, and S. W. Hutchins, "The effect of an isocentric reciprocating gait orthosis incorporating an active knee mechanism on the gait of a spinal cord injury patient: A single case study," *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 261–266, may 2013.

[28] D. B. Fineberg, P. Asselin, N. Y. Harel, I. Agranova-Breyter, S. D. Kornfeld, W. A. Bauman, and A. M. Spungen, "Vertical ground reaction force-based analysis of powered exoskeleton-assisted walking in persons with motor-complete paraplegia," *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 313–321, jul 2013.

[29] P. Malcolm, W. Derave, S. Galle, and D. De Clercq, "A Simple Exoskeleton That Assists Plantarflexion Can Reduce the Metabolic Cost of Human Walking," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. e56137, feb 2013.

[30] T. Lenzi, M. C. Carrozza, and S. K. Agrawal, "Powered Hip Exoskeletons Can Reduce the User's Hip and Ankle Muscle Activations During Walking," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 938–948, nov 2013.

[31] Y. David Li and E. T. Hsiao-Wecksler, "Gait mode recognition and control for a portable-powered ankle-foot orthosis," in *IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2013.

[32] J. Olivier, M. Bouri, A. Ortlieb, H. Bleuler, and R. Clavel, "Development of an assistive motorized hip orthosis: Kinematics analysis and mechanical design," in *2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jun 2013, pp. 1–5.

[33] D. Novak, P. Reberšek, S. M. M. De Rossi, M. Donati, J. Podobnik, T. Beravs, T. Lenzi, N. Vitiello, M. C. Carrozza, and M. Munih, "Automated detection of gait initiation and termination using wearable sensors," *Medical Engineering & Physics*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 1713–1720, dec 2013.

[34] L. M. Mooney, E. J. Rouse, and H. M. Herr, "Autonomous exoskeleton reduces metabolic cost of human walking during load carriage," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 80, 2014.

[35] R. J. Farris, H. A. Quintero, S. A. Murray, K. H. Ha, C. Hartigan, and M. Goldfarb, "A Preliminary Assessment of Legged Mobility Provided by a Lower Limb Exoskeleton for Persons With Paraplegia," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 482–490, may 2014.

[36] D. Zanotto, P. Stegall, and S. K. Agrawal, "Adaptive assist-as-needed controller to improve gait symmetry in robot-assisted gait training,"

in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, may 2014, pp. 724–729.

[37] K. Shamaei, M. Cenciarini, A. A. Adams, K. N. Gregorczyk, J. M. Schiffman, and A. M. Dollar, "Design and Evaluation of a Quasi-Passive Knee Exoskeleton for Investigation of Motor Adaptation in Lower Extremity Joints," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 1809–1821, jun 2014.

[38] S. A. Murray, K. H. Ha, and M. Goldfarb, "An assistive controller for a lower-limb exoskeleton for rehabilitation after stroke, and preliminary assessment thereof," in *2014 36th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*. IEEE, aug 2014, pp. 4083–4086.

[39] Y. Ding, I. Galiana, A. Asbeck, B. Quinlivan, S. M. M. De Rossi, and C. Walsh, "Multi-joint actuation platform for lower extremity soft exosuits," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, may 2014, pp. 1327–1334.

[40] A. J. Del-Ama, Ã. Gil-Agudo, J. L. Pons, and J. C. Moreno, "Hybrid gait training with an overground robot for people with incomplete spinal cord injury: a pilot study," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 8, p. 298, may 2014.

[41] C. Hartigan, C. Kandilakis, S. Dalley, M. Clausen, E. Wilson, S. Morrison, S. Etheridge, and R. Farris, "Mobility Outcomes Following Five Training Sessions with a Powered Exoskeleton," *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 93–99, mar 2015.

[42] A. Kozlowski, T. Bryce, and M. Dijkers, "Time and Effort Required by Persons with Spinal Cord Injury to Learn to Use a Powered Exoskeleton for Assisted Walking," *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 110–121, mar 2015.

[43] A. Yang, P. Asselin, S. Knezevic, S. Kornfeld, and A. Spungen, "Assessment of In-Hospital Walking Velocity and Level of Assistance in a Powered Exoskeleton in Persons with Spinal Cord Injury," *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 100–109, mar 2015.

[44] T. Yoshimoto, I. Shimizu, Y. Hiroi, M. Kawaki, D. Sato, and M. Nagasawa, "Feasibility and efficacy of high-speed gait training with a voluntary driven exoskeleton robot for gait and balance dysfunction in patients with chronic stroke," *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 338–343, dec 2015.

[45] M. Bortole, A. Venkatakrishnan, F. Zhu, J. C. Moreno, G. E. Francisco, J. L. Pons, and J. L. Contreras-Vidal, "The H2 robotic exoskeleton for gait rehabilitation after stroke: early findings from a clinical study," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 54, dec 2015.

[46] Y. Hasegawa, K. Nakayama, K. Ozawa, and Mengze Li, "Electric stimulation feedback for gait control of walking robot," in *2015 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, sep 2015, pp. 14–19.

[47] I. M. Da Silva, M. Ceccarelli, C. Copilusi, and P. Flores, "Lab experiences with a linkage exoskeleton for walking assistance," in *Mechanisms and Machine Science*, 09 2014, vol. 24.

[48] K. Z. Takahashi, M. D. Lewek, and G. S. Sawicki, "A neuromechanics-based powered ankle exoskeleton to assist walking post-stroke: a feasibility study," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 23, 2015.

[49] A. J. Del-Ama, Á. Gil-Agudo, E. Bravo-Esteban, S. Pérez-Nombela, J. L. Pons, and J. C. Moreno, "Hybrid therapy of walking with Kinesis overground robot for persons with incomplete spinal cord injury: A feasibility study," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 73, pp. 44–58, nov 2015.

[50] S. Wang, L. Wang, C. Meijneke, E. van Asseldonk, T. Hoellinger, G. Cheron, Y. Ivanenko, V. La Scaleia, F. Sylos-Labini, M. Molinari, F. Tamburella, I. Pisotta, F. Thorsteinsson, M. Ilzkovitz, J. Gancet, Y. Nevatia, R. Hauffe, F. Zanow, and H. van der Kooij, "Design and Control of the MINDWALKER Exoskeleton," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 277–286, mar 2015.

[51] H.-g. Kim, J.-w. Lee, J. Jang, S. Park, and C. Han, "Design of an exoskeleton with minimized energy consumption based on using elastic and dissipative elements," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 463–474, apr 2015.

[52] K.-M. Lee and D. Wang, "Design analysis of a passive weight-support lower-extremity-exoskeleton with compliant knee-joint," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, may 2015, pp. 5572–5577.

[53] A. T. Asbeck, S. M. De Rossi, K. G. Holt, and C. J. Walsh, "A biologically inspired soft exosuit for walking assistance," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 744–762, may 2015.

[54] A. T. Asbeck, K. Schmidt, and C. J. Walsh, "Soft exosuit for hip assistance," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 73, pp. 102–110, nov 2015.

[55] F. Giovacchini, F. Vannetti, M. Fantozzi, M. Cempini, M. Cortese, A. Parri, T. Yan, D. Lefeber, and N. Vitiello, "A light-weight active orthosis for hip movement assistance," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 73, pp. 123–134, nov 2015.

[56] K. I. Mangan, T. D. Kingsbury, B. N. Mazzone, M. P. Wyatt, and K. M. Kuhn, "Limb Salvage With Intrepid Dynamic Exoskeletal Orthosis Versus Transtibial Amputation," *Journal of Orthopaedic Trauma*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. e390–e395, dec 2016.

[57] M. Lancini, M. Serpelloni, S. Pasinetti, and E. Guanziroli, "Healthcare sensor system exploiting instrumented crutches for force measurement during assisted gait of exoskeleton users," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 16, pp. 8228–8237, 2016.

[58] O. Mazumder, A. S. Kundu, P. K. Lenka, and S. Bhaumik, "Ambulatory activity classification with dendogram-based support vector machine: Application in lower-limb active exoskeleton," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 50, pp. 53–59, oct 2016.

[59] T. Yoshimoto, I. Shimizu, and Y. Hiroi, "Sustained effects of once-a-week gait training with hybrid assistive limb for rehabilitation in chronic stroke: case study," *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*, vol. 28, no. 9, pp. 2684–2687, 2016.

[60] I. Mileti, J. Taborri, S. Rossi, M. Petrarca, F. Patane, and P. Cappa, "Evaluation of the effects on stride-to-stride variability and gait asymmetry in children with Cerebral Palsy wearing the WAKE-up ankle module," in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Medical Measurements and Applications (MeMeA)*. IEEE, may 2016, pp. 1–6.

[61] K. Yoshikawa, M. Mizukami, H. Kawamoto, A. Sano, K. Koseki, Y. Hashizume, Y. Asakawa, K. Iwamoto, Y. Kohno, H. Nagata, K. Nakai, and H. Tsurushima, "Hybrid Assistive Limb enhances the gait functions in sub-acute stroke stage: A multi single-case study," *Physiotherapy Practice and Research*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 91–100, jun 2016.

[62] M. Arazpour, A. Moradi, M. Samadian, M. Bahramizadeh, M. Joghtaei, M. Ahmadi Bani, S. W. Hutchins, and M. A. Mardani, "The influence of a powered kneeanklefoot orthosis on walking in poliomyelitis subjects: A pilot study," *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 377–383, jun 2016.

[63] M. Arazpour, M. Ahmadi Bani, M. Samadian, M. E. Mousavi, S. W. Hutchins, M. Bahramizadeh, S. Curran, and M. A. Mardani, "The physiological cost index of walking with a powered kneeanklefoot orthosis in subjects with poliomyelitis: A pilot study," *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 454–459, aug 2016.

[64] G. Stampacchia, A. Rustici, S. Bigazzi, A. Gerini, T. Tombini, and S. Mazzoleni, "Walking with a powered robotic exoskeleton: Subjective experience, spasticity and pain in spinal cord injured persons," *NeuroRehabilitation*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 277–283, aug 2016.

[65] A. Pourghasem, I. E. Takamjani, M. T. Karimi, M. Kamali, M. Jannesari, and I. Salafian, "The effect of a powered ankle foot orthosis on walking in a stroke subject: a case study," *Journal of Physical Therapy Science*, vol. 28, no. 11, pp. 3236–3240, 2016.

[66] E. C. Ranz, E. Russell Esposito, J. M. Wilken, and R. R. Neptune, "The influence of passive-dynamic ankle-foot orthosis bending axis location on gait performance in individuals with lower-limb impairments," *Clinical Biomechanics*, vol. 37, pp. 13–21, aug 2016.

[67] Y. Hu and K. Mombaur, "Analysis of human leg joints compliance in different walking scenarios with an optimal control approach," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 49, no. 14, pp. 99–106, 2016.

[68] Z. F. Lerner, D. L. Damiano, and T. C. Bulea, "A robotic exoskeleton to treat crouch gait from cerebral palsy: Initial kinematic and neuromuscular evaluation," in *2016 38th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, aug 2016, pp. 2214–2217.

[69] R. E. Bayón C., Lerma S., Ramírez O., Serrano J.I., Del Castillo M.D., Raya R., Belda-Lois J.M., Martínez I., "Locomotor training through a novel robotic platform for gait rehabilitation in pediatric population: short report," *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 2016.

[70] J. Park, S. J. Kim, Y. Na, and J. Kim, "Custom optoelectronic force sensor based ground reaction force (GRF) measurement system for providing absolute force," in *2016 13th International Conference on Ubiquitous Robots and Ambient Intelligence (URAI)*. IEEE, aug 2016, pp. 75–77.

[71] M. Attias, A. Bonnefoy-Mazure, G. De Coulon, L. Cheze, and S. Armand, "Feasibility and reliability of using an exoskeleton to emulate muscle contractures during walking," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 50, pp. 239–245, oct 2016.

[72] L. Lonini, N. Shawen, K. Scanlan, W. Z. Rymer, K. P. Kording, and A. Jayaraman, "Accelerometry-enabled measurement of walking performance with a robotic exoskeleton: a pilot study," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 35, dec 2016.

[73] A. Collo, V. Bonnet, and G. Venture, "A quasi-passive lower limb exoskeleton for partial body weight support," in *2016 6th IEEE International Conference on Biomedical Robotics and Biomechatronics (BioRob)*. IEEE, jun 2016, pp. 643–648.

[74] S. Pardoel and M. Doumit, "A critical examination of three approaches for the design of passive ankle walking assist devices," in *2016 IEEE EMBS International Student Conference (ISC)*. IEEE, may 2016, pp. 1–4.

[75] P. K. Asselin, M. Avedissian, S. Knezevic, S. Kornfeld, and A. M. Spungen, "Training Persons with Spinal Cord Injury to Ambulate Using a Powered Exoskeleton," *Journal of Visualized Experiments*, no. 112, jun 2016.

[76] J. C. Selinger and J. M. Donelan, "Myoelectric Control for Adaptable Biomechanical Energy Harvesting," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 364–373, mar 2016.

[77] H. T. Tran, H. Cheng, H. Rui, X. Lin, M. K. Duong, and Q. Chen, "Evaluation of a Fuzzy-Based Impedance Control Strategy on a Powered Lower Exoskeleton," *International Journal of Social Robotics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 103–123, jan 2016.

[78] I. Benson, K. Hart, D. Tussler, and J. J. van Middendorp, "Lower-limb exoskeletons for individuals with chronic spinal cord injury: findings from a feasibility study," *Clinical Rehabilitation*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 73–84, jan 2016.

[79] J. Jang, K. Kim, J. Lee, B. Lim, J.-K. Cho, and Y. Shim, "Preliminary study of online gait recognizer for lower limb exoskeletons," in *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, sep 2017, pp. 5818–5824.

[80] R. B. van Dijsseldonk, H. Rijken, I. J. W. van Nes, H. van de Meent, and N. L. W. Keijsers, "A Framework for Measuring the Progress in Exoskeleton Skills in People with Complete Spinal Cord Injury," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 11, p. 699, dec 2017.

[81] A. Parri, K. Yuan, D. Marconi, T. Yan, S. Crea, M. Munih, R. M. Lova, N. Vitiello, and Q. Wang, "Real-Time Hybrid Locomotion Mode Recognition for Lower Limb Wearable Robots," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 2480–2491, dec 2017.

[82] H.-J. Lee, S. Lee, W. H. Chang, K. Seo, Y. Shim, B.-O. Choi, G.-H. Ryu, and Y.-H. Kim, "A Wearable Hip Assist Robot Can Improve Gait Function and Cardiopulmonary Metabolic Efficiency in Elderly Adults," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, pp. 1–1, 2017.

[83] S.-H. Lee, H.-J. Lee, W. H. Chang, B.-O. Choi, J. Lee, J. Kim, G.-H. Ryu, and Y.-H. Kim, "Gait performance and foot pressure distribution during wearable robot-assisted gait in elderly adults," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 123, dec 2017.

[84] C. Bach Baunsgaard, U. Vig Nissen, A. Katrin Brust, A. Frotzler, C. Ribeill, Y.-B. Kalke, N. León, B. Gómez, K. Samuelsson, W. Antepohl, U. Holmström, N. Marklund, T. Glott, A. Opheim, J. Benito, N. Murillo, J. Nachtegaal, W. Faber, and F. Biering-Sørensen, "Gait training after spinal cord injury: safety, feasibility and gait function following 8 weeks of training with the exoskeletons from Ekso Bionics," *Spinal Cord*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 106–116, feb 2018.

[85] Y. Li and M. Hashimoto, "PVC gel soft actuator-based wearable assist wear for hip joint support during walking," *Smart Materials and Structures*, vol. 26, no. 12, p. 125003, dec 2017.

[86] J. Ochoa, D. Sternad, and N. Hogan, "Treadmill vs. overground walking: different response to physical interaction," *Journal of Neurophysiology*, vol. 118, no. 4, pp. 2089–2102, oct 2017.

[87] M. Attias, A. Bonnefoy-Mazure, G. De Coulon, L. Cheze, and S. Armand, "Influence of different degrees of bilateral emulated contractures at the triceps surae on gait kinematics: The difference between gastrocnemius and soleus," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 58, pp. 176–182, oct 2017.

[88] C. A. McGibbon, S. C. Brandon, M. Brookshaw, and A. Sexton, "Effects of an over-ground exoskeleton on external knee moments

during stance phase of gait in healthy adults," *The Knee*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 977–993, oct 2017.

[89] D. H. Gagnon, J. D. Cunha, M. Boyer-Delestre, L. Bosquet, and C. Duclos, "How does wearable robotic exoskeleton affect overground walking performance measured with the 10-m and six-minute walk tests after a basic locomotor training in healthy individuals?" *Gait & Posture*, vol. 58, pp. 340–345, oct 2017.

[90] A. J. Ikeda, J. R. Fergason, and J. M. Wilken, "Effects of altering heel wedge properties on gait with the Intrepid Dynamic Exoskeletal Orthosis," *Prosthetics and Orthotics International*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 265–274, jun 2018.

[91] M. C. Roser, P. K. Canavan, B. Najafi, M. Cooper Watchman, K. Vaishnav, and D. G. Armstrong, "Novel In-Shoe Exoskeleton for Offloading of Forefoot Pressure for Individuals With Diabetic Foot Pathology," *Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 874–882, sep 2017.

[92] C. Shirota, M. R. Tucker, O. Lambercy, and R. Gassert, "Kinematic effects of inertia and friction added by a robotic knee exoskeleton after prolonged walking," in *IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics*, 2017, pp. 430–434.

[93] A. Martinez, B. Lawson, and M. Goldfarb, "Preliminary assessment of a lower-limb exoskeleton controller for guiding leg movement in overground walking," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 375–380.

[94] K. Seo, J. Lee, and Y. J. Park, "Autonomous hip exoskeleton saves metabolic cost of walking uphill," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 246–251.

[95] A. Tsukahara, K. Yoshida, A. Matsushima, K. Ajima, C. Kuroda, N. Mizukami, and M. Hashimoto, "Evaluation of walking smoothness using wearable robotic system curara® for spinocerebellar degeneration patients," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 1494–1499.

[96] S. Mazzoleni, E. Battini, A. Rustici, and G. Stampacchia, "An integrated gait rehabilitation training based on Functional Electrical Stimulation cycling and overground robotic exoskeleton in complete spinal cord injury patients: Preliminary results," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 289–293.

[97] L.-F. Yeung, C. Ockenfeld, M.-K. Pang, H.-W. Wai, O.-Y. Soo, S.-W. Li, and K.-Y. Tong, "Design of an exoskeleton ankle robot for robot-assisted gait training of stroke patients," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 211–215.

[98] A. J. Kozlowski, M. Fabian, D. Lad, and A. D. Delgado, "Feasibility and Safety of a Powered Exoskeleton for Assisted Walking for Persons With Multiple Sclerosis: A Single-Group Preliminary Study," *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, vol. 98, no. 7, pp. 1300–1307, jul 2017.

[99] G. Chen, P. Qi, Z. Guo, and H. Yu, "Gait-Event-Based Synchronization Method for Gait Rehabilitation Robots via a Bioinspired Adaptive Oscillator," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1345–1356, jun 2017.

[100] A. Ramanujam, C. M. Cirnigliaro, E. Garbarini, P. Asselin, R. Pilkar, and G. F. Forrest, "Neuromechanical adaptations during a robotic powered exoskeleton assisted walking session," *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine*, pp. 1–11, apr 2017.

[101] V. R. Garate, A. Parri, T. Yan, M. Munih, R. M. Lova, N. Vitiello, and R. Ronsse, "Experimental validation of motor primitive-based control for leg exoskeletons during continuous multi-locomotion tasks," *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, vol. 11, no. MAR, pp. 11–15, 2017.

[102] I. Mahmood, U. Martinez-Hernandez, and A. A. Dehghani-Sanij, "Towards behavioral based sensorimotor controller design for wearable soft exoskeletal applications," in *Converging Clinical and Engineering Research on Neurorehabilitation II*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017, pp. 1281–1286.

[103] T. Yan, A. Parri, V. Ruiz Garate, M. Cempini, R. Ronsse, and N. Vitiello, "An oscillator-based smooth real-time estimate of gait phase for wearable robotics," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 759–774, mar 2017.

[104] J. Zhang, P. Fiers, K. A. Witte, R. W. Jackson, K. L. Poggensee, C. G. Atkeson, and S. H. Collins, "Human-in-the-loop optimization of exoskeleton assistance during walking," *Science*, vol. 356, no. 6344, pp. 1280–1284, jun 2017.

[105] L. N. Awad, J. Bae, K. O'Donnell, S. M. M. De Rossi, K. Hendron, L. H. Sloot, P. Kudzia, S. Allen, K. G. Holt, T. D. Ellis, and C. J. Walsh, "A soft robotic exosuit improves walking in patients after stroke," *Science Translational Medicine*, vol. 9, no. 400, p. eaai9084, jul 2017.

[106] Y. Long, Z. Du, C. Chen, W. Wang, L. He, X. Mao, G. Xu, G. Zhao, X. Li, and W. Dong, "Development and Analysis of an Electrically Actuated Lower Extremity Assistive Exoskeleton," *Journal of Bionic Engineering*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 272–283, apr 2017.

[107] P. Felix, J. Figueiredo, C. P. Santos, and J. C. Moreno, "Electronic design and validation of Powered Knee Orthosis system embedded with wearable sensors," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Autonomous Robot Systems and Competitions (ICARSC)*. IEEE, apr 2017, pp. 110–115.

[108] M. B. Yandell, B. T. Quinlivan, D. Popov, C. Walsh, and K. E. Zelik, "Physical interface dynamics alter how robotic exosuits augment human movement: implications for optimizing wearable assistive devices," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 40, dec 2017.

[109] A. Esquenazi, S. Lee, A. Wikoff, A. Packel, T. Toczylowski, and J. Feeley, "A Comparison of Locomotor Therapy Interventions: Partial-Body WeightSupported Treadmill, Lokomat, and G-EO Training in People With Traumatic Brain Injury," *PM&R*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 839–846, sep 2017.

[110] G. Zhao, M. Sharbafi, M. Vlutters, E. van Asseldonk, and A. Seyfarth, "Template model inspired leg force feedback based control can assist human walking," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 473–478.

[111] H. Zhu, J. Doan, C. Stence, G. Lv, T. Elery, and R. Gregg, "Design and validation of a torque dense, highly backdrivable powered knee-ankle orthosis," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, may 2017, pp. 504–510.

[112] P. Malcolm, S. Lee, S. Crea, C. Siviy, F. Saucedo, I. Galiana, F. A. Panizzolo, K. G. Holt, and C. J. Walsh, "Varying negative work assistance at the ankle with a soft exosuit during loaded walking," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 62, dec 2017.

[113] J. R. Koller, C. David Remy, and D. P. Ferris, "Comparing neural control and mechanically intrinsic control of powered ankle exoskeletons," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 294–299.

[114] J. PARK, H. PARK, and J. KIM, "Performance estimation of the lower limb exoskeleton for plantarflexion using surface electromyography (sEMG) signals," *Journal of Biomechanical Science and Engineering*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 16–00 595–16–00 595, 2017.

[115] G. Androwis Ph.D. and K. Nolan, "Evaluation of a robotic exoskeleton for gait training in acute stroke: A case study," in *Biosystems and Biorobotics*, 10 2016, vol. 16.

[116] M. Dežman, T. Debevec, J. Babič, and A. Gams, "Effects of Passive Ankle Exoskeleton on Human Energy Expenditure: Pilot Evaluation," 2017, pp. 491–498.

[117] S. O. Schrade, K. Dätwyler, M. Stücheli, K. Studer, D.-A. Türk, M. Meboldt, R. Gassert, and O. Lambercy, "Development of VariLeg, an exoskeleton with variable stiffness actuation: first results and user evaluation from the CYBATHLON 2016," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 18, dec 2018.

[118] M. K. Boes, R. E. Bollaert, R. M. Kesler, Y. C. Learmonth, M. Islam, M. N. Petrucci, R. W. Motl, and E. T. Hsiao-Wecksler, "Six-Minute Walk Test Performance in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis While Using Passive or Powered Ankle-Foot Orthoses," *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, vol. 99, no. 3, pp. 484–490, mar 2018.

[119] A. Martinez, B. Lawson, and M. Goldfarb, "A Controller for Guiding Leg Movement During Overground Walking With a Lower Limb Exoskeleton," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 183–193, feb 2018.

[120] B. Hwang and D. Jeon, "Estimation of the User's Muscular Torque for an Over-ground Gait Rehabilitation Robot Using Torque and Insole Pressure Sensors," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 275–283, feb 2018.

[121] M. Dežman, J. Babič, and A. Gams, "Qualitative assessment of a clutch-actuated ankle exoskeleton," in *Advances in Service and Industrial Robotics*, C. Ferraresi and G. Quaglia, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 778–786.

[122] R. Baud, A. Ortlieb, J. Olivier, M. Bouri, and H. Bleuler, "Hibso hip exoskeleton: Toward a wearable and autonomous design," in

International Workshop on Medical and Service Robots, 07 2018, pp. 185–195.

[123] C. Tefertiller, K. Hays, J. Jones, A. Jayaraman, C. Hartigan, T. Bushnik, and G. F. Forrest, "Initial Outcomes from a Multicenter Study Utilizing the Indego Powered Exoskeleton in Spinal Cord Injury," *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 78–85, jan 2018.

[124] W. M. dos Santos, G. A. Caurin, and A. A. Siqueira, "Design and control of an active knee orthosis driven by a rotary Series Elastic Actuator," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 58, pp. 307–318, jan 2017.

[125] J. R. Koller, D. H. Gates, D. P. Ferris, and C. D. Remy, "Confidence in the curve: Establishing instantaneous cost mapping techniques using bilateral ankle exoskeletons," *Journal of Applied Physiology*, vol. 122, no. 2, pp. 242–252, feb 2017.

[126] F. Sylos-Labini, V. La Scaleia, A. d'Avella, I. Pisotta, F. Tamburella, G. Scivoletto, M. Molinari, S. Wang, L. Wang, E. van Asseldonk, H. van der Kooij, T. Hoellinger, G. Cheron, F. Thorsteinsson, M. Ilzkovitz, J. Gancet, R. Hauffe, F. Zanov, F. Lacquaniti, and Y. Ivanenko, "Emg patterns during assisted walking in the exoskeleton," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 8, no. 423, 2014.

[127] A. Rathore, M. Wilcox, D. Ramirez, R. Loureiro, and T. Carlson, "Quantifying the human-robot interaction forces between a lower limb exoskeleton and healthy users," vol. 2016-October, 2016, pp. 586–589.

[128] G. S. Sawicki, A. Domingo, and D. P. Ferris, "The effects of powered ankle-foot orthoses on joint kinematics and muscle activation during walking in individuals with incomplete spinal cord injury," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 3, 2006.

[129] S. M. Cain, K. E. Gordon, and D. P. Ferris, "Locomotor adaptation to a powered ankle-foot orthosis depends on control method," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 48, 2007.

[130] Y. Ding, F. A. Panizzolo, C. Siviy, P. Malcolm, I. Galiana, K. G. Holt, and C. J. Walsh, "Effect of timing of hip extension assistance during loaded walking with a soft exosuit," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 87, dec 2016.

[131] T. Yan, A. Parri, M. Fantozzi, M. Cortese, M. Muscolo, M. Cempini, F. Giovacchini, G. Pasquini, M. Munih, and N. Vitiello, "A novel adaptive oscillators-based control for a powered multi-joint lower-limb orthosis," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, aug 2015, pp. 386–391.

[132] J. R. Koller, D. A. Jacobs, D. P. Ferris, and C. D. Remy, "Learning to walk with an adaptive gain proportional myoelectric controller for a robotic ankle exoskeleton," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 97, dec 2015.

[133] J. Zhang, C. C. Cheah, and S. H. Collins, "Experimental comparison of torque control methods on an ankle exoskeleton during human walking," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, may 2015, pp. 5584–5589.

[134] J. Veneman, R. Kruidhof, E. Hekman, R. Ekkelenkamp, E. Van Asseldonk, and H. van der Kooij, "Design and Evaluation of the LOPES Exoskeleton Robot for Interactive Gait Rehabilitation," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 379–386, sep 2007.

[135] K. Turcot, R. Aissaoui, K. Boivin, N. Hagemeister, M. Pelletier, and J. A. de Guise, "Test-Retest Reliability and Minimal Clinical Change Determination for 3-Dimensional Tibial and Femoral Accelerations During Treadmill Walking in Knee Osteoarthritis Patients," *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, vol. 89, no. 4, pp. 732–737, apr 2008.

[136] E. H. F. van Asseldonk, J. F. Veneman, R. Ekkelenkamp, J. H. Buurke, F. C. T. van der Helm, and H. van der Kooij, "The Effects on Kinematics and Muscle Activity of Walking in a Robotic Gait Trainer During Zero-Force Control," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 360–370, aug 2008.

[137] H. Vallery, J. Veneman, E. van Asseldonk, R. Ekkelenkamp, M. Buss, and H. van Der Kooij, "Compliant actuation of rehabilitation robots," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 60–69, sep 2008.

[138] M. Noel, K. Fortin, and L. J. Bouyer, "Using an electrohydraulic ankle foot orthosis to study modifications in feedforward control during locomotor adaptation to force fields applied in stance," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 16, 2009.

[139] G. S. Sawicki and D. P. Ferris, "Powered ankle exoskeletons reveal the metabolic cost of plantar flexor mechanical work during walking with longer steps at constant step frequency," *Journal of Experimental Biology*, vol. 212, no. 1, pp. 21–31, jan 2009.

[140] K. K. Mankala, S. K. Banala, and S. K. Agrawal, "Novel swing-assist un-motorized exoskeletons for gait training," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 24, 2009.

[141] H. Vallery, E. van Asseldonk, M. Buss, and H. van der Kooij, "Reference Trajectory Generation for Rehabilitation Robots: Complementary Limb Motion Estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 23–30, feb 2009.

[142] A. Domingo, E. Marriott, R. B. de Grave, and T. Lam, "Quantifying lower limb joint position sense using a robotic exoskeleton: A pilot study," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics*. IEEE, jun 2011, pp. 1–6.

[143] C. L. Lewis and D. P. Ferris, "Invariant hip moment pattern while walking with a robotic hip exoskeleton," *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 789–793, mar 2011.

[144] P. Beyl, K. Knaepen, S. Duerinck, M. Van Damme, B. Vanderborght, R. Meeusen, and D. Lefeber, "Safe and Compliant Guidance by a Powered Knee Exoskeleton for Robot-Assisted Rehabilitation of Gait," *Advanced Robotics*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 513–535, jan 2011.

[145] S. Galle, P. Malcolm, W. Derave, and D. De Clercq, "Adaptation to walking with an exoskeleton that assists ankle extension," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 495–499, jul 2013.

[146] K. Van Kammen, A. Boonstra, H. Reinders-Messelink, and R. den Otter, "The Combined Effects of Body Weight Support and Gait Speed on Gait Related Muscle Activity: A Comparison between Walking in the Lokomat Exoskeleton and Regular Treadmill Walking," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 9, no. 9, p. e107323, sep 2014.

[147] S. Šlajpah, R. Kamnik, and M. Munih, "Kinematics based sensory fusion for wearable motion assessment in human walking," *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, vol. 116, no. 2, pp. 131–144, sep 2014.

[148] R. W. Jackson and S. H. Collins, "An experimental comparison of the relative benefits of work and torque assistance in ankle exoskeletons," *Journal of Applied Physiology*, vol. 119, no. 5, pp. 541–557, sep 2015.

[149] R. R. Caron, C. L. Lewis, E. Saltzman, R. C. Wagenaar, and K. G. Holt, "Musculoskeletal stiffness changes linearly in response to increasing load during walking gait," *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1165–1171, apr 2015.

[150] S. Galle, W. Derave, F. Bossuyt, P. Calders, P. Malcolm, and D. De Clercq, "Exoskeleton plantarflexion assistance for elderly," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 52, pp. 183–188, feb 2017.

[151] A. E. Chisholm, A. Domingo, J. Jeyasurya, and T. Lam, "Quantification of Lower Extremity Kinesthesia Deficits Using a Robotic Exoskeleton in People With a Spinal Cord Injury," *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 199–208, mar 2016.

[152] L. M. Mooney and H. M. Herr, "Biomechanical walking mechanisms underlying the metabolic reduction caused by an autonomous exoskeleton," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 4, dec 2016.

[153] F. A. Panizzolo, I. Galiana, A. T. Asbeck, C. Siviy, K. Schmidt, K. G. Holt, and C. J. Walsh, "A biologically-inspired multi-joint soft exosuit that can reduce the energy cost of loaded walking," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 43, dec 2016.

[154] O. Jansen, T. A. Schildhauer, R. C. Meindl, M. Tegenthoff, P. Schwenkreis, M. Sczesny-Kaiser, D. Grasmücke, C. Fisahn, and M. Aach, "Functional Outcome of Neurologic-Controlled HAL-Exoskeletal Neurorehabilitation in Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: A Pilot With One Year Treatment and Variable Treatment Frequency," *Global Spine Journal*, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 735–743, dec 2017.

[155] A. Wu, F. Dzeladini, T. Brug, F. Tamburella, N. Tagliamonte, E. van Asseldonk, H. van der Kooij, and A. IJspeert, "A versatile neuromuscular exoskeleton controller for gait assistance: A preliminary study on spinal cord injury patients," in *Wearable Robotics*, ser. Biosystems and Biorobotics. Springer, 2017, pp. 163–167.

[156] A. R. Wu, F. Dzeladini, T. J. H. Brug, F. Tamburella, N. L. Tagliamonte, E. H. F. van Asseldonk, H. van der Kooij, and A. J. Ijspeert, "An Adaptive Neuromuscular Controller for Assistive Lower-Limb Exoskeletons: A Preliminary Study on Subjects with Spinal Cord Injury," *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, vol. 11, jun 2017.

[157] Z. F. Lerner, D. L. Damiano, and T. C. Bulea, "A lower-extremity exoskeleton improves knee extension in children with crouch gait from cerebral palsy," *Science Translational Medicine*, vol. 9, no. 404, aug 2017.

[158] M. T. Alvarez, D. Torricelli, A. J. Del-Ama, D. Pinto, J. Gonzalez-Vargas, J. C. Moreno, A. Gil-Agudo, and J. L. Pons, "Simultaneous estimation of human and exoskeleton motion: A simplified protocol," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 1431–1436.

[159] S. Kwon and W.-K. Song, "Gait pattern analysis using an end-effector type rehabilitation robot and a wearable inertial measurement unit," in *2017 14th International Conference on Ubiquitous Robots and Ambient Intelligence (URAI)*. IEEE, jun 2017, pp. 576–577.

[160] P. Malcolm, D. M. Rossi, C. Siviy, S. Lee, B. T. Quinlivan, M. Grimmer, and C. J. Walsh, "Continuous sweep versus discrete step protocols for studying effects of wearable robot assistance magnitude," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 72, dec 2017.

[161] K. van Kammen, A. M. Boonstra, L. H. V. van der Woude, H. A. Reinders-Messelink, and R. den Otter, "Differences in muscle activity and temporal step parameters between Lokomat guided walking and treadmill walking in post-stroke hemiparetic patients and healthy walkers," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 32, dec 2017.

[162] N. D'Elia, F. Vanetti, M. Cempini, G. Pasquini, A. Parri, M. Rabuffetti, M. Ferrarin, R. Molino Lova, and N. Vitiello, "Physical human-robot interaction of an active pelvis orthosis: toward ergonomic assessment of wearable robots," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 29, dec 2017.

[163] J. Olivier, A. Ortlieb, M. Bouri, and H. Bleuler, "Influence of an Assistive Hip Orthosis on Gait," 2017, pp. 531–540.

[164] Y. Ding, I. Galiana, A. T. Asbeck, S. M. M. De Rossi, J. Bae, T. R. T. Santos, V. L. de Araujo, S. Lee, K. G. Holt, and C. Walsh, "Biomechanical and Physiological Evaluation of Multi-Joint Assistance With Soft Exosuits," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 119–130, feb 2017.

[165] S. Galle, P. Malcolm, S. H. Collins, and D. De Clercq, "Reducing the metabolic cost of walking with an ankle exoskeleton: interaction between actuation timing and power," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 35, dec 2017.

[166] E. Zheng, S. Manca, T. Yan, A. Parri, N. Vitiello, and Q. Wang, "Gait Phase Estimation Based on Noncontact Capacitive Sensing and Adaptive Oscillators," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 2419–2430, oct 2017.

[167] A. Ikumi, S. Kubota, Y. Shimizu, H. Kadone, A. Marushima, T. Ueno, H. Kawamoto, Y. Hada, A. Matsumura, Y. Sankai, and M. Yamazaki, "Decrease of spasticity after hybrid assistive limb ® training for a patient with C4 quadriplegia due to chronic SCI," *The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 573–578, sep 2017.

[168] C. E. Carr and D. J. Newman, "Exoskeleton energetics: Implications for planetary extravehicular activity," in *2017 IEEE Aerospace Conference*. IEEE, mar 2017, pp. 1–14.

[169] L. Grazi, S. Crea, A. Parri, R. Molino Lova, S. Micera, and N. Vitiello, "Gastrocnemius Myoelectric Control of a Robotic Hip Exoskeleton Can Reduce the User's Lower-Limb Muscle Activities at Push Off," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 12, feb 2018.

[170] O. Jansen, D. Grasmuecke, R. C. Meindl, M. Tegenthoff, P. Schwenkreis, M. Sczesny-Kaiser, M. Wessling, T. A. Schildhauer, C. Fisahn, and M. Aach, "Hybrid Assistive Limb Exoskeleton HAL in the Rehabilitation of Chronic Spinal Cord Injury: Proof of Concept; the Results in 21 Patients," *World Neurosurgery*, vol. 110, pp. e73–e78, feb 2018.

[171] S. Galle, P. Malcolm, W. Derave, and D. De Clercq, "Uphill walking with a simple exoskeleton: Plantarflexion assistance leads to proximal adaptations," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 246–251, jan 2015.

[172] S. Galle, P. Malcolm, W. Derave, and D. De Clercq, "Enhancing performance during inclined loaded walking with a powered ankle-foot exoskeleton," *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, vol. 114, no. 11, pp. 2341–2351, nov 2014.

[173] T. Miyatake, S. Lee, I. Galiana, D. Rossi, C. Siviy, F. Panizzolo, and C. Walsh, "Biomechanical analysis and inertial sensing of ankle joint while stepping on an unanticipated bump," in *Biosystems and Biorobotics*, 10 2017, vol. 16.

[174] M. Trkov, S. Wu, K. Chen, J. Yi, T. Liu, and Q. Zhao, "Design of a Robotic Knee Assistive Device (ROKAD) for Slip-Induced Fall Prevention during Walking," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 9802–9807, jul 2017.

[175] V. Monaco, P. Tropea, F. Aprigliano, D. Martelli, A. Parri, M. Cortese, R. Molino-Lova, N. Vitiello, and S. Micera, "An ecologically-controlled exoskeleton can improve balance recovery after slippage," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 7, 2017.

[176] J. M. Aldridge Whitehead, E. Russell Esposito, and J. M. Wilken, "Stair ascent and descent biomechanical adaptations while using a custom anklefoot orthosis," *Journal of Biomechanics*, vol. 49, no. 13, pp. 2899–2908, sep 2016.

[177] J. Jang, K. Kim, J. Lee, B. Lim, and Y. Shim, "Assistance strategy for stair ascent with a robotic hip exoskeleton," in *2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, oct 2016, pp. 5658–5663.

[178] C. L. Zhang J.-X., Dou S.-F., Su H.-L., "Variation characteristics of gait parameters during stair ascent and descent," *Yiyong Shengwu Lixue/Journal of Medical Biomechanics*, 2016.

[179] S. Rossi, A. Colazza, M. Petrarca, E. Castelli, P. Cappa, and H. I. Krebs, "Feasibility Study of a Wearable Exoskeleton for Children: Is the Gait Altered by Adding Masses on Lower Limbs?" *PLoS ONE*, vol. 8, no. 9, sep 2013.

[180] Z. Zhou, Y. Liao, C. Wang, and Q. Wang, "Preliminary evaluation of gait assistance during treadmill walking with a light-weight bionic knee exoskeleton," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO)*. IEEE, dec 2016, pp. 1173–1178.

[181] Y. Ding, I. Galiana, C. Siviy, F. A. Panizzolo, and C. Walsh, "IMU-based iterative control for hip extension assistance with a soft exosuit," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, may 2016, pp. 3501–3508.

[182] D. J. Hyun, H. Park, T. Ha, S. Park, and K. Jung, "Biomechanical design of an agile, electricity-powered lower-limb exoskeleton for weight-bearing assistance," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 95, pp. 181–195, sep 2017.

[183] K. A. Witte, A. M. Fatschel, and S. H. Collins, "Design of a lightweight, tethered, torque-controlled knee exoskeleton," in *2017 International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. IEEE, jul 2017, pp. 1646–1653.

[184] J. Schiffman, K. Gregorczyk, C. Bensel, L. Hasselquist, and J. Obusek, "The effects of a lower body exoskeleton load carriage assistive device on limits of stability and postural sway," *Ergonomics*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 1515–1529, 2008.

[185] S. S. Druzbicki M., Rusek W., Szczepanik M., Dudek J., "Assessment of the impact of orthotic gait training on balance in children with cerebral palsy," *Acta of Bioengineering and Biomechanics*, 2010.

[186] T. Wojtara, M. Sasaki, H. Konosu, M. Yamashita, S. Shimoda, F. Alnajjar, and H. Kimura, "Artificial balancer Supporting device for postural reflex," *Gait & Posture*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 316–321, feb 2012.

[187] L. K. Li L., Hoon K.H., "Balance analysis and optimal posture estimation during assisted walking," *Assistive Robotics: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Climbing and Walking Robots and the Support Technologies for Mobile Machines, CLAWAR 2015*, pp. 75–86, 2015.

[188] A. Emmens, E. Van Asseldonk, and H. Van Der Kooij, "Effects of a powered ankle-foot orthosis on perturbed standing balance," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2018.

[189] Y. Akiyama, S. Okamoto, Y. Yamada, and K. Ishiguro, "Measurement of Contact Behavior Including Slippage of Cuff When Using Wearable Physical Assistant Robot," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 784–793, jul 2016.

[190] N. Birch, J. Graham, T. Priestley, C. Heywood, M. Sakel, A. Gall, A. Nunn, and N. Signal, "Results of the first interim analysis of the RAPPER II trial in patients with spinal cord injury: ambulation and functional exercise programs in the REX powered walking aid," *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 60, dec 2017.

[191] C. E. Carr and J. McGee, "The Apollo Number: Space Suits, Self-Support, and the Walk-Run Transition," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 4, no. 8, aug 2009.

[192] M. S. Cherry, S. Kota, A. Young, and D. P. Ferris, "Running with an Elastic Lower Limb Exoskeleton," *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 269–277, jun 2016.

[193] E. Russell Esposito, H. S. Choi, J. G. Owens, R. V. Blanck, and J. M. Wilken, "Biomechanical response to anklefoot orthosis stiffness during running," *Clinical Biomechanics*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 1125–1132, dec 2015.

[194] A. L. Hof, R. M. van Bockel, T. Schoppen, and K. Postema, "Control of lateral balance in walking: Experimental findings in normal subjects

and above-knee amputees," *Gait   Posture*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 250 – 258, 2007.