

Medical Science

To Cite:

Gołacki R, Burda B, Januszczak R, Kaczmarek A, Cholewa J, Szelc S, Śliwa W, Szymonek K, Gołacka K, Szymonek P. Patient-Related Predictors of Response to Lower Limb Exoskeleton-Assisted Gait Rehabilitation: A Review. *Medical Science* 2026; 30: e130ms3883 doi:

Authors' Affiliation:

¹Uniwersytecki Szpital Kliniczny Nr 4 w Lublinie, ul. Dra K. Jaczewskiego 8, 20-090 Lublin, Poland

²University Clinical Hospital in Białystok, ul. M. C. Skłodowskiej 24a, 15-276 Białystok, Poland

³Medical University of Lublin, Faculty of Medicine, 19 Chodźki St, 20-093 Lublin, Poland

⁴Wojewódzki Szpital Specjalistyczny im. Stefana Kardynała Wyszyńskiego w Lublinie, al. Kraśnicka 100, 20-718 Lublin, Poland

⁵SP ZOZ MSWiA w Lublinie, ul. Grenadierów 3, 20-331 Lublin, Poland

⁶SPZOZ w Lubartowie, ul. Cicha 14, 21-100 Lubartów, Poland

*Corresponding author:

Rafał Gołacki,
Uniwersytecki Szpital Kliniczny Nr 4 w Lublinie, ul. Dra K. Jaczewskiego 8, 20-090 Lublin, Poland,
Email: rgołacki00@gmail.com

Orcid list:

Rafał Gołacki -	0009-0002-0562-4480
Katarzyna Gołacka -	0009-0003-8408-2049
Aleksandra Kaczmarek -	0009-0006-3494-7990
Bartosz Burda -	0009-0002-1871-424X
Karolina Szymonek -	0009-0000-1928-3125
Julianna Cholewa -	0009-0007-2432-1828
Radosław Januszczak -	0009-0007-4088-8138
Paweł Szymonek -	0009-0002-6345-7721
Sylwia Szelc -	0009-0004-8754-9107
Wiktoria Śliwa -	0009-0008-2594-2172

Contact list:

Rafał Gołacki -	rgołacki00@gmail.com
Katarzyna Gołacka -	kn.procajlo@gmail.com
Aleksandra Kaczmarek -	aleksandra.kosmider.29@gmail.com
Bartosz Burda -	bartosz.burda2000@gmail.com
Karolina Szymonek -	karolina.szymonek47@gmail.com
Julianna Cholewa -	juliannacholewas@gmail.com
Radosław Januszczak -	januszczak.md@gmail.com
Paweł Szymonek -	szymonek.p.lbl@gmail.com
Sylwia Szelc -	sylwiaszelc01@gmail.com
Wiktoria Śliwa -	wiktoria.weronika.sliwa@gmail.com

Peer-Review History

Received: 07 April 2026

Reviewed & Revised: 18/April/2026 to 27/June/2026

Accepted: 09 July 2026

Published: 25 July 2026

Peer-review Method

External peer-review was done through double-blind method.

Medical Science

pISSN 2321-7359; eISSN 2321-7367



© The Author(s) 2026. Open Access. This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 \(CC BY 4.0\)](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.



Patient-Related Predictors of Response to Lower Limb Exoskeleton-Assisted Gait Rehabilitation: A Review

Rafał Gołacki^{1*}, Bartosz Burda¹, Radosław Januszczak¹, Aleksandra Kaczmarek², Julianna Cholewa³, Sylwia Szelc³, Wiktoria Śliwa³, Karolina Szymonek⁴, Katarzyna Gołacka⁵, Paweł Szymonek⁶

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Gait impairments are a main cause of disability. Conventional rehabilitation often requires an intense effort from the physiotherapist with repetitive, specific movements. Lower limb exoskeletons have become a useful tool for gait rehabilitation. They enable training repetitive movements and enhance neuroplasticity by providing controlled movement patterns. Several studies reported improvements in gait speed, walking distance, and other functional outcomes due to the use of these devices. Due to heterogeneity in patient populations, intervention protocols, and reported outcomes, we sought to study how to improve therapy fit and identify the patients who will benefit most from such a treatment option. It is essential to identify predictors of response to exoskeleton-assisted gait rehabilitation to improve decision-making and optimize treatment strategies. **Methodology:** We reviewed the selected literature in the databases: PubMed and Science Direct between January and March 2026. We focused on studies published from 2021 onward that were relevant to the study's topic. We emphasize systematic reviews and clinical trials. **Result and discussion:** Relatively few studies, particularly randomized trials and subgroup analyses, directly investigated predictors of treatment response. Baseline functional status, severity of impairment, and recovery phase were the most consistently identified positive response factors. Future research will help physicians better identify good responders for exoskeleton rehabilitation.

Keywords: exoskeleton, lower limb, gait rehabilitation, predictors

1. INTRODUCTION

Gait problems are a major cause of disability in patients with stroke, Spinal Cord Injury (SCI), and Multiple Sclerosis (MS) or other neurological conditions. The loss of walking ability significantly reduces functional independence, lowers quality of life, and increases the risk of falls and muscle atrophy. Studies show the general

effectiveness of exoskeleton usage. It is safe and has measurable gait rehabilitation outcomes in multiple devices (Gołacki et al., 2025). In this meta-analysis, the researchers do not explore why some patients respond better than others, and the effectiveness of robot-assisted gait training is variable and often limited (Bin et al., 2023). The idea of identifying predictors of response is a step toward better therapy fit and does not overstate treatment effectiveness.

The goal of this review is to explore why some patients benefit more than others and what the implications of these differences are. This approach aligns with the principles of personalized medicine and does not introduce bias, provided that analyses are conducted transparently across patient groups. It is risky to assume uniform treatment effects across heterogeneous patient populations because this may introduce bias and because treatment response varies between patients. Previous studies failed to identify potential predictors of a better response to exoskeleton gait rehabilitation.

2. REVIEW METHODS

We carried out a literature review from January to March 2026 using PubMed and ScienceDirect. We searched for relevant papers using keywords alone and in combination, and checked titles and abstracts to identify studies related to our topic. We excluded papers that did not fit these criteria. Relevant studies included original research articles, such as randomized controlled trials (RCTs), as well as review papers focusing on predictors of the effectiveness of lower-limb exoskeletons in the rehabilitation of patients with gait impairments. We created the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram (Figure 1).




Figure 1. PRISMA consort chart of selected studies

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Clinical predictors of response

According to the researchers, the most important factor affecting treatment response is the patient’s starting level of function. Patients who have better initial mobility, partial maintenance of motor function, early start of intervention and less severe neurological

impairment tend to achieve greater objective improvements in functional outcomes (Chang et al., 2026). Conversely, people with more severe impairments or complete motor deficits generally show more limited gains.

Negative factor for both classic rehabilitation and exoskeleton-assisted rehabilitation is co-morbidity. Initial muscle strength is particularly important in the classic approach. Some factors of good response to the therapy are related to exoskeleton-patient interaction. It is important to have adequate ability to generate motor signals, good biomechanic fit, and the patient who is willing to work with new technology. These findings highlight the importance of residual motor capacity in enabling effective interaction with robotic assistance. Patients with complete Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) do not show significant motor benefits (Hu et al., 2024). In contrast the patients with incomplete SCI, even in chronic cases, improve measurably (Echemendía del Valle et al., 2023; Edwards et al., 2022), including physical activity (Belsey et al., 2026). Researchers did not directly compare complete and incomplete SCI, and did not evaluate the impact of this factor as a predictor. A recent meta-analysis reported only minor overall improvements in the gait parameters following exoskeleton-assisted training in patients with SCI, with substantial heterogeneity across publications (Liu & Chen, 2024).

Neurophysiological Mechanisms

Exoskeletons support the motor components of rehabilitation and also activate brain motor function (Zhang et al., 2025). Researchers suggest that a patient’s neuroplastic potential may predict how well they respond to treatment.

Exoskeleton training that uses AI algorithms and brain–computer interface (BCI) control has been linked to better motor function and greater neural engagement. Researchers believe that having preserved neuronal pathways and the ability to actively use cortical networks may influence treatment outcomes (Hu et al., 2026). Robot-assisted gait rehabilitation also affects the autonomic nervous system, and can improve urodynamic function (Ziętek et al., 2026). Researchers have studied its effects on neuropathic pain, but the results are still inconclusive (White et al., 2025).

Intervention and Device-related Factors

The subacute phase of injury characterizes increased neuroplasticity; hence, the timing of the intervention may be important. Patients who underwent exoskeleton-assisted rehabilitation in the subacute phase of stroke showed better outcomes than patients treated with conventional rehabilitation (Huo et al., 2024). However, direct comparisons with patients in the chronic post-stroke phase are needed.

Further advances in technology should improve clinical outcomes - modern exoskeleton control algorithms use real-time gait prediction and intention recognition. It provides better support and leads to better gait symmetry and coordination outcomes (Li et al., 2025). Device-related factors and control strategies should improve rehabilitation results and users’ satisfaction. Nevertheless, improving patients’ interaction with the device does not directly determine success (Qin et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2021).

Overall findings

Outcomes suggest that exoskeleton-assisted gait rehabilitation is associated with some improvements in gait performance and functional outcomes. Albeit the magnitude of benefit varies considerably between patients (Mehrholtz et al., 2025; Bin et al., 2023). The variability appears to be influenced, at least in part, by baseline patient characteristics (Lee et al., 2023).

Researchers checked outcomes using several standardized measures: inter alia the 6-Minute Walk Test (6MWT), the Functional Ambulation Category (FAC), and quality of life (QoL) scales. We presented a detailed summary of the included studies in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Included Studies - Patient-Related Predictors of Response to Exoskeleton-Assisted Gait Rehabilitation

Study	Design	Population Number	Condition	Intervention	Outcomes	Key Results	Predictors of response
Lee et al., 2023	RCT	Adults, 44	Stroke	Exoskeleton-assisted gait training.	6MWT, FAC, QoL.	Significant improvement in walking distance and function.	Baseline functional status, treatment intensity.
Huo et al., 2024	RCT	Adults, 40	Subacute stroke	Unilateral exoskeleton training.	Balance, gait, neuroplasticity.	Improved gait and balance vs control.	Subacute phase, neuroplastic potential
Chang et al.,	Subgroup	Adults,	Stroke	Torque-	Gait function	Identified responders	Baseline

2026	analysis (RCT-based)	55		assisted exoskeleton		vs non-responders	impairment, motor function.
Hu et al., 2026	Pilot RCT	Adults, 20	SCI	BCI-controlled exoskeleton training	Motor function, gait	Functional improvement and neural recovery	Neural engagement, residual pathways
Echemendía del Valle et al., 2023	Prospective cohort	Adults, 30	SCI	Gait training program (incl. robotic elements)	Gait performance.	Improved walking ability.	Training duration, baseline status
(Rodríguez-Fernández et al., 2021)	Systematic review	Mixed neuro 87 studies.	Stroke, SCI, MS	Wearable exoskeletons	Gait, independence	Consistent improvement, high heterogeneity	Not defined; suggests the patient variability
de Miguel-Fernández et al., 2023	Systematic review	159 studies.	Brain injury	Control strategies of exoskeletons.	Gait performance	Adaptive control improves outcomes	Device-patient interaction
Herrera-Valenzuela et al., 2023	Qualitative study	Adults, 15.	SCI	Exoskeleton use	User experience	Identified usability barriers	Patient needs, comfort, adaptation
Mehrholz et al., 2025	Systematic review	Adults >1000 (pooled)	Stroke	Electromechanical gait training	Walking independence	Improved independent walking	Time since stroke, severity.

4. CONCLUSION

Due to differences in responses to exoskeleton-assisted gait rehabilitation and results often dependent on the patient's profile, we observed some dependencies. The most consistent predictors of better rehabilitation outcomes are higher baseline functional status, less severe neurological impairment, and earlier stages of injury recovery. Moreover, preserved motor function and efficient patient-device interaction enhance the positive therapeutic response. Patient stratification and personalization of rehabilitation protocols are the correct path for future development. However, current evidence is limited. Future research should focus on large RCTs with longer follow-up periods, especially those identifying patient-related predictors of response, to improve treatment success rates. Combining clinical predictors with advanced data models may be a key step toward more effective and better-tailored rehabilitation.

Acknowledgments

There are no acknowledgments to disclose.

Authors' Contributions

Conceptualization: Rafał Gołacki, Karolina Szymonek

Methodology: Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Bartosz Burda, Wiktoria Śliwa

Software: Katarzyna Gołacka, Radosław Januszczak

Check: Rafał Gołacki, Paweł Szymonek, Bartosz Burda

Formal analysis: Sylwia Szelc, Wiktoria Śliwa, Julianna Cholewa

Investigation: Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Katarzyna Gołacka, Rafał Gołacki

Resources: Wiktoria Śliwa, Bartosz Burda, Aleksandra Kośmider

Data curation: Radosław Januszczak, Julianna Cholewa, Sylwia Szelc

Writing - rough preparation: Karolina Szymonek, Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Rafał Gołacki, Katarzyna Gołacka, Julianna Cholewa, Radosław Januszczak, Wiktoria Śliwa

Writing - review and editing: Rafał Gołacki, Bartosz Burda, Paweł Szymonek, Sylwia Szelc

Visualization: Aleksandra Kaczmarek, Katarzyna Gołacka, Julianna Cholewa

Supervision: Bartosz Burda, Radosław Januszczak, Aleksandra Kaczmarek

Project administration: Paweł Szymonek, Rafał Gołacki, Katarzyna Gołacka

All authors reviewed the manuscript and approved its final version for publication.

Informed consent

Not applicable.

Ethical approval

Not applicable. This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

Funding

This research did not receive any external funding like specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or nonprofit sectors.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest, competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

Data and materials availability

All data associated with this study will be available based on the reasonable request to corresponding author.

REFERENCES

1. Belsey J, Reid A, Hannah S, Johnson L, Faulkner J. The effect of robot-assisted gait training on physical activity outcomes in people with spinal cord injury: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil* 2026. doi:10.1177/02692155251411864
2. Bin L, Wang X, Jiatong H, Donghua F, Qiang W, Yingchao S, Yiming M, Yong M. The effect of robot-assisted gait training for patients with spinal cord injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Neurosci* 2023;17:1252651. doi:10.3389/fnins.2023.1252651
3. Chang WH, Kim TW, Kim HS, Hanapiah FA, Lee JW, Han SH, Jia CW, Kim DH, Kim DY. Identifying candidates for torque-assisted exoskeleton for gait assistance after stroke: a pre-specified subgroup analysis. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med* 2026. doi:10.23736/S1973-9087.26.09160-4
4. De Miguel-Fernández J, Lobo-Prat J, Prinsen E, Font-Llagunes JM, Marchal-Crespo L. Control strategies used in lower limb exoskeletons for gait rehabilitation after brain injury: a systematic review and analysis of clinical effectiveness. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2023;20(1):23. doi:10.1186/s12984-023-01144-5
5. Echemendía del Valle A, Bender del Busto JE, Sentmanat Belisón A, Nicolás Cuenca-Zaldívar A, Martínez-Pozas O, Martínez-Lozano P, Fernández-Carnero S, Valcárcel Izquierdo N, A Sánchez-Romero E. Effects of a gait training program on spinal cord injury patients: a single-group prospective cohort study. *J Clin Med* 2023;12(22):7208. doi:10.3390/jcm12237208
6. Edwards DJ, Forrest G, Cortes M, Weightman MM, Sadowsky C, Chang SH, Furman K, Bialek A, Prokup S, Carlow J, VanHiel L, Kemp L, Musick D, Campo M, Jayaraman A. Walking improvement in chronic incomplete spinal cord injury with exoskeleton robotic training (WISE): a randomized controlled trial. *Spinal Cord*. 2022;60(6):522-532. doi:10.1038/s41393-022-00751-8
7. Gołacki R, Świta M, Procajło K, Szewczyk J. The Role of Lower Limb Exoskeletons in the Rehabilitation of Gait Disorders: A Review. *Med Sci* 2025;29:e130ms3623. doi:10.54905/disssi.v29i162.e130ms3623
8. Herrera-Valenzuela D, Díaz-Peña L, Redondo-Galán C, José Arroyo M, Cascante-Gutiérrez L, Gil-Agudo A, Moreno JC, Del-Ama AJ. A qualitative study to elicit user requirements for lower limb wearable exoskeletons for gait rehabilitation in spinal cord injury. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2023;20:138. doi:10.1186/s12984-023-01264-y
9. Hu X, Li N, Pang M, Bai S, Mo J, Yao S, Lu Y, Huang M, Di J, Kang Y, Tang J, Zhang H, Zhao T, He J, He L, Xie R, Liu B, Xu G, Hu X, Rong L. Brain-computer interface-controlled exoskeleton training for lower-limb rehabilitation in spinal cord injury: a pilot randomized clinical trial. *Ann Neurol*. 2026;99(5):1124-1138. doi:10.1002/ana.78144
10. Hu X, Lu J, Wang Y, Pang R, Liu J, Gou X, Bai X, Zhang A, Cheng H, Wang Q, Chang Y, Yin J, Chang C, Xiao H, Wang W. Effects of a lower limb walking exoskeleton on quality of life and activities of daily living in patients with complete

- spinal cord injury: a randomized controlled trial. *Technol Health Care* 2024;32(1):243-253. doi:10.3233/THC-220871
11. Huo C, Shao G, Chen T, Li W, Wang J, Xie H, Wang Y, Li Z, Zheng P, Li L, Li L. Effectiveness of unilateral lower-limb exoskeleton robot on balance and gait recovery and neuroplasticity in patients with subacute stroke: a randomized controlled trial. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2024;21:213. doi:10.1186/s12984-024-01493-9
12. Lee YH, Ko LW, Hsu CY, Cheng YY. Therapeutic effects of robotic-exoskeleton-assisted gait rehabilitation and predictive factors of significant improvements in stroke patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Bioengineering (Basel)* 2023;10(5):585. doi:10.3390/bioengineering10050585
13. Li Y, Luo S, Luo R, Liu H. A novel real-time assistive hip-wearable exoskeleton robot based on motion prediction for lower extremity rehabilitation in subacute stroke: a single-blinded randomized controlled trial. *BMC Neurol* 2025;25:399. doi:10.1186/s12883-025-04437-5
14. Liu W, Chen J. The efficacy of exoskeleton robotic training on ambulation recovery in patients with spinal cord injury: a meta-analysis. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2024;47(6):840-849. doi:10.1080/10790268.2023.2214482
15. Mehrholz J, Kugler J, Pohl M, Elsner B. Electromechanical-assisted training for walking after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2025;5(5):CD006185. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006185.pub6
16. Qin T, Yang Y, Wen B, Chen Z, Bao Z, Dong H, Dou K, Yang C. Research on human gait prediction and recognition algorithm of lower limb-assisted exoskeleton robot. *Intell Serv Robot* 2021;14:445-457. doi:10.1007/s11370-021-00367-6
17. Rodríguez-Fernández A, Lobo-Prat J, Font-Llagunes JM. Systematic review on wearable lower-limb exoskeletons for gait training in neuromuscular impairments. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2021;18(1):22. doi:10.1186/s12984-021-00815-5
18. White C, Klus S, Ho WH, Barrett L, Doherty O, Lennon O. Robotic-assisted gait training for spinal cord injury neuropathic pain: a systematic review. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2025. doi:10.1080/10790268.2025.2503049
19. Zhang X, Xie L, Liu W, Liang S, Huang L, Wang M, Tian L, Zhang L, Liang Z, Li H, Huang G. Exoskeleton-guided passive movement elicits standardized EEG patterns for generalizable BCIs in stroke rehabilitation. *J Neuroeng Rehabil* 2025;22:97. doi:10.1186/s12984-025-01627-7
20. Zhou J, Yang S, Xue Q. Lower limb rehabilitation exoskeleton robot: a review. *Adv Mech Eng* 2021;13(4):16878140211011862. doi:10.1177/16878140211011862
21. Ziętek Z, Frasuńska J, Korczyński B, Szopiński T, Tarnacka B. Effects of robot-assisted gait therapy on urodynamic changes in the subacute phase after spinal cord injury: a prospective study. *Med Sci Monit* 2026;32:e950018 doi:10.12659/MSM.950018