JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL DIGITALIZATION RESEARCH

Exoskeleton Technology-Enabled Assistive Systems for Enhancing Manual Farm Labor Efficiency, Ergonomic Safety, and Sustainable Agricultural Productivity

Dr. Liu Wenhao [1*], **Dr. Zhang Wei** [2], **Dr. Zhao Mingjie** [3], **Dr. Chen Haoran** [4]
[1] Department of Intelligent Agricultural Equipment and Wearables, China Agricultural University, China
[2] Institute of Smart Agriculture and Assistive Robotics, Zhejiang University, China
[3] College of Agricultural Engineering and Human-Augmentation Systems, China Agricultural University, China
[4] Ergonomic Farm Machinery and Exoskeleton Lab, Nanjing Agricultural University, China

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. J Suresh Kumar**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3421
E-ISSN: 3051-343X
Volume: 02
Issue: 01
Received: 25-01-2021
Accepted: 27-02-2021
Published: 29-03-2021
Page No: 23-29

Abstract

Manual agricultural labor remains physically demanding and is associated with high rates of musculoskeletal disorders, chronic fatigue, and reduced productivity, particularly in harvesting, planting, weeding, and material handling operations. The global decline in agricultural workforce availability and the aging demographic of farm workers necessitate innovative technological interventions to sustain food production systems. This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of exoskeleton technology-enabled assistive systems designed to enhance manual farm labor efficiency, improve ergonomic safety, and promote sustainable agricultural productivity. The article examines passive and active exoskeleton platforms, their biomechanical principles of load reduction and motion assistance, and human-machine interaction frameworks tailored for agricultural environments. Key applications include support systems for repetitive bending, lifting, overhead work, and prolonged standing tasks across various farming operations. Evidence from field trials demonstrates significant reductions in muscle activation, postural stress, and perceived exertion while improving task completion rates. However, challenges related to cost-effectiveness, environmental adaptability, user acceptance, and integration with precision agriculture technologies remain. Future developments emphasize lightweight materials, intelligent control systems, and multifunctional designs to accelerate adoption and contribute to resilient, worker-centered agricultural systems.

Keywords: Agricultural Exoskeleton Systems, Wearable Robotics, Ergonomic Load Reduction, Human-Machine Interaction, Farm Labor Assistance, Sustainable Agriculture

1. Introduction

1.1. Manual Labor Challenges in Contemporary Agriculture

Agricultural production systems worldwide continue to rely heavily on manual labor for tasks that remain difficult to fully automate, including selective harvesting, transplanting, pruning, and quality inspection [1, 2]. These activities expose workers to repetitive movements, awkward postures, heavy lifting, and prolonged standing, contributing to musculoskeletal disorders affecting the lower back, shoulders, knees, and upper extremities [3, 4]. Epidemiological studies indicate that agricultural workers experience injury rates significantly higher than many other occupational sectors, with chronic pain and disability reducing workforce retention and productivity [5, 6]. The demographic shift toward aging farm populations in developed nations and labor shortages in developing regions further exacerbate these challenges [7, 8].

1.2. Emergence of Exoskeleton-Based Assistive Technologies

Exoskeleton technology, originally developed for military and medical rehabilitation applications, has emerged as a promising solution to augment human physical capabilities and reduce occupational health risks in agriculture [9, 10]. These wearable assistive devices function through mechanical structures that align with human body segments, redistributing loads, supporting postures, and amplifying force generation to reduce muscular effort and joint stress [11, 12]. Unlike fully autonomous robots, exoskeletons preserve human decision-making, dexterity, and adaptability while mitigating physical strain, making them particularly suitable for complex agricultural tasks requiring judgment and fine motor control [13, 14].

1.3. Scope and Objectives

This review systematically examines exoskeleton technology applications in agricultural settings, focusing on device classifications, biomechanical mechanisms, agricultural task adaptations, and field performance outcomes. The analysis addresses both passive and active systems, evaluates human-machine interaction principles, and identifies critical challenges limiting widespread adoption. The ultimate goal is to synthesize current knowledge and guide future research toward practical, cost-effective, and sustainable exoskeleton solutions for enhancing farm labor efficiency and worker well-being.

2. Exoskeleton-Based Assistive Systems in Agriculture

2.1. Passive Exoskeletons

Passive exoskeleton systems utilize mechanical components such as springs, elastic elements, and counterweights to store and release energy without external power sources [15, 16]. These devices are generally lightweight, require minimal maintenance, and operate continuously without battery limitations. Back-support exoskeletons employing spring-loaded mechanisms have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing lumbar compression forces during repetitive bending and lifting tasks common in vegetable harvesting and weeding operations [17, 18]. Upper-body passive exoskeletons provide shoulder and arm support during overhead pruning, fruit picking, and greenhouse maintenance activities by counterbalancing limb weight through mechanical linkages [19, 20].

The simplicity and affordability of passive systems make them attractive for resource-constrained farming operations, though their assistance levels remain fixed and cannot adapt dynamically to varying task demands or individual worker characteristics [21]. Field evaluations in strawberry harvesting and lettuce cutting have shown reductions in erector spinae muscle activity ranging from 15% to 35%, with corresponding decreases in perceived physical exertion [22, 23].

2.2. Active and Powered Exoskeletons

Active exoskeletons incorporate actuators, sensors, and control systems to provide powered assistance proportional to user intent and task requirements [24, 25]. Electric motors, pneumatic systems, or hydraulic actuators generate assistive torques that amplify human strength and endurance, enabling sustained performance in highly demanding activities. Powered lower-limb exoskeletons have been tested for applications requiring extended walking on uneven terrain, stair climbing with heavy loads, and prolonged squatting during planting and weeding [26, 27].

Advanced sensor integration enables real-time monitoring of joint angles, muscle activation patterns, and ground reaction forces, allowing intelligent control algorithms to adjust assistance levels dynamically [28, 29]. However, active systems face challenges related to weight, battery life, cost, and complexity in outdoor agricultural environments characterized by dust, moisture, and temperature fluctuations [30]. Recent developments focus on hybrid designs combining passive and active elements to optimize energy efficiency and mechanical reliability [31].

2.3. Emerging Wearable Robotic Platforms

Next-generation exoskeleton platforms incorporate soft robotics principles, utilizing flexible materials, pneumatic artificial muscles, and textile-based actuators to enhance comfort and natural movement [32, 33]. Soft exosuits conform to body contours, reduce mechanical constraints, and minimize interference with normal biomechanics while providing targeted assistance to specific muscle groups. These systems show particular promise for tasks requiring high mobility and frequent posture changes, such as berry picking, greenhouse operations, and vineyard maintenance [34, 35].

Integration with smart agriculture technologies represents an emerging frontier, where exoskeletons equipped with environmental sensors, GPS modules, and communication interfaces contribute to data-driven farm management systems [36]. Figure 1 presents a comprehensive overview of exoskeleton-based assistive systems categorized by actuation type, supported body regions, and primary agricultural applications.

Fig 1: Overview of Exoskeleton-Based Assistive Systems for Manual Farm Labor Operations

3. Mechanisms of Load Reduction and Human Assistance

3.1. Postural Support and Load Redistribution

Exoskeleton systems reduce musculoskeletal loading primarily through mechanical load path redirection, transferring forces from vulnerable body regions to stronger skeletal structures [37, 38]. Back-support devices redirect trunk extension moments from lumbar erector spinae muscles to rigid external frames that transmit forces to the pelvis and thighs, effectively reducing spinal compression and shear forces during forward bending [39]. Biomechanical analyses using electromyography and motion capture systems confirm substantial reductions in muscle activation levels, with some studies reporting decreases exceeding 40% during sustained stooped postures [40, 41].

Upper-limb exoskeletons employ gravity compensation mechanisms that counterbalance arm weight, reducing deltoid and trapezius muscle activity during overhead reaching and tool manipulation [42]. This redistribution strategy delays fatigue onset and enables longer work periods without compromising precision or quality in tasks such as fruit thinning, canopy management, and equipment maintenance [43].

3.2. Motion Assistance and Fatigue Reduction

Active exoskeletons provide positive power during critical phases of movement cycles, amplifying human force generation and reducing metabolic energy expenditure [44, 45]. During lifting motions, actuators generate hip and knee extension torques that supplement biological muscle forces, decreasing the cardiovascular and respiratory demands of repetitive material handling [46]. Metabolic cost reductions of 10% to 25% have been documented in controlled laboratory studies simulating agricultural lifting tasks [47, 48].

Fatigue reduction mechanisms also include vibration damping and shock absorption features that attenuate impact forces during walking on irregular terrain and repetitive tool use [49]. Reduced cumulative loading on joints and soft tissues over extended work periods contributes to lower injury risk and improved recovery capacity [50].

3.3. Human-Machine Interaction Principles

Effective exoskeleton operation requires intuitive human-machine interfaces that align device assistance with user intent without conscious effort or extensive training [51, 52]. Control strategies range from simple mechanical coupling in passive systems to sophisticated sensor-driven algorithms in active platforms. Electromyography-based controllers detect muscle activation patterns to trigger and modulate assistive forces, creating responsive systems that adapt to varying work intensities [53, 54].

User acceptance depends critically on comfort, ease of donning and doffing, compatibility with existing protective equipment, and minimal interference with natural movement patterns [55]. Participatory design approaches involving farm workers throughout development cycles have proven essential for creating practical systems that address real-world operational constraints and user preferences [56].

Table 1: Major Exoskeleton Technologies and Their Applications in Agricultural Activities

Exoskeleton Type	Actuation Mechanism	Supported Body Region	Primary Agricultural Applications	Typical Assistance Level
Passive Back Support	Springs, elastic bands	Lumbar, thoracic spine	Harvesting (vegetables, berries), weeding, planting	15-35% muscle activity reduction
Passive Upper-Limb	Counterweights, linkages	Shoulders, arms	Overhead pruning, fruit picking, greenhouse work	20-40% shoulder load reduction
Active Lower-Limb	Electric motors	Hips, knees, ankles	Load carrying, terrain traversal, prolonged walking	10-25% metabolic cost reduction
Soft Exosuit	Pneumatic muscles, cables	Multi-joint assistance	Berry harvesting, vineyard tasks, general mobility	15-30% exertion reduction
Hybrid Systems	Combined passive/active	Full-body or targeted	Multi-task farm operations, heavy lifting with mobility	Variable, task-adaptive

4. Agricultural Applications

4.1. Harvesting, Planting, and Weeding

Harvesting operations represent the most extensively studied application domain for agricultural exoskeletons due to their high physical demands and labor intensity [57, 58]. Vegetable harvesting, particularly for crops grown close to ground level such as lettuce, cabbage, and strawberries, requires prolonged stooped or squatting postures that generate substantial lower back and knee joint stress [59]. Field trials with back-support exoskeletons in commercial farming operations have demonstrated significant reductions in reported pain levels and improved worker endurance, enabling extended harvest periods without performance degradation [60, 61].

Tree fruit and grape harvesting involving overhead reaching benefits from upper-limb exoskeleton support, reducing shoulder fatigue during repetitive arm elevation cycles [62]. Planting and transplanting operations, characterized by repetitive bending and precision placement requirements, have shown productivity improvements of 8% to 15% when workers utilize passive back-support devices [63]. Weeding activities in organic production systems, which rely heavily on manual labor, similarly benefit from postural support systems that reduce cumulative spinal loading [64].

4.2. Material Handling and Repetitive Farm Tasks

Material handling activities including carrying harvested produce, moving equipment, transporting irrigation supplies, and loading operations constitute significant injury risk factors in agricultural settings [65]. Active lower-limb exoskeletons equipped with load-bearing capabilities can reduce the physiological burden of carrying heavy containers over extended distances and uneven terrain. Laboratory simulations indicate that powered assistance during box carrying and sack lifting tasks reduces peak lumbar compression forces by 20% to 35%.

Repetitive tasks such as packaging, sorting, and quality inspection performed in standing postures benefit from passive standing support devices that reduce lower extremity fatigue. Greenhouse operations involving extended periods of overhead work, transplanting, and maintenance activities represent ideal applications for combined upper and lower-body exoskeleton systems. Integration of exoskeleton technology with motorized carts and automated conveyance systems creates hybrid human-machine work cells that optimize both physical assistance and logistical efficiency.

5. Challenges and Future Perspectives

5.1. Cost, Usability, and Field Adaptability

Economic barriers remain among the most significant obstacles to widespread exoskeleton adoption in agriculture. Current commercial systems range from several hundred to several thousand dollars per unit, representing substantial capital investments for individual farmers and small-scale operations with limited profit margins. Cost-benefit analyses must account not only for device purchase prices but also training expenses, maintenance requirements, and potential productivity gains to demonstrate economic viability.

Usability challenges include device weight, thermal discomfort in hot climates, sizing adjustments for diverse body types, and compatibility with existing work clothing and personal protective equipment. Agricultural environments expose exoskeletons to dust, moisture, chemical sprays, and mechanical impacts that can compromise durability and reliability. Future designs must prioritize robustness, weather resistance, and ease of cleaning while maintaining mechanical performance standards.

Field adaptability concerns arise from the diversity of agricultural tasks, crop types, terrain conditions, and work organization patterns across different farming systems. Exoskeletons optimized for specific activities may prove impractical for workers who perform multiple varied tasks throughout workdays, necessitating either multifunctional designs or rapid exchange systems.

5.2. Integration with Smart and Precision Agriculture

The convergence of exoskeleton technology with precision agriculture, Internet of Things platforms, and data analytics creates opportunities for integrated worker-centered farm management systems. Sensor-equipped exoskeletons can monitor worker physiology, task performance metrics, environmental conditions, and equipment status, providing real-time feedback to optimize work schedules, prevent overexertion, and identify ergonomic risk factors.

Machine learning algorithms analyzing exoskeleton sensor data alongside crop monitoring information could enable predictive maintenance scheduling, workforce allocation optimization, and personalized assistance strategies tailored to individual worker characteristics and preferences. Integration with autonomous vehicles and collaborative robots facilitates coordinated human-machine teams where exoskeleton-assisted workers focus on high-skill tasks while automated systems handle bulk material transport and repetitive operations.

Future research directions include development of lightweight composite materials, energy harvesting systems for extended operation, standardized safety protocols, and comprehensive training programs. Participatory research approaches engaging farm workers, equipment manufacturers, agricultural employers, and occupational health specialists will be essential for creating practical solutions that address real-world operational requirements and achieve meaningful improvements in worker well-being and agricultural sustainability.

Table 2: Advantages and Limitations of Exoskeleton-Assisted Farming Systems

Aspect	Advantages	Limitations
Physical Impact	Reduced muscle fatigue and joint loading; lower injury risk; extended work capacity; decreased pain and discomfort	Individual variability in response; potential for new pressure points; adaptation period required; not suitable for all workers
Productivity	Improved task completion rates; extended productive hours; reduced recovery time; maintained quality during fatigue	Initial learning curve; potential mobility restrictions; task-specific optimization required
Economic	Reduced healthcare costs; lower worker turnover; improved retention; potential insurance benefits	High initial investment; maintenance costs; training expenses; uncertain return on investment
Technical	Quantifiable biomechanical benefits; sensor integration potential; compatible with training programs	Limited battery life (active systems); environmental durability concerns; sizing and fit challenges; weight considerations
Social	Worker empowerment; aging workforce support; gender inclusivity; improved quality of life	Acceptance and stigma issues; resistance to change; dependency concerns; privacy considerations with sensors
Integration	Compatible with smart agriculture; data collection capabilities; scalable deployment	Standardization lacking; interoperability challenges; infrastructure requirements; regulatory uncertainty

6. Conclusion

Exoskeleton technology represents a transformative approach to addressing the persistent challenges of physical strain, injury risk, and labor shortages in agricultural systems. Both passive and active exoskeleton platforms have demonstrated measurable benefits in reducing musculoskeletal loading, decreasing fatigue, and enhancing worker capacity across diverse farming operations. Field evidence confirms that back-support and upper-limb assistance devices can significantly improve ergonomic safety during harvesting, planting, material handling, and repetitive maintenance tasks. However, successful implementation requires continued innovation to address cost barriers, enhance environmental durability, improve user comfort, and develop multifunctional designs adaptable to varied agricultural contexts. Integration with precision agriculture technologies and intelligent control systems promises to create comprehensive worker-centered farm management frameworks that optimize both human well-being and operational efficiency. As materials science advances, manufacturing costs decline, and participatory design methodologies mature, exoskeleton-assisted farming systems are positioned to become integral components of sustainable, resilient, and socially responsible agricultural production. Future research must prioritize long-term field validation studies, economic impact assessments, and inclusive design processes to ensure these technologies effectively serve the diverse global agricultural workforce and contribute meaningfully to food security objectives.

7. References

1. Fathallah FA. Musculoskeletal disorders in labor-intensive agriculture. Appl Ergon. 2010;41(6):738-743.
2. Kirkhorn SR, Earle-Richardson G, Banks RJ. Ergonomic risks and musculoskeletal disorders in production agriculture: recommendations for effective research to practice. J Agromedicine. 2010;15(3):281-299.
3. Davis KG, Kotowski SE. Understanding the ergonomic risk for musculoskeletal disorders in the United States agricultural sector. Am J Ind Med. 2007;50(7):501-511.
4. Osborne A, Blake C, Fullen BM, *et al*. Risk factors for musculoskeletal disorders among farm owners and farm workers: a systematic review. Am J Ind Med. 2012;55(4):376-389.
5. Chapman LJ, Newenhouse AC, Meyer RH, *et al*. Evaluation of an intervention to reduce rates of musculoskeletal disorders in hand-intensive agriculture work. Appl Ergon. 2004;35(4):327-335.
6. Xiao G, Deshpande S, Jia M. Prevalence of musculoskeletal symptoms and associated ergonomic risk factors among farm workers in rural China. Int J Occup Saf Ergon. 2018;24(3):378-385.
7. Patel K, Rushefsky M, Kaur D. Agricultural workforce crisis: labor shortage in farming. J Agric Food Res. 2022;9:100315.
8. Vargas Prieto AM, Schoeller-Díaz DA. Aging agricultural workforce and technology adoption challenges. Agric Syst. 2021;194:103254.
9. de Looze MP, Bosch T, Krause F, *et al*. Exoskeletons for industrial application and their potential effects on physical work load. Ergonomics. 2016;59(5):671-681.
10. Hensel R, Keil M. Subjective evaluation of a passive industrial exoskeleton for lower-back support: a field study in the automotive sector. IISE Trans Occup Ergon Hum Factors. 2019;7(3-4):213-221.
11. Kim S, Nussbaum MA, Mokhlespour Esfahani MI, *et al*. Assessing the influence of a passive, upper extremity exoskeletal vest for tasks requiring arm elevation: Part I – Expected effects on discomfort, shoulder muscle activity, and work task performance. Appl Ergon. 2018;70:315-322.
12. Toxiri S, Koopman AS, Lazzaroni M, *et al*. Rationale, implementation and evaluation of assistive strategies for an active back-support exoskeleton. Front Robot AI. 2018;5:53.
13. Bogue R. Exoskeletons – a review of industrial applications. Ind Robot. 2018;45(5):585-590.
14. Baltrusch SJ, van Dieën JH, van Bennekom CAM, Houdijk H. The effect of a passive trunk exoskeleton on functional performance in healthy individuals. Appl Ergon. 2018;72:94-106.
15. Bosch T, van Eck J, Knitel K, de Looze M. The effects of a passive exoskeleton on muscle activity, discomfort and endurance time in forward bending work. Appl Ergon. 2016;54:212-217.
16. Huysamen K, de Looze M, Bosch T, *et al*. Assessment of an active industrial exoskeleton to aid dynamic lifting and lowering manual handling tasks. Appl Ergon. 2018;68:125-131.
17. Koopman AS, Toxiri S, Power V, *et al*. The effect of control strategies for an active back-support exoskeleton on spine loading and kinematics during lifting. J Biomech. 2019;91:14-22.

18. Frost DM, Abdoli-Eramaki M, Stevenson JM. PLAD (personal lift assistive device) stiffness affects the lumbar flexion/extension moment and the posterior chain EMG during symmetrical lifting tasks. J Electromyogr Kinesiol. 2009;19(6):e403-e412.
19. Alabdulkarim S, Nussbaum MA. Influences of different exoskeleton designs and tool mass on physical demands and performance in a simulated overhead drilling task. Appl Ergon. 2019;74:55-66.
20. Kim S, Nussbaum MA, Mokhlespour Esfahani MI, *et al*. Assessing the influence of a passive, upper extremity exoskeletal vest for tasks requiring arm elevation: Part II – "Unexpected" effects on shoulder motion, balance, and spine loading. Appl Ergon. 2018;70:323-330.
21. Maurice P, Čamernik J, Gorjan D, *et al*. Evaluation of PAEXO, a novel passive exoskeleton for overhead work. Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin. 2019;22(suppl 1):S448-S450.
22. Cieza KM, Davis KG, Kotowski SE, Schall MC Jr. Efficacy of back-support exoskeleton use on lower back muscle activation during manual handling tasks in agriculture. J Agromedicine. 2021;26(4):428-435.
23. Yan X, Peng J, Li X, *et al*. Reducing muscle fatigue during agricultural harvesting operations with passive back-support exoskeletons: a field study. Appl Ergon. 2022;103:103787.
24. Toxiri S, Näf MB, Lazzaroni M, *et al*. Back-support exoskeletons for occupational use: an overview of technological advances and trends. IISE Trans Occup Ergon Hum Factors. 2019;7(3-4):237-249.
25. Zhang T, Huang H. A lower-back robotic exoskeleton: industrial handling augmentation used to provide spinal support. IEEE Robot Autom Mag. 2018;25(2):95-106.
26. Giovacchini F, Vannetti F, Fantozzi M, *et al*. A light-weight active orthosis for hip movement assistance. Robot Auton Syst. 2015;73:123-134.
27. Yan S, Xiao D, Xiang K. Development and preliminary field evaluation of a powered knee-supporting exoskeleton for agricultural workers. Biosyst Eng. 2022;217:122-133.
28. Kermavnar T, de Vries AW, de Looze MP, O'Sullivan LW. Effects of industrial back-support exoskeletons on body loading and user experience: an updated systematic review. Ergonomics. 2021;64(6):685-711.
29. Pesenti M, Antonietti A, Gandolla M, Pedrocchi A. Towards a functional performance validation standard for industrial low-back exoskeletons: state of the art review. Sensors. 2021;21(3):808.
30. Theurel J, Desbrosses K, Roux T, Savescu A. Physiological consequences of using an upper limb exoskeleton during manual handling tasks. Appl Ergon. 2018;67:211-217.
31. Haufe FL, Kober AM, Schmidt K, *et al*. User-driven walking assistance: first experimental results using the MyoSuit. In: 2019 IEEE 16th International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR); 2019. p. 944-949.
32. Ding Y, Kim M, Kuindersma S, Walsh CJ. Human-in-the-loop optimization of hip assistance with a soft exosuit during walking. Sci Robot. 2018;3(15):eaar5438.
33. Asbeck AT, De Rossi SM, Holt KG, Walsh CJ. A biologically inspired soft exosuit for walking assistance. Int J Robot Res. 2015;34(6):744-762.
34. Galle S, Malcolm P, Collins SH, De Clercq D. Reducing the metabolic cost of walking with an ankle exoskeleton: interaction between actuation timing and power. J Neuroeng Rehabil. 2017;14(1):35.
35. Schmidt K, Duarte JE, Grimmer M, *et al*. The myosuit: bi-articular anti-gravity exosuit that reduces hip extensor activity in sitting transfers. Front Neurorobot. 2017;11:57.
36. Christensen S, Rasmussen J, Nielsen J. Wearable sensor-based task analysis for agricultural human-robot collaboration. Comput Electron Agric. 2021;185:106127.
37. Alemi MM, Geissinger J, Simon AA, *et al*. A passive exoskeleton reduces peak and mean EMG during symmetric and asymmetric lifting. J Electromyogr Kinesiol. 2019;47:25-34.
38. Graham RB, Agnew MJ, Stevenson JM. Effectiveness of an on-body lifting aid at reducing low back physical demands during an automotive assembly task: assessment of EMG response and user acceptability. Appl Ergon. 2009;40(5):936-942.
39. Lamers EP, Yang AJ, Zelik KE. Feasibility of a biomechanically-assistive garment to reduce low back loading during leaning and lifting. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng. 2018;65(8):1674-1680.
40. Lotz CA, Agnew MJ, Godwin AA, Stevenson JM. The effect of an on-body personal lift assist device (PLAD) on fatigue during a repetitive lifting task. J Electromyogr Kinesiol. 2009;19(2):331-340.
41. Whitfield BH, Costigan PA, Stevenson JM, Smallman CL. Effect of an on-body ergonomic aid on oxygen consumption during a repetitive lifting task. Int J Ind Ergon. 2014;44(1):39-44.
42. Rashedi E, Kim S, Nussbaum MA, Agnew MJ. Ergonomic evaluation of a wearable assistive device for overhead work. Ergonomics. 2014;57(12):1864-1874.
43. Gillette JC, Stephenson ML. EMG assessment of a shoulder support exoskeleton during on-farm occupational tasks. Int J Ind Ergon. 2019;70:140-150.
44. Kazerooni H, Steger R, Huang L. Hybrid control of the Berkeley lower extremity exoskeleton (BLEEX). Int J Robot Res. 2006;25(5-6):561-573.
45. Lim B, Lee J, Jang J, *et al*. Delayed output feedback control for gait assistance with a robotic hip exoskeleton. IEEE Trans Robot. 2019;35(4):1055-1062.
46. Weston EB, Alizadeh M, Knapik GG, *et al*. Biomechanical evaluation of exoskeleton use on loading of the lumbar spine. Appl Ergon. 2018;68:101-108.
47. Moyon A, Poirson E, Petiot JF. Experimental study of workload and muscle fatigue during overhead tasks with and without exoskeleton. IISE Trans Occup Ergon Hum Factors. 2021;9(2):112-121.
48. Picchiotti MT, Weston EB, Knapik GG, *et al*. Impact of two postural assist exoskeletons on biomechanical loading of the lumbar spine. Appl Ergon. 2019;75:1-7.
49. Baltrusch SJ, van Dieën JH, Koopman AS, *et al*. SPEXOR passive spinal exoskeleton decreases metabolic cost during symmetric repetitive lifting. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2020;120(2):401-412.
50. Muramatsu Y, Umehara H, Kobayashi H. Improvement and quantitative performance estimation of the back support muscle suit. In: 2013 35th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC); 2013. p. 2844-2849.
51. Miao Q, Zhang M, Wang C, Li H. Towards optimal

platform-based robot design for ankle rehabilitation: the state of the art and future prospects. J Healthc Eng. 2018;2018:1534247.

52. Zhang J, Fiers P, Witte KA, *et al*. Human-in-the-loop optimization of exoskeleton assistance during walking. Science. 2017;356(6344):1280-1284.
53. Lotti N, Xiloyannis M, Durandau G, *et al*. Adaptive model-based myoelectric control for a soft wearable arm exosuit: a new generation of wearable robot control. IEEE Robot Autom Mag. 2020;27(1):43-53.
54. Garate VR, Parri A, Yan T, *et al*. Walking assistance using artificial primitives: a novel bioinspired framework using motor primitives for locomotion assistance through a wearable cooperative exoskeleton. IEEE Robot Autom Mag. 2016;23(1):83-95.
55. Settembre N, Maurice P, Paysant J, *et al*. The use of exoskeletons to help with prone positioning in the intensive care unit during COVID-19. Ann Phys Rehabil Med. 2020;63(4):379-382.
56. Baltrusch SJ, Houdijk H, van Dieën JH, van Bennekom CAM. Perspectives of end users on the potential use of trunk exoskeletons for people with low-back pain: a focus group study. Hum Factors. 2020;62(3):365-376.
57. Schall MC Jr, Sesek RF, Cavuoto LA. Barriers to the adoption of wearable sensors in the workplace: a survey of occupational safety and health professionals. Hum Factors. 2018;60(3):351-362.
58. Marino M, Possibility of using exoskeletons in agriculture and forestry: A preliminary investigation. AgriEngineering. 2023;5(1):172-185.
59. Miles JA, Pirkle BA, Larsen JJ. Ergonomic evaluation of stooped manual harvesting postures in agriculture. Appl Ergon. 2020;85:103065.
60. Luger T, Bär M, Seibt R, *et al*. A passive back exoskeleton supporting symmetric and asymmetric lifting in stoop and squat posture reduces trunk and hip extensor muscle activity and adjusts body posture – A laboratory study. Appl Ergon. 2021;97:103530.
61. Park JH, Lee SH, Kim SH. Effects of a passive shoulder exoskeleton on muscle activity and posture in overhead agricultural tasks. J Agric Saf Health. 2022;28(2):89-102.
62. Chen B, Lanotte F, Grazi L, *et al*. Classification of lifting techniques for application of a robotic hip exoskeleton. Sensors. 2019;19(4):963.
63. Sadler EM, Graham RB, Stevenson JM. The personal lift-assist device and lifting technique: a principal component analysis. Ergonomics. 2011;54(4):392-402.
64. Coenen P, Parry S, Willenberg L, *et al*. Associations of prolonged standing with musculoskeletal symptoms—a systematic review of laboratory studies. Gait Posture. 2017;58:310-318.
65. Meyers AR, Wurzelbacher SJ, Bertke SJ, *et al*. Farm-related injury hospitalization and death in Ohio, 2005–2012. Am J Ind Med. 2017;60(11):1013-1023.