Why Intelligent Automation Fails Outside the Lab: A Review of Deployment Challenges in Robotics

Khushi Mangla

Student

Abstract

In the last decade, intelligent automation has driven a lot of robotics research forward, changing how industries operate by improving efficiency, accuracy, and flexibility. Laboratory demonstrations can show impressive performance in controlled settings, but taking these systems and deploying them in the real world has proven to be much more complex than we initially expected.

This discussion brings to light various challenges, including environmental uncertainties, issues with human-robot interaction, system integration problems, and hardware limitations. It's important to recognize the difference between lab success and real-world application. Increased deployment-oriented research in robotics is necessary to bridge this gap and ensure that advancements in automation truly benefit society.

In essence, while we are making progress, we need a clearer focus on how these systems will function in the unpredictable nature of everyday life. What we really require is a shift toward studying how these technologies can work seamlessly in reality, where people and robots coexist and collaborate effectively.

Keywords - Automation, Deployment challenges, Real-world robotics, Lab-to-field gap, robots, human-robot

1. Introduction

The age of robotics and artificial intelligence (AI) has arrived in the world, and intelligent automation could be the answer to many of the world's ills. The robots are not confined to doing repetitive tasks; they learn how to think, make decisions, and fix things as well (Singh, H. 2020). This has been feasible due to the advancements in machine learning algorithms, the ready availability of big data, and increased computational capability.

The controlled environment of a research setting, such as a laboratory, is probably the most appropriate for the development and testing of technologies. This enables researchers to meticulously control and evaluate the performance of the system by certain benchmarks. In many laboratory conditions, such systems exhibit outstanding performance with high accuracy, stability, and efficiency, etc., which motivates the broad anticipation of their industrial scale application, such as the manufacturing industry, healthcare applications, agriculture industry, etc.

But when it comes to success in the real world, not all wins are conceived in a lab. If effective in confined systems, they degrade as soon as they encounter a real-time, dynamic, and uncertain environment. "Have you tried turning it off and on again?" Anyone in the real-world trying to work with automated systems today knows that it is highly unreliable. But when they are performing live in a theater, there's no restart button. (Fallatah, A. et al 2019). The loss is measured in accuracy and safety. As intelligent automation surrounds us in modern life, we should act to close the lab-to-field gap.

It's not usually a single tech flaw that causes these break-faults, but rather accumulations of systemic interactions. Even though such systems may "look good" to an observer when they run in isolation and are decoupled from the training data, forecasting their behavior to super-realistic settings is challenging. This exposes a central limitation of today's practice. The analysis also focuses on short-duration tests rather than long-time operation under realistic operating conditions.

The purpose of the present paper is to study and understand why intelligent automation has failed outside labs. Based on a review of the available studies and reports, this paper extracts general issues in real operations. It concentrates on deployment strategies and not new algorithm inventions.

2. Background

Robotics as a field of study has something special that makes it all the more appealing for academia and industry alike. Its ability to generate cutting-edge innovations along with applications presents a broad scope of challenges, as well as opportunities (Song, Q., and Zhao, Q. 2024). Intelligent automation robotics refers to systems that can perceive, compute, and act in an autonomous way. In earlier work on robotics, rule-based control was important, but now those use data-driven solutions (including machine learning) for perception and decision-making tasks.

Such systems often consist of a mixture of hand-tuned features and learned components structured into numerous sensing and decision-making “pipelines”. However, since systems are complex with layers of dependences it is difficult to construct the systems and understand why they do not work correctly. Laboratory conditions are integral for such systems' formation. Controlled environments enable researchers to isolate factors, reproduce experiments, and quantify against alternatives. For “in-the-wild” operations out of the controlled laboratory setting, there are additional issues of novelty due to unforeseen events (Bohus, D. et al 2017).

Parameters like illumination, obstacles, and system inputs are often constant and simplified in order to get repeatability and reliable measures of the performance within the laboratory. Many such relayings are invalid when applied to fielded systems over extended periods of time, leading to unpredictable system performance. It is this distinction between testing and runtime that forms one of the cornerstones on which intelligent automation systems break.

3. Deployment Challenges in Real-World Robotics

3.1 Environmental Uncertainty

Ensuring safe and effective interaction between robots and their environment is a vital and complex issue, especially when faced with uncertainty and unexpected changes (Zhiqiang, T. et al 2025). The real-world environment is unpredictable.

Changes in lighting, weather conditions, and surrounding objects significantly affect the sensor performance. For example, vision-based systems that perform well indoors might underperform during deployment because of shadows or beams.

Research on autonomous mobile robots shows that perception algorithms trained under fixed conditions often fail when exposed to unseen environments. Even small visual differences between training and deployment environments can significantly reduce performance (Tremblay, J. et al 2018).

Since it is arduous to replicate all possible environmental conditions inside a laboratory, robotic systems are often not prepared for the situations they encounter during deployment. This results in errors in perception and decision-making, which further lead to safety concerns.

3.2 Human-Robot Interaction Issues

Now, let's look at the issues surrounding human-robot interaction. We're making strides towards ensuring that machines can work closely and safely alongside humans. However, we still have a long way to go before this becomes a reality on the shop floor. (Sorrosal, G. et al 2021). One of the sticking points is the current lack of safety in complex interactions between humans and robots. Research shows that achieving effective social interactions between robots and people in shared spaces is challenging and can hinder widespread deployment of these systems. (Nigro, M. et al., 2025).

Human behavior varies widely from person to person and can change depending on the context, which makes interaction quite unpredictable. A lot of research indicates that not taking the human element into account, such as safety, trust, and usability, can severely limit how well robotic systems perform in real-world scenarios.

If designers neglect these human-related factors, even technically advanced robot systems may struggle to gain acceptance, regardless of how capable they are.

3.3 System Integration Challenges

Robots working in the real environment are usually expected to coexist with other systems/infrastructure. The lab-built software may not work well with current, real-time demands or legacy systems still in service. System-level integration is a bottleneck in moving prototypes to deployable robots (Siciliano, B., and Khatib, O. 2016). The integration issues can lead to long delays, poor performance, and even crashes. Such difficulties are usually neglected at the design phase, where attention is generally given to single components rather than the complete system.

3.4 Hardware Constraints

In lab-based systems, robot systems are well kept and work as expected in ideal circumstances. When deploying robots in daily environments, they have to deal with two necessary processes: (1) They suffer from mechanical wear and sensor aging; (2) power supply limitations and communication delays. These issues may slowly decrease the performance of the device and cause a sudden failure in the future (Mitrevski, A. et al 2022). Even small, subtle hardware errors such as actuator backlash or calibration drift have been shown through field experimentation to result in substantial effects on perception and control algorithms, which further propagate into system-level effects (Ryalat, M. et al 2025).

There will be an interaction between hardware and software limitations of the learning base in deployment. Standard learning algorithms are enabled by the always-working property for two reasons: a) they lean on learning invariances, and b) stable hardware that gives you the same results no matter when it is queried. This cognitive dissonance of software expectation with physical reality remains daunting to the cause of intelligent automation (Urrea, C. 2025).

3.5 Learning and Generalization Limitations

A major drawback of intelligent automation systems is that many of them do not know how to respond in situations that differ from those they were specifically trained for. A large number of robots capable of learning from data are trained using examples collected in controlled environments that don't adequately capture the diversity and complexity of the real world. As a result, systems that perform well during testing often exhibit degraded performance when deployed, especially when confronted with unseen objects, light/material variations, or task changes (Mitrevski, A. et al 2022). The problem is amplified when the systems are trained mainly in simulation. Discrepancies between simulated and real-world settings may cause instability in the behavior of robots after deployment, an issue known as the simulation-to-reality gap. Some teaching methods, such as domain randomization and continual learning, have been developed to avoid these limitations, but they have their own challenges in terms of stability and safety during online adaptation. It remains quite a challenge to implement safety-critical, long-term deployment, particularly where unpredictable human interaction is involved (Belardinelli, A. et al 2025).

4. Examples from Real-World Deployment

Several real-world deployment examples clearly demonstrate the challenges discussed in earlier sections. Delivery robots, for example, are capable of performing well in pilot testing under controlled or semi-controlled circumstances. Yet once they are released in crowded public areas, these robots must contend with bumpy sidewalks, unforeseen obstructions, weather shifts, and a great deal of human interaction. Such situations may cause improper navigation, lower efficiency, or the necessity of human involvement. Another example is in the field of industrial and warehouse robotics. Robots that are designed and tested for the structured floors of a factory can falter when inside warehouses where configurations shift constantly, and objects are haphazardly placed. Even small perturbations, such as dislocated shelves or temporary obstacles, can disturb the performance of the systems in a remarkable way (Siciliano, B. and Khatib, O. 2016). These challenges underscore the limitations of lab-based testing, as it rarely encompasses all of the variability that is present in actual operational conditions.

The gap between lab and real-world conditions is even starker in agricultural and field robots. In terms of soil texture, plant growth and development, light exposure, and weather, you can never know what these perception and control systems will do.

Although accurate sensing and control can be realized in laboratory environments, the performance of systems frequently collapses over prolonged outdoor deployment due to their poor robustness and adaptability. This set of examples, taken together, demonstrates that real-world performance is influenced by factors beyond the scope of laboratory benchmarks.

5. Discussion

The gap between laboratory and field performance, in great part, is attributed to technical, materials, environmental, and human origins. While experimentation in the laboratory is essential for conducting studies on the development of components, complex operational conditions are not always reflected. So those that trade off for performance, maybe are not going to do such a good job when we start introducing uncertainty or stretching out the timescale.

One interesting thing we have discovered is that many of the bugs that show up during deployment are not just small, incremental issues. They often involve how different components interact with each other. For instance, tiny mistakes from sensors can mix with the flaws in learning models and hardware delays, leading to significant problems. Unfortunately, these interactions are hard to predict in lab tests, which usually only look at systems under very controlled conditions for a short time.

When we talk about the gaps between how well machines work in the lab versus out in the field, it’s clear that several factors come into play. These can be technical glitches, environmental conditions, or even human behaviors. Lab tests are crucial for developing and designing components, but they don’t always mirror real-world situations. What works well under controlled conditions may not perform the same when faced with unexpected changes or over longer periods.

This discrepancy is something we have seen documented over time: the parameters set up for testing in a lab don't always translate to real life. Take robotic systems, for example. They might be evaluated on their ability to perform tasks in a confined space, which overlooks their resilience to failures or adaptability to a changing environment.

For students studying automation, it's essential to understand the broader system dynamics involved in intelligent automation research. It's not just about perfecting algorithms. A successful outcome relies on integrating the right algorithms, proper calibration, and a long-term stability focus that often gets overlooked during the testing phase. Understanding these elements is key if we want to develop robots and systems that can operate effectively outside of familiar, controlled environments.

6. Future Directions

In the next few years, long-term evaluations will still center around research in intelligent automation. It is tough to catch failures linked to system aging over time, environmental factors, and how humans adapt, especially when relying on short-term tests in labs. We will need telemetry deployment benchmarks using real-world operational scenarios, given the latest research points to this need for effectively comparing the system (Ryalat, M. et al 2025).

To make deployment more reliable, it is crucial that we improve how learning and generalization work. We are optimistic about two promising paths ahead: first, continuous learning, and second, adaptive systems that can evolve by processing new data even after they are up and running. Plus, these systems might get updates through human oversight as well. Still, it is crucial that these approaches not only strike a good balance between being adaptable and safe, but they also need to be clear and robust. This is especially true in social robotics, where accidents can occur when robots are close to people (Belardinelli, A. et al 2025).

In designing future intelligent robotic systems, it is crucial to give deployment considerations as much weight as the core functionalities, rather than treating them as an afterthought. It is vital to think about designing both hardware and software together, especially when integrating with older systems, and focusing on making things robust instead of just aiming for the best performance. The work on collaborative and industrial robotics also supports this that such design practices should be deployment aware if they are to realise the impact outside of the lab (Urrea, C. 2025).

7. Conclusion

This review looks at why robotic systems that perform well in controlled lab settings often struggle when put to use in real-life situations. It highlights similarities found in various case studies and academic papers, focusing on aspects like unpredictable environments, learning limitations, dependency on specific equipment, and how well these systems work together with human users. Research shows that experiments conducted in labs can overlook the real complexities that exist outside those carefully controlled conditions.

The study finds that current research tends to focus too much on controlled experiments and short-term success. While these methods can be useful in the beginning, they often fall short when it comes to preparing systems for long-term use in the real world. To tackle this problem effectively, we need more practical evaluation methods. However, fixing these issues requires a comprehensive approach rather than just quick fixes through technology.

The paper suggests that it might be time to shift our focus towards understanding how robotics is used in everyday settings. This means we require more long-term studies in the field, a design that takes human needs into account, and addressing broader system challenges to ensure that intelligent automation truly benefits our daily lives, not just in lab conditions.

References

1. Adesiji, A. D., Ibitoye, S. E., Mahamood, R. M., Olayemi, O. A., Omoniyi, P. O., Jen, T.-C., & Akinlabi, E. T. (2026). Safety considerations in deployment of robotic systems – A systematic review. *Journal of Field Robotics*, *43*(1), 5–33. https://doi.org/10.1002/rob.70022
2. Afzal, A., Goues, C. L., Hilton, M., & Timperley, C. S. (2020). A study on the challenges of testing robotic systems. *2020 IEEE 13th International Conference on Software Testing, Validation and Verification (ICST)*, 96–107.
3. Aljalbout, E., Xing, J., Romero, A., Akinola, I., Garrett, C. R., Heiden, E., Gupta, A., Hermans, T., Narang, Y., Fox, D., Scaramuzza, D., & Ramos, F. (2025). The reality gap in robotics: Challenges, solutions, and best practices. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-control-031924-100130
4. Andrist, S., Bohus, D., Kamar, E., & Horvitz, E. (2017). What went wrong and why? Diagnosing situated interaction failures in the wild. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (pp. 293–303). Springer International Publishing.
5. Belardinelli, A., Wang, C., Tanneberg, D., Hasler, S., & Gienger, M. (2025). Train your robot in AR: insights and challenges for humans and robots in continual teaching and learning. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, *12*, 1605652. Train your robot in AR: insights and challenges for humans and robots in continual teaching and learning
6. Diehl, M., & Ramirez-Amaro, K. (2022). Why did I fail? A causal-based method to find explanations for robot failures. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, *7*(4), 8925–8932. https://doi.org/10.1109/lra.2022.3188889
7. Fallatah, A., Urann, J., & Knight, H. (2019). The robot show must go on: Effective responses to robot failures. *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 325–332.
8. Mitrevski, A., Thoduka, S., Sáinz, A. O., Schöbel, M., Nagel, P., Plöger, P. G., & Prassler, E. (2022). Deploying robots in everyday environments: Towards dependable and practical robotic systems. In *arXiv [cs.RO]*. [2206.12719] Deploying Robots in Everyday Environments: Towards Dependable and Practical Robotic Systems
9. Nigro, M., Akinrintoyo, E., Salomons, N., & Spitale, M. (2025). Social group human-robot interaction: A scoping review of computational challenges. *2025 20th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, 468–478.
10. Rodríguez-Guerra, D., Sorrosal, G., Cabanes, I., & Calleja, C. (2021). Human-robot interaction review: Challenges and solutions for modern industrial environments. *IEEE Access: Practical Innovations, Open Solutions*, *9*, 108557–108578. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2021.3099287
11. Sheridan, T. B. (2016). Human-robot interaction: Status and challenges: Status and challenges. *Human Factors*, *58*(4), 525–532. Human–Robot Interaction - Thomas B. Sheridan, 2016
12. Siciliano, B., & Khatib, O. (2016). Robotics and the handbook. In *Springer Handbook of Robotics* (pp. 1–6). Springer International Publishing.

13. Tang, Z., Wang, P., Xin, W., & Laschi, C. (2025). Learning to control a soft robotic manipulator under uncertainty and unforeseen changes in robot–environment interaction. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, *02783649251360254*. https://doi.org/10.1177/02783649251360254
14. Tremblay, J., Prakash, A., Acuna, D., Brophy, M., Jampani, V., Anil, C., To, T., Cameracci, E., Boochoon, S., & Birchfield, S. (2018). Training deep networks with synthetic data: Bridging the reality gap by domain randomization. In *arXiv [cs.CV]* (pp. 969–977). CVPR 2018 Open Access Repository
15. Treusch, P. (n.d.). *The art of failure in robotics: Queering the (Un)making of*. Proquest.com. Retrieved January 17, 2026, from https://www.proquest.com/openview/fbb84f365077c98c12104551053f02a4/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2069169
16. (N.d.-a). Mdpi.com. Retrieved January 17, 2026, from Multi-Robot Deployment Using a Virtual Force Approach: Challenges and Guidelines
17. (N.d.-b). Ssrn.com. Retrieved January 17, 2026, from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5267868
18. (N.d.-c). Mdpi.com. Retrieved January 17, 2026, from Recent Advances in Robotics and Intelligent Robots Applications
19. (N.d.-d). Mdpi.com. Retrieved January 17, 2026, from Research and Education in Robotics: A Comprehensive Review, Trends, Challenges, and Future Directions
20. (N.d.-e). Mdpi.com. Retrieved January 17, 2026, from Hybrid Deep Learning-Reinforcement Learning for Adaptive Human-Robot Task Allocation in Industry 5.0