International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

Robotics And Site Automation

Ms. Nazeema[1], Mr. Abdul Rahman Ibn Fayyaz[2], Mr. Abdul Mannan Shakir[3], Mr. Syed Jaffer Sadiq[4], Mr. Syed Ghouse[5], Mr. Rehaan Ghalib[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, Dept. of English, Lords Institute of Engineering and Technology, Himayathsagar, Hyderabad, Telangana.

[2,3,4,5,6] UG Scholars, Dept. of CE, Lords Institute of Engineering and Technology, Himayathsagar, Hyderabad, Telangana.

Emails: *nazeema@lords.ac.in[1], abdulrahmanibnfayyaz@gmail.com[2], amsr2930@gmail.com[3], syedjaffersadiq2007@gmail.com[4], syedghouse8814@gmail.com[5], ghalibrehaan@gmail.com[6]*

Abstract

Modern construction and industrial worksites face persistent challenges, including acute labour shortages, schedule delays, stagnating productivity and high workplace safety risks. Robotics and site automation offer ways to automate repetitive, hazardous and labour-intensive field operations. This review examines recent developments across five areas: autonomous heavy machinery and earthmoving systems; task-specific fabrication and mobile manipulation, including robotic masonry, rebar operations and three-dimensional (3D) concrete printing; unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and legged robots for inspection and progress monitoring; intelligent perception, Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM), and Building Information Modeling (BIM)-enabled digital twins; and human–robot collaboration (HRC), wearable exoskeletons and site safety. The paper adopts a desk-based review of published research and relevant technical guidance, with particular attention to the constraints of real construction environments. The literature indicates meaningful progress in earthmoving, digital inspection, robotic fabrication and worker-assistance systems, but also shows that most deployments remain task-specific or operator-supervised. High capital cost, changing site geometry, dust and weather, limited interoperability, uncertain return on investment, safety assurance and workforce readiness continue to restrict large-scale adoption. A phased implementation framework is proposed, beginning with repeatable high-risk tasks and progressing towards connected, BIM-informed and human-centred jobsites. The paper does not report new field experiments; performance outcomes should therefore be validated through monitored pilot projects.

Keywords: *Robotics, Site Automation, Construction Robotics, Autonomous Mobile Robots (AMRs), Building Information Modeling (BIM), Human-Robot Collaboration (HRC), SLAM, UAVs, 3D Concrete Printing.*

1. Introduction

Construction is one of the most physically demanding and operationally variable industrial sectors. Unlike factory production, work on a building site takes place in changing environments where access routes, workfaces, materials, temporary structures and worker locations shift continuously. Many activities still depend on manual handling, visual inspection and conventional equipment operated by people. These conditions contribute to delays, inconsistent productivity, rework and exposure to hazards.

Robotics and site automation are being developed to address selected parts of this problem. The aim is not simply to replace workers with machines. Construction robots can undertake repetitive or hazardous tasks, provide more consistent measurements, support difficult lifting and positioning, and connect physical work with digital project information. Recent reviews describe growing activity in structural construction, site preparation, inspection and finishing, while noting that operator-led and supervised systems remain common [1]. The construction site is not a controlled factory. A robot may encounter uneven ground, changing lighting, dust, rain, temporary obstructions, incomplete drawings and people entering its work zone. It must therefore combine mechanical capability with perception,

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

localization, planning, communication and safety functions. The practical question is not whether every construction task can be automated, but which tasks are sufficiently repetitive, hazardous, measurable or constrained to justify automation.

1.1.Research Questions and Contributions

This paper addresses four questions: (i) which categories of robotics and automation are currently relevant to construction sites; (ii) how are autonomous machinery, task-specific fabrication robots, UAVs and legged robots being used; (iii) how can perception, SLAM and BIM/digital-twin systems connect robots to project information; and (iv) what technical, economic, organisational and safety barriers must be addressed before wider adoption. The paper contributes a structured overview of five technology domains, a comparison of suitable construction applications, an analysis of adoption barriers and a phased implementation framework. It also proposes performance indicators for pilot projects so that claims about productivity, safety and cost can be assessed using site data rather than promotional estimates.

2. Literature Review

2.1.Construction Robotics and the Site Environment

Construction robotics has evolved from fixed industrial manipulators and mechanised tools towards mobile platforms, autonomous equipment and collaborative systems. The field is shaped by the variability of construction sites: each project has a different layout, work sequence and set of materials. A broad review of construction robotics identifies the importance of robot type, task application and human–robot collaboration, and reports that current research is concentrated more strongly in structural work than in planning, maintenance and demolition [1]. The distinction between automation and autonomy is important. Automated equipment may repeat a predefined movement or sequence, while an autonomous system senses its environment, estimates its state and adjusts its actions. Many construction deployments are best described as semi-autonomous: the robot performs a defined operation while a human operator supervises, approves or intervenes. This arrangement can be more reliable than attempting full autonomy in an environment that changes daily.

2.2.Autonomous Heavy Machinery and Earthmoving Systems

Earthmoving operations such as excavation, grading, loading and material transport are promising targets because they often contain repeated motion cycles and measurable geometric objectives. Autonomous or machine-guided excavators, bulldozers and loaders use combinations of GNSS, inertial sensors, cameras, LiDAR, machine-control systems and site models to estimate position and execute planned movements. A 2025 review of autonomous earthwork machinery screened 597 records and retained 157 studies, identifying perception-driven autonomy, integrated control, safety assurance and fleet coordination as major themes [3].

The strongest near-term opportunities are likely to be machine guidance, automated grading, geofenced work zones, semi-autonomous digging and coordinated equipment operation. These applications can improve repeatability and reduce the need for workers to stand close to moving equipment. However, full autonomy remains difficult where soil conditions change, buried services are uncertain, visibility is poor or several machines and workers share a confined area. Research on earthmoving automation similarly identifies unstructured terrain and variable operating conditions as persistent constraints [4].

A practical deployment should therefore begin with a clearly surveyed work zone, known machine limits, verified underground-service information, controlled access and an operator override. Fleet coordination should be introduced only after individual machines can communicate position, task status and exclusion zones reliably [7].

2.3.Task-Specific Fabrication and Mobile Manipulation Robots

Task-specific robots are designed around a defined operation rather than a general-purpose construction role. Examples include robotic bricklaying, block placement, drilling, surface finishing, rebar tying, material handling and prefabricated component assembly. Their value

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

depends on the repeatability of the task, the accuracy required and the degree to which materials and workspaces can be prepared in advance. Robotic masonry systems typically combine material feeding, positioning, mortar or adhesive application and placement. They can support consistent alignment and reduce repetitive lifting, but require dependable material supply, accurate layout information and a workface that can be reached by the robot [8]. Rebar tying and reinforcement placement are also attractive because they involve repetitive actions and awkward postures. Mobile manipulators combine a mobile base with a robotic arm and end-effector. They can move between work areas and perform tasks such as drilling, fastening, scanning or handling components. Their performance depends on stable localization, safe navigation, accurate tool positioning and coordination with other trades. Rather than assuming that one robot can perform many unrelated activities, projects should evaluate a task-specific system against the time, quality and safety performance of the existing method.

2.4.Three-Dimensional Concrete Printing and Robotic Construction

Three-dimensional concrete printing (3DCP) deposits cementitious material layer by layer using a computer-controlled extrusion system. Robotic arms, gantry systems and mobile platforms can follow digital toolpaths to produce walls, components or complex geometries. Reviews identify progress in hardware, tool design, digital control, multi-robot systems and in-process monitoring, while highlighting challenges involving reinforcement, material behaviour, quality control and field deployment [3]. The process links digital design directly to physical fabrication. The printable geometry must be translated into a toolpath that respects reach, collision limits, extrusion rate, layer height, travel speed and material open time. Concrete must maintain pumpability and extrudability while developing sufficient shape stability after deposition. Layer interfaces, anisotropy, dimensional tolerances, curing and reinforcement integration remain important engineering issues. 3DCP should not be treated as a universal replacement for conventional construction. Its suitability depends on structural requirements, local codes, material availability, weather, scale, reinforcement strategy and economic comparison. Hybrid approaches—robotic printing combined with conventional reinforcement, prefabrication or casting—may be more practical for some applications. Research has demonstrated BIM-linked robotic workflows for synchronising printed concrete and reinforcement placement [4].

2.5.UAVs and Legged Robots for Inspection and Progress Monitoring

UAVs, commonly called drones, provide rapid aerial views of large or difficult-to-access construction areas. Their applications include topographic survey, stockpile measurement, roof and façade inspection, progress documentation, safety observation and comparison of actual site conditions with planned models. A systematic review of UAV applications in construction reports use in inspection, damage assessment, surveying, safety monitoring, progress tracking and maintenance [5]. Images and point clouds captured by UAVs can be processed using photogrammetry or LiDAR to generate orthomosaics, three-dimensional models and surface measurements. Repeated surveys can support progress comparison, earthwork quantity checks and documentation of inaccessible areas. Limitations include flight endurance, payload, wind and rain, occlusion, image quality, battery management, data-processing effort and aviation rules. UAV use must be planned around people [10], cranes, power lines and other aircraft. Legged robots, particularly quadruped platforms, can travel over some uneven surfaces and access areas that are difficult for wheeled vehicles. They can carry cameras, LiDAR, thermal sensors and other payloads for inspection, reality capture and safety monitoring. Recent reviews describe their potential for site inspection, 3D data capture and BIM/digital-twin integration, while noting that localization and reliable operation on changing sites remain challenging [6]. UAVs and legged robots are complementary: aerial platforms cover broad areas efficiently, while ground robots can inspect selected spaces at closer range [11].

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

3. Methodology

This paper is a narrative, desk-based review prepared from the topic and scope stated in the supplied abstract and title. It synthesises published review articles and research papers on construction robotics, autonomous earthmoving, 3D concrete printing, UAVs, legged inspection robots, BIM–robotics integration, human–robot collaboration and robot safety. The source set was selected for relevance to the five technology dimensions identified in the abstract and for its coverage of recent developments and practical deployment barriers. The review followed four steps: (i) identify the main technology domains and construction tasks; (ii) summarise the operating principles and reported applications; (iii) compare the benefits and constraints that recur across the literature; and (iv) derive a phased implementation framework and measurable pilot indicators. This is not a PRISMA systematic review and does not claim exhaustive coverage of all publications. No new laboratory tests, field trials, surveys or original performance measurements were conducted. Quantitative performance claims are therefore not generated by this paper. As shown in Table 1 Potential value

4. Applications And Opportunities

Table 1 Potential value

Application area	Representative robotic systems	Potential site value	Conditions for successful use
Earthmoving and site preparation	Machine-guided/autonomous excavators, dozers, loaders; fleet systems	Repeatable grading, reduced exposure near equipment, improved quantity control	Surveyed work zones, reliable localization, machine safety controls and operator supervision
Masonry and assembly	Brick/block laying robots, mobile manipulators, component placement systems	Consistent placement, reduced repetitive handling, improved dimensional repeatability	Standardised components, prepared workface, dependable material feed and digital layout
Rebar and concrete fabrication	Rebar handling/tying robots, robotic arms, 3D concrete printers	Automation of repetitive fabrication; complex geometry; reduced manual positioning	Validated material/process parameters, reinforcement strategy, quality inspection and code compliance
Inspection and monitoring	UAVs, quadruped robots, UGVs, camera/LiDAR payloads	Frequent data capture, access to difficult locations, progress and safety records	Flight/site permissions, sensor calibration, safe routes and data-processing workflow
Digital coordination	BIM-linked robot controllers, SLAM, digital twins	Model-based planning, as-built comparison, traceable task status	Common data formats, model quality, coordinate control and cybersecurity
Worker assistance	Exoskeletons, lifting aids, collaborative robots	Reduced physical loading and support for repetitive tasks	Ergonomic evaluation, worker training, task suitability and monitoring

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

4.1. Benefits Across the Construction Lifecycle

During planning and design, simulation and BIM can identify repetitive tasks, access constraints and opportunities for prefabrication. During site preparation, autonomous or guided equipment can support grading and earthwork measurement. During construction, task-specific robots can assist with placement, drilling, fastening, printing and material handling. During inspection, UAVs and legged robots can collect repeatable visual and geometric data. During operation and maintenance, mobile robots may support inspection of façades, roofs, plant rooms and infrastructure assets. Potential benefits should be measured rather than assumed. Relevant outcomes include cycle time per task, setup time, geometric accuracy, rework rate, material waste, worker exposure hours, ergonomic workload, equipment utilisation, downtime and total cost per completed unit. A robot that performs a task quickly but requires long setup, specialist support or repeated reprogramming may not deliver a net productivity improvement. As shown in Table 2 Effect on deployment

5. Challenges And Barriers to Adoption

Table 2 Effect on deployment

ID	Barrier	Effect on deployment	Practical response
B1	High initial capital and uncertain return	Robots may be uneconomic for one-off or low-volume tasks	Pilot on repeatable tasks; compare lifecycle cost, utilisation and rental/service models
B2	Unstructured and changing terrain	Navigation, localization and task execution can fail as the site changes	Use site preparation, geofencing, sensor fusion and frequent map updates
B3	Perception limitations	Dust, rain, glare, occlusion and moving objects reduce detection reliability	Combine sensors; define operating limits; provide human confirmation for critical decisions
B4	Interoperability and fragmented data	BIM, equipment, sensors and contractor systems may not exchange data reliably	Adopt documented interfaces, common coordinates and controlled data standards
B5	Safety and liability	Unexpected movement or unclear responsibility can expose workers to harm	Conduct task-level risk assessment, guarding, exclusion zones, emergency stops and supervision
B6	Skills and organisational readiness	Operators and trades may lack confidence or training	Provide role-based training and involve workers in system selection and trials
B7	Site variability and logistics	Different project layouts and material tolerances require repeated adaptation	Prefer modular systems and standardise selected work packages where

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

			feasible
B8	Maintenance and reliability	Breakdowns, calibration and spare-parts delays can stop work	Provide service plans, local support, spare parts and downtime tracking
B9	Regulation and data governance	Drone operations, worker privacy and site data ownership may be unclear	Check applicable aviation and safety rules; establish data access and retention policies

The Indian construction context adds cost sensitivity, fragmented contracting, variable levels of digital maturity and a large workforce with diverse skill profiles. An Indian industry study on automation adoption identified high initial cost, rigid organisational processes, interoperability, competency and standardisation among the influential barriers [9]. These factors suggest that technology selection alone is insufficient: procurement, training, contracts, maintenance and project planning must change alongside equipment.

6. Integrated Robotics–Bim Workflow

A construction robot should not operate as an isolated machine where the project already maintains digital information. A coordinated workflow can be organised into six steps:

1. Model preparation: confirm that the BIM model contains the geometry, element identity, coordinates and tolerances required for the selected task.
2. Task definition: translate the model element or work package into a robot task, including sequence, tool, material and acceptance criteria.
3. Simulation and validation: check reachability, collisions, access, toolpath and safety zones before work begins.
4. Site localisation: establish control points and align the robot map with the project coordinate system using GNSS, total station, fiducials, SLAM or a combination.
5. Execution and monitoring: execute under the required supervision level while recording position, task status, sensor observations and exceptions.
6. As-built feedback: compare measured output with design intent, flag deviations for human review and update the construction record.

This workflow requires clear ownership of model updates and coordinate transformations. A mismatch between the BIM coordinate system and the robot's local map can produce systematic placement errors. Model data should also be checked for construction readiness: design models may omit temporary works, tolerances, lifting points, access constraints or the latest site changes. Human approval should remain mandatory where a robot's decision affects structural integrity or worker safety.

Conclusion

Robotics and site automation can improve selected construction operations by combining machine capability with digital information, sensing and human supervision. Autonomous earthmoving systems can support repetitive site-preparation tasks; task-specific robots can assist with masonry, reinforcement, drilling, assembly and concrete printing; UAVs and legged robots can improve inspection and progress capture; and SLAM, BIM and digital twins can connect physical work with project information. Exoskeletons and collaborative systems may support workers when their task fit and ergonomic effects are properly assessed. The main barriers are not limited to robot technology. High initial cost, variable site

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 10 October 2026
Page No: 5748 - 5754
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0746

conditions, perception failures, interoperability, safety assurance, maintenance, workforce readiness and uncertain utilisation all affect adoption. The most credible route is a phased programme that begins with a small number of well-defined tasks, establishes baseline performance, runs supervised pilots, verifies safety and quality, and scales only when evidence supports the investment. Construction automation should be judged by measurable improvements in accepted output, worker safety, quality and lifecycle cost—not by autonomy alone. This paper is a desk-based review and does not present new experimental results. The proposed framework and indicators are intended to guide future field validation and should be adapted to the requirements of each project.

References

[1]. Y. Xu, C. Cheung, M. S. Ng, A. Y. Kaltungo, T. Ishizawa, and K. Fujimoto, "Construction robotics: A systematic review of robot types, applications and human–robot collaborations," Results in Engineering, vol. 30, Art. no. 110406, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.rineng.2026.110406.

[2]. Z. Liu and J. I. Kim, "Autonomous earthwork machinery for urban construction: A review of integrated control, fleet coordination, and safety assurance," Buildings, vol. 15, no. 14, Art. no. 2570, 2025, doi: 10.3390/buildings15142570.

[3]. S. Li, T. Lan, H.-X. Nguyen, et al., "Frontiers in construction 3D printing: Self-monitoring, multi-robot, drone-assisted processes," Progress in Additive Manufacturing, vol. 10, pp. 2001–2030, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40964-024-00794-8.

[4]. S. Dua, F. Teng, Z. Zhuang, D. Zhang, M. Li, H. Li, and Y. Weng, "A BIM-enabled robot control system for automated integration between rebar reinforcement and 3D concrete printing," Virtual and Physical Prototyping, vol. 19, no. 1, Art. no. e2332423, 2024, doi: 10.1080/17452759.2024.2332423.

[5]. "Unmanned aerial system applications in construction: A systematic review," Construction Innovation: Information, Process, Management, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 453–468, 2018, doi: 10.1108/CI-02-2018-0010.

[6]. A. Kakhkharov, J.-W. Kim, and J.-H. Choi, "Quadruped robots in construction automation: A comprehensive review of applications, localization, and site-level operations," Buildings, vol. 16, no. 5, Art. no. 962, 2026, doi: 10.3390/buildings16050962.

[7]. "Interactions between BIM and robotics: Towards intelligent construction engineering and management," Computers in Industry, vol. 169, Art. no. 104299, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.compind.2025.104299.

[8]. M. Zhang, R. Xu, H. Wu, J. Pan, and X. Luo, "Human–robot collaboration for on-site construction," Automation in Construction, vol. 150, Art. no. 104812, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.autcon.2023.104812.

[9]. T. Patel, "Assessing barriers of automation and robotics adoption in the Indian construction industry: A fuzzy DEMATEL approach," Construction Innovation: Information, Process, Management, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 935–957, 2026, doi: 10.1108/CI-04-2024-0120.

[10]. International Organization for Standardization, ISO 10218-1:2025, Robotics—Safety requirements—Part 1: Industrial robots, 2025.

[11]. International Organization for Standardization, ISO 10218-2:2025, Robotics—Safety requirements—Part 2: Industrial robot applications and robot cells, 2025.