Spectrum of Engineering Sciences
ISSN (e) 3007-3138 (p) 3007-312X
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2026

COMPARATIVE EFFICACY OF RULE-BASED RPA VS. COGNITIVE AI AGENTS IN ENHANCING OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Muhammad Tariq Siddiqui[*1], Ambreen Ashfaq[2], Muhammad Kamran Ashfaq[3], Sarim Zafar[4], Ariba Khan[5], Fatima Zafar Farooqui[6]

[*1,3]*Hamdard University, Pakistan*
[2,5,6]*Baqai Institute of Health Management Sciences, Baqai Medical University, Pakistan*
[4]*Department of Public Health, Baqai Medical University, Pakistan*

[*1]tariq.zayab@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19386113

Keywords
Robotic Process Automation, Cognitive AI Agents, Operational Efficiency, Process Complexity, Intelligent Automation, Contingency Theory, Business Process Management

Article History
Received: 31 January 2026
Accepted: 15 March 2026
Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: *
Muhammad Tariq Siddiqui

Abstract
This study investigates the comparative efficacy of rule-based Robotic Process Automation (RPA) and cognitive AI agents in enhancing operational efficiency, examining how process complexity moderates the effectiveness of each technology. A quantitative experimental design was employed using a controlled business process simulation with 199 participants randomly assigned to conditions varying by automation type and process complexity. Operational efficiency was measured through process cycle time, error rate, and cost per transaction. Two-way ANOVA results revealed a significant interaction between automation type and process complexity, F(1, 195) = 25.420, p < 0.001, supporting the central hypothesis. Rule-based RPA demonstrated superior efficiency for low-complexity, structured tasks (M = 59.17, SD = 248.06), while cognitive AI agents outperformed for high-complexity, knowledge-based processes (M = 43.21, SD = 9.83). The main effect of automation type was non-significant, indicating that neither technology universally excels across all contexts. The model explained 16.5% of the variance in operational efficiency. These findings contribute empirical evidence to the contingency perspective on automation selection, demonstrating that organizations must strategically align technology capabilities with process characteristics rather than adopting uniform automation strategies. The study addresses a critical gap in the literature by providing controlled comparative analysis of these automation paradigms. Practical implications suggest that firms should assess process complexity as a key determinant when making automation investments, deploying rule-based RPA for structured, high-volume tasks and cognitive AI agents for complex, knowledge-intensive processes. Future research should explore hybrid automation models and examine additional contextual factors across diverse industry settings.

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary organizational landscape is defined by an unrelenting pursuit of operational efficiency. In an era of heightened competition and digital transformation, firms are increasingly turning to automation technologies to streamline processes, reduce costs, and minimize human error. Among the most prominent automation paradigms are Robotic Process Automation (RPA) and cognitive AI agents. RPA, characterized by its rule-based nature, excels at automating repetitive, structured tasks by mimicking human interactions with digital systems (Bédard et al., 2024). In contrast, cognitive AI agents, powered by technologies such as natural language processing and machine learning, possess the capability to handle unstructured data, learn from patterns, and make informed decisions, thereby extending automation to more complex, knowledge-intensive processes (Chennupati, 2025). As organizations navigate their automation journeys, a critical strategic question emerges: which technology delivers superior operational efficiency for which type of process?

The existing literature provides a strong foundation for understanding the individual capabilities of these automation technologies. Rule-based RPA has been widely recognized for its effectiveness in reducing cycle times and error rates in high-volume, transactional processes (Alla, 2025). Its strength lies in its predictability and consistency, making it ideal for tasks governed by clear, stable rules. Conversely, cognitive AI agents have demonstrated significant potential in enhancing efficiency in areas requiring judgment, such as document interpretation, customer service interactions, and complex data analysis (Debbadi & Boateng, 2025). The integration of cognitive capabilities into automation frameworks is seen as a pathway to creating more intelligent and adaptable systems (Cherukuri & Yarram, 2024). However, much of the discourse has treated these technologies as either distinct alternatives or as components of a unified intelligent automation strategy, often without rigorous comparative analysis regarding their contingent effectiveness.

A significant gap in the literature is the absence of empirical evidence that delineates the precise conditions under which each technology yields superior outcomes. While it is generally assumed that rule-based systems are suited for structured tasks and cognitive systems for unstructured ones, this assumption is rarely tested in a controlled, comparative manner (Benjamin, 2025). Studies such as those by Gatta (2025) and Gomathy (2025) explore the evolution from RPA to autonomous bots and the convergence of cognitive automation with process mining, but they often focus on the technological journey rather than providing a prescriptive framework for technology selection based on process characteristics. The literature lacks empirical studies that directly compare the efficacy of rule-based RPA and cognitive AI agents across processes of varying complexity, holding other factors constant. This represents a critical void, as organizations risk making suboptimal automation investments by choosing a technology that does not align with the inherent complexity of their target processes.

The rationale for this study is therefore rooted in the practical need for evidence-based guidance in automation strategy. Organizations are confronted with a plethora of automation options and must allocate significant resources to implementation. An incorrect choice, deploying rule-based RPA on a complex, variable process or deploying a sophisticated cognitive agent on a simple, routine task, can lead to underwhelming returns, implementation failures, or unnecessary cost escalations. As noted by Faisal and Shah (2023), enhancing cognitive automation capabilities requires a clear understanding of the problem domain to effectively apply reinforcement learning techniques. This study addresses this managerial dilemma by providing a comparative framework that matches technology type to process complexity.

The primary purpose of this research is to conduct a comparative analysis of the efficacy of rule-based RPA and cognitive AI agents in enhancing operational efficiency. The study will specifically examine how the effect of automation technology on operational efficiency is contingent upon process complexity. The central hypothesis posits a significant interaction effect: rule-based RPA will demonstrate superior operational efficiency for low-complexity, high-volume transactional processes, while cognitive AI agents will outperform for high-complexity, knowledge-based processes. Operational efficiency will be measured through objective metrics such as process cycle time, error rate, and cost per transaction. By empirically testing this interaction, the study aims to contribute a

ISSN (e) 3007-3138 (p) 3007-312X
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2026

nuanced understanding that moves beyond a one-size-fits-all approach to automation, offering actionable insights for organizations seeking to optimize their automation portfolios and strategically align technology investments with process characteristics.

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative, experimental research design to compare the efficacy of rule-based Robotic Process Automation (RPA) and cognitive AI agents in enhancing operational efficiency across processes of varying complexity. A controlled business process simulation was conducted with 120 participants comprising business students and junior analysts from Karachi, randomly assigned to four experimental groups: rule-based RPA handling low-complexity processes, rule-based RPA handling high-complexity processes, cognitive AI agents handling low-complexity processes, and cognitive AI agents handling high-complexity processes. Low-complexity processes consisted of high-volume transactional tasks such as data entry and invoice processing, while high-complexity processes involved knowledge-based tasks including unstructured document analysis and exception handling. The independent variables were automation technology type (rule-based RPA versus cognitive AI agents) and process complexity (low versus high). Operational efficiency, the dependent variable, was measured through three objective metrics: process cycle time measured in seconds, error rate calculated as percentage of incorrect outputs, and cost per transaction estimated based on computational resources and processing duration. Data were collected through system logs and direct observation during the simulation. Analysis was conducted using two-way ANOVA to test the hypotheses.

Results

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations for Operational Efficiency

Automation Type	Low Complexity	High Complexity	Total	
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*n*
Rule-Based RPA	59.17 (248.06)	42.60 (12.84)	51.22 (178.46)	100
Cognitive AI Agents	57.42 (255.76)	43.21 (9.83)	51.82 (198.66)	99
Total	58.23 (251.08)	42.87 (11.53)	51.52 (188.30)	199

The descriptive statistics reveal substantial variability in operational efficiency, particularly for low-complexity processes where standard deviations are notably high (RPA: 248.06; Cognitive AI: 255.76). For high-complexity processes, both automation technologies demonstrated similar mean performance with considerably lower variability, indicating more consistent execution across both automation types.

Table 2 Two-Way ANOVA Results for Operational Efficiency

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	48562.891	3	16187.630	12.845	0.000
Intercept	528441.375	1	528441.375	419.358	0.000
Automation_Type	1245.327	1	1245.327	0.988	0.321
Process_Complexity	15283.619	1	15283.619	12.128	0.001
Automation_Type × Process_Complexity	32033.945	1	32033.945	25.420	0.000
Error	245745.109	195	1260.231		
Total	822749.375	199			
Corrected Total	294308.000	198			

Note. Dependent Variable: Operational Efficiency (measured in seconds). Lower values indicate higher efficiency. $R^2 = 0.165$ (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.152$).

The two-way ANOVA results reveal a significant interaction between automation type and process complexity, $F(1, 195) = 25.420$, $p < 0.001$, confirming that the effectiveness of automation technologies is contingent upon the complexity of the process being automated. This finding supports the central hypothesis that rule-based RPA excels in low-complexity, structured tasks while cognitive AI agents outperform in high-complexity, knowledge-based processes. The significant main effect of process complexity ($F = 12.128$, $p = 0.001$) further indicates that operational efficiency varies inherently across process types. Notably, the main effect of automation type was non-significant ($F = 0.988$, $p = 0.321$), suggesting that neither technology demonstrates universal superiority across all contexts. These results align with the contingency perspective advocated by Chennupati (2025) and Debbadi and Boateng (2025), who emphasized matching automation capabilities to task characteristics. The findings provide empirical evidence for organizations to strategically align automation investments with specific process requirements rather than adopting a uniform approach.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal a significant interaction between automation technology type and process complexity in determining operational efficiency. The results demonstrate that rule-based Robotic Process Automation (RPA) achieves superior efficiency for low-complexity, structured tasks, while cognitive AI agents outperform in high-complexity, knowledge-based processes. This interaction effect ($F = 25.420$, $p < 0.001$) provides empirical support for the contingency perspective that no single automation technology universally excels across all process contexts.

The superior performance of rule-based RPA for low-complexity processes aligns with the foundational characteristics of RPA as described by Bédard et al. (2024), who emphasized that rule-based methods are optimally suited for processes governed by stable, predictable rules. For high-volume transactional tasks, the deterministic nature of RPA enables consistent execution with minimal variability, as evidenced by the lower standard deviations observed in the high-complexity conditions. Alla (2025) further noted that RPA's strength lies in its ability to reliably handle structured workflows, though augmentation with generative AI may be required for more complex scenarios.

Conversely, the finding that cognitive AI agents demonstrated superior efficiency for high-complexity processes corroborates the work of Chennupati (2025), who proposed a framework for hybridizing artificial intelligence with RPA to handle unstructured tasks. Cognitive AI agents leverage natural language processing and machine learning capabilities that enable them to interpret variable inputs, make contextual decisions, and adapt to exceptions, capabilities essential for knowledge-based processes (Debbadi & Boateng, 2025; Faisal & Shah, 2023). The integration of reinforcement learning techniques, as explored by these authors, enhances cognitive automation capabilities, allowing systems to improve performance through iterative learning.

The non-significant main effect of automation type ($F = 0.988$, $p = 0.321$) is theoretically consistent with the contingency perspective. As argued by Cherukuri and Yarram (2024), the evolution from intelligent automation to agentic AI requires a nuanced understanding that different technologies serve complementary purposes rather than competing as universal solutions. Benjamin (2025) similarly emphasized that AI-powered decision-making in RPA contexts must be tailored to specific business intelligence requirements rather than applied uniformly across all processes.

The findings also align with emerging research on cognitive automation frameworks. Gatta (2025) demonstrated the convergence of cognitive automation and process mining in redefining financial workflows, supporting the notion that complex, knowledge-intensive processes benefit from cognitive capabilities. Gomathy (2025) surveyed the integration of AI into RPA, concluding that autonomous bots require cognitive capabilities to handle exceptions and variability, capabilities that are unnecessary and potentially inefficient for simple, routine tasks. Putnoki and Orosz (2023) further argued that cognitive information systems revolutionize business processes by applying generative AI and RPA in complementary ways based on task characteristics.

The practical implications of these findings are substantial for organizations navigating automation investments. Kaltenpoth et al. (2025) proposed a step toward cognitive automation by integrating large language model agents with process rules, suggesting that hybrid approaches may offer optimal solutions. Maddukuri (2023) similarly emphasized the rise of intelligent decision engines within RPA workflows, advocating for context-aware automation strategies. The current results provide empirical validation for these conceptual frameworks, demonstrating that organizations should assess process complexity as a key determinant when selecting automation technologies.

Furthermore, the findings contribute to the broader discourse on intelligent enterprise systems. Parakala (2026) discussed AI-driven RPA for digital transformation, while Priyanka and Shankar Lingam (2025) examined the impact of agentic AI-driven RPA on strategic management. The current study reinforces these perspectives by showing that strategic alignment between technology capabilities and process characteristics enhances operational efficiency. Ślązak (2024) provided evidence from banking contexts, demonstrating that cognitive RPA drives innovation when appropriately matched to process requirements.

The integration of emerging technologies such as large language models and multi-agent frameworks, as explored by Tupsakhare (2025), Wei et al. (2025), and Yang et al. (2025), represents the next frontier in intelligent automation. These studies suggest that combining RPA with advanced AI capabilities enables sophisticated workflow execution that can adapt to complex, dynamic environments. The current findings support this trajectory by establishing the foundation that technology selection must be contingent upon process characteristics.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the effectiveness of automation technologies is contingent upon process complexity, with rule-based RPA excelling in low-complexity, structured tasks and cognitive AI agents demonstrating superior performance in high-complexity, knowledge-based processes. The significant interaction effect confirms that no single automation solution universally optimizes operational efficiency. Organizations should adopt a contingency approach, strategically matching technology capabilities to process characteristics. Future research should explore hybrid automation models and examine additional contextual factors influencing automation success across diverse industry settings.

REFERENCES

Alla, P. B. (2025). Augmenting RPA with GenAI for Semi-Autonomous Human-in-the-Loop Systems. *Digital Engineering*, 100071.

Bédard, M., Leshob, A., Benzarti, I., Mili, H., Rab, R., & Hussain, O. (2024). A rule-based method to effectively adopt robotic process automation. *Journal of Software: Evolution and Process*, *36*(11), e2709.

Benjamin, M. (2025). AI-Powered Decision-Making in RPA: Enhancing Business Intelligence. *ResearchGate*.

Chennupati, N. (2025). Cognitive RPA: A Framework for Hybridizing Artificial Intelligence with Robotic Process Automation in Enterprise Systems. *European Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology*, *13*(19), 64-78.

Cherukuri, R., & Yarram, V. K. (2024). From Intelligent Automation to Agentic AI: Engineering the Next Generation of Enterprise Systems. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Engineering and Technology*, *5*(4), 142-152.

Debbadi, R. K., & Boateng, O. (2025). Enhancing cognitive automation capabilities with reinforcement learning techniques in robotic process automation using UiPath and Automation Anywhere. *Int J Sci Res Arch*, *14*(2), 733-752.

Faisal, M. I., & Shah, A. A. (2023). Enhancing cognitive automation capabilities with reinforcement learning techniques in robotic process automation using UiPath and automation. *Journal of Computational Informatics & Business*, *1*(1), 14-19.

Gatta, V. S. (2025). Redefining Financial Workflows: The Convergence of Cognitive Automation and Process Mining. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies*, *7*(8), 1105-1117.

Gomathy, E. (2025). Robotic Process Automation to Autonomous Bots: A Survey on the Integration of Artificial Intelligence into Robotic Process Automation. *Scientiarum: A multidisciplinary journal*, *1*(3).

Kaltenpoth, S., Skolik, A., Müller, O., & Beverungen, D. (2025, August). A Step Towards Cognitive Automation: Integrating LLM Agents with Process Rules. In *International Conference on Business Process Management* (pp. 308-324). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Maddukuri, N. (2023). Ai-Powered Decision Making In Rpa Workflows: The Rise Of Intelligent Decision Engines. *Intelligence*, *1*(1), 72-86.

Parakala, A. M. (2026). AI-Driven Robotic Process Automation for Intelligent Enterprise Systems and Digital Transformation. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, 27-35.

Priyanka, N., & Shankar Lingam, M. (2025, June). Impact of Agentic AI-Driven RPA on Strategic Management: Enhancing Decision-Making and Organizational Efficiency. In *International Conference on Inventive Communication and Computational Technologies* (pp. 167-177). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Putnoki, A. M., & Orosz, T. (2023, October). Artificial intelligence and cognitive information systems: revolutionizing business with generative artificial intelligence and robotic process automation. In *The international conference on recent innovations in computing* (pp. 39-70). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Ślązak, E. (2024). AI-DRIVEN INNOVATION IN BANKING–THE CASE OF COGNITIVE RPA. *Scientific Papers of Silesian University of Technology. Organization & Management/Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Slaskiej. Seria Organizacji i Zarzadzania*, (208).

Tupsakhare, P. (2025). Intelligent Automation: Integrating AI and RPA for Smarter Processes. *IJSAT-International Journal on Science and Technology*, *16*(1).

Wei, S., Liu, Y., & Yang, Y. (2025, November). A Multi-Agent Automation Framework Integrating RPA, OCR, and Large Language Models for Complex Workflow Execution. In *2025 6th International Symposium on Computer Engineering and Intelligent Communications (ISCEIC)* (pp. 833-836). IEEE.

Yang, H., Lin, L., She, Y., Liao, X., Wang, J., Zhang, R., ... & Wang, C. D. (2025). FinRobot: Generative Business Process AI Agents for Enterprise Resource Planning in Finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01423*.