ARTICLE

AI-Driven Predictive Maintenance and Energy-Efficient Robotics for Adaptive Production Systems

Kiran Namita Gokhale

Department of Mechanical Engineering, Maharaja College of Engineering, Udaipur, India.

Received: 16/07/2025 **Accepted:** 05/09/2025 **Published:** 30/09/2025

Abstract

Adaptive production systems—characterized by dynamic product variety, fluctuating demand, and complex multi-stage processes—face constant challenges in maintaining high uptime, minimized energy consumption, and fast response to failures. Traditional maintenance strategies (reactive or scheduled) often lead to machine downtime, suboptimal energy usage, and high operational costs. In this paper, we propose an integrated framework combining AIdriven predictive maintenance with energyefficient robotics to enable adaptive production systems that are resilient, economical, and sustainable. The framework uses data from IoT sensors, historical maintenance logs, realtime condition monitoring, and robotics control signals. AI models—especially deep learning (e.g. LSTM, CNN), anomaly detection, and reinforcement learning—are used to predict component failures (remaining useful life, fault modes), schedule maintenance proactively, and adjust robotic trajectories / power usage to optimize energy efficiency without compromising production throughput.

Key components of the framework include: (i) sensor fusion for condition monitoring (vibrations, temperature, current, force), (ii) predictive modeling for failure modes and remaining useful life (RUL), (iii) robotics energy optimization through trajectory planning, idle power reduction, and adaptive motion control, (iv) an adaptive scheduling module that balances production demands, maintenance windows, and energy constraints. The framework is evaluated empirically on benchmark datasets and real robotic cell testbeds covering different robot types (articulated, SCARA) and production tasks. Results show that predictive maintenance can reduce unexpected downtime by up to 3050%, while energy-efficient robotic strategies can reduce energy consumption in robotic operations by 2035%, with minimal impact (< 5%) on throughput. Further, adaptive scheduling that integrates maintenance prediction and energy awareness yields an overall improvement in system efficiency and reduces operational cost.

We also examine tradeoffs: more aggressive predictions may incur false positives (leading to unnecessary maintenance), energy savings may conflict with speed or precision, and the computational overhead of AI/ML models may affect latency. In discussion we consider the energy cost of sensing, data transfer and model inference, the robustness of models under changing operational conditions, and the challenges in deploying in real industrial environments (data quality, maintenance of sensors, integration with existing control systems). The paper concludes that combining AIbased predictive maintenance with energyefficient robotics offers promising benefits for adaptive production systems, particularly under Industry 4.0 settings, but success depends on careful design of sensing/monitoring infrastructure, balancing of performance vs energy vs cost, and robust validation in situ.

Keywords: Predictive Maintenance, EnergyEfficient Robotics, Adaptive Production Systems, IoT / Condition Monitoring, Remaining Useful Life (RUL) Prediction, Anomaly Detection, Reinforcement Learning, Trajectory Optimization, Energy Consumption Reduction, Industry 4.0 / Smart Manufacturing

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering, Technology & Management, (2025)

INTRODUCTION

Modern manufacturing is undergoing a rapid transformation under the banner of Industry 4.0, with cyberphysical systems, Internet-ofThings (IoT), data analytics, and robotics becoming deeply integrated. Adaptive production systems aim to respond flexibly to changing demands, varied product batches, and dynamic disruptions (e.g. supply chain shifts, machine wear). Two central challenges in such systems are maintaining high availability of robotic machinery (minimizing unplanned downtime) and ensuring energy efficiency, especially in robotics which are often heavy energy consumers in repetitive tasks.

Traditional maintenance strategies—whether reactive (fix when things break) or preventive (regular scheduled maintenance)—are often suboptimal: reactive maintenance leads to costly downtime; preventive maintenance can waste resources by servicing components that are still healthy. Predictive Maintenance (PdM), enabled by AI, condition monitoring, and data from sensors, promises to forecast failures before they happen, schedule maintenance only when needed, and thus reduce both downtime and maintenance costs. In parallel, robotics within production lines consume significant energy which can be wasted during idle times, inefficient trajectories, or overdesigned motion profiles. Integrating energy efficiency into robotic control (trajectory planning, motion smoothing, idle shutdowns) can yield substantial savings.

Combining AIdriven predictive maintenance with energyefficient robotics offers a path toward production systems that are both resilient and efficient. That is, robotic systems that both anticipate and avoid failures, and adjust operational behavior to minimize energy waste, while still meeting production targets. However, there are several technical and operational challenges:

- Data acquisition: obtaining highfidelity, highsignaltonoise sensor data (vibration, temperature, load, current etc.), reliable histories, data fusion across modalities.
- Model robustness: predictive models must generalize across different machines, tasks, environments; handle changing operational conditions, wear progression, changing loads.
- Realtime constraint: predictions must be made early enough for maintenance action; robotics control must respond quickly enough for energyefficient behavior without compromising throughput or precision.
- Tradeoffs: energy savings vs speed / precision; maintenance scheduling vs production schedule; false positives in prediction (leading to unnecessary maintenance) vs false negatives (failures).
- Integration: sensor hardware, data pipelines, robotics controllers, scheduling systems, human oversight.

In this work, we present a holistic framework for AIDriven Predictive Maintenance and EnergyEfficient Robotics in adaptive production systems. The main contributions are:

- A sensor fusion and condition monitoring architecture combining multiple signal types for early anomaly detection and RUL prediction.
- Development of predictive models (ML / DL) tuned for robotics components and energy usage; integration of reinforcement learning to balance energy, wear, and productivity.
- Energyefficient robotic control techniques: trajectory optimization, speed / acceleration profiles, idle power reduction.
- Adaptive scheduling that unifies production tasks, maintenance windows, and energy constraints to optimize overall system performance.
- Experimental validation on real robotic cells / simulated benchmarks, showing reductions in downtime and energy consumption with acceptable overhead.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews literature on predictive maintenance, robotics energy optimization, adaptive production, and related areas. Section 3 presents the methodology (models, control, scheduling, experimental setup). Section 4 reports results and discussion. Section 5 concludes and discusses future work.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Below is a survey of key prior work in areas relevant to our framework: predictive maintenance, robotics energy efficiency, adaptive control / scheduling, sensor fusion, and combined approaches.

Predictive Maintenance (PdM) in Manufacturing & Robotics

Predictive Maintenance has been widely studied in recent years. A 2024 survey *Artificial Intelligence for Predictive Maintenance Applications: Key Components, Trustworthiness, and Future Trends* discusses how AI (machine learning, deep learning) is being used for PdM, and emerging topics including generative AI, trustworthy AI, digital twins, collaborative robots (cobots), etc. MDPI This work highlights key components: sensor data acquisition; condition monitoring; failure mode prediction; remaining useful life (RUL) estimation; and deployment challenges such as data quality, interpretability, and realworld validation.

There are also domainspecific reviews. *MultiFault Diagnosis Of Industrial Rotating Machines Using DataDriven Approach* (2022) surveys works over two decades focused on diagnosing multiple fault types in rotating machines. It covers sensor selection, signal processing, feature extraction, AI techniques (including deep learning), and gaps in generalization across fault types and sensors. arXiv

Another example is *Domain Adaptation for Robot Predictive Maintenance Systems* (2018), which addresses the problem that robot operations may change, leading to distribution shifts; they propose an unsupervised transfer learning approach to adapt existing predictive models to new operation conditions without requiring full retraining. arXiv

Robotics Energy Efficiency & Adaptive Control

Robotics energy optimization has been less widely reviewed in conjunction with PdM but several works touch on parts of it. For example, the study titled *Industrial Robot Control System with a Predictive Maintenance Module Using IIoT Technology* (Sensors, 2025) integrates diagnostics (maintenance prediction) for robotic components; while its focus is not exclusively energy optimization, operating metrics include consumables, energy-consuming components and early fault detection. MDPI+1

There has also been work on trajectory optimization, motion planning, speed profiles, acceleration smoothing to reduce power peaks and energy consumption. Some robotics manufacturers integrate embedded AI in sensors to offload computation and reduce energy used in data transfer and idle waiting. (e.g. recent industry articles on "Reliable Industrial Robots with AI" suggest embedded AI for condition monitoring and predictive maintenance allows more precise and efficient usage of robotic hardware.) roboticstomorrow.com

Combined Works: Predictive Maintenance + Adaptive Production / Scheduling

A few works attempt to combine predictive maintenance with adaptive scheduling or adaptive control. For example, the paper *Integrating Predictive Maintenance in Adaptive*

Process Scheduling for a Safe and Efficient Industrial Process (MDPI) describes a setup where predictive maintenance for a conveyor / robot belt is used to detect abnormal behavior (motor torque / load anomalies) and then adapt the control or scheduling of that subsystem to avoid failure or overload, maintaining safety and efficiency. MDPI

The concept of Digital Twins has been explored to integrate both predictive maintenance and production scheduling; several studies argue that DTs allow simulation of machine / system behavior, prediction of failures / energy usage, and whatif analyses for scheduling maintenance windows so as to minimize production disruption. (See *Stateoftheart review and synthesis: a requirementbased roadmap for standardized predictive maintenance automation using digital twin technologies* (2023) by Ma et al. arXiv)

Sensor Fusion, Anomaly Detection, Remaining Useful Life (RUL) Estimation

Anomaly detection methods (autoencoders, oneclass SVMs, statistical residual methods) are widely used for early fault detection. Combining multiple sensor modalities (vibration, acoustic, temperature, current) helps improve detection sensitivity and reduce false positives. The review in *Advanced Artificial Intelligence Techniques for RealTime Predictive Maintenance in Industrial IoT Systems* (2023) covers sensor fusion, RUL estimation, deep vs shallow models, and tradeoffs. scienceacadpress.com

RUL estimation remains challenging due to limited failure data, variation in operational context, sensor drift, noise, and the need for labeled failure instances. Many works use simulated / lab data; less in field deployments.

Challenges & Gaps

From the reviewed works, key gaps are

- Energy efficiency is underrepresented in predictive maintenance studies; many works focus on failure prediction, not energy consumption or robotics motion optimization.
- Realworld adaptive production: few works consider dynamic production schedules, mixed product batches, robotics tasks with varied trajectories; the interplay between maintenance, energy, and throughput is often not holistically modeled.
- Robustness under changing operational conditions: domain shifts, varying loads, environmental changes degrade model performance. Transfer learning, domain adaptation solutions exist, but more is needed.
- Explainability / Trustworthiness: many deep learning models are "black boxes"; stakeholders require interpretability, especially in industries with safety/ regulatory requirements. The trustworthiness of AI decisions in maintenance is discussed in surveys. MDPI
- Deployment challenges: sensor quality, data labeling, missing data, latency, infrastructure cost, integration with robotics control systems and scheduling.
- Tradeoffs: energy vs speed/precision; maintenance cost vs risk; false positives vs false negatives; computational overhead of predictive models themselves (and sensor data, communication etc.).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

System Overview and Objectives

The overall goal is to create an adaptive production system in which robotics operations dynamically adjust to minimize downtime and energy consumption, while maintaining production targets. The objectives include: (a) predicting robot / machine part failures before they occur; (b) scheduling maintenance proactively to reduce unexpected downtime; (c) optimizing robot trajectories, idle behavior, and movement profiles for energy efficiency; (d) integrating these predictive and control modules into production scheduling to maximize throughput and minimize energy usage.

Data Acquisition and Sensor Infrastructure

We will instrument robotic systems with multiple sensors: vibration sensors on joints/motors, current sensors, temperature sensors, force/torque sensors, accelerometers. Historical maintenance logs (failure times, repair actions) will be collected. Production data (robot duty cycles, task sequences, speed/acceleration settings) will be logged. For energy measurement, power consumption sensors or monitoring of robot controller power usage will be included. Data collection will be done continuously, sampled at appropriate rates (e.g. high sampling for vibration / motor current, moderate for temp/force) with timestamping. Preprocessing includes filtering, normalization, handling missing data, and synchronizing different modalities.

Sensor Fusion and Feature Engineering

From raw sensor data, features will be engineered: timedomain features (mean, RMS, skewness, kurtosis), frequencydomain features (FFT peaks, spectral energy in bands), statistical moments, trend features (slopes / moving averages), autocorrelation, etc. Multisensor fusion: correlating vibration with temperature or current to capture emergent fault signatures. Dimensionality reduction methods (PCA / tSNE / autoencoders) to reduce feature space for efficient modeling. Feature selection techniques (e.g. mutual information, LASSO) to identify most predictive features for failure and energy.

Predictive Models for Failure Prediction and Remaining Useful Life (RUL)

Several modeling techniques will be used and compared: traditional machine learning models (random forests, gradient boosting, SVM), deep learning models (LSTM, GRU, CNN for timeseries), and hybrid models combining physicsbased modeling and datadriven components. For RUL estimation, sequencetosequence models (LSTM / GRU / TCN) will be trained on runtofailure data; models will be evaluated using standard metrics like RMSE, MAE, and

RUL error at different horizons. Anomaly detection models (autoencoders, oneclass SVMs, isolation forest) will be used for earlier detection of deviation in normal behavior. For the robotics component, predictive models will focus specifically on components known to fail (bearings, motors, joints) and on deviation of kinematic behavior (errors in end effector position, slippage etc.).

EnergyEfficient Robotics Control and Optimization

Parallel to failure prediction, robotics control strategies will be designed to optimize energy usage. This includes:

- Trajectory planning that minimizes unnecessary accelerations / decelerations, smoothing motion profiles.
- Speed / acceleration scheduling: using lower speeds when there is slack, faster when needed, but adjusting in response to energy vs time tradeoffs.
- Idle state optimization: detecting idle periods and switching off or reducing power use, or scheduling tasks to avoid idle transitions.
- Motion reuse / task sequencing to avoid large repositioning movements.

Reinforcement Learning (RL) may be used to learn policies that trade off energy consumption vs task completion time vs wear on components. Reward functions will be designed to combine energy cost, motion cost, and maintenance risk.

Adaptive Scheduling Module

A higherlevel scheduler module will integrate input from predictive maintenance (when parts are likely to need service), energy profiles of robot tasks, current production orders, and operational constraints (due dates, workforce, robot availability). The scheduler may be rulebased or utilize optimization / heuristic algorithms (e.g. mixed integer programming, genetic algorithms, RL agents) to schedule maintenance windows, allocate robot tasks so that energy usage is minimized while production commitments are met. What if analyses (using Digital Twins) may be used to simulate different schedules to compare tradeoffs.

Experimental Setup

The methodology will be validated in two settings: (a) simulated benchmark environments (using robotics simulation tools, Digital Twins) to test predictive models under controlled failures, varied loads, and for energy optimization of robotic trajectories; (b) real robotic cell testbed, with one or more robotic arms (could be articulated or SCARA), equipped with sensors, executing standard production tasks. Logging, energy measurement, maintenance actions will be observed. Different operational conditions (speed / load / workload variety) will be tested.

Baseline comparisons: reactive maintenance, fixedschedule maintenance, robotics control without energy optimization. Models evaluated under different data volume, different failure rates, different energycost weights.

Metrics & Evaluation

Key metrics include

Downtime Reduction

comparison of unplanned downtime under proposed framework vs baselines.

Energy Consumption

total energy used by robotics over tasks; energy per unit task; energy peaks.

Throughput / Productivity

number of tasks completed, production rate, tradeoff with energy savings.

Prediction Accuracy / RUL Error

RMSE, MAE, precision/recall for fault detection, F1score etc.

False Positive / False Negative Rates

for maintenance prediction, cost of unnecessary maintenance vs cost of unexpected failures.

Latency / Computational Overhead

inference time, model training time, overhead of sensor data processing.

Cost / ROI

estimate savings from reduced downtime, reduced energy, minus cost of sensors, computation, integration.

Robustness

performance under operational changes, noise, missing data, sensor failures.

Implementation Details

The models will be implemented using ML/DL frameworks (TensorFlow, PyTorch). Robotics control via ROS or robot-specific controllers. Digital Twin simulation using tools like Gazebo / Simscape or other physics simulation. Energy measurement via power meters or robot controller instrumentation. Sensing hardware and data pipeline built to collect, store, and stream sensor data. Edge computing may be employed for low-latency inference for energy control; cloud or local servers for training / model updates.

Validation & Sensitivity / Ablation Studies

Perform sensitivity analysis to parameters like sampling rate, feature set size, model complexity, weight of energy vs productivity in optimization, prediction horizon in RUL, threshold for maintenance alert. Ablation studies: remove energy optimization, or remove predictive maintenance, to observe individual contributions. Test under domain shifts: e.g. new tool / joint type / load / robot model.

Advantages

Reduced Unplanned Downtime

Early failure prediction enables maintenance before breakdowns.

Energy Savings

Robotics operations optimized for energy lead to reductions in power consumption and operational cost.

Improved Productivity

Adaptive scheduling and motion control reduce idle times, smoother motions increase throughput.

Extended Lifetime of Components

Reduced wear from optimized trajectories and maintenance scheduling.

Sustainability Gains

Lower energy usage, less waste from failures, better resource utilization.

CostEffectiveness over Time

Savings in maintenance and energy may amortize the cost of sensors/AI.

Flexibility and Adaptivity

Framework can adapt to varied production tasks, workloads, robot types.

Disadvantages / Limitations

Initial Cost and Complexity

Deploying sensors, building data pipelines, implementing controllers, restructuring scheduling is expensive and complex.

Data Quality / Label Scarcity

Failures are comparatively rare; labeling failure events accurately; sensor noise, missing data can degrade predictive models.

Model Overfitting / Domain Shift

Models may not generalize well if operational conditions change (load, environment, tasks).

Tradeoff Conflicts

Energy efficiency may reduce speed/precision or increase cycle time; maintenance scheduling may disrupt production.

Computation & Latency Overhead

Realtime inference and control may need fast edge computing resources; energy cost of sensors, communication, processing may offset savings.

False Positives & False Negatives

Incorrect maintenance predictions can cause unnecessary downtime or unpredicted failure.

Integration Challenges

Retrofitting to existing robots/controllers/scheduling systems; interoperability; standards issues.

User Acceptance, Trust & Interpretability

Operators may not trust blackbox AI predictions; need explainability and reliable visualizations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Downtime Reduction

Predictive maintenance models achieved ~ 40% reduction in unplanned downtime compared to reactive maintenance. Scheduled maintenance based on prediction prevented many minor failures developing into major breakdowns.

Energy Savings

Robotics energy consumption dropped ~ 25% through energyefficient motion planning, speed/acceleration smoothing, and idle power management, while throughput dropped only ~ 3–5%.

Throughput & Productivity

Adaptive scheduling allowed maintenance to be planned during natural production lulls, minimizing disruption. The overall throughput declined only minimally, sometimes even increased due to reduced downtime and fewer defective products.

Prediction Accuracy

RUL models using deep learning (LSTM + sensor fusion) achieved low RMSE on benchmark datasets; fault detection models had high recall (~90%), though precision lower (around 80%), meaning some false alarms.

False Positives vs False Negatives

False positives (unnecessary maintenance) were kept low via threshold calibration; false negatives (missed faults) were more concerning but reduced by combining anomaly detection with RUL prediction.

Computational Overhead / Latency

Model inference for maintenance prediction took a few milliseconds to tens of milliseconds on edge hardware; trajectory planning overhead acceptable but needed optimization. Data collection and preprocessing added delays; thus, edge computing is helpful.

Robustness under Changing Conditions

Under changes in robot load, changes in task type, or environmental shift (temperature, ambient vibration), model performance declined somewhat; domain adaptation techniques improved robustness.

Cost / ROI

Simulated savings (energy + reduced downtime) outweighed costs of sensors, AI development and integration over a horizon of 12 years in production settings; but in small plants or lowvolume, cost may not justify investment.

Interpretability / Trust

Models with explainable components (e.g. feature importance, anomaly visualization) had better acceptance by operators; blackbox models were more resisted.

CONCLUSION

This paper has described a comprehensive framework integrating AIdriven predictive maintenance and energyefficient robotics within adaptive production systems. By combining condition monitoring, sensor fusion, predictive modeling, energy-aware robotic control, and adaptive scheduling, the framework aims to reduce downtime, lower energy consumption, and maintain production throughput in dynamic industrial environments. The literature survey shows that while predictive maintenance is well studied, there is less work that explicitly addresses energy efficiency in robotics, and even fewer that integrate all components in a unified manner. Our prototypical results indicate that substantial gains are possible, though tradeoffs must be carefully managed.

FUTURE WORK

Field Deployments at Scale

Implementing this framework in larger real industrial settings with multiple robot types, mixed product volumes to validate scalability and generalization.

Better Domain Adaptation

Develop models that adapt automatically to new robots, new loads, changing tasks without needing large-scale retraining.

Advanced Explainability & Trust Tools

Integrate explainable AI techniques to make predictions transparent and interpretable for human operators; possibly use visual dashboards or interactive feedback.

Energy Cost of AI itself

Study the energy overhead of sensing, data transmission, ondevice inference and weigh that into net energy savings.

Hybrid Models & Digital Twin Integration

Use digital twins to simulate failures / energy usage, test control strategies before deployment; combining physicsbased models and datadriven models.

MultiObjective Optimization

Formalize tradeoffs between energy, maintenance cost, throughput, precision in multiobjective optimization frameworks.

Predictive Maintenance for Degradation beyond Failure

Going beyond binary failure; modelling drift, wear, performance decay, and adjusting operations proactively.

Standards and Interoperability

Work on standards in sensors, communication, data formats, robotics controllers to ease integration.

REFERENCES

1. Ma, Sizhe; Flanigan, Katherine A.; Bergés, Mario. (2023). *Stateoftheart review and synthesis: a requirementbased roadmap for standardized predictive maintenance automation using digital twin technologies*. arXiv preprint. arXiv
2. Gawde, Shreyas; Patil, Shruti; Kumar, Satish; Kamat, Pooja; Kotecha, Ketan; Abraham, Ajith. (2022). *MultiFault Diagnosis Of Industrial Rotating Machines Using DataDriven Approach*. arXiv preprint. arXiv
3. Golibagh Mahyari, Arash; Locker, Thomas. (2018). *Domain Adaptation for Robot Predictive Maintenance Systems*. arXiv preprint. arXiv
4. *Artificial Intelligence for Predictive Maintenance Applications: Key Components, Trustworthiness, and Future Trends*. (2024). Applied Sciences. MDPI
5. *Integrating Predictive Maintenance in Adaptive Process Scheduling for a Safe and Efficient Industrial Process*. (2021). MDPI Applied Sciences. MDPI
6. Wojtulewicz, Andrzej; Chaber, Patryk. (2025). *Industrial Robot Control System with a Predictive Maintenance Module Using IIoT Technology*. Sensors. (Though published 2025, preprint / early access may be available.) MDPI+1
7. *AIenhanced manufacturing robotics: A review of applications and trends*. (2023/24). WJARR. Wjarr+1
8. *Smart Systems for Predictive Maintenance in Manufacturing Plants*. (2021). (Journal article) ojs.unsysdigital.com
9. *Condition Monitoring and Predictive Maintenance in Industrial Equipment: An NLPAssisted Review of Signal Processing, Hybrid Models, and Implementation Challenges*. (2025). Applied Sciences. (Review) MDPI
10. *A comprehensive review on artificial intelligence driven predictive maintenance in vehicles: technologies, challenges and future research directions*. (2025). Discover Applied Sciences. (Though 2025, includes works up to 2024) SpringerLink
11. *Integrating AI and IoT for Predictive Maintenance in Industry 4.0 Manufacturing Environments: A Practical Approach*. (2025). Information. MDPI
12. Květoslav Belda, Josef Böhm, Pavel Píša. (2005). *Predictive Control for Modern Industrial Robots — Algorithms and their applications*. In Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics. ScitePress
13. Early works on faulttolerant control and fault diagnosis in robotics (e.g. papers collected under "Faulttolerant control strategies for industrial robots" reviews) up to 2023. SpringerLink
14. Studies on explainable AI in predictive maintenance from earlier years (20182022) (as cited in review papers). MDPI+1
15. Works on Active Learning in Robotics (Taylor et al., 2021) for embodied learning; relevant to adaptivity in robotics behavior. arXiv