

Self-Building Labs

Jiaru Bai^{†,1,3,✉}, Yuchi Zhao^{†,2,3,✉}, Han Hao^{1,7,✉}, Miroslav Bogdanovic^{2,3,7,✉}, Yang Cao^{1,7,*,✉},
Varinia Bernales^{1,2,7,*,✉}, Alán Aspuru-Guzik^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,*,✉}

¹Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, 80 St. George St., Toronto, ON M5S 3H6, Canada

²Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, 40 St George St., Toronto, ON M5S 2E4, Canada

³Vector Institute for Artificial Intelligence, W1140-108 College St., Schwartz Reisman Innovation Campus, Toronto, ON M5G 0C6, Canada

⁴Department of Materials Science & Engineering, University of Toronto, 184 College St., Toronto, ON M5S 3E4, Canada

⁵Department of Chemical Engineering & Applied Chemistry, University of Toronto, 200 College St., Toronto, ON M5S 3E5, Canada

⁶Institute of Medical Science, 1 King's College Circle, Medical Sciences Building, Room 2374, Toronto, ON M5S 1A8, Canada

⁷Acceleration Consortium, 700 University Ave., Toronto, ON M7A 2S4, Canada

⁸Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR), 661 University Ave., Toronto, ON M5G 1M1, Canada

⁹NVIDIA, 431 King St W #6th, Toronto, ON M5V 1K4, Canada

[†]Equal contribution

Self-driving laboratories (SDLs) accelerate scientific discovery by automating experimental execution and optimization. AI agents can increasingly propose new experiments, but existing SDLs can only run the procedures they were built for. Adapting them to a new experiment still requires extensive manual engineering, which makes laboratory flexibility the bottleneck for scaling discovery. We introduce the self-building laboratory (SBL), which designs, configures, and operates its own laboratory setup given a high-level scientific goal. SBL starts from whatever already exists, from an empty room to a working SDL, and builds the missing capabilities: the lab layout, its digital twin, robot skills, and experimental workflows. We demonstrate the system working across different robots and setups, scaling from a single workstation to laboratories with several robots working together. We validate SBL's end-to-end capabilities through a real-world quantum-dot synthesis experiment. By shifting the role of human researchers from manually configuring and programming device automation to specifying scientific objectives, SBL makes scientific automation more accessible, flexible, and scalable.

Website: self-building-labs.github.io

Date: October 19, 2026

Correspondence:

yangcyril.cao@utoronto.ca, varinia@bernales.org and alan@aspuru.com



1 Introduction

Self-driving laboratories (SDLs) accelerate scientific research by automating experiments through the design–make–test–analyse (DMTA) cycle, in which experimental results inform subsequent decisions (1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12). These approaches have been used to design biological systems, synthesize solid-state materials, optimize nanocrystals (13; 14; 15), to name a few. However, the autonomy of an SDL is typically bounded by the equipment and operational capabilities established during its development (16).

This boundary becomes a bottleneck as scientific research evolves. New research questions may require experimental procedures or instrumentation that were not anticipated when the platform was configured. Extending these capabilities typically requires specialists to integrate hardware and develop the software needed to execute new procedures (17; 12; 18). Such modifications are time-consuming (19) and often depend




Figure 1 Concept of a self-building laboratory (SBL). Scientific goals guide the identification of capability gaps, development in a digital twin, and validation in the physical laboratory. Feedback and reuse support continued capability development across workflows, equipment, and entire laboratories. The image combines SDL2 at the Acceleration Consortium, University of Toronto, Canada, with its digital twin built by the SBL and rendered in Isaac Sim in a blue wireframe style.

on tacit knowledge that is difficult to preserve or transfer (20). Changes in equipment placement or laboratory layout can further compromise the reliability of existing workflows. Modular platforms and robots that reconfigure equipment can adapt workflows using existing hardware and software (21; 4; 22). Capabilities beyond those already available still require human development.

Recent advances provide an opportunity to address this limitation. Large language model (LLM)-based agents have demonstrated the ability to plan experiments, generate instrument control code, and interact with laboratory hardware (23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30), while physics-based simulation enables developing digital twins of laboratory environments (31; 32). Advances in robotics, particularly mobile manipulation, allow experiments to draw on instruments distributed across a laboratory by transferring samples between instruments (6; 33; 34; 35; 36). Language models can select existing robot skills based on their likelihood of success (37) and generate control programs that use sensory feedback (38). Using robots as tools for general-purpose agents has also been discussed as a broader direction for robotics (39). Recent studies test GPT-6-Astra for robot control in simulation (40; 41; 42). Experiments and technical reports also show control of real robots, with some systems reusing experience or using a digital twin to guide actions (43; 44; 45). These advances support flexible experimental execution, but adapting a laboratory to new scientific requirements still requires substantial time and expertise (46).

Here, we demonstrate a **self-building laboratory (SBL)** that incorporates the identification, development, and validation of task-required operational capabilities into the autonomous scientific process (Figure 1). Researchers define the scientific objectives that guide this process. SBL self-identifies gaps between these objectives and its available capabilities, then develops or extends the interfaces, skills, and workflows needed to address them. The system uses a digital twin to develop candidate operations and check them against task constraints before refining and validating them through physical interaction. Successful procedures are retained as reusable skills for subsequent tasks. Table 1 compares how experimental capabilities are developed and used across laboratory paradigms.

We demonstrate capability development of SBLs from digital twin construction and operational skill development to experimental workflow building and laboratory expansion. SBL constructs task-relevant digital twins and develops execution interfaces and reusable skills that incorporate sensory feedback. It combines these capabilities into experimental workflows for physical execution using existing instruments. In simulation, the system also coordinates different robotic configurations and interconnected workstations. By incorporating capability development into the autonomous scientific process, SBLs could reduce the engineering effort required to adapt laboratory automation to new scientific objectives and make it more accessible to researchers without specialized automation expertise.

Table 1 Comparison of laboratory paradigms.

Aspect	Traditional lab	Self-driving lab	Self-building lab (this work)
Experiment execution	Researcher-led procedures	Automated workflows using integrated capabilities	Workflows using capabilities developed as needed
New capabilities	Developed by researchers	Typically engineered by specialists	Developed and validated by agents
Knowledge retention	Written procedures and researcher experience	Protocols and script libraries tailored for one setup	Reusable skills across laboratories

2 Results

2.1 Overview




Figure 2 Architecture of the self-building laboratory. The **scientific agent** translates user goals into experimental plans, while the **twin agent** constructs a **digital twin**, develops task-relevant skills, and validates workflows in simulation. The **safety agent** uses the twin for scenario analysis and generates **runtime guardrails** through which all physical laboratory commands pass. The scientific agent invokes the **physical laboratory** through this layer. Physical state feedback supports twin calibration and subsequent simulation, while simulation and physical execution traces support **skill distillation** and the retention of experience as agent memory. Reusable skills and memories inform subsequent tasks.

SBL takes a user’s scientific goal together with a description of the current laboratory: photographs of the space, device identifiers, and any existing automation interfaces (Figure 2). The starting point can range from an empty room to a working SDL; in each case, SBL builds the capabilities missing for the goal: the lab layout, its digital twin, robot skills, and experimental workflows (Table 2). It builds a digital twin of the laboratory, from individual device models to the layout of the whole space, using robot-mounted cameras where available to gather additional observations (Section 2.2). SBL identifies the capabilities the desired workflow requires and acquires the missing skills using the digital twin and, with user approval, trial-and-error

Table 2 Starting points for a self-building laboratory. The same process applies in each case; only the set of capabilities that must be built differs.

Starting point	Already exists	SBL builds
Empty laboratory	N/A	Layout, digital twin, skills, and workflows
Existing manual laboratory	Equipment	Digital twin, skills, and workflows
Automated laboratory requiring reconfiguration	Equipment and some skills	New layout, updated digital twin, and adapted skills
SDL with a new protocol	Equipment and skills	New workflows and any missing skills

in the real world (Section 2.3). This allows it to go from a user’s scientific goal to safely executing the desired workflow in the real world, with minimal human intervention (Section 2.4). The same process extends to designing laboratory layouts and coordinating several robots across workstations (Section 2.5).

2.2 Building digital twin

Figure 3 shows how the twin agent reconstructs individual equipment and assembles these models into a calibrated laboratory scene. The user provides laboratory photographs, equipment model numbers when available, and device application programming interface (API) endpoints. From these inputs, the agent builds a task-oriented representation of equipment identity, geometry, articulation, spatial arrangement, and control interfaces.

Equipment reconstruction begins with identifying the individual devices from the photographs and any supplied model numbers. For each device, the agent first searches for existing computer-aided design (CAD) models and Unified Robot Description Format (URDF) files. If these are unavailable, the agent reconstructs an approximate 3D model using manufacturer documentation, technical specifications, and reference images. The agent first estimates the device dimensions using available measurements and known reference objects, then breaks down the device into individual components, such as frames, housings, doors, and moving mechanisms. Using Python, the agent constructs these components from basic geometric primitives and custom meshes. The generated models are then iteratively refined by comparing rendered views against reference images and adjusting their geometry, proportions, and relative positions. Once the geometry is established, the agent adds articulations for movable components by defining their joints, motion axes, and limits. This process produces simulation-ready equipment models without requiring manual CAD modelling. Missing or uncertain parameters are recorded for further refinement.

The agent then assembles the equipment models into an initial scene based on the observed laboratory layout. To refine this arrangement, the agent plans camera poses and acquires colour and depth observations from each pose using its wrist-mounted camera. The agent compares observed and rendered views and iteratively updates equipment positions and orientations. This procedure reduces equipment-pose discrepancies and establishes the robot-to-device poses needed for motion planning.

To support operations within the reconstructed scene, the agent implements simulated devices with the same API interfaces as their physical counterparts but different endpoints. Selecting the target endpoint determines whether an operation runs in the twin or the physical laboratory. A monitoring system polls physical device status through the APIs and updates the corresponding states in the twin. Using the calibrated scene, the agent plans robot motion in the twin and sends the resulting trajectories to the physical execution endpoint to control the robot. The twin remains a living replica of the physical laboratory, continually updated as new observations become available.

2.3 Building laboratory skills

Figure 4 illustrates laboratory skills at three levels: device execution interfaces, embodied operations, and scientific procedures and interpretation. Scientific requirements create demand for embodied skills, which in turn depend on the capabilities exposed by device interfaces. The agent develops missing skills and interfaces as these requirements arise, building the operational capabilities needed to complete the task.



Figure 3 Building a digital twin of the laboratory. (a) Starting from laboratory images and equipment model numbers when available, the twin agent identifies individual devices, searches product documentation, and retrieves or constructs equipment models with task-relevant geometry, articulation, and control interfaces. (b) These models are assembled into an initial simulation scene and refined using colour and depth observations acquired from multiple robot poses. The agent compares observed and rendered views and iteratively updates equipment poses to align the scene with the physical laboratory.




Figure 4 Scientific tasks drive laboratory skill development. A plate-sealing task drives the development and integration of embodied and device skills. Digital-twin planning and feedback from physical execution guide refinement of the twin and skills, connecting scientific requirements to executable laboratory capabilities.

Physical skills that enable the robot to perform experimental tasks are developed by the agent in simulation and on the real robot. In simulation, the agent maps the required experimental operations onto available equipment and explores candidate action sequences through trial and error. Specifically, using object states, the agent automatically defines grasping and placement poses, then uses a motion planner (47) to generate collision-free trajectories through the cluttered laboratory workspace. It composes these motion segments into an experimental workflow.

Direct transfer of a workflow from simulation to the real world is bounded by calibration and modelling errors. Transport and coarse localization can often be directly deployed. On the other hand, precise interactions, like grasping and insertion that require millimetre-scale precision, are more sensitive to these errors. There, online exploration is needed. The agent can autonomously use local sensory feedback to refine those interactions on the real robot. During exploration, it selects actions based on visual observations, depth measurements, robot state, and force/torque feedback, then examines the resulting sensory responses to identify successful strategies. Through this process, it learns to interpret feedback and use it to guide subsequent actions. Placement into a constrained fixture, for example, can involve visual alignment, guarded descent, contact detection, lateral adjustment, and resumed insertion after the measured load decreases.

The agent is capable of completing a range of tasks using this approach, through repeated cycles of reasoning, code generation, physical action, and observation. However, these cycles were too slow to meet the requirements of a chemical workflow. To reuse the experience gained during exploration, successful action sequences and their associated feedback are distilled into executable skills. Once an agent establishes a procedure that is repeatable, it is encoded as a Python script containing deterministic actions, sensor-based conditions, and recovery branches, then tested through repeated physical execution. The resulting skill can then run without agent involvement during nominal operation. Agentic reasoning resumes only when execution departs from the conditions encoded with the skill.

Safety Guardrail. Safety is a critical consideration when deploying autonomous agents in physical laboratories, particularly in environments shared with human researchers (48; 49; 50). To address this challenge, SBL incorporates safety mechanisms at both the simulation and physical execution levels. Specifically, beyond collision-free motion planning, SBL enables safety discovery by leveraging AI agents to autonomously propose and evaluate potentially hazardous scenarios in simulation. Through large-scale exploration of possible failure

conditions, we demonstrate that SBL identifies potential risks and generates candidate safety guidelines that can be incorporated into subsequent workflow planning. These findings also provide a foundation for building a shared knowledge base of laboratory hazards and safety practices. During physical execution, SBL implements multiple layers of safety guardrails. A separate control interface allows human operators to stop the entire experimental workflow at any time. Additionally, SBL enforces speed limits on robot trajectories and continuously monitors onboard force sensors to detect unexpected contact and trigger protective stops. Together, these capabilities extend SBL beyond conventional safety enforcement toward proactive hazard discovery and risk-aware autonomous laboratory operation.

2.4 Building experimental workflow

Figure 5 demonstrates the quantum dot synthesis experiment, which combines Opentrons liquid handling, plate sealing, and photophysics measurements. The experiment was chosen to highlight the challenges of end-to-end task planning and long-horizon robotic execution. A rail-mounted robotic arm transfers a 96-well plate between instruments, requiring millimetre-level precision during pick-up and insertion while keeping the plate level throughout each trajectory. SBL autonomously performs these tasks after a human operator provides the initial information and approves the proposed plan.

SBL used read-only API calls to establish the deck layout, the pipettes, the tip inventory, and the sealer and reader capabilities, then adapted the requested chemistry to these constraints. It wrote and verified a standalone Opentrons Python protocol offline, ran it in an Opentrons simulator matching the robot’s software version, and froze the reviewed file by recording its SHA-256 hash. The protocol consists of 236 commands covering setup, flow rates, tip, and liquid commands, all with timestamped event markers. These actions were validated against the gateway’s live OpenAPI schema, with the gateway configured to reject any change to the protocol’s hash. Before execution, SBL re-read the protocol and required the equipment to be ready and idle. It then sent the actions sequentially, recording before each request and confirming afterwards that no motion was in progress. For the subsequent plate transfers, SBL used the digital twin for motion planning, and visual and sensory feedback to guide grasping and placement. The robotic arm first transferred the plate from the OT-2 to the PlateLoc for sealing. To prepare the plate for insertion into the Cytation 5, SBL then used an intermediate plate holder as a transfer station, where the arm re-grasped the plate along its short side. The arm placed the plate in the reader’s plate slot, and SBL registered it with the Cytation 5 for optical readout.

The chemistry is the synthesis of water-soluble end-capped cadmium sulfide quantum dots (CdS QDs) exploring several factors simultaneously: the reaction pH and the ratios of sulfide and stabilizing ligand with respect to Cd concentration. The reaction were performed in a 96-well microplate and incubated at 60 °C in a microplate reader, where it was monitored by absorbance and photoluminescence measurements to assess how these factors affect the formation of nanoparticles and their emission properties. $\text{Cd}(\text{NO}_3)_2$ and thiourea served as the cadmium and sulfide precursors. 3-mercaptopropionic acid (MPA) acted as the stabilizing ligand, coordinating to the nanocrystal surface through its thiolate group to restrict growth and aggregation (51; 52). Alkaline buffers govern the deprotonation state of MPA and thereby its coordination with Cd^{2+} . At a fixed Cd concentration, the screen varied the Cd:MPA molar ratio (1:0–1:2), the Cd:thiourea molar ratio (1:1–1:2) and the initial buffer pH (8.5–10.0).

The solution remains clear and colourless at room temperature after the addition of all reagents with homogeneous optical properties across the plate and almost no emission within 450–680 nm. Reaction monitoring over the course of 8 h indicates no significant formation of amorphous precipitates, while a region with increasingly strong emission becomes notable in wells G7–H9. In well H8, for example, the increase in emission intensity above 500 nm and the shift of the emission peak from 520 nm to 560 nm are indicative of the progressive growth of MPA-capped CdS QDs (51). The result revealed the optimal ligand loading of 0.75–1.5 eq, and the preferential QD formation at high pH values, which can be attributed to more advantageous release of sulfide via thiourea hydrolysis. It is consistent with the fact that ligands are required to stabilize soluble QDs after nucleation, yet excess ligands will inhibit QD growth.

2.5 Building scalable labs

One of the major challenges in laboratory automation is scalability, as existing systems are often tailored to specific hardware configurations and experimental workflows (17; 19). SBL addresses this challenge by




Figure 5 SBL-coordinated CdS synthesis and optical readout. SBL executed 236 OT-2 commands to prepare a 96-well plate, followed by 19 robotic stages for transfer, sealing, re-grasping, and reader loading. Overlaid video frames and teal arrows illustrate plate handling. The heatmap shows fluorescence intensity at 560 nm after 8 h, with well H8 highlighted. The adjacent plots show the evolution of the H8 emission spectrum and its fluorescence intensity at 560 nm alongside the temperature trace.

automatically designing, evaluating, and optimizing laboratory configurations in simulation before physical deployment. We demonstrate its scalability across increasingly complex setups, from single-arm and bimanual robotic systems to multi-station laboratories, where mobile robots coordinate material transfer between workstations. This enables SBL to adapt laboratory layouts, robotic configurations, and experimental workflows to different automation requirements.

Scaling to different robots. We first demonstrate the adaptability of SBL to a solid-handling workstation, as shown in Figure 6. The task involves dispensing solid materials into six vials and transferring the vial rack to the opposite side of the workbench for subsequent experiments. SBL first reconstructs a digital twin from images of the physical laboratory, including particle-based simulation of solid dispensing. Since the vial and vial rack designs are not specified by the user, SBL automatically generates CAD models that ensure secure vial placement and robotic graspability. Furthermore, a central shelf prevents the smaller UR3 robot from directly transporting the vial rack across the workbench. To overcome this constraint, SBL autonomously plans a collision-free handoff between the UR3 and UR5 robots, enabling the completion of the task through coordinated bimanual-independent robot manipulation.

Scaling to multiple setups. Fixed-base robot arms are constrained by their limited workspace, while practical chemistry workflows often require devices distributed across multiple workstations. To demonstrate the scalability of SBL beyond a single robotic setup, we integrate the previously described UR-based solid-handling workstation with an xArm-based liquid-handling workstation to perform a buffer preparation workflow. Given only the high-level experimental goal, SBL autonomously generates a workflow that coordinates multiple robotic platforms and laboratory instruments. Specifically, SBL first leverages the UR workstation for solid dispensing, then plans and generates actions for a wheeled mobile manipulator to transport the vial rack between workstations. At the xArm workstation, the system coordinates the placement of the rack into an Opentrons liquid handler for reagent dispensing, followed by transfer to a shaker for mixing. This demonstration highlights the ability of SBL to extend existing robotic setups into an interconnected laboratory by automatically coordinating task allocation, inter-workstation transportation, and instrument operation.

3 Discussion


SBL brings the development of experimental capabilities into the scientific process. In our implementation this meant two kinds of work: adding control that was missing, such as a joint-servoing interface for the arm, and establishing the conditions under which an operation succeeds, such as feedback-guided insertion where scene calibration was not precise enough. The quantum-dot workflow demonstrates both in the physical laboratory; coordination across further robots and workstations was examined in simulation.

What the agent can build depends on what the laboratory infrastructure lets it observe and verify (53). Some device failures produced no error from the API, leaving the agent unable to tell success from failure (54). Fine insertion became possible only after force and torque sensing exposed contact conditions that cameras and scene calibration could not (55). Interpreting and weighing these sources still required human expertise.

The digital twin also plays a role in safety. Simulation supports trajectory planning, collision checks, and exploration of hazardous scenarios before physical execution. The resulting constraints inform workflow planning and runtime guardrails, including robot speed limits and force-triggered protective stops. These guardrails must not rely on the model refusing unsafe instructions: tests on real robots show that GPT-6-Astra and other models will follow them (56). The validity of twin-based checks depends on the geometry, device states, and physical interactions represented in the twin (57). Collision checking covers modelled geometry; chemical hazards and uncertain contact conditions, such as the millimetre-scale grasping and placement in our workflow, require additional checks during physical execution. Safe capability development therefore requires both a space for exploration and enforced limits on physical actions, with observations from execution used to refine the twin and its constraints (48; 50).

Human involvement remains necessary as new operating conditions emerge during long-horizon tasks (24; 12). Agents retrieve documentation, reconcile information, and execute code at a pace that makes continuous human inspection impractical. During development, we observed both actions based on assumptions that required

Self-built laboratory layout



Self-built multi-workstation workflow




Figure 6 Scaling self-building laboratories across robots and workstations. The reconstructed simulation layout (top) integrates a UR3/UR5 solid-handling workstation, a mobile manipulator, and an xArm-based liquid-handling workstation. Given a high-level buffer-preparation goal, SBL generates a coordinated workflow (bottom) in simulation, and also generates task-relevant powder and fluid simulation models for solid and liquid handling.

clarification and overly cautious motion decisions that obstructed task progress. Disagreements between agents also produced repeated exchanges that required human intervention to resolve. These experiences identify a communication requirement: the system must surface the assumptions, conflicting evidence, and operational consequences relevant to a decision. Researchers retain responsibility for scientific objectives and supply physical facts that the available interfaces cannot observe. Twin-based checks and runtime guardrails provide a basis for delegating routine verification, while unresolved conditions are brought to the researcher with enough context for intervention. This division directs human expertise towards the unresolved decisions that limit further capability development. This need for expert involvement, in turn, calls for training researchers to work in SBL environments, where human-agent-robot interaction becomes central, in contrast to both traditional human-led discovery and established SDLs running predefined workflows.

For this development process to accumulate capability, successful exploration must produce procedures that can be reused (58; 59). Because agentic cycles were too slow for the chemical workflow, successful explorations were distilled into executable policies that run without the language model and return control to the agent when conditions fall outside them. Encoding these conditions makes operational knowledge available for reuse beyond the original exploration. Reuse across changed equipment or layouts requires checking those conditions and validating the adapted procedure (60). Related work tests reusable skills with visual feedback in simulation and on real robots (43), and programs that check their own outcomes in simulation (61). Capability development thus becomes part of the scientific process rather than a prerequisite for it. The next step is to measure whether successive cycles improve task performance and reduce the engineering effort and human intervention needed for new tasks, while retaining validated capabilities. This would provide a quantitative basis for assessing self-improvement in physical artificial intelligence (AI).

A global community of researchers can extend this process across laboratories by sharing the resources needed to develop and assess new capabilities (62; 63; 12; 64; 65). Shareable resources include equipment models and digital-twin assets, device interfaces, operational skills, execution records, and safety guidelines accompanied by their applicability and validation conditions. Shared safety standards would provide a common basis for assessing these resources, while deployment in another laboratory would still require local checks (50). A global capability map of SDLs would connect scientific objectives to available instruments, skills, and resources, and expose the gaps that further capability development must address (12; 62). Such a map could support planning investigations that draw on capabilities distributed across laboratories. The result is a dynamic ecosystem for SBLs, in which scientific infrastructure evolves alongside scientific inquiry. The case for self-building laboratories is strongest where engineers cannot follow the equipment: remote field stations, contaminated or hazardous sites, and even laboratories in space, which must operate under constraints on resources, communication, and crew time and develop new capabilities from what is already on board (66; 67).

4 Methods

Equipment The experimental platform comprised a five-degree-of-freedom xArm5 robotic manipulator mounted on a motorized linear rail and equipped with a parallel gripper (BIO GRIPPER G2) and a 6-axis force/torque sensor for microplate handling (UFACTORY). The rail extended the robot’s access across the liquid-handling, sealing, and measurement stations. Liquid dispensing was performed using an Opentrons OT-2 pipetting robot equipped with an eight-channel pipette (P300 Gen2) on the left, and a single-channel pipette (P1000 Gen2) on the right. The microplates were sealed using an Agilent PlateLoc Thermal Microplate Sealer and characterized using a BioTek Cytation5 multimode reader. We used 19-mm-tall 96-well flat bottom (Agilent 201242-100) and 45-mm-tall deep 96-well U-shape bottom (Agilent 5043-9302) polypropylene microplates. Intel RealSense D435i and D405 RGB-D cameras provided laboratory observations and close-range views of manipulation interfaces. Each instrument was exposed as an authenticated HTTP service with a read-only `GET /status` endpoint, an OpenAPI schema, and documentation of available functions and valid input ranges.

Software We used `openai-gpt6-astra` to construct and modify laboratory representations, generate experimental workflows, and invoke planning and equipment-control tools. The digital twin was implemented in NVIDIA Isaac Sim 6.1 using Universal Scene Description (USD) (68). Equipment representations were assembled from available CAD models, reconstructed geometry, laboratory photographs, and device documentation.

Articulated components were represented using joints, while liquid-handling states tracked liquid volume and composition. Robot motion planning used cuRobo (47) with robot collision-sphere representations and environment obstacles represented by meshes and cuboids. Collision checking was performed within the GPU planning pipeline. During workflow execution in the physical laboratory, all commands were issued through equipment-specific APIs, and robot and instrument status were recorded during operation. Measurement responses were saved incrementally as CSV files, together with run metadata. All machines connect through a private Tailscale network. Agents interact with instruments through two interfaces: REST and the Model Context Protocol (MCP). For REST requests, the central API checks the agent’s authorization and records each device claim. The agent then sends commands directly to the instrument with the claim token. The MCP interface provides access to a selected set of approved tools.

Chemistry Chemicals were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and used as-is without further purification. A series of pH 8.5, 9, 9.5 and 10 buffer solutions at 1 M concentration were prepared from 1 M NH_4Cl and 1 M NH_4OH stock solutions with volumetric ratios of 17.0:3.0, 12.8:7.2, 7.2:12.8, 3.0:17.0 (mL:mL), respectively. The 0.1 M $\text{Cd}(\text{NO}_3)_2$, 3-mercaptopropionic acid (MPA) and thiourea solutions were prepared by dissolving 0.617 g $\text{Cd}(\text{NO}_3)_2 \cdot 4\text{H}_2\text{O}$, 0.213 g MPA and 0.152 g thiourea in deionized H_2O and diluting to 20 mL, respectively. All operations were performed in fumehoods, and appropriate PPE was used for manual stock preparation. Only the source plate is pre-defined: the stock solutions were transferred to corresponding wells of the 45 mm 96-well deep well plate using volumetric pipettes, and placed on the OT-2 pipetting robot for downstream reactions. Column 1 held buffers (1.5 mL): rows A–B pH 8.5, C–D 9.0, E–F 9.5, G–H 10.0. Column 2 held 0.1 M $\text{Cd}(\text{NO}_3)_2$, column 3 0.1 M MPA and column 4 0.1 M thiourea. Column 5 held deionized water (1.5 mL). Working stocks of 0.01 M $\text{Cd}(\text{NO}_3)_2$, MPA and thiourea were made on deck by 1:10 dilution with water; the sulfide solution was diluted immediately before use. The absorption values were measured at 350, 400, and 450 nm wavelengths. The emission spectra were measured in the 450–680 nm range and 10 nm intervals using 360 nm excitation wavelength.

Acknowledgments

J.B. acknowledges funding from the Eric and Wendy Schmidt AI in Science Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, a program by Schmidt Futures. A.A.-G. thanks Anders G. Frøseth for his generous support. A.A.-G. also acknowledges the generous support of Natural Resources Canada and the Canada 150 Research Chairs program. This work was supported by the AI2050 program of Schmidt Sciences. This research is part of the University of Toronto’s Acceleration Consortium, which receives funding from the CFREF-2022-00042 Canada First Research Excellence Fund. This work was supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under Agreement No. HR0011262E022.

References

- [1] Alán Aspuru-Guzik and Kristin Persson. Materials Acceleration Platform: Accelerating Advanced Energy Materials Discovery by Integrating High-Throughput Methods and Artificial Intelligence. Mission Innovation: Innovation Challenge 6, 2018. <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:35164974>. Accessed 15 October 2026.
- [2] Loïc M Roch, Florian Häse, Christoph Kreisbeck, Teresa Tamayo-Mendoza, Lars P E Yunker, Jason E Hein, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. ChemOS: Orchestrating Autonomous Experimentation. *Sci. Robot.*, 3(19):eaat5559, 2018. doi:10.1126/scirobotics.aat5559.
- [3] Sebastian Steiner, Jakob Wolf, Stefan Glatzel, Anna Andreou, Jarosław M Granda, Graham Keenan, Trevor Hinkley, Gerardo Aragon-Camarasa, Philip J Kitson, Davide Angelone, and Leroy Cronin. Organic Synthesis in a Modular Robotic System Driven by a Chemical Programming Language. *Science*, 363(6423):eaav2211, 2019. doi:10.1126/science.aav2211.
- [4] Connor W Coley, Dale A Thomas, Justin A M Lummiss, Jonathan N Jaworski, Christopher P Breen, Victor Schultz, Travis Hart, Joshua S Fishman, Luke Rogers, Hanyu Gao, Robert W. Hicklin, Pieter P. Plehiers, Joshua Byington, John S. Piotti, William H. Green, A. John Hart, Timothy F. Jamison, and Klavs F. Jensen. A Robotic Platform for Flow Synthesis of Organic Compounds Informed by AI Planning. *Science*, 365(6453):eaax1566, 2019. doi:10.1126/science.aax1566.
- [5] Benjamin P MacLeod, Fraser G L Parlane, Thomas D Morrissey, Florian Häse, Loïc M Roch, Kevan E Dettelbach, Raphaell Moreira, Lars P E Yunker, Michael B Rooney, Joseph R Deeth, V. Lai, G. J. Ng, H. Situ, R. H. Zhang, M. S. Elliott, T. H. Haley, D. J. Dvorak, A. Aspuru-Guzik, J. E. Hein, and C. P. Berlinguette. Self-Driving Laboratory for Accelerated Discovery of Thin-Film Materials. *Sci. Adv.*, 6(20):eaaz8867, 2020. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz8867.
- [6] Benjamin Burger, Phillip M Maffettone, Vladimir V Gusev, Catherine M Aitchison, Yang Bai, Xiaoyan Wang, Xiaobo Li, Ben M Alston, Buyi Li, Rob Clowes, Nicola Rankin, Brandon Harris, Reiner Sebastian Sprick, and Andrew I. Cooper. A Mobile Robotic Chemist. *Nature*, 583(7815):237–241, 2020. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2442-2.
- [7] Piotr S Gromski, Jarosław M Granda, and Leroy Cronin. Universal Chemical Synthesis and Discovery with ‘the Chemputer’. *Trends Chem.*, 2(1):4–12, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.trechm.2019.07.004.
- [8] Malcolm Sim, Mohammad Ghazi Vakili, Felix Strieth-Kalthoff, Han Hao, Riley J. Hickman, Santiago Miret, Sergio Pablo-García, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. ChemOS 2.0: An orchestration architecture for chemical self-driving laboratories. *Matter*, 7(9):2959–2977, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.matt.2024.04.022.
- [9] Gary Tom, Stefan P. Schmid, Sterling G. Baird, Yang Cao, Kouros Darvish, Han Hao, Stanley Lo, Sergio Pablo-García, Ella M. Rajaonson, Marta Skreta, Naruki Yoshikawa, Samantha Corapi, Gun Deniz Akkoc, Felix Strieth-Kalthoff, Martin Seifrid, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Self-Driving Laboratories for Chemistry and Materials Science. *Chem. Rev.*, 124(16):9633–9732, 2024. doi:10.1021/acs.chemrev.4c00055.
- [10] Amanda A. Volk, Robert W. Epps, Daniel T. Yonemoto, Benjamin S. Masters, Felix N. Castellano, Kristofer G. Reyes, and Milad Abolhasani. AlphaFlow: Autonomous Discovery and Optimization of Multi-Step Chemistry Using a Self-Driven Fluidic Lab Guided by Reinforcement Learning. *Nat. Commun.*, 14(1), 2023. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-37139-y.
- [11] Aidan Slattery, Zhenghui Wen, Pauline Tenblad, Jesús Sanjosé-Orduna, Diego Pintossi, Tim den Hartog, and Timothy Noël. Automated self-optimization, intensification, and scale-up of photocatalysis in flow. *Science*, 383(6681):eadj1817, 2024. doi:10.1126/science.adj1817.
- [12] Jiaru Bai, Sebastian Mosbach, Connor J. Taylor, Dogancan Karan, Kok Foong Lee, Simon D. Rihm, Jethro Akroyd, Alexei A. Lapkin, and Markus Kraft. A Dynamic Knowledge Graph Approach to Distributed Self-Driving Laboratories. *Nat. Commun.*, 15:462, 2024. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-44599-9.
- [13] Mohammad Hamedirad, Ran Chao, Scott Weisberg, Jiazhang Lian, Saurabh Sinha, and Huimin Zhao. Towards a Fully Automated Algorithm Driven Platform for Biosystems Design. *Nat. Commun.*, 10(1):1–10, 2019. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-13189-z.
- [14] Nathan J. Szymanski, Bernardus Rendy, Yuxing Fei, Rishi E. Kumar, Tanjin He, David Milsted, Matthew J. McDermott, Max Gallant, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Amil Merchant, Haegyeom Kim, Anubhav Jain, Christopher J. Bartel, Kristin Persson, Yan Zeng, and Gerbrand Ceder. An autonomous laboratory for the accelerated synthesis of inorganic materials. *Nature*, 624(7990):86–91, 2023. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06734-w.

- [15] Jinge Xu, Christopher H. J. Moran, Arup Ghorai, Fazel Bateni, Jeffrey A. Bennett, Nikolai Mukhin, Koray Latif, Andrew Cahn, Pragyan Jha, Fernando Delgado Licon, Sina Sadeghi, Lior Politi, and Milad Abolhasani. Autonomous multi-robot synthesis and optimization of metal halide perovskite nanocrystals. *Nature Communications*, 16(1), 2025. ISSN 2041-1723. doi:10.1038/s41467-025-63209-4.
- [16] Richard B. Canty and Milad Abolhasani. The past, present and future of self-driving laboratories. *Nature Reviews Chemistry*, 10(8):523–537, 2026. ISSN 2397-3358. doi:10.1038/s41570-026-00847-2.
- [17] Jiaru Bai, Liwei Cao, Sebastian Mosbach, Jethro Akroyd, Alexei A Lapkin, and Markus Kraft. From Platform to Knowledge Graph: Evolution of Laboratory Automation. *JACS Au*, 2(2):292–309, 2022. doi:10.1021/jacsau.1c00438.
- [18] Fuzhan Rahmanian, Jackson Flowers, Dan Guevarra, Matthias Richter, Maximilian Fichtner, Phillip Donnelly, John M Gregoire, and Helge S Stein. Enabling Modular Autonomous Feedback-Loops in Materials Science through Hierarchical Experimental Laboratory Automation and Orchestration. *Adv. Mater. Interfaces*, 9(8):2101987, 2022. doi:10.1002/admi.202101987.
- [19] Benjamin P. MacLeod, Fraser G. L. Parlane, and Curtis P. Berlinguette. How to build an effective self-driving laboratory. *MRS Bulletin*, 48(2):173–178, 2023. doi:10.1557/s43577-023-00476-w.
- [20] Melodie Christensen, Lars PE Yunker, Parisa Shiri, Tara Zepel, Paloma L Prieto, Shad Grunert, Finn Bork, and Jason E Hein. Automation isn’t Automatic. *Chem. Sci.*, 12(47):15473–15490, 2021. doi:10.1039/D1SC04588A.
- [21] Anne-Catherine Bédard, Andrea Adamo, Kosi C Aroh, M Grace Russell, Aaron A Bedermann, Jeremy Torosian, Brian Yue, Klavs F Jensen, and Timothy F Jamison. Reconfigurable System for Automated Optimization of Diverse Chemical Reactions. *Science*, 361(6408):1220–1225, 2018. doi:10.1126/science.aat0650.
- [22] Simone Pilon, Elia Savino, Oliver M. Bayley, Michael Vanzella, Miguel Claros, Petros Siasiaridis, Junsong Liu, Florian Lukas, Matteo Damian, Vasilis Tseliou, Niccolò Intini, Aidan Slattey, Jesus SanJosé-Orduna, Tim den Hartog, Ron A. H. Peters, Andrea F. G. Gargano, Francesco G. Mutti, and Timothy Noël. A flexible and affordable self-driving laboratory for automated reaction optimization. *Nature Synthesis*, 2026. doi:10.1038/s44160-026-01053-0.
- [23] Yunheng Zou, Austin H. Cheng, Abdulrahman Aldossary, Jiaru Bai, Shi Xuan Leong, Jorge Arturo Campos-Gonzalez-Angulo, Changhyeok Choi, Cher Tian Ser, Gary Tom, Andrew Wang, Zijian Zhang, Ilya Yakavets, Han Hao, Chris Crebolder, Varinia Bernales, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. El Agente: An autonomous agent for quantum chemistry. *Matter*, 8(7):102263, 2025. doi:10.1016/j.matt.2025.102263.
- [24] Naruki Yoshikawa, Marta Skreta, Kourosh Darvish, Sebastian Arellano-Rubach, Zhi Ji, Lasse Bjørn Kristensen, Andrew Zou Li, Yuchi Zhao, Haoping Xu, Artur Kuramshin, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Florian Shkurti, and Animesh Garg. Large language models for chemistry robotics. *Autonomous Robots*, 2023. doi:10.1007/s10514-023-10136-2.
- [25] Sebastian Pagel, Michael Jirasek, and Leroy Cronin. Verification and execution of the scientific literature via chemputation augmented by large language models. *Communications Chemistry*, 9:191, 2026. doi:10.1038/s42004-026-01993-w.
- [26] Daniil A. Boiko, Robert MacKnight, Ben Kline, and Gabe Gomes. Autonomous Chemical Research with Large Language Models. *Nature*, 624(7992):570–578, 2023. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06792-0.
- [27] Andres M. Bran, Sam Cox, Oliver Schilter, Carlo Baldassari, Andrew D. White, and Philippe Schwaller. Augmenting Large Language Models with Chemistry Tools. *Nat. Mach. Intell.*, 6(5):525–535, 2024. doi:10.1038/s42256-024-00832-8.
- [28] Keyan Ding, Jing Yu, Junjie Huang, Yuchen Yang, Qiang Zhang, and Huajun Chen. SciToolAgent: A knowledge-graph-driven scientific agent for multitool integration. *Nat. Comp. Sci.*, 5(10):962–972, 2025. doi:10.1038/s43588-025-00849-y.
- [29] Jiaru Bai, Abdulrahman Aldossary, Thomas Swanick, Marcel Müller, Yeonghun Kang, Changhyeok Choi, Naruki Yoshikawa, Zijian Zhang, Jin Won Lee, Tsz Wai Ko, Aiwei Yin, Mohammad Ghazi Vakili, Chris Crebolder, Varinia Bernales, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. El agente gráfico: A semantic execution runtime for scientific agents. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2602.17902.
- [30] Marcel Müller, Jiaru Bai, Willi Gottstein, Abhijoy Mandal, Mohammad Nazeri, Elia Savino, Yanlin Fang, Sujoy Das, Sergio Pablo García Carrillo, Yeonghun Kang, Juan B. Pérez-Sánchez, Simone Pilon, Martin Fitzner, Timothy Noël, Frank Gu, Varinia Bernales, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. La agente Óptima: Towards agentic self-driving laboratories. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2609.04564.

- [31] Kourosh Darvish, Arjun Sohal, Abhijoy Mandal, Hatem Fakhruddin, Nikola Radulov, Zhengxue Zhou, Satheeshkumar Veeramani, Joshua Choi, Sijie Han, Brayden Zhang, Jeeyeoun Chae, Alex Wright, Yijie Wang, Hossein Darvish, Yuchi Zhao, Gary Tom, Han Hao, Miroslav Bogdanovic, Gabriella Pizzuto, Andrew I. Cooper, Alán Aspuru Guzik, Florian Shkurti, and Animesh Garg. MATTERIX: toward a digital twin for robotics-assisted chemistry laboratory automation. *Nat. Comput. Sci.*, 6:67–82, 2026. doi:10.1038/s43588-025-00924-4.
- [32] S. D. Rihm, J. Bai, A. Kondinski, S. Mosbach, J. Akroyd, and M. Kraft. Transforming Research Laboratories with Connected Digital Twins. *Nexus*, 1(1):100004, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.nexs.2024.100004.
- [33] Kourosh Darvish, Marta Skreta, Yuchi Zhao, Naruki Yoshikawa, Sagnik Som, Miroslav Bogdanovic, Yang Cao, Han Hao, Haoping Xu, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Animesh Garg, and Florian Shkurti. ORGANA: A Robotic Assistant for Automated Chemistry Experimentation and Characterization. *Matter*, 8(2):101897, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.matt.2024.10.015.
- [34] Tianwei Dai, Sriram Vijayakrishnan, Filip T. Szczypiński, Jean-François Ayme, Ehsan Simaei, Thomas Fellowes, Rob Clowes, Lyubomir Kotopantov, Caitlin E. Shields, Zhengxue Zhou, John W. Ward, and Andrew I. Cooper. Autonomous mobile robots for exploratory synthetic chemistry. *Nature*, 635(8040):890–897, 2024. ISSN 1476-4687. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-08173-7.
- [35] Naruki Yoshikawa, Andrew Zou Li, Kourosh Darvish, Yuchi Zhao, Haoping Xu, Artur Kuramshin, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, Animesh Garg, and Florian Shkurti. Chemistry lab automation via constrained task and motion planning. *arXiv Preprint*, 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.09672.
- [36] Louis Longley, Francisco Munguia-Galeano, Yushu Han, Rob Clowes, Sriram Vijayakrishnan, Adam Edwards, Gabriella Pizzuto, Hatem Fakhruddin, and Andrew Cooper. Robinhood: a robotic chemist in a fume hood. *Digital Discovery*, 5(6):2438–2447, 2026. ISSN 2635-098X. doi:10.1039/d6dd00007j.
- [37] Michael Ahn, Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Yevgen Chebotar, Omar Cortes, Byron David, Chelsea Finn, Chuyuan Fu, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, Alex Herzog, Daniel Ho, Jasmine Hsu, Julian Ibarz, Brian Ichter, Alex Irpan, Eric Jang, Rosario Jauregui Ruano, Kyle Jeffrey, Sally Jesmonth, Nikhil J Joshi, Ryan Julian, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Yuheng Kuang, Kuang-Huei Lee, Sergey Levine, Yao Lu, Linda Luu, Carolina Parada, Peter Pastor, Jornell Quiambao, Kanishka Rao, Jarek Rettinghouse, Diego Reyes, Pierre Sermanet, Nicolas Sievers, Clayton Tan, Alexander Toshev, Vincent Vanhoucke, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Peng Xu, Sichun Xu, Mengyuan Yan, and Andy Zeng. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. *arXiv Preprint*, 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2204.01691.
- [38] Jacky Liang, Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Peng Xu, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Pete Florence, and Andy Zeng. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. *arXiv Preprint*, 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2209.07753.
- [39] Phillip Isola. Robot-use agents. Blog post, September 2026. <https://web.mit.edu/phillipi/www/writing/robot-use-agents.html>. Published 7 September 2026; accessed 16 October 2026.
- [40] Wenbo Zhang, Kaixuan Wang, Yutao Ouyang, Xiaoyu Huang, Liyang Li, Kailun Su, Weiyang Jin, Wenhao Chai, Haotian Liang, Zhiyang Dou, Yue Chen, and Tianxing Chen. An unexpected robot policy: Early evaluations of gpt-6 astra on robodojo and beyond. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2609.24170.
- [41] Galbot Team, Xuchuan Chen, Xiaoqian Cheng, Yu Deng, Lihe Ding, Shaocong Dong, Xiangjun Gao, Haozhe Jia, Zekai Li, Zhoujian Li, Yunrui Lian, Sikai Liang, Chenghui Lin, Dairu Liu, Jiahang Liu, Qingtao Liu, Yuxuan Ma, Zekun Qi, Jiayi Su, He Wang, Ruochen Xu, Tianyu Xu, Xudong Xu, Zhe Xu, Mi Yan, Siming Yan, Li Yi, Ruixi Yu, Jinlu Zhang, Yintianrun Zhang, Zhikai Zhang, Zhizheng Zhang, Yixin Zheng, and Weiyi Zhu. Systematically exploring the capabilities of gpt-6 astra as embodied policies. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2609.38537.
- [42] Jenai Xuning Yang, Ashna Khetan, and Shun Zhang. Astronomy: An empirical study of GPT-6 Astra as a native robot policy. NVIDIA Seattle Robotics Lab technical report, 2026. <https://research.nvidia.com/labs/srl/project-s/astronomy/>. Accessed 16 October 2026.
- [43] Sida He, Lingxi Xie, Yunning Cao, Pengfei Chen, Kaiwen Duan, Jiannan Ge, Xinyue Huo, Jiacheng Shao, and Qi Tian. Robot manipulation with gpt-6-astra: Body knowledge, experience reuse, emergent skills, and sim2real transfer. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2609.31770.
- [44] Gio Huh, Cayden Gu, Takara E. Truong, C. Karen Liu, and Guy Tevet. HomeBody: A humanoid that explores, remembers, and acts on its own. Project technical report, 2026. <https://tml.stanford.edu/homebody/>. Accessed 16 October 2026.

- [45] Achu Menon, Sravanthi Machcha, Sabrina Zou, Tzu Kit Chan, and Jay Chooi. GPT-6 Astra on robotic manipulation. Robocurve benchmark report, September 2026. <https://openai.robocurve.org/gpt-6-astra/>. Published 4 September 2026; accessed 16 October 2026.
- [46] Andrew I. Cooper, Patrick Courtney, Kourosh Darvish, Moritz Eckhoff, Hatem Fakhruddin, Andrea Gabrielli, Animesh Garg, Sami Haddadin, Kanako Harada, Jason Hein, Maria Hübner, Dennis Knobbe, Gabriella Pizzuto, Florian Shkurti, Ruja Shrestha, Kerstin Thurow, Rafael Vescovi, Birgit Vogel-Heuser, Ádám Wolf, Naruki Yoshikawa, Yan Zeng, Zhengxue Zhou, and Henning Zwirnmann. Accelerating discovery in natural science laboratories with ai and robotics: Perspectives and challenges. *Science Robotics*, 10(106), 2025. doi:10.1126/scirobotics.adv7932.
- [47] Balakumar Sundaralingam, Siva Kumar Sastry Hari, Adam Fishman, Caelan Garrett, Karl Van Wyk, Valts Blukis, Alexander Millane, Helen Oleynikova, Ankur Handa, Fabio Ramos, Nathan Ratliff, and Dieter Fox. Curobo: Parallelized collision-free robot motion generation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 8112–8119, 2023. doi:10.1109/ICRA48891.2023.10160765.
- [48] Shi Xuan Leong, Caleb E Griesbach, Rui Zhang, Kourosh Darvish, Yuchi Zhao, Abhijoy Mandal, Yunheng Zou, Han Hao, Varinia Bernales, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Steering towards safe self-driving laboratories. *Nat. Rev. Chem.*, 9(10):707–722, 2025. doi:10.1038/s41570-025-00747-x.
- [49] Yeonghun Kang, Shi Xuan Leong, Hyun Suk Park, Jiaru Bai, Sven Papidocha, Yuchi Zhao, Rui Zhang, Magali Gimeno, Stanley Lo, Eric S. Isbrandt, Han Hao, Yang Cao, Felix Katzenburg, Fangshi Du, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Varinia Bernales. El agente seguro: An agent for chemical safety. 2026. doi:10.26434/chemrxiv.15004378/v2.
- [50] Linjiang Chen, Xiaobo Li, Quan Lin, and Jun Jiang. Self-driving laboratories need an autonomy safety harness. *Nat. Synth.*, 2026. doi:10.1038/s44160-026-01120-6.
- [51] Abdelhay Aboulaich, Denis Billaud, Mouhammad Aryan, Lavinia Balan, Jean-Jacques Gaumet, Ghouti Medjadhi, Jaafar Ghanbaja, and Raphaël Schneider. One-pot noninjection route to cds quantum dots via hydrothermal synthesis. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 4(5):2561–2569, 2012. doi:10.1021/am300232z.
- [52] Naim Bel Haj Mohamed, Nassim Ben Brahim, Randa Mrad, Mohamed Haouari, Rafik Ben Chaâbane, and Michel Negrier. Use of MPA-capped CdS quantum dots for sensitive detection and quantification of Co²⁺ ions in aqueous solution. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 1028:50–58, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.aca.2018.04.041.
- [53] Lulu Guo, Yingkai Sun, Xiaobo Li, Luyao Ge, Ziming Wang, Haitao Zheng, Jingyu Li, Huijuan Zhang, Bingxu Chen, Daobin Liu, Yuebo Liu, Jie Li, Xiaohui Li, Linjiang Chen, Yi Luo, and Jun Jiang. Stress-testing large language model agents in a robotic chemistry laboratory. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2607.23045.
- [54] Henning Bär, Remo Hochstrasser, and Bernd Papenfuß. SiLA: Basic Standards for Rapid Integration in Laboratory Automation. *SLAS Technol.*, 17(2):86–95, 2012. doi:10.1177/2211068211424550.
- [55] Zhengxue Zhou, Satheeshkumar Veeramani, Francisco Munguia-Galeano, Hatem Fakhruddin, and Andrew I. Cooper. Localization, inspection, and reasoning (lira) module for autonomous workflows in self-driving laboratories. *Communications Chemistry*, 8(1), 2025. ISSN 2399-3669. doi:10.1038/s42004-025-01770-1.
- [56] Edward Sun, Sravanthi Machcha, Sabrina Zou, Tzu Kit Chan, and Jay Chooi. RoboHarm: Do frontier robot policies refuse unsafe instructions? Robocurve benchmark report, September 2026. <https://robocurve.org/roboharm/>. Published 18 September 2026; accessed 16 October 2026.
- [57] Alberto Ferrari and Karen E. Willcox. Digital twins in mechanical and aerospace engineering. *Nat. Comput. Sci.*, 4:178–183, 2024. doi:10.1038/s43588-024-00613-8.
- [58] Tianle Cai, Xuezhi Wang, Tengyu Ma, Xinyun Chen, and Denny Zhou. Large Language Models as Tool Makers. *arXiv Preprint*, 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2305.17126.
- [59] Xu Huang, Junwu Chen, Yuxing Fei, Zhuohan Li, Philippe Schwaller, and Gerbrand Ceder. Cascade: Cumulative agentic skill creation through autonomous development and evolution. *arXiv Preprint*, 2025. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2512.23880.
- [60] Robert Rauschen, Mason Guy, Jason E. Hein, and Leroy Cronin. Universal Chemical Programming Language for Robotic Synthesis Repeatability. *Nat. Synth.*, 2024. doi:10.1038/s44160-023-00473-6.
- [61] Ruiyang Si, Jianxin Bi, Shunyu Yang, Rui Ni, Wenbo Huang, Qiang Wang, Shulong Jiang, Yintianrun Zhang, Feixiang Ruan, Kewei Zhang, Duomin Wang, Xiuyu Li, Haiwen Feng, Zhen Dong, and Daquan Zhou. Fewer tokens, better action: Gpt-6 astra robot agents with 14% higher success rate but 65% fewer tokens. *arXiv Preprint*, 2026. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2610.01939.

- [62] Felix Strieth-Kalthoff, Han Hao, Vandana Rathore, Joshua Derasp, Théophile Gaudin, Nicholas H. Angello, Martin Seifrid, Ekaterina Trushina, Mason Guy, Junliang Liu, Xun Tang, Masashi Mamada, Wesley Wang, Tuul Tsagaantsooj, Cyrille Lavigne, Robert Pollice, Tony C. Wu, Kazuhiro Hotta, Leticia Bodo, Shangyu Li, Mohammad Haddadnia, Agnieszka Wołos, Rafał Roszak, Cher Tian Ser, Carlota Bozal-Ginesta, Riley J. Hickman, Jenya Vestfrid, Andrés Aguilar-Granda, Elena L. Klimareva, Ralph C. Sigerson, Wenduan Hou, Daniel Gahler, Slawomir Lach, Adrian Warzybok, Oleg Borodin, Simon Rohrbach, Benjamin Sanchez-Lengeling, Chihaya Adachi, Bartosz A. Grzybowski, Leroy Cronin, Jason E. Hein, Martin D. Burke, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Delocalized, asynchronous, closed-loop discovery of organic laser emitters. *Science*, 384(6697), 2024. doi:10.1126/science.adk9227.
- [63] Chang Jie Leong, Kai Yuan Andre Low, Jose Recatala-Gomez, Pablo Quijano Velasco, Eleonore Vissol-Gaudin, Jin Da Tan, Balamurugan Ramalingam, Riko I Made, Shreyas Dinesh Pethe, Saumya Sebastian, Yee-Fun Lim, Zi Hui Jonathan Khoo, Yang Bai, Jayce Jian Wei Cheng, and Kedar Hippalgaonkar. An object-oriented framework to enable workflow evolution across materials acceleration platforms. *Matter*, 5(10):3124–3134, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.matt.2022.08.017.
- [64] Eric Stach, Brian DeCost, A Gilad Kusne, Jason Hattrick-Simpers, Keith A Brown, Kristofer G Reyes, Joshua Schrier, Simon Billinge, Tonio Buonassisi, Ian Foster, Carla P. Gomes, John M. Gregoire, Apurva Mehta, Joseph Montoya, Elsa Olivetti, Chiwoo Park, Eli Rotenberg, Semion K. Saikin, Sylvia Smullin, Valentin Stanev, and Benji Maruyama. Autonomous Experimentation Systems for Materials Development: A Community Perspective. *Matter*, 4(9):2702–2726, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.matt.2021.06.036.
- [65] Richard B. Canty, Jeffrey A. Bennett, Keith A. Brown, Tonio Buonassisi, Sergei V. Kalinin, John R. Kitchin, Benji Maruyama, Robert G. Moore, Joshua Schrier, Martin Seifrid, Shijing Sun, Tejs Vegge, and Milad Abolhasani. Science acceleration and accessibility with self-driving labs. *Nature Communications*, 16(1), 2025. ISSN 2041-1723. doi:10.1038/s41467-025-59231-1.
- [66] Lauren M. Sanders, Ryan T. Scott, Jason H. Yang, Amina Ann Qutub, Hector Garcia Martin, Daniel C. Berrios, Jaden J. A. Hastings, Jon Rask, Graham Mackintosh, Adrienne L. Hoarfrost, Stuart Chalk, John Kalantari, Kia Khezeli, Erik L. Antonsen, Joel Babdor, Richard Barker, Sergio E. Baranzini, Afshin Beheshti, Guillermo M. Delgado-Aparicio, Benjamin S. Glicksberg, Casey S. Greene, Melissa Haendel, Arif A. Hamid, Philip Heller, Daniel Jamieson, Katelyn J. Jarvis, Svetlana V. Komarova, Matthieu Komorowski, Prachi Kothiyal, Ashish Mahabal, Uri Manor, Christopher E. Mason, Mona Matar, George I. Mias, Jack Miller, Jerry G. Myers, Charlotte Nelson, Jonathan Oribello, Seung min Park, Patricia Parsons-Wingenter, R. K. Prabhu, Robert J. Reynolds, Amanda Saravia-Butler, Suchi Saria, Aenor Sawyer, Nitin Kumar Singh, Michael Snyder, Frank Soboczenski, Karthik Soman, Corey A. Theriot, David Van Valen, Kasthuri Venkateswaran, Liz Warren, Liz Worthey, Marinka Zitnik, and Sylvain V. Costes. Biological Research and Self-Driving Labs in Deep Space Supported by Artificial Intelligence. *Nat. Mach. Intell.*, 5(3):208–219, 2023. doi:10.1038/s42256-023-00618-4.
- [67] Qing Zhu, Yan Huang, Donglai Zhou, Luyuan Zhao, Lulu Guo, Ruyu Yang, Zixu Sun, Man Luo, Fei Zhang, Hengyu Xiao, Xincheng Tang, Xuchun Zhang, Tao Song, Xiang Li, Baochen Chong, Junyi Zhou, Yihan Zhang, Baicheng Zhang, Jiaqi Cao, Guozhen Zhang, Song Wang, Guilin Ye, Wanjun Zhang, Haitao Zhao, Shuang Cong, Huirong Li, Li-Li Ling, Zhe Zhang, Weiwei Shang, Jun Jiang, and Yi Luo. Automated synthesis of oxygen-producing catalysts from martian meteorites by a robotic ai chemist. *Nature Synthesis*, 3(3):319–328, 2023. ISSN 2731-0582. doi:10.1038/s44160-023-00424-1.
- [68] NVIDIA. Isaac Sim: Robotics simulation and synthetic data generation. Official software framework and documentation. <https://developer.nvidia.com/isaac/sim>. Accessed 28 September 2026.