International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)
International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal
ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529
| An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Journal |

Enhancing Business Efficiency through UiPath-Driven Robotic Process Automation for Invoice Data Handling

[1]Aditya Tomar , [2]Sandeep Kumar Tiwari
M.Tech (CSE), Department of Computer Science and Information Technology,
Vikrant University, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India
Supervisor: Prof. , HOD, Dept. of CS&IT, Vikrant University, Gwalior
Corresponding Author Email: [soet_sandeep@vikrantuniversity.ac.in]

Abstract
Invoice processing is a critical yet labor-intensive task in business operations across all sectors. Manual execution of this process is time-consuming, error-prone, and difficult to scale as transaction volumes grow. This paper presents the design, development, and performance evaluation of a Robotic Process Automation (RPA) solution built using UiPath Studio to automate invoice generation from structured Microsoft Excel data through the online platform invoice-generator.com. The automation workflow comprises fourteen sequential activities, including Read Range, Open Browser, For Each Row in Data Table, eight Type Into activities, two Click activities, and robust exception handling via Try/Catch blocks. The solution was tested against a manual baseline using a dataset of ten real-format invoice records across five repeated runs. Results demonstrate an 83.7% reduction in per-invoice processing time (from 4 minutes 28 seconds to 43 seconds) and a 6.7 percentage-point improvement in field-level data accuracy (from 91.8% to 98.5%). Scalability testing confirms near-constant throughput of approximately 82-84 invoices per hour from 10 to 5,000 records. The automation also achieves full 24/7 operational availability via UiPath Orchestrator scheduling. These findings validate the efficacy of UiPath-driven RPA for invoice processing and contribute a fully reproducible, documented case study to the RPA literature.

Keywords: Robotic Process Automation (RPA), UiPath Studio, Invoice Automation, Process Definition Document (PDD), Business Efficiency, Digital Transformation

1. Introduction

Businesses of every size generate invoices as a fundamental operational necessity. These documents record goods sold, quantities, prices, and payment terms. Despite their importance, the process of creating invoices manually is repetitive, rule-based, and prone to human error. Employees routinely spend hours entering the same fields from spreadsheets into web forms — a task that demands attention without requiring creativity or judgment.

Robotic Process Automation (RPA) addresses exactly this category of work. RPA software robots can interact with computer systems at the User-Interface (UI) level, mimicking human actions such as opening browsers, reading data, typing into fields, and clicking buttons — without requiring access to underlying databases or source code [27]. This non-invasive characteristic makes RPA deployable across legacy and modern systems alike.

This paper presents the Invoice Generator project: A UiPath Studio automation that reads invoice records from an Excel spreadsheet (InvoiceData.xlsx) and automatically fills and downloads PDF invoices through invoice-generator.com. The project was developed as part of an M.Tech thesis at Vikrant University, Gwalior, and serves as a concrete, reproducible case study of RPA applied to financial process automation.

The primary research objectives are: (1) to design and implement a UiPath automation for invoice data handling; (2) to measure performance improvement in speed and accuracy over manual processing; (3) to evaluate scalability across varying invoice volumes; and (4) to identify limitations and directions for future development.

2. Literature Review

The application of RPA to financial back-office processes has been extensively studied. Verma (2018) identified that manual invoice processing in medium and large organizations consumes 15-20 hours per 100 invoices, predicting that automation could yield efficiency gains exceeding 60% [10]. Johnson (2019) confirmed these projections in a multi-organization case study, reporting 50-70% time reductions, and importantly found that implementations preceded by detailed process documentation consistently outperformed those that were not [11].

Avasarala (2021) conducted a controlled experiment automating 200 invoice records with UiPath, achieving a reduction from 4.2 minutes per invoice manually to 80 seconds with the bot, alongside an accuracy improvement from 91.8% to 97.4% [3]. These figures closely align with the present study's findings. A comprehensive systematic review by Syed et al. (2020), covering over 125 peer-reviewed RPA publications, confirmed that financial back-office automation — including invoice handling and accounts payable — represents among the highest-impact RPA application domains [28].

On the technology side, Wanner et al. (2021) evaluated OCR engines for invoice data extraction within RPA workflows, finding that ML-augmented extraction achieved 96.8% accuracy across diverse invoice formats [34]. UiPath's Document Understanding framework extends these capabilities to unstructured vendor invoices through integrated OCR and machine learning extractors [36]. Gupta and Mehta (2022) demonstrated that full RPA-ERP integration reduced invoice approval cycle time from 3.2 days to 0.4 days, highlighting the potential of end-to-end automation [1]. Singh and Patel (2019) reported that 70% of 150 surveyed organizations achieved positive ROI within the first 12 months of RPA deployment, with clear process documentation identified as the most critical success factor [9].

A gap exists in the published literature regarding reproducible, fully documented UiPath implementations with multi-run statistical validation and scalability evidence beyond the initial dataset. The present study addresses these gaps through five-run experimental validation, coefficient-of-variation analysis, and scalability testing across 10 to 5,000 records.

International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)
International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal
ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529
| An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Journal |

3. Methodology

3.1 System Architecture and Tools

The Invoice Generator Automation integrates four primary components: (1) Microsoft Excel, providing structured source data; (2) UiPath Studio 2023.10 LTS, the automation development environment; (3) Google Chrome with the UiPath Chrome Extension, enabling GUI-level web interaction; and (4) invoice-generator.com, the online invoice creation platform. All experiments were conducted on a laptop with an Intel Core i3-1005G1 processor, 12 GB RAM, Windows 11, and a 50 Mbps Wi-Fi connection.

3.2 Dataset — InvoiceData.xlsx

The input dataset, InvoiceData.xlsx, contains ten invoice records representing a fictitious tea import company (T&T Automation, Oslo, Norway) billing US-based customers. Each record contains eight fields: InvoiceNumber, InvoiceDate, InvoiceDueDate, InvoiceFrom, InvoiceTo, ProductDescription, ProductQuantity, and ProductPrice. Products include ten varieties of tea — Black Tea, Matcha, Green Tea, Oolong, White Tea, Pu Erh, Darjeeling, English Breakfast Tea, Biluochun, and Longjing Tea — with quantities ranging from 3 to 15 units and prices from $15 to $85 per unit.

No.	Inv. No.	Invoice Date	Invoice To (Customer)	Product	Qty	Price ($)	Total ($)
1	6007	01-05-2012	Mitsue Tollner, Chicago, IL	Black Tea	4	55	220
2	5394	03-05-2021	Leota Dilliard, San Jose, CA	Matcha	10	60	600
3	5154	05-05-2021	Sage Wieser, Sioux Falls, SD	Green Tea	8	85	680
4	9099	08-05-2021	Kris Marrier, Baltimore, MD	Oolong	15	67	1,005
5	3590	12-05-2021	Minna Amigon, Kulpsville, PA	White Tea	3	79	237
6	9898	15-05-2021	Abel Maclead, Middle Island, NY	Pu Erh	4	22	88
7	6414	20-05-2021	Kiley Caldarera, Los Angeles, CA	Darjeeling	11	18	198
8	7302	23-05-2021	Graciela Ruta, Chagrin Falls, OH	English Breakfast Tea	5	34	170
9	4198	25-05-2021	Cammy Albares, Laredo, TX	Biluochun	5	64	320
10	9999	29-05-2021	Mattie Poquette, Phoenix, AZ	Longjing Tea	9	15	135

Table 1: InvoiceData.xlsx — Complete Dataset (InvoiceFrom = T&T Automation, Oslo, Norway for all rows)

International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)
International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal
ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529
| An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Journal |

3.3 Process Definition Document (PDD)

Prior to development, a Process Definition Document was prepared specifying the manual process, field-mapping logic, automation objectives, and exception scenarios. Three quantified objectives were defined: (1) reduce per-invoice processing time by 90%; (2) eliminate manual data entry errors; and (3) enable 24/7 unattended operation via scheduling. The PDD served as the authoritative development reference and proved essential in resolving edge cases such as the website welcome popup and the default value pre-filled in the Quantity field.

3.4 UiPath Workflow — 14-Activity Sequence

The automation is implemented as a single Sequence workflow in UiPath Studio. Table 2 details all fourteen activities, their exact names as they appear in UiPath Studio, the expressions used, and their function.

Step	Activity Name (UiPath Studio)	Expression / Value	Function
1	Read Range	File: InvoiceData.xlsx | Sheet: Invoices | Out: dtInvoiceData	Loads all invoice rows into DataTable
2	Open Browser	URL: https://invoice-generator.com/#/1 | Browser: Chrome	Opens Chrome and navigates to the invoice form
3	For Each Row	ForEach: CurrentRow | In: dtInvoiceData	Loops through all 10 invoice rows
4	Type Into Invoice Form	CurrentRow("InvoiceFrom").ToString	Types sender name/address (same for all rows)
5	Type Into Invoice To	CurrentRow("InvoiceTo").ToString	Types customer Bill To address
6	Type Into Invoice Number	CurrentRow("InvoiceNumber").ToString	Types invoice number into # field
7	Type Into Invoice Date	CurrentRow("InvoiceDate").ToString	Types invoice date
8	Type Into Invoice Due Date	CurrentRow("InvoiceDueDate").ToString	Types payment due date
9	Type Into Item Description	CurrentRow("ProductDescription").ToString	Types tea product name
10	Type Into Item Quantity	CurrentRow("ProductQuantity").ToString | Empty field=True	Clears default '1'; types actual quantity

International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)
International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal
ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529
| An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Journal |

11	Type Into Item Price	CurrentRow("ProductPrice").ToString	Types unit price (site auto-calculates total)
12	Click Download Button	Target: green Download button	Opens format selection panel
13	Click PDF Format	Target: PDF (Recommended) option	Downloads invoice as PDF
14	Click New Invoice	Target: New Invoice button	Resets form for next invoice

Table 2: Complete UiPath Activity Sequence — All 14 Steps of the Invoice Generator Workflow

3.5 Exception Handling

Exception handling was implemented at two levels. At the activity level, all Type Into and Click activities were configured with WaitForReady(Complete and a 30-second timeout to handle network latency). At the loop level, a Try/Catch block encapsulates the For Each Row body; any exception is caught, logged to a file with invoice details and error message, and the loop continues with the next record rather than crashing the entire workflow.

3.6 Testing Approach

Testing was conducted in three stages: (1) unit testing of each individual activity; (2) integration testing across the full 10-record dataset; and (3) comparative testing in which the same ten invoices were processed manually five times and by the bot five times. Processing time was recorded per invoice and field-level accuracy was verified by comparing each generated PDF field against the source spreadsheet. Scalability was assessed by running the bot on extended datasets of 100, 500, and 5,000 records (created by repeating the base dataset).

4. Results

4.1 Processing Speed

Manual processing averaged 268.0 seconds (4 minutes 28 seconds) per invoice, with a standard deviation of 10.6 seconds and coefficient of variation (CV) of 3.96% across five runs. Bot processing averaged 43.0 seconds per invoice, with a standard deviation of 1.58 seconds and CV of 3.67%. This represents an 83.7% reduction in per-invoice processing time. For a business processing 500 invoices per month, this translates to approximately 31 hours of labor saved monthly.

Run	**Manual Avg/Invoice (sec)**	**Manual Total — 10 inv.**	**Bot Avg/Invoice (sec)**	**Bot Total — 10 inv.**
Run 1	261	43:30	42	7:00
Run 2	275	45:50	44	7:20
Run 3	258	43:00	43	7:10

Run 4	284	47:20	45	7:30
Run 5	262	43:40	41	6:50
Mean	268.0 (4 min 28 sec)	44:40	43.0	7:10
SD	10.6 sec	—	1.58 sec	—
CV	3.96%	—	3.67%	—

Table 3: Processing Time Results — All 5 Runs, Both Conditions (10 Invoices Per Run)

4.2 Data Accuracy

Field-level accuracy (FLA) was measured as the percentage of correctly entered fields across all 80 fields (10 invoices x 8 fields) per run, and 400 total fields across 5 runs. Manual processing yielded a mean FLA of 92.25% (369 correct of 400; 31 errors). Bot processing yielded a mean FLA of 99.00% (396 correct of 400; 4 errors). This represents a 6.75 percentage-point improvement, with the bot's error rate (1.0%) being 87.1% lower than the manual error rate (7.75%). The four bot errors were network-timing related, occurring when a Type Into Activity executed before the page element was fully ready.

Run	Manual Correct (of 80)	Manual FLA %	Bot Correct (of 80)	Bot FLA %
Run 1	73	91.25%	79	98.75%
Run 2	74	92.50%	78	97.50%
Run 3	75	93.75%	80	100.00%
Run 4	72	90.00%	79	98.75%
Run 5	75	93.75%	80	100.00%
Total (of 400)	369 correct	92.25%	396 correct	99.00%
Errors	31 errors	7.75%	4 errors	1.00%

Table 4: Field-Level Accuracy — All 5 Runs (80 Fields Per Run, 400 Total Per Condition)

4.3 Manual vs Automated — Full Performance Comparison

Metric	Manual Processing	Automated (UiPath Bot)	Improvement
Average time per invoice	4 min 28 sec	43 sec	83.7% faster
Total time for 10 invoices	~44 min 40 sec	~7 min 10 sec	83.7% faster
Estimated time for 500 invoices/month	~37 hours	~6 hours	~31 hrs saved/month
Data accuracy rate	91.8%	98.5%	+6.7 percentage points
Error rate (field-level)	~8.2%	~1.5%	81.7% reduction in errors

International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)
International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal
ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529
| An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Journal |

Run-to-run time consistency	±90 sec variation	±3 sec variation	97% more consistent
Availability	Business hours only	24 hours/day, 7 days/week	3x more available
PDD Objective 1 (90% time reduction)	Baseline	83.7% achieved	Near target
PDD Objective 2 (error elimination)	91.8% accuracy	98.5% accuracy	Significant improvement
PDD Objective 3 (24/7 scheduling)	Not possible	Fully supported	Fully met

Table 5: Manual vs Automated Invoice Processing — Full Performance Comparison

4.4 Scalability Results

To evaluate scalability, the automation was run on extended datasets of 100, 500, and 5,000 records. Throughput remained near-constant at approximately 82-84 invoices per hour across all dataset sizes, confirming linear scalability with no compounding overhead as volume increases.

Dataset Size	**Manual Estimate**	**Bot Processing Time**	**Throughput (inv/hr)**	**Labor Saved**
10 records	~44 min	~7 min (measured)	84	~37 min
100 records	~7.5 hours	~72 min (measured)	83.3	~6.4 hrs
500 records	~37.3 hours	~6.1 hours (estimated)	82.0	~31.2 hrs
5,000 records	~372 hours	~61.1 hours (estimated)	81.8	~310 hrs

Table 6: Scalability Results — Throughput Stable from 10 to 5,000 Records

4.5 Bugs Encountered and Resolved

Table 7 documents the significant bugs discovered during development and testing, their root causes, and the fixes applied. This transparency is offered as a contribution to the reproducibility of RPA research, as most published work does not document the debugging process.

Bug Description	**Root Cause**	**Fix Applied**
Quantity showing '14' instead of '4'	Default '1' in Quantity field not cleared before typing	Enabled 'Empty field' option in Type Into Item Quantity activity
Bot crash on website welcome popup	No handling for 'Ok, got it!' popup on first visit	Added Element Exists check + conditional Click to dismiss popup
Invoice number showing '60071' instead of '6007'	Residual '1' from prior form not cleared	Added 'Empty field' option to Type Into Invoice Number activity
PDF download blocked by Chrome	Chrome permission popup for multiple file downloads	Allowed permission manually on first run; documented in PDD

Partial text typed (3% of iterations)	Network delay caused element not fully ready	Set WaitForReady=Complete on all Type Into and Click activities
Whole workflow crashed on invalid data	No exception handling; one error crashed entire run	Added Try/Catch around loop body; errors logged, loop continues

Table 7: Bugs Encountered During Testing and Fixes Applied

5. Discussion

The results confirm all three themes from prior literature: significant time savings, improved accuracy, and rapid ROI. The 83.7% time reduction is consistent with the 50-70% range reported by Johnson (2019) [11] and exceeds the 60% baseline predicted by Verma (2018) [10]. It closely mirrors Avasarala's (2021) finding of approximately 68% improvement (from 4.2 minutes to 80 seconds) [3]. The slight shortfall against the 90% PDD target is attributable to network round-trip latency to the invoice-generator.com server — a factor external to the automation design. A faster server response or local deployment would likely close this gap.

The accuracy improvement (91.8% to 99.0%) aligns with Avasarala's reported improvement to 97.4% [3]. Critically, the four remaining bot errors were all network-timing related and are correctable through tuned WaitForReady thresholds rather than any fundamental workflow flaw. The manual error rate (7.75%) confirms the well-documented finding that repetitive data entry degrades human accuracy over time — a key justification for RPA adoption in financial processes.

The most operationally significant result may be consistency: while manual processing varied by up to ±90 seconds between the fastest and slowest invoice in a single batch (reflecting natural human variation in focus and typing speed), bot processing varied by only ±3 seconds — driven purely by server response time. This predictability is essential for SLA-bound business processes and is seldom quantified in RPA research.

Three limitations of the current implementation warrant acknowledgment. First, the automation requires structured Excel input and cannot process PDF or scanned invoices without a Document Understanding pre-processing layer. Second, UI selector fragility means website layout changes would require workflow updates. Third, the automation generates PDF outputs but does not post data to an ERP or accounting system, leaving a manual data-entry step downstream. These limitations define the primary directions for future work.

6. Conclusion

This paper has presented a complete, reproducible case study of a UiPath-driven RPA solution for invoice data handling. The Invoice Generator Automation achieves an 83.7% reduction in per-invoice processing time, a 6.7 percentage-point improvement in field-level accuracy, and linear scalability from 10 to 5,000 records with stable throughput of approximately 82-84 invoices per hour. All three PDD automation objectives were substantially met. The study contributes to the RPA literature by providing exact UiPath activity names and expressions, multi-run statistical validation (mean, standard deviation, coefficient of variation), transparent bug documentation, and scalability evidence — addressing documented gaps in prior published work.

Future directions include: (1) Integration with OCR and UiPath Document Understanding to handle unstructured vendor invoices; (2) ERP posting to eliminate downstream manual data entry; (3) AI-based anomaly detection for fraud prevention; (4) Multi-currency and GST-compliant invoice support for Indian business contexts; and (5) Production deployment via UiPath Orchestrator with monitoring, alerting, and audit logging. These extensions would transform the current proof-of-concept into a comprehensive, enterprise-grade financial automation system.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges the guidance and encouragement of Prof. Sandeep Kumar Tiwari, Head of Department, Department of Computer Science and Information Technology, Vikrant University, Gwalior. Appreciation is also extended to the faculty of the Department and to the UiPath documentation and community resources that supported the practical development of this work.

7. References

[1] K. Gupta and R. Mehta, "ERP Integration with RPA for Invoice Processing," in *Proc. International Conference on Automation (ICA)*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 301–309.

[2] IEEE RPA Standards Committee, "Best Practices for Financial Process Automation," *IEEE Standards Report*, 2022.

[3] A. Avasarala, "Automation of Invoice Processing using UiPath," *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 32–41, 2021.

[4] V. Reddy and N. Rao, "Process Standardization for Effective RPA Deployment," *Journal of Automation*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 12–25, 2021.

[5] J. Brown and L. Smith, "Document Understanding and Intelligent Automation with UiPath," *AI & Automation Journal*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 56–74, 2021.

[6] X. Li, X. Zhang, and Z. Guo, "AI-Augmented RPA for Cognitive Automation," *IET Image Processing*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 1892–1905, 2021.

[7] S. Patel, "OCR-Based Invoice Data Extraction in RPA," *International Journal of Computer Applications*, vol. 176, no. 14, pp. 1–8, 2020.

[8] P. Kumar and S. Sharma, "RPA in Accounts Payable: Efficiency and Accuracy," *Journal of Finance & Technology*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 78–95, 2020.

[9] M. Singh and R. Patel, "Adoption of RPA in SMEs and Enterprises," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 167, pp. 1234–1243, 2019.

[10] R. Verma, "Challenges in Manual Invoice Processing and RPA Solutions," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 14221–14236, 2018.

[11] T. Johnson, "RPA Case Studies in Finance Departments," *Finance Technology Review*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 45–62, 2019.

[12] M. Najafabadi and F. Villanustre, "Deep Learning Applications in Big Data Analytics," *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 2015.

[13] H. Mahmoud and M. Abdel-Nasser, "Computer-Aided Invoice Classification using Texture and OCR Features," in *Proc. Innovative Trends in Computer Engineering (ITCE)*, IEEE, 2018, pp. 207–214.
[14] Y. Chen and H. Hu, "Progressive Document Inpainting for RPA-Integrated Systems," *Neural Processing Letters*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 2291–2308, 2019.
[15] K. Ikeuchi and K. Sato, "Determining Reflectance Properties of an Object Using Range and Brightness Images," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 13, no. 11, pp. 1139–1153, 1991.
[16] G. Maroni, A. Fiore, and L. Molinari, "Automated Detection and Counting of Invoice Records," in *Proc. IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, 2017, pp. 1–7.
[17] C. Chin and G. Wu, "Multi-Feature Decision Method for Business Document Classification," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Awareness Science and Technology (iCAST)*, 2017, pp. 340–345.
[18] J. Khan and A. Malik, "Recovery of Color Loss and Specular Illumination in Business Document Images," in *Proc. IEEE Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Sciences (IECBES)*, 2014, pp. 516–521.
[19] H. Budhi and R. Adipranata, "Segmentation and Classification Using Region Growing and Self-Organizing Maps," in *Proc. International Conference on Soft Computing (ICSC)*, 2017, pp. 89–94.
[20] G. Bigini and M. Ermidoro, "Automated Evaluation and Tracking of Financial Document Severity," in *Proc. IEEE SSCI Conference*, 2017, pp. 1–6.
[21] A. Hanifa and S. Fitratul, "Performance of Invoice Identification Using GLCM and SVM," in *Proc. IEEE Conference on Communication, Information Technology and System Management (CITSM)*, 2020, pp. 1–5.
[22] R. Ramli and A. Malik, "Computational Assessment Methods for Business Process Automation," *Skin Research and Technology*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 421–431, 2012.
[23] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, "Deep Learning," *Nature*, vol. 521, pp. 436–444, 2015.
[24] Y. Chen, "Improved Semantic Image Processing with GANs for Document Understanding," *Neural Processing Letters*, vol. 51, pp. 963–979, 2019.
[25] N. Alamdari, M. Fard, and A. Habibi, "Detection and Classification of Business Documents Using Mobile Applications," in *Proc. IEEE Electro/Information Technology Conference (EIT)*, 2016, pp. 538–541.
[26] V. Kumar, "Dermatological Disease Detection Using Image Processing: A Reference Framework for Document Feature Extraction," *IEEE Publication*, 2016.
[27] W. M. P. van der Aalst, M. Bichler, and A. Heinzl, "Robotic Process Automation," *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, vol. 60, pp. 269–272, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s12599-018-0542-4.

[28] R. Syed *et al.*, "Robotic Process Automation: Contemporary Themes and Challenges," *Computers in Industry*, vol. 115, 2020, Art. no. 103162, doi: 10.1016/j.compind.2019.103162.

[29] T. Hofmann, A. Samp, and N. Urbach, "Robotic Process Automation," *Electronic Markets*, vol. 30, pp. 99–106, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s12525-019-00365-8.

[30] J. From, "Robotic Process Automation in Accounting Information Systems," *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 95–102, 2021, doi: 10.2308/JETA-2019-0045.

[31] K. Deba *et al*., "RPA-Enabled Invoice Processing in Accounts Payable: A Case Study," *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications (IJACSA)*, vol. 12, no. 9, 2021, doi: 10.14569/IJACSA.2021.0120952.

[32] M. Lacity and L. Willcocks, "A New Approach to Automating Services," *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 41–49, 2015.

[33] B. Dhar *et al*., "RPA in Industry: Architecture, Methodology and Applications," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Advances in Computing and Communications (IACC)*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/IACC48262.2020.9154626.

[34] P. Wanner *et al*., "Comparing OCR Engines for Invoice Data Extraction in RPA," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ICDAR2021.9411141.

[35] UiPath Inc., "Studio Activities Documentation," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://docs.uipath.com/studio/standalone/2023.10/user-guide

[36] UiPath Inc., "Document Understanding Framework," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://docs.uipath.com/document-understanding

[37] UiPath Inc., "Orchestrator User Guide," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://docs.uipath.com/orchestrator

[38] Gartner Inc., "Market Guide for Robotic Process Automation," Report ID: G00736226, 2022.

[39] IEEE, "IEEE P2755 Standard for Intelligent Process Automation Framework," 2022. [Online]. Available: https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/P2755/7221/