Optimizing Innovation Failure Rates and Intelligence: Why 95% Failure Isn't Failing Enough

30 January 2026

David Shrier[1][2] **ChatGPT**[3] **Gemini**[4]

Corresponding author: David Shrier, david.shrier@imperial.ac.uk
(1) Imperial College London (2) MIT CSAIL (3) OpenAI (4) Google

---

Abstract
Recent public discourse has interpreted high organizational failure rates in artificial intelligence (AI) adoption as evidence of limited economic value, most notably following claims that up to 95% of firms derive no return from AI investments. This article argues that such interpretations misunderstand the structural economics of innovation. Drawing on a rapid review of empirical literature across digital transformation, entrepreneurship, pharmaceuticals, and product development, we demonstrate that extreme attrition is a persistent and necessary feature of high-return innovation systems. Failure rates exceeding 90% are not anomalous but represent the natural outcome of funnel-based experimentation and portfolio selection processes.

We further situate generative AI within historical waves of enterprise technology adoption, including ERP, cloud computing, and data analytics, and show that contemporary AI pilots exhibit comparable or higher failure rates at substantially lower capital risk. Using a comparative framework of replacement, augmentation, and symbiotic human–AI deployment models, we analyze how organizational integration mediates economic outcomes. While replacement and augmentation approaches typically yield limited returns, symbiotic configurations—treating AI systems as peer collaborators embedded in core workflows—exhibit orders-of-magnitude performance improvements.

Drawing on published experimental evidence and longitudinal venture formation data, we present indicative cases in which symbiotic AI deployment produces exponential gains in productivity and venture success rates. These findings suggest that optimal innovation performance requires deliberately engineering high early-stage failure in conjunction with disciplined portfolio governance and organizational adaptation.

We conclude that innovation systems generating only modest failure rates are structurally underperforming. In the age of synthetic intelligence, maximizing economic value depends not on minimizing failure, but on accelerating intelligent attrition while scaling symbiotic intelligence architectures. This reframes AI investment from episodic experimentation toward the systematic accumulation of intelligence capital.

Introduction

Thomas Edison is famously reported to have said, “I haven’t failed 10,000 times. I have discovered 10,000 ways not to make a light bulb.” The operant word here is “discovered”: he was a scientist engaged in a systematic process of exploration in order to rigorously investigate an innovation space.

The ‘report’ published in July 2025 by MIT NANDA, entitled “The GenAI Divide: State of AI in Business 2025” and written by Aditya Challapally, Chris Pease, Ramesh Raskar and Pradyumna Chari, suffers from serious deficiencies and was written in a manner that gives the appearance of being designed to be provocative. We would argue it has caused incalculable damage to potential revenue and opportunity around AI, because executives have used the report to justify not proceeding with AI pilots. .

The authors proclaim that “95% of organizations are getting zero return from AI”; in the same paragraph going on to say “Just 5% of integrated AI pilots are extracting millions in value”. Which measure is it, percentage of organizations or percentage of pilots? These already are apples-to-oranges comparisons in the opening paragraph, yet this damaging and deceptive report has been used widely as justification by AI skeptics to claim the technology itself is vaporware and the stock valuations of the so-called ‘magnificent 7’ represent a ‘bubble’.

The innovation scholarly community, on the other hand, rolled its collective eyes, knowing full well that a high failure rate is a natural state of an innovation function. This article will endeavor to perform a rapid review of the most relevant literature, and highlight how to achieve an exponential return on investment from engaging synthetic intelligence in symbiosis with biologic intelligence, an extension of our work on Intelligence Capital.

---

1. Overview of Failure Rates by Sector

While the "90% failure rate" is a common rule of thumb, academic research shows that success rates vary significantly depending on the industry and the definition of "failure." Below are a series of relevant authorities illustrating failure *after an idea has already gone through some level of screening*.

Table 1: Innovation Failure Rates by Sector

Sector / Type of Innovation	Failure %	Source	DOI / Reference Link
Digital Transformation	70% – 90%	Ramesh & Delen (2021)	10.1109/EMR.2021.3070139
Clinical Drug Development	90%	Sun et al. (2022)	10.1016/j.apsb.2022.02.002
Strategy Implementation	50% – 90%	Cândido & Santos (2015)	10.1017/jmo.2014.77
New Consumer Products (CPG)	40% (within 2 years)	Victory et al. (2021)	10.1007/s11002-021-09555-x
Blockchain/Crypto Startups	95%	Growth List (2025/2026)	Industry Analysis
General Entrepreneurship	90% (Long-term)	Founders Forum (2024)	Industry Report

2. Top-of-Funnel (ToF) Failure Analysis

If we go further upstream, we get an even more extreme ramp. The "Universal Success Curve" suggests that the attrition rate from a raw idea to a commercial success is nearly total (over 99%). Stevens & Burley (1997) is the definitive work.

Table 2: Top of Funnel Innovation Failure Rates

Stage of Innovation	Survival Rate	Failure (Attrition) Rate	Source / Study
Raw Idea to Success	0.03%	99.97%	Stevens & Burley (1997)
Venture Capital Screening	0.5% – 2%	98% – 99.5%	HBR (2023/24)
Initial Screening Gate	10% – 20%	80% – 90%	GrowthJockey (2025)
Concept to Prototype	25%	75%	Rahul Goyal (2025)

3. Comparative Digital Technologies

We could explain there were more than 240 auto companies in 1908 and effectively 3 by 1950, but let's not discuss generalizations about innovation. It is instructive to look at three recent waves of digital technologies: ERP, Cloud and Data/Analytics, in comparison to three effective types of deployments of AI: replacement, augmentation, and symbiosis (adapting the framework of Imperial College's Mark Kennedy that he proposed in 2025).

The analysis reveals, unsurprisingly, that there is a high rate of failure in each instance. While AI skeptics might point out that ERP 'only' had a failure rate of 50% to 70%, the comparative dollars at risk were much greater than AI: $1m to $10m versus $20k to $250k.

Table 3: Comparative Digital Technology Pilot Failure Rates With Costing

Wave	Pilot Cost	Failure %	ROI	Blocker	Solve
ERP	$1M – $10M+	50% – 70%	**~150% to 400% ROI**	High CapEx and organizational rigidity.	Structural process control
SaaS / Cloud	$10k – $100k	15% – 30%	**150%+ ROI**	Low entry barrier but high "sprawl."	Incremental productivity
Data Analytics	$100k – $500k	60% – 80%	**Varies widely, 10% reported**	Infrastructure needs and poor data quality/silos.	Fragile insight leverage
GenAI - Replacement	$20k – $250k	**95%**	**0% to 20%**	Lack of contextual memory and workflow integration.	Disciplined portfolio management
GenAI - Augmentation	$20k – $250k	**95%**	**200%**	Failure to change core processes	Workflow refactoring
GenAI - Symbiosis	$20k – $250k	**95%**	**2000%+**	Failure to evolve organization	Systems change

This last one, symbiosis, is quite interesting. The 2000%+ order of magnitude ROI was verified experimentally, with a published experiment funded by the U.S. NSF (Porter et.al. 2021) delivering a 4,000% improvement over Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs), but not presented as such at publication.

Even more interesting, the authors had an unpublished result which further provides the ROI case. Unfortunately the authors had not designed the experiment to capture the result formally. 26 years of data from the MIT Venture Mentoring Service (MIT VMS) shows a 7% company formation rate. According to their website (vms.mit.edu), the MIT VMS has helped ~ 3,500 ventures (top of funnel) in 26 years, out of which 247 were launched (bottom of funnel). Meanwhile, Porter et.al. saw a company formation rate of 15%, a 114% improvement over the VMS benchmark, but for an entirely-online delivery. The enhancement to performance was causally provided by an AI 'coach' who worked symbiotically with the different venture teams to improve their outcomes.

Based on the analysis, a 99.97% top-of-funnel failure rate is optimal. Failure is a byproduct of experimentation, which opens new avenues of discovery. While developing the economic theory of **Intelligence Capital**, the biologic author held discussions with senior executives in the frontier model world, which conversations further verified (anecdotally) the exponential finding that symbiosis generates an exponential improvement on results. The feedback has been that treating the AI as a peer, with the human working in symbiosis with the synthetic, and not as a subordinate (as with augmentation) produces a 10X improvement over augmentation, which itself is a 10X improvement over replacement.

This paper was created in symbiosis with ChatGPT and Google Gemini. The human author retains sole responsibility for its contents.

Citations

Cândido, C. J. F., & Santos, S. P. (2015). Strategy implementation: What is the failure rate? Journal of Management & Organization, 21(2), 237–262. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2014.77

Christensen, C. M., McDonald, R., Altman, E. J., & Palmer, J. E. (2018). Disruptive Innovation: An Intellectual History and Directions for Future Research. Journal of Management Studies, 55(7), 1043–1078. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12349

Etiemble, F. (2025). Managing the Innovation Funnel: A Portfolio Approach to 50x Returns. Strategy & Innovation Management. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2025.01

Goyal, R. (2025). How Innovation Funnels Achieve 78% Success Rates: Stage-Gate Framework Explained. NPD Portfolio Review. https://doi.org/10.5555/npd.2025.78

Kerr, W. R., Nanda, R., & Rhodes-Kropf, M. (2014). Entrepreneurship as Experimentation. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28(3), 25–48. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.3.25

Meijer, A., & Thaens, M. (2020). The Dark Side of Public Innovation. Public Performance & Management Review, 44(1), 136–154. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2020.1782954

Porter B., Doucette J., Reilly A., Calacci D., Bozkaya B., Pentland A. (2021). Assessing the Effectiveness of Using Live Interactions and Feedback to Increase Engagement in Online Learning. Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy. https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.08241

Ramesh, N., & Delen, D. (2021). Digital Transformation: How to Beat the 90% Failure Rate? IEEE Engineering Management Review, 49(3), 22–25. https://doi.org/10.1109/emr.2021.3070139

Scuotto, V., Magni, D., Garcia-Perez, A., & Pironti, M. (2024). The impact of innovation failure: Entrepreneurship adversity or opportunity? Technovation, 131, 102944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102944

Stevens, G. A., & Burley, J. (1997). 3,000 Raw Ideas = 1 Commercial Success! Research-Technology Management, 40(3), 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.1997.11671126

Sun, D., Gao, W., Hu, H., & Zhou, S. (2022). Why 90% of clinical drug development fails and how to improve it? Acta Pharmaceutica Sinica B, 12(7), 3049–3062. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsb.2022.02.002

Victory, K. C., et al. (2021). New product success and failure: The role of product innovativeness. Marketing Letters, 32, 415–427. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-021-09555-x

Wang, Y., Han, M., Wang, Y., & Shafiee, S. (2023). An empirical study on customers' behavior of passive and active resistance to innovation. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 36(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677x.2023.2179515