Autonomous Robotic Door Negotiation: A Comprehensive Review of Perception, Manipulation, and Learning from Simulation to Reality

Introduction

The ability to navigate and interact with environments designed for humans remains one of the most significant and revealing grand challenges in robotics. Among the myriad of objects that populate these spaces, the simple hinged door stands out as a particularly formidable obstacle for autonomous agents. As described in the framework for the 2025 Smart City Competition, a door is "one of the pieces of human engineering that are most closely matched to human capabilities and limitations".[1] Its design, refined over millennia, is so perfectly tuned to human biomechanics and intuition that it is simultaneously trivial for a person to operate and profoundly difficult for a robot. Successfully negotiating a door requires a seamless integration of advanced perception, dexterous manipulation, robust control, and intelligent planning. For this reason, the task of opening a door has become a de facto benchmark for evaluating the holistic capabilities of an autonomous system, a role it prominently played in events like the DARPA Robotics Challenge (DRC).[1]

The scientific and engineering approaches to this problem have undergone a significant paradigm shift. Foundational research, prevalent in the late 2000s and early 2010s, was characterized by a modular, "sense-plan-act" pipeline. These systems relied on explicit, hand-engineered models of the door, the handle, and the task constraints themselves. While successful in controlled laboratory settings, this model-based philosophy often proved brittle when faced with the immense variability of the real world—different handle types, unknown door dynamics, and cluttered environments. The limitations of these classical methods, which often failed to "satisfy the expected level of dexterity nor achieve the desired natural and robust behaviour," have catalyzed a move towards more adaptive, data-driven strategies.[1]

This report provides a comprehensive review of the field of robotic door negotiation, charting its evolution from these foundational methods to the current state of the art. The central theme of this analysis is the transition from modular, model-based systems to integrated, learning-based frameworks that leverage deep learning, reinforcement learning, and large-scale simulation. The structure of modern robotics competitions, such as the Smart City Challenge, serves to codify the inherent difficulties of real-world operation. By specifying variable elements like handle types, panel appearances, and opening directions, the competition framework explicitly challenges the brittleness of traditional systems and necessitates the development of the generalizable, adaptive strategies that form the core of modern research.[1]

This report is structured to guide the reader through the multifaceted nature of the door negotiation problem. Section 1 provides a formal definition of the task, decomposing it into four canonical phases based on the competition framework. Section 2 establishes a historical baseline by systematically reviewing the foundational literature, highlighting the classical "sense-plan-act" paradigm. Building on this, Section 3 explores the state-of-the-art in robotic perception, detailing the profound impact of deep learning on scene understanding, from object detection to panoptic segmentation and high-fidelity 6D pose estimation. Section 4 delves into advanced manipulation and control, contrasting traditional force control with modern paradigms for skill acquisition, including Learning from Demonstration (LfD), Reinforcement Learning (RL), Vision-Language-Action (VLA) models, and diffusion models. Section 5 addresses the critical challenge of transferring learned skills from simulation to reality, reviewing key techniques like domain randomization and domain adaptation. Finally, Section 6 synthesizes these threads, discussing the convergence of modern paradigms, identifying persistent challenges, and offering a forward-looking perspective on the role of embodied AI and foundation models in solving this quintessential robotics problem.

The Door Negotiation Task: A Four-Phase Framework

To systematically analyze the research in robotic door negotiation, it is essential to first establish a clear and comprehensive definition of the task itself. The problem is not monolithic; rather, it is a sequential process involving distinct but interdependent sub-tasks. The Smart City Competition Rulebook provides a well-defined decomposition, framing the task as a "scientifically grounded 'door benchmark'" and dividing it into four canonical phases: detection, approach, manipulation, and traversal.[1] This framework serves as a valuable lens through which to understand the challenges and evaluate the evolution of proposed solutions.

Analysis of the Smart City Competition Rulebook

The competition rulebook provides a rich and detailed problem specification that moves beyond a simple pass/fail test. Its goal is to create a standardized benchmark that rigorously evaluates a robot's ability to adapt to an environment that is intentionally variable and not fully known in advance.[1] This mirrors the challenges of deploying robots in real-world human spaces.

A key aspect of the competition design is the introduction of controlled uncertainty through variable elements. These variations are not arbitrary; they are specifically chosen to target the failure modes of brittle, hard-coded systems and to reward generalizable, adaptive policies. The variable elements include [1]:

- **Door Panel:** The visual appearance of the door can change, including its color, surface type (flat or shaped), and the presence of subpanels. This challenges perception systems that may be overfitted to a specific door appearance.
- **Handle Type:** The competition explicitly allows for different types of commercial door handles, with the two primary examples being the **lever handle** (requiring a downward force) and the **knob handle** (requiring a more complex rotation). This directly tests the robot's ability to recognize handle affordances and execute different manipulation strategies.
- **Unlocking Mechanism:** The mechanism can vary, with some requiring only a push/pull action and others requiring a coordinated turn-and-push/pull motion. The robot must inspect or interact with the door to determine the correct unlocking procedure.
- **Opening Direction:** The door may open inwards (requiring a pull), outwards (requiring a push), or be bidirectional. The rulebook states that this direction should be changed often without the teams' knowledge, forcing the robot to discover this property through physical interaction rather than relying on prior information.

The phases of the task are not entirely independent. The rulebook notes that manipulation requires "visual monitoring," and traversal can occur "while opening the door".[1] This implies that a successful system cannot be purely modular; there must be tight coupling and feedback loops between the perception, manipulation, and navigation subsystems. This operational intertwining is a major source of the task's complexity and a key driver for research into integrated planning and control systems.

The Four Canonical Phases of Door Negotiation

Based on the literature and the competition framework, the door negotiation task can be broken down into the following four phases.[1]

Phase 1: Detection

This is the initial perception phase, where the robot must locate and identify the relevant objects in the scene. The primary goal is to extract sufficient information to plan the subsequent phases. The key challenges in this phase, as highlighted by the competition and its cited literature, are to develop a system capable of [1]:

1. **Recognizing doors in different states:** The system must be able to detect the door whether it is fully closed, fully open, or partially ajar.[1]
2. **Handling diverse environmental conditions:** The detection must be robust to real-world complexities such as background clutter, partial occlusions (e.g., by furniture), and varying lighting conditions.[1]
3. **Estimating door properties:** Beyond simple detection, the robot needs to estimate key properties like the door's orientation and locate its handle.

This phase sets the foundation for the entire task. An error in detection—misidentifying the door, failing to locate the handle, or misjudging the door's state—will inevitably lead to failure in the subsequent phases.

Phase 2: Approach

Once the door and handle have been detected, the robot must navigate to a suitable position and orientation from which to begin manipulation. This is primarily a navigation and positioning task, but its success is critically dependent on the target object. The rulebook notes that the key factors affecting a successful approach are the "object-target appearance, and the robot embodiment".[1]

The goal is to bring the robot's manipulator within its workspace relative to the handle, while ensuring the robot's base is positioned such that it will not collide with the door as it swings open. This phase acts as the bridge between the robot's large-scale navigation capabilities and its fine-grained manipulation skills. The final pose of the robot at the end of this phase dictates the feasibility of the subsequent manipulation.

Phase 3: Manipulation

This is the core physical interaction phase of the task and is often the most complex. It requires the robot to "detect the type of handle, trigger the related behaviour, and perform the desired movement".[1] This phase encompasses several sub-actions:

1. **Grasping:** Reaching for and securely grasping the handle.
2. **Unlocking:** Actuating the handle (e.g., depressing a lever, turning a knob) to disengage the locking mechanism. As noted in the rulebook, this may require significant forces and often needs to be coordinated with the initial opening motion.[1]
3. **Opening:** Applying a pushing or pulling force to the door panel to swing it open. This requires the robot to understand the door's kinematic constraints (i.e., that it rotates around a hinge) and to apply forces that generate the correct torque.

This phase demands a tight coupling of perception and control. The robot must often perform "visual monitoring and manipulation, simultaneously" to ensure the task is proceeding correctly.[1] Furthermore, due to uncertainties in the door's exact dynamics (e.g., friction, weight, presence of a door closer), compliant, force-controlled motion is often necessary to avoid exerting excessive forces that could damage the robot or the door.

Phase 4: Traversal

The final phase is to navigate the robot through the now-open doorway to the other side. While this may seem like a standard navigation task, it is complicated by the fact that the robot may need to continue interacting with the door to keep it open while moving its base.

The key challenge of this phase is to "plan several steps ahead of both base motions and handle manipulation actions".[1] Some of the most effective strategies, as noted in the literature, involve performing manipulation and traversal simultaneously.[1] This requires a sophisticated planner that can coordinate the motion of the robot's base and its manipulator within the confined space of the doorway, dynamically updating its plan as the door's position changes. The task is considered complete when the entire robot has passed the threshold of the door.

Foundational Approaches in Door Negotiation

The body of research on robotic door negotiation is extensive, with many of the seminal works published in the decade leading up to 2017. These foundational papers, many of which are cited in the Smart City Competition rulebook, established the core principles and challenges of the task. An analysis of this literature reveals a clear trend: the dominance of a modular, "sense-plan-act" pipeline, where perception, planning, and control are treated as distinct, sequential stages. Furthermore, these methods exhibit a strong reliance on explicit, pre-defined models of the environment and the task, a philosophy that is both powerful in known conditions and brittle in the face of novelty.

Systematic Review of Cited Literature

The foundational literature can be categorized according to the four-phase framework, revealing the common methodologies employed in each stage of the task.[1]

Detection: Early work in door detection relied heavily on processing geometric information from 2D and 3D sensors. Image-based methods were explored for their ability to detect doors in various scenarios [1], though they were often susceptible to false positives due to visual ambiguity.[1] To improve robustness, researchers turned to 3D data. For instance, demonstrated automated door detection using a 3D sensor, while [Quintana et al., 2016] proposed a model-based method using RGB-D sensor data to detect doors in cluttered environments and in different states (open, closed, or semi-open).[1] A significant step towards modern techniques was taken by [Chen et al., 2014], who described an early application of deep learning, using a convolutional neural network (CNN) to recognize doors with greater robustness to varying lighting and clutter.[1]

Approach: In the foundational paradigm, the approach phase was typically not considered a door-specific problem. Instead, it was framed as a general navigation and positioning task. The literature cited in this context includes surveys on indoor positioning systems [1] and work on generic "next-best-view" planning for 3D model acquisition.[1] This perspective treats the door simply as a goal destination for the robot's navigation stack, under-emphasizing the need for precise, manipulation-aware positioning.

Manipulation: This phase received the most research attention, with a strong focus on geometric analysis and compliant control. To identify handles, methods like and [Klingbeil et al., 2010] exploited 3D laser scan data to find geometric features corresponding to handles.[1] Once the handle was located, the challenge shifted to controlling the interaction. A key contribution came from [Meeussen et al., 2010], who introduced a compliant and force-controlled approach using the Task Frame Formalism (TFF) to plan and execute motions, allowing the robot to adapt to small uncertainties.[1] This emphasis on compliance was echoed by, who used impedance control to manage forces during interaction. Their work also introduced the idea of learning and storing kinematic models of objects like doors and drawers to improve future interactions, a clear example of the model-based philosophy.[1] A notable outlier that foreshadowed future trends was the work of [Gu et al., 2017], which used deep reinforcement learning to develop an end-to-end system that mapped images directly to motor commands, bypassing the need for explicit models and hand-crafted controllers.[1]

Traversal: Planning for traversal was addressed as a motion planning problem with dynamic constraints. A prime example is the work of [Chitta et al., 2010], who generated a cost map for navigation that was continuously updated based on the door's current angle. The robot's base path was then planned using a fast replanning algorithm, Anytime Repairing A* (ARA*).[1] A more integrated approach was presented by with the HERB robot. They developed the Constrained Bidirectional Rapidly-exploring Random Tree (CBIRRT) planner, which could generate coordinated motions for the robot's base and arm simultaneously, enabling the robot to manipulate the door while traversing the doorway.[1]

Lessons from the DARPA Robotics Challenge (DRC)

The DRC served as a major catalyst for this research, pushing teams to develop robust systems for a variety of manipulation tasks, including door opening. The approaches taken by the top teams are indicative of the state-of-the-art during this period. For example, Team IHMC used a combination of point cloud coloring and texturing techniques to locate doors and handles, then manipulated them using a concept of "interactable objects".[1] The WPI-CMU team used a mix of 2D and 3D geometric segmentation for detection and approach, and a modified version of the TrajOpt planner to generate efficient manipulation trajectories.[1] The team behind the DRC-HUBO robot also relied on detecting geometric features for the handle and used key-pose interpolation to plan the robot's motions.[1] These approaches, while effective for the competition, underscore the reliance on geometric models, specialized planners, and pre-defined motion templates.

The common thread in this foundational era is the "model is king" philosophy. The performance of these systems was intrinsically linked to the fidelity of their models—be it a 3D CAD model of a handle, a kinematic model of the door's rotation, or a geometric model of the task constraints. While powerful, this reliance on prior knowledge is also the source of their brittleness. The rulebook's concluding remark that these solutions "still do not satisfy the expected level of dexterity nor achieve the desired natural and robust behaviour" is a direct critique of this model-based paradigm's inability to generalize to the unmodeled variations inherent in the real world, setting the stage for the field's subsequent shift toward learning-based methods.[1]

Paper	Year	Phase(s) Addressed	Key Contribution/Methodology	Sensor Modality
[1]	2009	Manipulation	Laser-based perception for door and handle identification.	3D Laser

[Chitta et al., 2010][1]	2010	Traversal, Manipulation	Dynamic cost map with ARA* planner for coordinated base motion.	Not Specified
[Klingbeil et al., 2010][1]	2010	Detection, Manipulation	Learning to open new doors, estimating door orientation.	3D Laser
[Meeussen et al., 2010][1]	2010	Manipulation	Compliant, force-controlled motion using Task Frame Formalism (TFF).	Not Specified
[1]	2010	Traversal, Manipulation	HERB robot; Constrained Bidirectional RRT (CBIRRT) for simultaneous manipulation and traversal.	Not Specified
[1]	2012	Manipulation	Generalized framework using impedance control and learned kinematic models.	Not Specified
[Chen et al., 2014][1]	2014	Detection	Early use of deep learning (CNN) for robust door recognition.	Vision
[Johnson et al., 2015][1]	2015	Detection, Manipulation	DRC Team IHMC; Point cloud coloring/texturing for detection; "Interactable object" concept.	Point Cloud

[1]	2015	Approach, Manipulation	DRC Team WPI-CMU; 2D/3D geometric segmentation; TrajOpt planner.	2D/3D Vision
[Zucker et al., 2015][1]	2015	Detection, Manipulation	DRC-HUBO; Geometric feature detection; Key-pose interpolation for planning.	Not Specified
[Quintana et al., 2016][1]	2016	Detection	Model-based detection in cluttered environments from RGB-D data.	RGB-D
[Gu et al., 2017][1]	2017	Manipulation	End-to-end deep reinforcement learning (off-policy Q-functions) for motion generation.	Vision

State-of-the-Art in Robotic Perception for Door Negotiation (Post-2017)

The period since 2017 has witnessed a revolution in robotic perception, driven almost entirely by advancements in deep learning. The definition of "perception" has expanded dramatically, moving beyond the simple localization of objects to the pursuit of a holistic, semantic, and geometrically precise understanding of the entire scene. This shift is a direct response to the limitations of earlier methods. For instance, a simple bounding box detector might fail if a chair partially occludes a door, a common scenario in real-world environments.[2] A modern perception system, however, can explicitly segment the chair instance, the door instance, and the wall instance, allowing a planner to reason intelligently about the occlusion and formulate a more robust strategy. This evolution can be seen across three key areas: the move from detection to segmentation, the adoption of panoptic scene understanding, and the development of high-precision 6D pose estimation techniques.

Deep Learning for Detection and Segmentation

While early deep learning models like the one used by [Chen et al., 2014] demonstrated the potential of CNNs for door recognition, modern approaches have become far more sophisticated.[1] The dominant paradigm has shifted from simple classification or bounding-box detection to dense, pixel-wise prediction tasks.[3]

Object detection models, particularly from the YOLO (You Only Look Once) family, remain highly relevant due to their speed and efficiency, making them suitable for real-time applications on resource-constrained robotic platforms. Several recent works employ YOLOv5 to detect the initial bounding boxes of doors and handles, which then serve as a region of interest for more detailed analysis.[2] However, the primary innovation lies in semantic segmentation, which assigns a class label (e.g., "door," "wall," "floor") to every single pixel in an image. Architectures like SegNet have proven effective for this task, enabling a robot to parse its environment into semantically meaningful regions.[6] This provides a much richer understanding than a simple bounding box, forming the basis for more advanced perception capabilities.

Holistic Scene Understanding with Panoptic Segmentation

Panoptic segmentation represents a significant leap forward, unifying the strengths of two previously separate tasks: semantic segmentation and instance segmentation. While semantic segmentation labels amorphous "stuff" categories (like walls, floor, ceiling), instance segmentation detects and delineates countable "thing" objects (like *this specific door*, *that specific handle*, or a nearby chair).[7] Panoptic segmentation does both simultaneously, assigning every pixel in an image both a class label and, if applicable, a unique instance ID.[9]

For the door negotiation task, the benefit is profound. A robot equipped with panoptic segmentation can generate a complete and unambiguous model of its immediate surroundings. It can differentiate the door panel as a distinct instance from the surrounding wall instance and the handle as another instance on the door. This is critical for robust planning—for example, it allows the robot to plan manipulator trajectories that specifically target the handle while explicitly avoiding collisions with the door frame or nearby clutter.[10]

The state-of-the-art in this area is advancing rapidly. Many leading models, such as MaskDINO, are now based on the transformer architecture, which excels at capturing long-range dependencies in an image.[12] Research is also pushing this capability into higher dimensions, with methods emerging for 3D panoptic segmentation from multiple views and even 4D panoptic segmentation using Lidar data over time.[14] To support this research, new large-scale datasets like JRDB-PanoTrack are being developed specifically for training and benchmarking robotic perception in complex, human-centric indoor and outdoor environments.[17]

High-Precision Handle Localization: Advanced 6D Pose Estimation

For a robot to successfully grasp and manipulate a door handle, knowing its location in a 2D image is insufficient. The robot requires the handle's full 6D pose—its 3D translation (x,y,z) and 3D rotation (roll, pitch, yaw) relative to the robot's camera or end-effector.[20] The pursuit of accurate and generalizable 6D pose estimation is a major research thrust.

Modern approaches are almost exclusively based on deep learning and can be broadly categorized by their generalization capabilities [22]:

1. **Instance-Level Pose Estimation:** These methods achieve the highest precision but require an exact 3D CAD model of the specific object being viewed. They are effective in industrial settings where all objects are known but are impractical for domestic robots that must interact with a wide variety of unknown objects.[21]
2. **Category-Level Pose Estimation:** This is a more general and highly relevant approach for the door task. These methods are trained to recognize and estimate the pose of any object belonging to a known category (e.g., "lever handles," "mugs," "bottles") without having seen that specific instance before.[21] They learn the common geometric and visual features of a category. Recent methods like

CleanPose use causal learning techniques to improve generalization by mitigating spurious correlations in the training data, making them more robust to novel instances with significant visual variations.[25]

3. **Model-Free/Category-Agnostic Pose Estimation:** This is the most ambitious goal, aiming to estimate the 6D pose of a completely novel object, often from a single RGB or RGB-D image, without any prior model.[21] These methods often leverage foundation models or use a "render-and-compare" strategy to refine pose hypotheses.[21]

The development of category-level and model-free approaches is a direct response to the real-world challenge of object diversity, as codified by the competition rules that allow for any "commonly available type of commercial door handle".[1] A robot operating in a home or office cannot be equipped with a CAD model for every object it might encounter. This practical constraint has forced the research community to move away from instance-level methods towards these more generalizable and adaptive perception paradigms.

Technique	Output	Key Advantage for Door Task	Key Limitation	State-of-the-Art Models/Methods
Object Detection	2D Bounding Boxes	Fast and efficient for initial localization of door and handle.	Provides no depth, orientation, or segmentation information; struggles with occlusion.	YOLO family (e.g., YOLOv5) [2]
Semantic Segmentation	Pixel-wise Class Labels	Segments the scene into meaningful regions (wall, floor, door), aiding navigation.	Does not distinguish between different instances of the same class (e.g., two doors).	SegNet, DeepLab [6]
Panoptic Segmentation	Pixel-wise Class & Instance IDs	Provides a complete scene understanding, distinguishing the door	Computationally more expensive; performance can degrade on small objects	Transformer-based models (e.g., MaskDINO), 3D/4D

		instance from the wall and the handle instance from the door. Crucial for collision-free planning.	(like handles).	extensions [13]
6D Pose Estimation	3D Translation & 3D Rotation	Provides the precise pose of the handle required for grasping and manipulation.	Can be brittle. Instance-level methods require CAD models; category-level methods require extensive training data.	Category-level (CleanPose), Model-free (Any6D), Correspondence-based methods [21]

Advanced Manipulation and Control Strategies

While perception provides the "what" and "where," manipulation and control determine the "how." Successfully interacting with a door requires more than just knowing its pose; it demands a physical intelligence capable of handling the uncertainties and dynamics of contact. The field has evolved from rigid, position-controlled motions to sophisticated strategies that incorporate force feedback and learn complex behaviors from data. This evolution reveals a fundamental tension in modern robotics: a split between modular, hierarchical systems that integrate classical control with learned components, and end-to-end learning paradigms that seek to map sensory inputs directly to motor commands.

The Imperative of Force-Compliant Interaction

Early robotic manipulation was dominated by position control, where the robot's primary goal is to follow a precise geometric path. However, in any task involving contact with the environment, this approach is notoriously brittle. Minor errors in perception or calibration can lead to immense and potentially damaging interaction forces.[29] This has led to the widespread adoption of compliant control strategies, which prioritize managing interaction forces over rigidly tracking a path.

The two main families of compliant control are [30]:

- **Direct Force Control:** This approach uses a force/torque (F/T) sensor, typically at the robot's wrist, to directly measure the interaction forces. A control loop then adjusts the robot's motion to achieve a desired force profile. This provides explicit control over contact forces.
- **Indirect Force Control (Impedance/Admittance Control):** This approach does not regulate force directly. Instead, it controls the dynamic relationship between the robot's position and the external force it experiences. An **impedance controller** accepts a position deviation as input and produces a force as output (like a programmable spring-damper system), while an **admittance controller** accepts a force measurement as input and produces a motion as output. This allows the robot to be "soft" and yield to external forces in a predictable way.

Recent advancements are making force control more accessible and intelligent. AI and predictive modeling are being integrated to allow robots to learn from past interactions and adapt their force application strategies in real time.[33] Furthermore, the development of

sensorless force control represents a significant step towards democratization. Instead of relying on expensive and often fragile F/T sensors, these techniques estimate interaction forces by observing the current drawn by the robot's joint motors.[30] This approach provides a low-cost proxy for haptic feedback, enabling robust interaction on a wider range of platforms.

This haptic feedback is the critical missing link for robustly handling a door's non-visual properties. Vision alone cannot determine a door's weight, the friction in its hinge, or whether it needs to be pushed or pulled. As the competition rulebook suggests, the robot "needs to try and move the door to find out".[1] This act of "trying" is fundamentally a haptic exploration, requiring the robot to apply a force and sense the resulting reaction. Hybrid strategies that combine vision with force control are proving to be highly effective. One recent study demonstrated a method that could open a door in just 12 seconds with low contact forces, while another combined Quadratic Programming with Cartesian Compliance Control (CCC) to dramatically reduce the forces exerted compared to simple velocity control.[34]

A compelling case study is the **"DoorBot" framework**, presented at ICRA 2025. This system exemplifies a modern, practical approach to the problem.[35] DoorBot employs a haptic-aware, closed-loop hierarchical control framework. Crucially, its haptic perception module uses low-cost joint current readings to dynamically adapt its strategy, allowing it to infer properties like the push/pull direction of the door.[37] Its architecture is hierarchical: a high-level state machine acts as an interpretable planner, coordinating six low-level motion primitives (e.g., "grasp," "unlock," "open").[37] This hybrid system, which combines a classical planner with learned components and low-cost haptic feedback, achieved an impressive 90% success rate on 20 previously unseen doors, demonstrating a high degree of generalization and robustness.[35] The success of DoorBot suggests that for complex, safety-critical tasks in unstructured environments, a hierarchical approach that is interpretable, data-efficient, and leverages haptic feedback is a highly effective and practical strategy.

Modern Paradigms for Learning Manipulation Skills

The motions and strategies executed by the controller are increasingly being generated by machine learning models rather than being hand-programmed. Four major paradigms have emerged for acquiring these complex skills.

Learning from Demonstration (LfD) / Imitation Learning (IL)

LfD is a powerful and data-efficient method for transferring skills from a human expert to a robot.[39] The core idea is to have a robot learn a policy by observing one or more demonstrations of a task being performed. Demonstrations can be provided in several ways, including kinesthetic teaching (physically guiding the robot's arm), teleoperation, or passive observation of a human from video.[39] LfD is particularly well-suited for contact-rich tasks like pulling a door handle, which are intuitive for humans but difficult to specify programmatically.[40] One innovative approach even learns a visual reward function from videos of humans opening doors, which is then used to guide a reinforcement learning agent.[41] While LfD can learn skills from very few examples, a key challenge remains in generalizing the learned policy to situations and objects that differ from the demonstrations.[42]

Reinforcement Learning (RL)

RL provides a framework for an agent to learn optimal behaviors through trial and error, guided by a scalar reward signal.[43] By combining RL with deep neural networks (Deep RL), agents can learn complex policies directly from high-dimensional sensory inputs like camera images. In the context of door opening, RL has been used to train control strategies in simulation environments like CoppeliaSim, often using algorithms like Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO).[5] A key area of innovation is the integration of force feedback into the RL loop. One recent study combined force feedback with the Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) algorithm, using the force measurements to shape the reward function. This encouraged the agent to learn a compliant, low-force strategy, resulting in safer and more efficient door opening compared to methods without force feedback.[34] Haptic feedback is increasingly being incorporated into RL frameworks to enhance the robustness of manipulation policies.[37]

Vision-Language-Action (VLA) Models

VLAs represent a paradigm shift towards general-purpose robotic agents, fueled by the success of large language models (LLMs) and foundation models. These are typically large, transformer-based architectures that take multi-modal inputs—usually a camera image and a natural language instruction—and output a robotic action.[45] By pre-training on vast internet-scale datasets of images, text, and videos, VLAs can achieve remarkable zero-shot or few-shot generalization to novel tasks and objects.[46] For articulated object manipulation, a VLA could interpret a command like "open the cabinet drawer" and generate the appropriate actions.[46] However, the current generation of VLAs faces significant challenges. They often struggle with the fine precision required for contact-rich manipulation and lack robust long-horizon planning capabilities, as they typically predict only the next immediate action.[46] The research frontier for VLAs (2024-2025) is focused on addressing these limitations by incorporating more sophisticated 3D representations, hierarchical planning structures, and fine-tuning with reinforcement learning.[47]

Diffusion Models for Trajectory Generation

Diffusion models are a powerful new class of generative models that have shown state-of-the-art performance in image and video generation. In robotics, they are being adapted for motion planning and trajectory generation.[51] Unlike policies that predict a single action at a time, diffusion models can learn to generate a probability distribution over entire trajectories (a sequence of states and actions).[52] This is particularly advantageous for tasks like door opening, where multiple different trajectories could all be valid solutions. By sampling from this learned distribution, the robot can generate diverse, smooth, and collision-free motion plans.[54] These models can be conditioned on environmental information (e.g., a map or scene representation) and combined with classical optimizers to ensure that the generated trajectories satisfy hard constraints like collision avoidance.[54] The Diffusion Trajectory-guided Policy (DTP) framework is a promising two-stage approach where a diffusion model first generates a high-level, task-relevant trajectory, which then serves as a guide for a low-level imitation policy, improving performance on complex, long-horizon tasks.[56]

Paradigm	Core Concept	Data Requirement	Key Advantage	Key Challenge	Example Application to Door Task
Learning from Demonstration (LfD)	Learn a policy by imitating expert demonstrations.	Low (can learn from one or a few demonstrations).	Highly data-efficient for teaching complex, contact-rich skills.	Generalizing beyond the specific conditions of the demonstration.	Learning to pull a door handle via kinesthetic teaching.[40]
Reinforcement Learning (RL)	Learn a policy through trial and error to maximize a reward signal.	High (often requires millions of interactions, usually in simulation).	Can discover optimal and novel strategies without human supervision.	Reward function engineering; sim-to-real transfer.	Using force feedback and DDPG to learn a low-force opening strategy.[44]
Vision-Language-Action (VLA) Models	Use large, pre-trained models to map vision and language	Very High (leverages massive internet-scale datasets for	Excellent zero-shot/few-shot generalization to novel objects and	Poor performance on long-horizon planning and fine-precisio	Interpreting a command like "open the door" and generating

	inputs to actions.	pre-training) .	instructions.	n manipulation .	an action sequence.[46]
Diffusion Models	Learn a generative model of entire trajectories, then sample plans.	Moderate to High (requires a dataset of successful trajectories).	Can model multi-modal action distributions; generates smooth, complete plans.	Enforcing hard constraints (e.g., collision-free); computation ally intensive sampling.	Generating a smooth, full-body trajectory to open and pass through a door.[54]

Bridging the Reality Gap: Sim-to-Real Transfer

The rise of learning-based approaches, particularly Reinforcement Learning, has made simulation an indispensable tool in modern robotics. Training a policy on a physical robot through millions of trial-and-error attempts is often impractical, time-consuming, and dangerous. Simulation offers a safe, scalable, and parallelizable alternative. However, this introduces a fundamental challenge known as the "sim-to-real gap": policies trained in the idealized world of a simulator often fail when deployed on a physical robot in the real world.[57] This gap arises from discrepancies in visual appearance (textures, lighting), physical dynamics (friction, contact forces), and hardware characteristics (sensor noise, actuator delays).[58] Bridging this reality gap is one of the most critical areas of research for enabling the deployment of learned robotic skills. The primary strategies for tackling this problem fall into two main categories: domain randomization and domain adaptation.

A successful sim-to-real transfer for a complex, contact-rich task like door negotiation requires a multi-faceted approach. It is not enough to address only one aspect of the reality gap. For instance, while visual randomization of the door panel and handle is necessary to match the variability specified in the competition rules [1], it is equally crucial to randomize the underlying dynamics, such as hinge friction, latch mechanism behavior, and the forces exerted by a door closer. Furthermore, accurately modeling and randomizing the robot's own actuator dynamics, such as motor delays and controller dead zones, is essential for the learned policy to control the physical hardware effectively.[59] This indicates that a "one-size-fits-all" sim-to-real solution is unlikely to succeed; the strategy must be tailored to the specific robot, sensors, and task dynamics.

Domain Randomization (DR): Training for Robustness

Domain randomization is the most widely used technique for bridging the sim-to-real gap. The core principle is to train the policy not in a single, high-fidelity simulation, but across a vast ensemble of simulated environments where various parameters are randomized at the start of each training episode.[61] The parameters to be randomized can include:

- **Visual Properties:** Textures of objects, colors, lighting conditions, camera position and angle, and the presence of distractor objects.[62]
- **Dynamics Properties:** Mass and friction coefficients of objects, damping, gravity, and other physical parameters of the simulation engine.[63]
- **Robot Properties:** Physical dimensions of the robot's links, actuator dynamics, and sensor noise models.[60]

By exposing the policy to such wide variability, the goal is to force it to learn a strategy that is robust to these changes. If the randomization is sufficiently broad, the real world should appear to the policy as just another variation it has already seen during training, enabling zero-shot transfer.[64] For the door opening task, a well-designed DR strategy would involve randomizing the door's visual appearance, handle type and location, and its dynamic properties like mass and hinge friction.[65]

The field of domain randomization has evolved to include more sophisticated techniques beyond simply sampling from fixed uniform distributions (static DR). **Adaptive DR** methods dynamically update the distribution of randomization parameters during training, often using feedback from the real world to focus the simulation on more challenging or relevant scenarios.[64]

Adversarial DR formulates the problem as a two-player game where an "adversary" agent actively tries to find environmental parameters that cause the primary agent to fail, forcing the policy to become robust against worst-case scenarios.[64]

Domain Adaptation: Translating Simulation to Reality

Domain adaptation offers a complementary approach. Instead of making the policy robust to a wide range of domains, domain adaptation aims to make the simulated domain appear more like the target real-world domain. This is most commonly applied to the visual domain, using deep generative models, such as Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), to translate synthetic images from the simulator into "pseudo-real" images that more closely match the robot's camera feed.[57]

The policy is then trained on these adapted, more realistic images. However, a naive GAN translation can inadvertently alter or remove features that are critical for the task (e.g., changing the perceived shape of a door handle). To address this, recent work has focused on adding robot-specific consistency constraints to the GAN training process. Google's work on **RL-CycleGAN** and **RetinaGAN** are prominent examples of this approach.[57]

- **RL-CycleGAN** jointly trains the image-translation GAN with the RL policy, adding a loss term that ensures the robot's actions are consistent whether it sees the original simulated image or the translated one.
- **RetinaGAN** decouples the adaptation from the specific learning algorithm by enforcing "perception consistency." It uses an object detector and ensures that the location of detected objects remains the same before and after the image translation. This preserves the structural integrity of task-relevant objects while allowing the GAN to modify textures, shadows, and lighting.

In a direct application to a door opening task, a policy trained with images adapted by RetinaGAN successfully entered real conference rooms over 93% of the time, significantly outperforming baselines and demonstrating the power of this approach.[57] The most successful sim-to-real transfers often intelligently combine multiple techniques. For example, the seminal work by OpenAI on in-hand manipulation used a combination of massive dynamics randomization and a specific recurrent neural network architecture (LSTM) capable of implicitly learning and adapting to the system's dynamics from its observation history.[63] Similarly, the Sim2Real2 framework uses active interaction in the real world to build an explicit physics model of an articulated object, which is then used for more accurate planning.[66] This trend suggests that the future of sim-to-real lies not in a single "magic bullet" algorithm, but in hybrid, systems-level approaches that intelligently combine randomization, adaptation, and task-specific knowledge.

Technique	Core Principle	Example	Strengths	Weaknesses

		Parameters to Vary (for Door Task)		
Domain Randomization (DR)	Make the policy robust by training it on a wide variety of simulated domains.	**Visual:** Door/handle color, texture, lighting. **Dynamics:** Hinge friction, mass, door closer force. **Robot:** Actuator delay, sensor noise.	Conceptually simple; can enable zero-shot transfer without real-world data.	Requires careful tuning of randomization ranges; can be computationally expensive.
Domain Adaptation (DA)	Make the simulated data more realistic by translating it to match the real-world domain.	N/A (adapts the output, not the parameters).	Can create highly realistic training data, preserving task-relevant features with consistency losses.	Requires a dataset of real-world images; GAN training can be unstable.
Static DR	Use a fixed, predefined distribution for randomized parameters.	Uniformly sample handle position within a range.	Easiest to implement.	May fail to cover rare but critical real-world variations; requires manual tuning.
Adaptive DR	Dynamically update the randomization distribution based on performance.	Increase the probability of sampling difficult hinge friction values if the policy fails.	More efficient than static DR; can target challenging scenarios automatically.	More complex to implement; may require some real-world feedback.
Adversarial DR	Use an "adversary" agent to generate worst-case environmental perturbations.	Adversary places a virtual obstacle to block the most direct path.	Yields exceptionally robust policies that are resilient to a wide range of disturbances.	Can be unstable to train; may create unrealistically difficult scenarios.

Synthesis and Future Directions

The journey of a robot through a door, from foundational geometric methods to modern learning-based frameworks, mirrors the broader evolution of the field of robotics itself. The problem serves as a microcosm of the challenges and opportunities in creating autonomous agents that can operate robustly and intelligently in unstructured human environments. The analysis of the task's canonical phases, the historical context of early solutions, and the deep dive into state-of-the-art perception, manipulation, and sim-to-real transfer reveals a clear trajectory: a move away from rigid, model-based systems and towards flexible, data-driven, and increasingly integrated paradigms.

Convergence of Paradigms

The future of robotics does not lie in any single one of the techniques discussed, but in their intelligent fusion. The most advanced and promising systems are those that create a virtuous cycle between simulation, learning, and control. A forward-looking architecture for tackling the door negotiation challenge might involve:

- A **Vision-Language-Action (VLA) model**, pre-trained on internet-scale data, to provide high-level semantic understanding and a strong prior for task planning (e.g., interpreting the instruction "go through the wooden door").[47]
- This high-level plan would be refined by a **diffusion model-based trajectory generator**, which produces a smooth, kinematically feasible, and multi-modal plan for the robot's base and arm, conditioned on a rich scene representation from a **panoptic segmentation** network.[54]
- The policy would be trained via **Reinforcement Learning** in a **domain-randomized simulation**, where not only visual properties but also the physical dynamics of the door and the robot's actuators are varied extensively.[44]
- During execution, the policy would be guided by a **compliant controller** that uses **haptic feedback**, derived from low-cost joint current sensors, to adapt in real-time to the door's unknown dynamics, such as its weight and opening direction.[37]

This hypothetical system is no longer just "a perception system" or "a control system" but a deeply integrated framework where multiple advanced paradigms work in concert to achieve a level of robustness and generality that would be unattainable by any single component in isolation.

Persistent Challenges and Open Questions

Despite the remarkable progress, several fundamental challenges remain at the forefront of research.

- **Generalization vs. Specialization:** There is a persistent tension between the goal of creating general-purpose agents, as promised by VLAs, and the need for deep, specialized physical intuition required for contact-rich tasks. While a VLA might generalize to understand the concept of "opening" across many objects, it may lack the specific, nuanced policy needed to manipulate a stiff, heavy, or unusually shaped door handle.[49] How to best combine broad, semantic knowledge with fine-grained, task-specific motor skills is a key open question.
- **Safety and Interpretability:** As models become more powerful and complex, particularly end-to-end systems, ensuring their behavior is safe, predictable, and verifiable becomes increasingly difficult.[48] The "black box" nature of large neural networks poses a significant barrier to their deployment in safety-critical human environments. Hierarchical approaches, like the one used by DoorBot with its interpretable state machine planner, offer a promising path forward by retaining a degree of predictability and allowing for the integration of classical safety constraints.[37] Developing methods for verifying and guaranteeing the safety of large, learned policies is a critical area for future work.
- **Long-Horizon Reasoning and Recovery:** Many current learning methods, especially those that predict actions one step at a time, struggle with tasks that require long-term planning and the ability to recover from unexpected failures.[46] What should the robot do if it grasps the handle but fails to turn it? How does it decide to re-grasp or try a different strategy? The emergence of diffusion models that generate entire trajectories offers one potential solution by embedding a longer-term plan into the generated motion.[56] Hierarchical VLAs and neuro-symbolic approaches that combine learned policies with high-level, logical planners are also promising avenues for enabling more robust, multi-step reasoning and error recovery.

Future Outlook: The Role of Embodied AI and Foundation Models

Ultimately, the goal of this research extends beyond simply opening a door. It is about creating truly embodied artificial intelligence—agents that can perceive, reason about, and physically act upon the world in a competent and generalizable manner. The door negotiation task, as framed by the Smart City Competition, will continue to serve as a critical and revealing benchmark on this journey.[1]

The path forward will be heavily influenced by the continued development of foundation models. These models, trained on unprecedented scales of data, provide a powerful substrate of world knowledge and semantic understanding that can be leveraged for robotic tasks.[67] The future likely involves the development of more sophisticated world models—internal representations that allow a robot to simulate the consequences of its actions before executing them. This includes creating physics-informed learning systems that can build an intuitive understanding of dynamics from observation and interaction, much like the early work on learning door dynamics from sensor data.[69] By combining the semantic reasoning of foundation models with the physical grounding of learned dynamics and compliant control, the robotics community moves closer to creating agents that can finally navigate our world with the same ease and dexterity that we do.

Works cited

1. 2025-Smart City Competition Rulebook Episode 2 - Open the door.pdf
2. Door Pose Estimation and Robot Positioning for Autonomous Door Opening, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://robotik.informatik.uni-wuerzburg.de/telematics/download/ARW2022_Door_Detection_Final.pdf
3. [2401.07589] Semantic Scene Segmentation for Robotics - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.07589
4. An Approach for Opening Doors with a Mobile Robot Using Machine ..., accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2504-2289/7/2/69
5. Research on Door Opening Operation of Mobile Robotic Arm Based on Reinforcement Learning - MDPI, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/12/10/5204
6. Deep Learning Based Pavement Inspection Using Self-Reconfigurable Robot - MDPI, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/21/8/2595
7. Panoptic Segmentation with MaXDeepLab | ArcGIS API for Python - Esri Developer, accessed on July 7, 2025,

https://developers.arcgis.com/python/latest/guide/panoptic-segmentation-with-maxdeeplab/
8. Panoptic Segmentation: How It Works in 2025 - Label Your Data, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://labelyourdata.com/articles/panoptic-segmentation
9. Panoptic Segmentation | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338513316_Panoptic_Segmentation
10. Cascade contour-enhanced panoptic segmentation for ... - Frontiers, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neurorobotics/articles/10.3389/fnbot.2024.1489021/full
11. Indoor Navigation Assistance for Visually Impaired People via Dynamic SLAM and Panoptic Segmentation with an RGB-D Sensor - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359729798_Indoor_Navigation_Assistance_for_Visually_Impaired_People_via_Dynamic_SLAM_and_Panoptic_Segmentation_with_an_RGB-D_Sensor
12. A Panoptic Segmentation for Indoor Environments using MaskDINO: An Experiment on the Impact of Contrast, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://elcvia.cvc.uab.cat/article/view/1861
13. Panoptic Segmentation for Indoor Environments using MaskDINO: An Experiment on the Impact of Contrast - DDD UAB, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/elcvia/elcvia_a2025v24n1/elcvia_a2025v24n1p1.pdf
14. Multi-view Consistent 3D Panoptic Scene Understanding - AAAI Publications, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/32598/34753
15. arXiv:2503.18107v1 [cs.CV] 23 Mar 2025, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2503.18107?
16. Zero-Shot 4D Lidar Panoptic Segmentation - CVPR 2025 Open Access Repository, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2025/html/Zhang_Zero-Shot_4D_Lidar_Panoptic_Segmentation_CVPR_2025_paper.html
17. CVPR Poster JRDB-PanoTrack: An Open-world Panoptic Segmentation and Tracking Robotic Dataset in Crowded Human Environments, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://cvpr.thecvf.com/virtual/2024/poster/29542
18. JRDB-PanoTrack: An Open-world Panoptic Segmentation and Tracking Robotic Dataset in Crowded Human Environments - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2404.01686v1
19. JRDB-PanoTrack: An Open-world Panoptic Segmentation and Tracking Robotic Dataset in Crowded Human Environments, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2024/papers/Le_JRDB-PanoTrack_An_Open-world_Panoptic_Segmentation_and_Tracking_Robotic_Dataset_in_CVPR_2024_paper.pdf
20. 6D Pose Estimation of Objects: Recent Technologies and Challenges - MDPI, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/11/1/228
21. Any6D: Model-free 6D Pose Estimation of Novel Objects - arXiv, accessed on July

7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2503.18673v1
22. 6D Pose Estimation using RGB - Papers With Code, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://paperswithcode.com/task/6d-pose-estimation
23. Pose Estimation - Computer Vision and Learning Lab Heidelberg, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://hci.iwr.uni-heidelberg.de/vislearn/research/scene-understanding/pose-estimation/
24. A Survey of 6DoF Object Pose Estimation Methods for Different Application Scenarios - PMC, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10893425/
25. arXiv:2502.01312v1 [cs.CV] 3 Feb 2025, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2502.01312?
26. Any6D: Model-free 6D Pose Estimation of Novel Object - CVPR 2025, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://cvpr.thecvf.com/virtual/2025/poster/32502
27. Deep Learning Based 6D Pose Estimation of Unknown Objects - Preprints.org, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202502.1483/v1
28. CVPR Poster Pos3R: 6D Pose Estimation for Unseen Objects Made Easy, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://cvpr.thecvf.com/virtual/2025/poster/35115
29. Force control of manipulators, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://ocw.snu.ac.kr/sites/default/files/NOTE/Chap11_Force%20control%20of%20manipulators.pdf
30. Compliant Force Control for Robots: A Survey - MDPI, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/13/13/2204
31. Force Control in Robotics: A Review of Applications - Coalesce Research Group, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://crgjournals.com/robotics-and-mechanical-engineering/articles/force-control-in-robotics-a-review-of-applications
32. Variable Impedance Control and Learning—A Review - Frontiers, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/robotics-and-ai/articles/10.3389/frobt.2020.590681/full
33. Trends in Utilizing AI To Complement Integrated Force Control, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.amtonline.org/article/trends-in-utilizing-ai-to-complement-integrated-force-control
34. A robotic adaptive door opening method with a combination of force ..., accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390651401_A_robotic_adaptive_door_opening_method_with_a_combination_of_force_and_vision
35. [2504.09358] DoorBot: Closed-Loop Task Planning and Manipulation for Door Opening in the Wild with Haptic Feedback - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.09358
36. Doorbot debuts at ICRA | Siebel School of Computing and Data Science | Illinois, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://siebelschool.illinois.edu/news/doorbot
37. DoorBot: Closed-Loop Task Planning and Manipulation for Door Opening in the

Wild with Haptic Feedback - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2504.09358v1
38. [ICRA'25] DoorBot: Closed-Loop Task Planning and Manipulation for Door Opening in the Wild with Haptic Feedback - GitHub, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://github.com/TX-Leo/DoorBot
39. Robot Learning from Demonstration in Robotic Assembly: A Survey - MDPI, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2218-6581/7/2/17
40. Learning to pull a door handle from human demonstration with simultaneous teaching of pose and force requirements. - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Learning-to-pull-a-door-handle-from-human-demonstration-with-simultaneous-teaching-of_fig1_311716331
41. Unsupervised Perceptual Rewards for Imitation Learning - Robotics, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.roboticsproceedings.org/rss13/p50.pdf
42. The Surprising Effectiveness of Representation Learning for Visual Imitation - Robotics, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.roboticsproceedings.org/rss18/p010.pdf
43. Deep Reinforcement Learning for Robotics: A Survey of Real-World Successes - Annual Reviews, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-control-030323-022510
44. (PDF) Research on the opening method of robotic arm based on force feedback reinforcement learning - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377617959_Research_on_the_opening_method_of_robotic_arm_based_on_force_feedback_reinforcement_learning
45. VLATest: Testing and Evaluating Vision-Language-Action Models for Robotic Manipulation, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2409.12894v2
46. Vision-Language-Action (VLA) Models: LLMs for robots | by Gaurav ..., accessed on July 7, 2025, https://medium.com/black-coffee-robotics/vision-language-action-vla-models-llms-for-robots-f60ba0b79579
47. (PDF) Vision-Language-Action Models: Concepts, Progress, Applications and Challenges, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391575814_Vision-Language-Action_Models_Concepts_Progress_Applications_and_Challenges
48. Vision-Language-Action Models: Concepts, Progress, Applications and Challenges - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2505.04769v1
49. Exploring the Limits of Vision-Language-Action Manipulations in Cross-task Generalization, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2505.15660v1
50. jonyzhang2023/awesome-embodied-vla-va-vln - GitHub, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://github.com/jonyzhang2023/awesome-embodied-vla-va-vln
51. Diffusion Models for Robotics - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390709317_Diffusion_Models_for_Robotics
52. Diffusion Models for Robotic Manipulation: A Survey - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2504.08438v1

53. arXiv:2503.00535v1 [cs.LG] 1 Mar 2025, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2503.00535?
54. PRESTO: Fast motion planning using diffusion models based on key-configuration environment representation - Yoonchang Sung, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://yoonchangsung.com/pub/presto-icra-2025.pdf
55. Simultaneous Multi-Robot Motion Planning with Projected Diffusion Models - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388791713_Simultaneous_Multi-Robot_Motion_Planning_with_Projected_Diffusion_Models
56. DIFFUSION TRAJECTORY-GUIDED POLICY: ANOVEL FRAMEWORK FOR LONG-HORIZON ROBOT MANIPU - OpenReview, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://openreview.net/pdf/d76e1960b34ea4a4ef7615e633deb9b033507270.pdf
57. Toward Generalized Sim-to-Real Transfer for Robot Learning, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://research.google/blog/toward-generalized-sim-to-real-transfer-for-robot-learning/
58. (PDF) Sim-to-Real Transfer in Robotics: Addressing the Gap ..., accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390101654_Sim-to-Real_Transfer_in_Robotics_Addressing_the_Gap_between_Simulation_and_Real-_World_Performance
59. Robotic Sim-to-Real Transfer for Long-Horizon Pick-and-Place Tasks in the Robotic Sim2Real Competition - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2503.11012
60. What exactly makes sim to real transfer a challenge in reinforcement learning? : r/robotics, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/robotics/comments/1j99vrt/what_exactly_makes_sim_to_real_transfer_a/
61. Robot Learning From Randomized Simulations: A Review - Frontiers, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/robotics-and-ai/articles/10.3389/frobt.2022.799893/full
62. Enhancing Visual Domain Randomization with Real Images for Sim-to-Real Transfer - Infocommunications, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.infocommunications.hu/documents/169298/4797540/InfocomJournal_2023_1_4_EarlyAccess.pdf
63. Robust Visual Sim-to-Real Transfer for Robotic Manipulation | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376501078_Robust_Visual_Sim-to-Real_Transfer_for_Robotic_Manipulation
64. (PDF) Sim-to-Real Transfer in Robotic Manipulation Using Domain Randomization and Meta-Learning - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392601007_Sim-to-Real_Transfer_in_Robotic_Manipulation_Using_Domain_Randomization_and_Meta-Learning
65. (PDF) Watch Less, Feel More: Sim-to-Real RL for Generalizable Articulated Object

Manipulation via Motion Adaptation and Impedance Control - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389176002_Watch_Less_Feel_More_Sim-to-Real_RL_for_Generalizable_Articulated_Object_Manipulation_via_Motion_Adaptation_and_Impedance_Control
66. Sim2Real^2 Actively Building Explicit Physics Model for Precise Articulated Object Manipulation - GitHub Pages, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://ttimelord.github.io/Sim2Real2-site/
67. Humanoid Locomotion and Manipulation: Current Progress and Challenges in Control, Planning, and Learning *co-corresponding authors - arXiv, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2501.02116v1
68. Multi-Modal Perception with Vision, Language, and Touch for Robot Manipulation - UC Berkeley EECS, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www2.eecs.berkeley.edu/Pubs/TechRpts/2025/EECS-2025-68.pdf
69. Learning the dynamics of doors for robotic manipulation - ResearchGate, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261353071_Learning_the_dynamics_of_doors_for_robotic_manipulation
70. Learning the Dynamics of Doors for Robot Manipulation - Sci-Hub, accessed on July 7, 2025, https://2024.sci-hub.se/3369/afe69cacea951e333d43cbc3ce99099d/endres2013.pdf