

1 | State of the Art and Literature Review

This chapter will present the state of the art and literature review of the topics related to this project. The topics are: Robotic Manipulator Control, Deep Reinforcement Learning in Robotic Manipulation and Mobile Manipulation, Autonomous navigation, Object Detection and Grasping.

Particular focus is on the part regarding the Mobile Manipulation, since it is the main topic of this thesis project. In particular, the potential challenges as well as possible benefits and disadvantages of using each method will be discussed.

1.1. Autonomous Navigation

1.2. Robotic Manipulator Control

Currently, the control sequence of a robotic manipulator is mainly achieved by solving inverse kinematic equations to move or position the end effector with respect to the fixed frame of reference. Robots can be controlled in open-loop or with an exteroceptive feedback. The **open-loop control** does not have external sensors or environment sensing capability, but heavily relies on highly structured environments that are very sensitively calibrated. Under this strategy, the robot arm performs by following a series of positions in memory, and moving to them at various times in their programming sequence. In some more advanced robotic systems, **exteroceptive feedback control** (closed loop system) is employed, through the use of monitoring sensors, force sensors, even vision or depth sensors, that continually monitor the robot's axes or end-effector, and associated components for position and velocity. The feedback is then compared to information stored to update the actuator command so as to achieve the desired robot behavior. Either auxiliary computers or embedded microprocessors are needed to perform interface with these associated sensors and the required computational functions. These two traditional control scenarios are both heavily dependent on hardware-based solutions [4].

Other control strategies may include **robotic embodiment** and **teleoperation**. The former is a control strategy that is based on the idea that the robotic system emulates the human body movement, for learning a task quickly, instead of relying on specific ad-hoc training and programming, as suggested in [3]. This article presents an approach to the autoprogramming of robotic assembly tasks with minimal human assistance. The approach integrates "robotic learning of assembly tasks from observation" and "robotic embodiment of learned assembly tasks in the form of skills". These skills aim to enable robots to execute difficult tasks that involve inherent uncertainties and variations, and are most useful in smart manufacturing in industrial scenarios. The robotic embodiment is associated with a dramatic reduction in the human effort required for automating robotic assembly, as well for task training.

With the advancements in modern technologies in artificial intelligence, such as deep learning, and recent developments in robotics and mechanics, both the research and industrial communities have been seeking more software based control solutions using low-cost sensors, which has less requirements for the operating environment and calibration. The key is to make minimal but effective hardware choices and focus on robust algorithms and software. Instead of hard-coding directions to coordinate all the joints, the control policy could be obtained by learning and then be updated accordingly. **Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL)** is among the most promising algorithms for this purpose because no predefined training dataset is required, which ideally suits robotic manipulation and control tasks. A reinforcement learning approach might use input from a robotic arm experiment, with different sequences of movements, or input from simulation models. Either type of dynamically generated experiential data can be collected, and used to train a Deep Neural Network (DNN) by iteratively updating specific policy parameters of a control policy network [4].

Robotic control approaches can be broadly categorized into **model-based approaches**, such as the ones using a Model Predictive Controller (MPC) and Inverse Kinematics (IK) computation, and **model-agnostic approaches**, often characterized as **data-driven methods**, including Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) and other machine learning techniques.

- **Model-based approaches** rely on explicit models of the robot's dynamics or kinematics to formulate control strategies. MPC optimizes control inputs over a prediction horizon based on the system's dynamics and constraints, while IK determines joint configurations to achieve desired end-effector poses.
- **Model-agnostic approaches** learn control policies directly from data through

interactions with the environment. These data-driven methods leverage neural networks to map observations to actions, allowing robots to adapt to complex and dynamic scenarios without requiring an explicit model.

The main differences lie in the reliance on explicit models in model-based methods, providing transparency and interpretability, versus the model-free nature of data-driven methods, offering flexibility and adaptability to diverse and evolving environments. Integrating these approaches can harness the strengths of both paradigms, combining the precision of model-based control with the adaptability of data-driven learning for enhanced robotic control capabilities in multiple scenarios and tasks.

An issue raised by the real-world application is the safety of the system while sharing the workspace with human workers. Identifying and more importantly also certifying methods how to collaborate with humans in the workspace in a safe way is one of the key points for bringing autonomous mobile robots to real industrial applications.

The following paragraphs will describe the available methods used for robotic manipulator control.

1.2.1. Mobile Manipulation

Mobile manipulators that combine base mobility with the dexterity of an articulated manipulator have gained popularity in numerous applications ranging from manufacturing and infrastructure inspection to domestic service. Deployments span a range of interaction tasks with the operational environment comprising minimal interaction tasks such as inspection and complex interaction tasks such as logistics resupply and assembly. This flexibility, offered by the redundancy, needs to be carefully orchestrated to realize enhanced performance. Thus, advanced decision-support methodologies and frameworks are crucial for successful mobile manipulation in (semi-) autonomous and teleoperation contexts. Given the enormous scope of the literature, we restrict our attention to decision-support frameworks specifically in the context of wheeled mobile manipulation. [9]

As a quick aside, a disambiguation is necessary between the often interchangeably used "**motion planning**" and "**path planning**". Although path planning only generates a path within the configuration space, motion planning generates time-indexed motion trajectories. Instead much path-following only requires spatial feasibility (e.g., obstacle avoidance), while motion planning requires compatibility with spatiotemporal constraints (engendered in dynamics of both robot and environment). It is also noteworthy that ultimately any path planning effort requires a final time parameterization into a motion planning exercise before deployment [9].

The combined controllable degrees of freedom within the kinematic-chain (from both mobile base and the articulated manipulator) presents the mobile manipulator design architecture the opportunity to address very complex tasks. However, resolving the redundancy (internal/external) is crucial to realizing this potential. As the complexity of overall mobile manipulation process increases, a **two-stage hierarchical approach** is often pursued:

1. task planning/breakdown into a series of tractable motion planning subtasks and their sequencing
2. motion planning of the high degree-of-freedom mobile manipulator within each sequenced task

It is noteworthy that the two steps (task planning and motion planning) are closely coupled and should be solved concurrently but are addressed separately from a computational tractability perspective [9].

However, a breakdown along the lines of mobile manipulator subsystems (mobile base versus manipulator versus gripper or combinations) or along the nature of the manipulation task (transportation versus grasping) feature prominently in the literature. the task-level and motion-level planning frameworks may be viewed as a form of "artificially constrained" motion planning within a higher dimensional space.

Although traditional methods have led to promising mobile manipulation skills in some specific tasks, mobile manipulations tasks require the explicit programming of hard-to-engineer behaviours and often fail in more complex tasks where the decision-making process is hard. In addition, such solutions are generally very inflexible and error-prone due to the impossibility of modelling all the uncertainty of dynamic industrial environments when those are programmed.




Figure 1.1: The continuum in the literature in regards to control methodology ranging from model-based to end-end data-driven control [9]

Mobile Manipulator for Autonomous Localization, Grasping and Precise Placement of Construction Material in a Semi-Structured Environment A starting point for mobile manipulation is the work [7], presenting the winning mobile manipulation system for the *Mohamed Bin Zayed International Robotics Challenge (MBZIRC)* held in 2020. The proposed system is comprised of a mobile wheeled base performing localization and navigation in a semi-structured environment, and a 5-DoF manipulator for grasping and precise placement of bricks in a carrier. This work was among the first to demonstrate the potentialities in mobile manipulation in a practical scenario.




Figure 1.2: The described system loading and placing building material during the MBZIRC 2020 contest. [7]

However, their approach is based on many simplifying assumptions which may be suitable as a first one of a kind robotic pick and place system in a real-world scenario and application, but is not robust enough for a more complex task. For example, the grasp-

ing pipeline is trained to handle only bricks, i.e. solid parallelepiped objects, for which the grasping pose is straightforward to compute. Furthermore, the robot is not able to autonomously decide where to place the brick, but it is only able to place it in the predefined position. Also the arm controller is quite primitive, since it doesn't handle the self collisions appropriately, and the arm is not able to avoid obstacles in its workspace.

1.2.2. Deep Reinforcement Learning - Data Driven Approach

Explicit programming is often needed in practice to account for uncertainties in the environment and sensors used, as well as to solve highly variable problems in an efficient way. Explicit behavior programming is therefore often tedious and impractical, and more flexible solutions are needed in environments where the robot must adapt to. Alternatively, data-driven approaches address the main limitations of traditional methods and propose to learn robotic behaviours from real experience, thus alleviating the cost of modelling complex behaviours. This approach allows them to use deep neural networks to model the uncertainties of the environment, which leads to a more robust controller compared to traditional ones. Unlike deep learning (DL), the reinforcement learning (RL) paradigm allows to automatically obtain the experience needed to learn robotic skills through trial-and-error and allows to learn complex decision-making policies.

With RL, the explicit modelling of the problem is no longer required since the learnt models are grounded in real experience. Recently, the combination of DL and RL, also known as Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL), has made it possible to tackle complex decision-making problems that were previously unfeasible. It combines the ability of DL to model very high dimensional data with the ability of RL to model decision-making agents through trial and error. In fact, DRL has proven to be the state-of-the-art technology for learning complex robotic behaviours through the interaction with the environment and solely guided by a reward signal [4].

While ML-based methods are generally used for offline forecasting, DRL is generally used online in sequential decision-making problems. In fact, DRL allows to autonomously learn complex control policies through trial and error and only guided by a reward signal. In the case of robotics, the most common use case is to use such algorithms to model agents capable of performing continuous control of robots.

DRL has been successfully applied in a wide variety of areas such as robotics, computer vision and gaming. Taking into account the difficulty of modelling complex decision-making robotic skills, DRL offers a promising way to take advantage of the experience gathered interacting with the environment to autonomously learn complex robotic behaviours. In

particular, the field of DRL applied to robotics has recently gained popularity due to the remarkable performance obtained in applications with high decision-making and control complexity. Applications range from manipulation, to autonomous navigation and locomotion. [2]




Figure 1.3: A schematic diagram example for robotic manipulation control using a data-driven approach such as DRL [4]

Fully Autonomous Real-World Reinforcement Learning with Applications to Mobile Manipulation A work from Berkeley AI research [8] show *ReLMM*, a model that can learn continuously on a real-world platform without any environment instrumentation, without human intervention, and without access to privileged information, such as maps, objects positions, or a global view of the environment. Their method employs a modularized policy with components for manipulation and navigation, where manipulation policy uncertainty drives exploration for the navigation controller, and the manipulation module provides rewards for navigation. They trained the policy on a room cleanup task, where the robot must navigate to and pick up items scattered on the floor. The robot learns entirely from its own sensors in a real-world environment, without any simulation and minimal human intervention. Furthermore, the entire learning process is efficient enough for real-world training. On top of this, the robot is able to continually gather data at scale and improve its performance over time, with the auto-reset functionality.




Figure 1.4: ReLMM partitions the mobile manipulator into a navigation policy and grasping policy. Both policies are rewarded when an object is grasped [8]

Although the results shown in [8] demonstrate efficient performance in the pick and place task, there are many issues circumvented by simplifying the problem. For example, the robot is very small, a modified version of Turtlebot, running in a small and contained environment. They didn't address any safety and collision issues since the platform mounted bumping sensors, and any collision would not harm the robot at all. Doing so enabled them to train the policy online without any prior simulation. Furthermore the kinematics of the mobile base and the robotic arm are very simple, and having the stereo camera mounted on top of the robotic platform allowed them to easily detect the objects on the floor. This work paves the way for more complex systems and tasks, but it is still far from being a general solution for mobile manipulation.

1.2.3. Challenges in Data-Driven approaches

Two of the most important challenges here concern **sample efficiency and generalization**. The goal of DRL in the context of robotic manipulation control is to train a deep policy neural network, to detect the optimal sequence of commands for accomplishing the task. The current state of the algorithm can include the angles of joints of the manipulator, position of the end effector, and their derivative information, like velocity and acceleration. The output of this policy network is an action indicating control commands to be implemented to each actuator, such as torques or velocity commands. When the robotic manipulator accomplishes a task, a positive reward will be generated. With these delayed and weak signals, the algorithm is expected to find out the most successful control strategy for the robotic manipulation [4].

The challenges of learning robust and versatile manipulation skills for robots with DRL are still far from being resolved satisfactorily for real-world application. Currently, robotic manipulation control with DRL may be suited to fault tolerant tasks, like picking up and placing objects, where a disaster will not be caused if the operation fails occasionally. It is

quite attractive in situations, where there is enough variation that the explicit modeling algorithm does not work [4].

However, even in this kind of applications, DRL-based methods are not widely used in real-world robotic manipulation. The reasons are multiple, including sample efficiency and generation, where more progress is still required, as both gathering experiences by interacting with the environment and collecting expert demonstrations for imitation learning are expensive procedures, especially in situations where robots are heavy, rigid and brittle, and it will cost too much if the robot is damaged in exploration. Another very important issue is **safety guarantee**. Not like simulation tasks, we need to be very careful that learning algorithms are safe, reliable and predictable in real scenarios, especially if we move to other applications that require safe and correct behaviors with high confidence, such as surgery or household robots taking care of the elder or the disabled. There are also other challenges including but not limited to the algorithm explainability, the learning speed, high-performance computational equipment requirements. [4]



Figure 1.5: KUKA robot mounted on a mobile platform for pick and place tasks in industrial environments [4]

Learning positioning policies for mobile manipulation operations with deep reinforcement learning The work proposed in [4] is a practical example of a DRL-based approach facing these challenges and the enormous limitations to overcome (as well as the potentialities). The mobile platform in figure 1.5 is used in an industrial environment for an approaching task. The robot learns to navigate itself to the desk where the target object is located, then uses the MoveIt! planner to check whether the trajectory to pick the object is feasible. The robot locates itself using AMCL and the learned policy serves as a controller for local navigation task. Their work show many shortcomings of this approach, such as the difficult integration between the DRL policy and localization package, with noise in the real environment affecting negatively the performance of the robot. As a result, the video presented shows an inefficient and jiggly movement because of the non-smooth control policy. In fact, they mention the necessity of mounting a stereo camera for navigation, in order to reduce the errors in the localization and improve the navigation of the robot.

Deep Reinforcement Learning Based Mobile Robot Navigation Using Sensor Fusion The problem of unstable and imprecise navigation with learned policies is overcome in the paper [11], which proposes a DRL-based approach for navigation in dynamic environments. The proposed method is based on the Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) algorithm, which is a model-free, off-policy actor-critic algorithm that uses deep neural networks to represent the policy and the critic functions. The proposed method is evaluated in a simulated environment where the robot learns to navigate effectively and smoothly, while avoiding unknown dynamic obstacles. This work shows the right direction towards more robust navigation and obstacle avoidance systems.

1.3. Whole-body mobile manipulator control

In most control approaches to mobile manipulation, base and manipulator operation are strictly separated such that at any given time only one primary control objective is active. This separation principle is then augmented by a switching layer that determines the currently pertinent control objectives. The advantage of such a control formulation lies in its simplicity, i.e., priorities can be separated among the arm and the base with individually designed different control algorithms employed for each subsystem [9].

Instead, we refer to **whole-body control** as a unified control framework that considers the mobile manipulator as a single system (arm manipulator mounted on a mobile wheeled/legged robot). Despite the disadvantage that unified control needs to adhere to a single control framework, it allows for the exploitation of mobile manipulation in the

true sense of the term, wherein the manipulator and mobile base can be controlled at the same time. This can lead to several advantages during task achievement and makes the robot more dynamic in terms of its capabilities. The formulation for this type of control involves considering the onboard manipulator as an extended joint space of the mobile base, where the motion controller considers both the base and manipulator state. As a result, base control can be completed simultaneously without affecting much the performance of the end-effector manipulability [9].

1.3.1. MPC+IK for articulated object manipulation

Articulated Object Interaction in Unknown Scenes with Whole-Body Mobile Manipulation In a work conducted in universities in Zurich and Toronto [5], the researchers demonstrated a successful application of whole-body control for a mobile manipulator. The proposed system introduces a two-stage architecture for autonomous interaction with large articulated objects in unknown environments.




Figure 1.6: The two-level hierarchy in the proposed framework. The object-centric planner comprises of a scene interpreter and keyframe generator. It uses perceptual information to generate task space plans. The agent-centric planner follows the computed plan while satisfying constraints and performing online collision avoidance. [5]

In the first stage, an object-centric planner focuses solely on the object, providing an action-conditional sequence of states for manipulation using RGB-D data. The second stage involves an agent-centric planner that formulates whole-body motion control as an optimal control problem, ensuring safe tracking of the generated plan, even in scenes with moving obstacles. The system proposed in [5] demonstrates effectiveness in handling complex static and dynamic kitchen settings for both wheel-based and legged mobile manipulators. A comparison with other agent-centric planners reveals a higher success rate and lower execution time. Hardware tests on a legged mobile manipulator further confirm the system's capability to interact with various articulated objects in a real kitchen. The approach combines object-centric and agent-centric planning, leveraging MPC-based solutions for improved success rates and reduced execution times, particularly in articulated object manipulation scenarios. The contributions include the extension of collision-free whole-body MPC for mobile manipulation, benchmarking in hyper-realistic simulation, and successful hardware experiments showcasing the system's real-world applicability.




Figure 1.7: Legged mobile manipulation of articulated objects in the kitchen test scenario: (a) Drawer, (b) Cabinet. Throughout the interaction, we set the robot gait schedule to trot. Only while grasping the handle, the robot enters stance mode. [5]

The work [5], published in 2022, is the first and one of a kind in successful real-world application of whole-body control using a MPC-based approach combined with IK solvers for articulated object manipulation. Furthermore, they achieved good performance in both dynamic and static real world environments, which is a very challenging task for most of the existing methods. However, the proposed method is limited mostly with respect to the grasping capabilities, which were hard-coded into the known interactive objects (in their case, the kitchen appliances handles), meaning that explicit behavior programming and tuning was needed for the grasping task. They propose data-centric methods to overcome these limitations. This research proved the feasibility of this approach, which many other researchers claimed to be unfeasible and way too complex to be implemented in real-world applications. However, it is worth noting that the proposed method is not a

general solution for all robots hardware configurations, and extending it to other robots would require a lot of effort and time, since it boils down to an optimal control problem.

1.3.2. Deep Reinforcement Learning for high DoF control

Deep Whole-Body Control: Learning a Unified Policy for Manipulation and Locomotion The research paper [1] addresses the challenges in controlling legged manipulators with attached arms, proposing a novel approach to learn a unified policy for whole-body control using deep reinforcement learning. The standard hierarchical control pipeline is critiqued for its inefficiency, requiring significant engineering to coordinate arm and leg movements. The proposed method, Regularized Online Adaptation, aims to bridge the Sim2Real gap, and Advantage Mixing is introduced to overcome local minima during training. The authors present a low-cost legged manipulator design and demonstrate that their unified policy enables dynamic and agile behaviors across various tasks.



Figure 1.8: Framework for whole-body control of a legged robot with a robot arm attached. Left half shows how whole-body control achieves larger workspace by leg bending and stretching. Right half shows different real-world tasks, including wiping whiteboard, picking up a cup, pressing door-open buttons, placing, throwing a cup into a garbage bin and picking in clustered environments. [1]

The paper emphasizes the limitations of current hierarchical models, advocating for learning-based methods like reinforcement learning to reduce engineering efforts and improve generalization. However, it critiques existing learning-based approaches for semi-coupling legs and arms, highlighting issues of coordination, error propagation, and non-smooth motions. The proposed unified policy not only allows coordination but also enhances the capabilities of individual components, such as the robot dynamically adjusting

leg movements to extend the arm's reach [1].

The challenges in scaling standard sim2real reinforcement learning to whole-body control are discussed, including the high degree of freedom, conflicting objectives, and dependencies between manipulation and locomotion. The paper introduces a hardware setup for a low-cost, fully untethered legged manipulator and outlines a method for learning a unified policy to control both legs and the arm. The authors leverage causal structure in action space and regularization for domain adaptation to enhance stability and speed up learning. The proposed method is evaluated through tasks like teleoperation and vision-guided tracking, demonstrating successful picking tasks using visual feedback from an RGB camera. Comparative analysis with a baseline method (MPC+IK) across various pick-up tasks measures success rate, average time to completion, IK failure rate, and self-collision rate. The authors conclude by acknowledging the preliminary nature of their results and highlight potential extensions, such as incorporating vision-based policies and addressing challenges in general-purpose object interaction [1].




Figure 1.9: Whole-body control framework. During training, a unified policy is learned by conditioned on environment extrinsics. During deployment, the adaptation module is reused without any real-world fine-tuning. The robot can be commanded in various modes including teleoperation, vision and demonstration replay. [1]

As the authors of the paper [1] state, the main limitation (but also the core idea behind the control input) is the fact that the robot requires a human operator to provide the robot objectives, which are then translated into the control inputs. In fact, the robot is not able

to autonomously decide what to do, but it is only able to either track the end effector pose given by the human operator, or to track the April marker in the human's hand. This limitation can be overcome with appropriate task training, but it is not a general solution. However, the proposed method is very promising, since it is able to achieve very good results in the robot body-hand coordination, which is a very challenging task for most of the existing methods. The movements look very smooth and natural, and the robot is able to perform simple task in dynamic environment. The April marker tracking mode shows also the effectiveness of the use of a stereo camera for tracking the objective, meaning that promising results can be achieved in other tasks. This research used Isaac Gym as a simulation environment, which proved to be very powerful for training and overcoming the simulation-to-reality gap.

Multi-Task Reinforcement Learning based Mobile Manipulation Control for Dynamic Object Tracking and Grasping This research paper [10] addresses the challenges associated with agile control of mobile manipulators in unstructured environments, particularly focusing on dynamic object tracking and grasping. The authors propose a multi-task reinforcement learning-based control framework that aims to achieve general dynamic object tracking and grasping capabilities. The framework utilizes various dynamic trajectories as a training set, incorporating random noise and dynamics randomization to enhance policy generalization. Experimental results demonstrate the trained policy's ability to adapt to unseen dynamic trajectories, achieving a 0.1m tracking error and a 75% grasping success rate for dynamic objects. The proposed method is successfully deployed on a real mobile manipulator, showcasing its potential for real-world applications. The contributions of this work include the development of a versatile control framework and its successful deployment in unstructured environments, addressing the challenges of mobile manipulation with dynamic objects.




Figure 1.10: (a) Dynamic trajectory tracking task with a mobile manipulator. (b) Dynamic object grasping task with a mobile manipulator. (c) Several basic trajectories as multi-task RL training set. (d) Random trajectories as multi-task RL testing set.[10]

In [10] they use the proximal policy optimization (PPO) algorithm to train and learn a policy, but the method is general and can be applied to most on/off-policy RL algorithms. PPO is one of the state-of-the-art RL algorithms that is easy to implement and tune, and performs relatively well. The policy is learned through a deep neural network.




Figure 1.11: (a) In the multi-task RL training, six basic trajectories are used as the task training set to train a general policy. To improve the robustness, gaussian noise is added to the action and observation space in each training episode. (b) The RL testing includes simulation and real world for policy evaluation.[10]

The images above show the training and testing process of the proposed method. They created a realistic simulation environment which enabled efficient parallel training of the policy, and simulation of the dynamic objects and tracking. They also managed to correctly transfer the learned policy to the real robot, which is a very challenging task for most of the existing methods. Artificial noise addition was essential for the training process, since it allowed the policy to generalize better to unseen trajectories and environments.




Figure 1.12: Snapshots of the real robot experiments. The upper row shows a mobile tracking process in which the end-effector try to track the target trajectory. The lower row shows a mobile grasping process in which the object moves randomly. [10]

Overall, this research provides valuable insights and a practical solution for advancing the field of agile mobile manipulation. This is one of the very few works that addresses the problem of dynamic object tracking and grasping, which is a very challenging task for most of the existing models, due to the difficulty in modeling and the extensive training required. Although the model doesn't show very high success rate in the tasks shown, it shows promising results and a direction of research that can be further explored.

1.3.3. Comparison of Model-Based and Data-Driven approaches

Approach	Model-Based	Data-Driven
Control Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model Predictive Controllers (MPC) • Whole-Body Inverse Kinematics (IK) Solver 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) • Imitation Learning
Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires explicit modeling of system dynamics and kinematics • Suitable for simple tasks, unsuitable for complex tasks • Planning over end-effector pose or grasp in the workspace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No explicit modeling of system dynamics • Learning from experience in simulation environments • High-level planning over tasks, object detection, manipulation or other objectives
Interpretability and Adaptability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit modeling implies high system interpretability • Adaptable to many tasks but requires behaviors re-programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learned policies have very limited interpretability • Learning from experience allows high adaptability, given proper GPU-parallelized training
Advantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small simulation-to-reality gap • Adaptable to many tasks but with explicit programming • No training required • Safer operation due to explicit physical limitations modeling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No explicit modeling of system dynamics required • Learning from experience allows high generalization • Can perform well in unknown or dynamic environments • Can provide high body-hand movement coordination
Disadvantages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires very accurate physical models for seamless integration • Doesn't perform well in complex tasks or dynamic environments • Difficult to adapt to complex tasks (low generalization) • High computational cost for the solver in high DoF systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires large amounts of training data and extensive training • Very long time needed to fine tune the hyperparameters • May result in unstable and jiggly movements • May result in unsafe behaviors in real-world applications if not properly trained • Suffers a lot from the simulation-to-reality gap

Table 1.1: Summary of the main differences between model-based and data-driven approaches for robotic manipulator controls

1.4. Object Detection and Grasping

Grasp planning for mobile manipulators is a challenging problem that has been dealt with in several ways in the literature. On the one hand, grasping requires coordination within a very challenging high-dimensional constrained configuration space (mobile base / manipulator / gripper). Further, grasping requires detecting object, constructing data-driven representation, determining the gripper approach-vector, and computing all the mobile manipulator's plans in the presence of uncertainty. Many of the traditional grasp planners (designed for stationary manipulators) can be used for mobile manipulators once the mobile base has been fixed. However, a generic grasping pipeline is desirable, which achieves arm-base-gripper coordinated grasping given the information about object pose and the operating environment. Such concurrent manipulator / mobile base motion approaches are being explored till grasping is successful or at least until the gripper reaches the objects (and only manipulator moves for grasping). This may not be optimal as grasping can happen with the mobile base and the manipulator moving when the gripper is closing [9].

Autonomous Robotic Manipulation: Real-Time, Deep-Learning Approach for Grasping of Unknown Objects The work [6] proposes a novel approach for grasping unknown objects. The researchers present a full grasping pipeline proposing a real-time data-driven deep-learning approach for robotic grasping of unknown objects using MATLAB and deep convolutional neural networks. The proposed approach employs RGB-D image data acquired from an eye-in-hand camera centering the object of interest in the field of view using visual servoing. Their approach aims at reducing propagation errors and eliminating the need for complex hand tracking algorithm, image segmentation, or 3D reconstruction, which are often either infeasible or too prone to errors. The proposed approach is able to efficiently generate reliable multi-view object grasps regardless of the geometric complexity and physical properties of the object in question. The system employed is a 7 DoF robotic manipulator controlled with an IK solver, and a parallel gripper with overactuated fingers.




Figure 1.13: Grasp generation results: comparison between grasp generated by the GG-CNN with and without RGB-D image preprocessing for shiny and black objects [6]

One of the main limitations of the approach in [6] is the fact that the grasping pipeline is implemented in MATLAB, therefore hardly portable and hardly replicable on other robotic hardware. Furthermore grasping with a parallel gripper is very limited, and the approach can work well with a limited set of objects. The authors demonstrated a good grasping capability with many different and unknown objects, but the approach cannot be generalized well without creating a multi-view perspective of the target object, in order to gain more understanding of the object's shape and geometry. Although the approach is very promising, there is room for improvement, especially in the CNN for grasping pose detection, which is the core of the grasping pipeline.

TODO: review of different grasping methods, object semantic understanding via multiple views, object detection and pose estimation, grasping pipelines with heuristics, unknown objects

Bibliography

- [1] Zipeng Fu, Xuxin Cheng, and Deepak Pathak. “Deep Whole-Body Control: Learning a Unified Policy for Manipulation and Locomotion”. In: *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*. 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.10044>. arXiv: 2210.10044. URL: <https://manipulation-locomotion.github.io/>.
- [2] Ander Iriondo et al. “Learning positioning policies for mobile manipulation operations with deep reinforcement learning”. In: *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics* 14.9 (Sept. 2023), pp. 3003–3023. DOI: 10.1007/s13042-023-01815-8. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13042-023-01815-8>.
- [3] Sanghoon Ji et al. “Learning-Based Automation of Robotic Assembly for Smart Manufacturing”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE* 109.4 (2021), pp. 423–440. DOI: 10.1109/JPROC.2021.3063154.
- [4] Rongrong Liu et al. “Deep Reinforcement Learning for the Control of Robotic Manipulation: A Focussed Mini-Review”. In: *Robotics* 10 (2021), p. 22. DOI: 10.3390/robotics10010022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/robotics10010022>.
- [5] Mayank Mittal et al. “Articulated Object Interaction in Unknown Scenes with Whole-Body Mobile Manipulation”. In: *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. 2022, pp. 1647–1654. DOI: 10.1109/IROS47612.2022.9981779. URL: <https://www.pair.toronto.edu/articulated-mm/>.
- [6] Malak H. Sayour, Sharbel E. Kozhaya, and Samer S. Saab. “Autonomous Robotic Manipulation: Real-Time, Deep-Learning Approach for Grasping of Unknown Objects”. In: *Journal of Robotics* 2022 (June 2022). ISSN: 1687-9600. DOI: 10.1155/2022/2585656. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/2585656>.
- [7] Petr Štibinger et al. “Mobile Manipulator for Autonomous Localization, Grasping and Precise Placement of Construction Material in a Semi-Structured Environment”.

- In: *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* 6.2 (Apr. 2021), pp. 2595–2602. DOI: 10.1109/LRA.2021.3061377.
- [8] Charles Sun et al. “Fully Autonomous Real-World Reinforcement Learning with Applications to Mobile Manipulation”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Robot Learning*. Ed. by Aleksandra Faust, David Hsu, and Gerhard Neumann. Vol. 164. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, Nov. 2022, pp. 308–319. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v164/sun22a.html>.
 - [9] Shantanu Thakar et al. “A Survey of Wheeled Mobile Manipulation: A Decision-Making Perspective”. In: *Journal of Mechanisms and Robotics* 15.2 (July 2022), p. 020801. ISSN: 1942-4302. DOI: 10.1115/1.4054611. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4054611>.
 - [10] Cong Wang et al. “Multi-Task Reinforcement Learning based Mobile Manipulation Control for Dynamic Object Tracking and Grasping”. In: *2022 7th Asia-Pacific Conference on Intelligent Robot Systems (ACIRS)*. July 2022, pp. 34–40. DOI: 10.1109/ACIRS55390.2022.9845515.
 - [11] Kejian Yan, Jianqi Gao, and Yanjie Li. “Deep Reinforcement Learning Based Mobile Robot Navigation Using Sensor Fusion”. In: *2023 42nd Chinese Control Conference (CCC)*. 2023, pp. 4125–4130. DOI: 10.23919/CCC58697.2023.10240555.