A Survey on Reinforcement Learning Applications in SLAM

1st Mohammad Dehghani Tezerjani
Computer Science and Engineering
University of North Texas
Denton, TX, USA
mike.degany@unt.edu

2nd Mohammad Khoshnazar
Computer Science and Engineering
University of Bremen
Bremen, Germany
Khoshnam@uni-bremen.de

3rd Mohammadhamed Tangestanizadeh
Computer Science and engineering
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California, USA
mtangest@ucsc.edu

4th Qing Yang
Computer Science and Engineering
University of North Texas
Denton, TX, USA
qing.yang@unt.edu

Abstract—The emergence of mobile robotics, particularly in the automotive industry, introduces a promising era of enriched user experiences and adept handling of complex navigation challenges. The realization of these advancements necessitates a focused technological effort and the successful execution of numerous intricate tasks, particularly in the critical domain of Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM). Various artificial intelligence (AI) methodologies, such as deep learning and reinforcement learning, present viable solutions to address the challenges in SLAM. This study specifically explores the application of reinforcement learning in the context of SLAM. By enabling the agent (the robot) to iteratively interact with and receive feedback from its environment, reinforcement learning facilitates the acquisition of navigation and mapping skills, thereby enhancing the robot's decision-making capabilities. This approach offers several advantages, including improved navigation proficiency, increased resilience, reduced dependence on sensor precision, and refinement of the decision-making process. The findings of this study, which provides an overview of reinforcement learning's utilization in SLAM, reveal significant advancements in the field. The investigation also highlights the evolution and innovative integration of these techniques.

Index Terms—Simultaneous localization and mapping; Reinforcement learning; Path planning; Loop closure detection; Active SLAM

I. INTRODUCTION

Mobile robotics involves designing, constructing, operating, and utilizing robots to perform tasks in dynamic, non-fixed environments. These robots are usually designed to be mobile and autonomous, capable of operating without direct human control [1]. Autonomous driving vehicles are one of the specific applications of mobile robotics, focusing on developing vehicles that can navigate and operate on their own in real-world environments, such as roads and highways. These vehicles use a combination of sensors, cameras, radar, Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), as well as advanced algorithms to perceive their surroundings and make decisions about how to navigate safely to their destination [2]. Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) is a key technology in Mobile Robotics and Autonomous Driving (MRAD) [3]. SLAM enables a robot to navigate and create a map in an unknown environment by continuously observing map features to determine its own position and orientation [4, 5]. Localization enables the robot to determine its position within an environment, while mapping involves constructing a representation of the environment (the map) as the robot explores it [6]. The ability to accurately localize a robot using a map of its surroundings is essential for tasks ranging from spatial exploration to autonomous driving, as it provides the necessary information for predicting obstacle movements and determining optimal maneuvers [7, 8]. Accurate localization in robotics is a complex task due to the inherent noise in sensor measurements. Addressing outliers, occlusions, and sensor failures, as well as resolving scale differences between the map and robot motion, is essential for successful localization [4]. Additionally, detecting revisited locations, known as loop closures, presents a challenge due to perceptual aliasing and sensor limitations. It is crucial to maintain a consistent estimate of the robot's pose over time, especially in dynamic environments [6, 9]. Real-time performance is also a key consideration in ensuring effective robot navigation and localization [10, 11]. Mapping presents several challenges that require attention to ensure accuracy and reliability. One such challenge is aligning sensor measurements with map features, which demands careful consideration and precise alignment [3, 12]. Furthermore, extracting meaningful features from sensor data, such as point clouds and images, is essential for constructing an accurate map [13]. It is also crucial to accurately estimate vehicle motion during mapping and to identify revisited locations to close loops in the map [14]. Choosing an appropriate map representation, whether it's 2D grids, 3D point clouds, or another format tailored to specific mapping needs, is another key consideration. Finally,

maintaining map consistency as new data is incorporated is important for preserving its accuracy and reliability over time [6]. These challenges drive research and innovation in SLAM algorithms, aiming to improve accuracy, robustness, and efficiency. Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithms are integral to SLAM, as they enable robots to navigate and map their environment in real-time. Specifically, Reinforcement Learning (RL) offers promising opportunities for improving exploration, localization, and map building in SLAM applications [15]. The integration of RL in the context of MRAD aims to offer a systematic approach for robots or vehicles to acquire the skills needed for navigating environments and making informed decisions using sensor data [16, 17]. Therefore, this study explores the practical uses of RL within the context of SLAM. The key contributions are detailed as follows: • The concepts of SLAM were meticulously categorized into two distinct parts: passive and active. This nuanced classification enhances the analysis of SLAM approaches in studies, offering a clearer framework for evaluating and comparing different methodologies. • The sources of data utilized for input into the SLAM algorithm have been examined. • RL in SLAM is divided into four main categories: path planning, loop closure detection, environment exploration, obstacle detection, and Active SLAM. This classification enables researchers to explore the various applications of RL in SLAM and stimulates the development of new ideas for improvement. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, types of SLAM approaches are introduced. Section 3 describes RL and its operational principles. Section 4 focuses on reviewing and categorizing studies that have utilized RL in the context of SLAM. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

II. WHAT IS SLAM

The SLAM technology was first introduced at a conference in San Francisco in 1986. It combines map recognition and initialization to achieve simultaneous positioning and map creation [18]. SLAM is a collection of approaches utilized by robots to autonomously determine their location and map the surrounding environment as they traverse through it. The concept of SLAM can be further categorized into two main components: (1) localization, which involves estimating the robot's position in relation to the map, and (2) mapping, which involves reconstructing the environment using visual, visual–inertial, and laser sensors mounted on the robot [19]. In modern SLAM techniques, a graphical approach is commonly adopted, specifically a bipartite graph where nodes represent either the robot or landmark poses, and edges represent measurements between poses or poses and landmarks. Imagine a robot characterized by a state vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that defines its position and orientation (pose). The primary aim of the SLAM issue is to determine the optimal state vector x^*, minimizing the measurement error $e_i(x)$ weighted by the covariance matrix $\Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^{lxl}$, which accounts for the uncertainty

in pose measurements, with l representing the state vector's dimension, as illustrated in Equation (1) [20].

$$x^* = \arg\min_x \sum_t e_t^T(x)\Omega_t e_t(x) \quad (1)$$

There are two primary approaches to SLAM: Active SLAM and passive SLAM [21], which are discussed in the following.

A. Passive SLAM approach

Passive SLAM systems do not involve navigating a robot to explore unfamiliar environments. Instead, they rely on predetermined routes or manual guidance and do not actively adapt to changes in the environment. Passive SLAM is particularly suitable for scenarios where precise robot motion is not critical, focusing instead on effective mapping and localization [22]. This approach facilitates more predictable and controlled movement, which can be advantageous in specific applications. However, it also implies that the robot may lack the ability to autonomously adjust to unforeseen changes in its environment without additional intervention [18]. Passive SLAM separates the estimation of robot motion from map estimation. Manual control or adherence to predetermined waypoints is characteristic of the robot's operation [4]. In passive SLAM, Particle Filters (PF) are commonly used to estimate robot poses and build maps. PF is a probabilistic method that represents the posterior distribution using a set of particles (samples), where each particle represents a potential robot pose and map hypothesis [23].

B. Active SLAM approach

Active SLAM involves surveying the environment using sensors that are in motion, while simultaneously estimating the status of these sensors and constructing a map. Active SLAM setups use sensor readings as input and generate real-time decisions or actions to influence future measurements [24, 25]. Typically, it involves a three-part process [26]:

1) The recognition of all potential locations for exploration (ideally infinite),
2) The calculation of the efficacy or benefit derived from the actions that would transition the robot from its present coordinates to each of those locations,
3) The choice and implementation of the most advantageous course of action.

Active SLAM includes modules for planning waypoints and generating trajectories. It uses methods from information theory, optimal control theory, and RL to actively steer the robot towards its destination [4]. We discussed this approach in Section 5.3 and explored the RL application in Active SLAM.

III. DATA SOURCE

SLAM in autonomous driving typically involves integrating data from multiple sensors to create a comprehensive

Fig. 1. Input data in SLAM.

perception of the surroundings [27, 28]. These sensors include LiDAR, cameras, GNSS/INS (Global Navigation Satellite System / Inertial Navigation System), IMUs (Inertial Measurement Units), wheel odometry, and radar. The sensor measurements are combined to provide a detailed and accurate understanding of the environment [23]. Furthermore, control commands from the vehicle's actuators such as steering, throttle, and brakes affect the robot's movement. RL techniques can optimize these control maneuvers to improve SLAM performance [4, 23]. SLAM algorithms usually start with an initial estimate of the robot's pose, derived from sources like GNSS or wheel odometry [29]. RL approaches can refine this pose estimation throughout the SLAM process, enhancing accuracy and reliability [30]. Figure 1 illustrates the input data for SLAM, offering a visual representation to aid in understanding the initial parameters of the system.

LiDAR: LiDAR, a remote sensing technology, uses laser light to measure distances and create detailed 3D maps of environments [31]. By emitting laser beams and calculating the time it takes for them to reflect off objects, LiDAR generates accurate point cloud data. This data is instrumental in creating comprehensive maps, identifying obstacles, and ensuring collision-free paths [32]. Additionally, LiDAR enhances precise localization by matching current scans with previously mapped features. LiDAR scans are thus pivotal for both mapping and obstacle detection, providing critical support for autonomous navigation systems [33].

Cameras: Cameras capture images of the surroundings, extracting visual features such as key points and edges to aid in robot localization and map construction [34]. These images are crucial for visual odometry and feature extraction, enabling the estimation of motion by tracking features across consecutive frames. Additionally, cameras help identify previously visited locations and contribute to the creation of detailed 3D maps [35].

GNSS/INS: GNSS offers global positioning information via satellite signals, providing data on latitude, longitude, and altitude. In contrast, INS utilizes accelerometers and gyro-

scopes to estimate position and orientation by measuring accelerations and angular rates [23]. GNSS delivers an initial position estimate, while INS ensures continuous tracking and compensates for GNSS signal outages, maintaining accurate navigation even in challenging conditions [36].

IMU: IMUs measure both accelerations and angular rates by combining accelerometers and gyroscopes to capture linear acceleration and angular velocity. IMUs provide short-term motion estimates, and their data is integrated with other sensors, such as LiDAR and cameras, to enhance the robustness of SLAM systems [37].

Radar: Radar sensors identify objects using radio waves, making them particularly valuable for obstacle detection in challenging weather conditions. In SLAM systems, radar sensors are enhancing accuracy, especially under poor lighting or occlusions [38]. The number of radar sensors used in a SLAM system varies depending on the application, requirements, and desired accuracy [39]. Some systems utilize a single radar sensor for both motion estimation and environmental mapping. This approach is particularly beneficial in low-light conditions or adverse weather conditions, where other sensors such as cameras or LiDAR may have limitations. Advanced SLAM systems may use multiple radar sensors to improve robustness against sensor failures and cover a full 360-degree field of view [40]. Combining data from multiple radars enhances accuracy and reduces blind spots [41]. Radar sensors are often integrated with other sensors to provide complementary information [42]:

- **LiDAR**: Offers long-range detection and high-resolution mapping.
- **Cameras**: Radar-camera fusion helps handle challenging lighting conditions.
- **IMU**: Improves motion estimation. Ongoing research is focused on finding optimal configurations for radar-based SLAM, balancing factors such as cost, power consumption, and sensor placement [43].

Wheel odometry: Wheel odometry is a fundamental localization technique that uses wheel encoders to measure the rotation of a robot's wheels, allowing it to estimate incremental movement in terms of distance and direction [44]. This method is computationally inexpensive and widely available, providing continuous pose updates as the robot moves [45]. Encoders track the distance traveled, offering incremental pose updates, but they can accumulate errors over time due to factors like wheel slippage and uneven terrain. Encoder readings are also subject to noise, which can impact accuracy [46]. In SLAM systems, wheel odometry is commonly used as one of the sensor inputs [44]. RL algorithms can learn to integrate wheel odometry information for pose estimation. In RL-based SLAM, agents are trained to fuse wheel odometry data with other sensor modalities, such as LiDAR, cameras, and IMUs, to enhance overall system robustness and accuracy [27].

IV. REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

To effectively analyze data and develop intelligent automated applications, a solid understanding of RL is crucial [47]. In RL, an agent learns through interactions with its environment and receiving rewards [48]. The agent explores various actions to determine which yield the highest rewards over time. Given that actions can have lasting impacts, the return value R, defined by the reward function, is computed by summing discounted future rewards across episodes, as shown in Equation (2) where γ denotes the discount factor, and $r(s_t, a_t)$ represents the reward for action a_t in state s_t.

$$R = \sum_{i=0}^{T} \gamma^i r(s_i, a_i)$$

Each state is assigned a state value $V(s)$, which represents the expected return an agent can obtain by selecting actions. Equation (3) illustrates how $V(s)$ is computed.

$$V(s) = \mathbb{E}[R|s_0 = s] \text{ or } V(s) = \mathbb{E}[r(s) + \gamma V(s_{\text{next}})] \quad (2)$$

The expectation symbol E represents the value of a state as the expected return while following a specific policy. The value of a state, denoted as $r(s)$, is the total expected sum of rewards achievable in that state [49]. Additionally, each action within a state has an action value $Q(s, a)$ determined by the Bellman equation (Equation 4) [50].

$$Q(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[R|s_0 = s, a_0 = a]$$
$$\text{or } Q(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[r(s, a) + \gamma Q(s_{\text{next}}, a_{\text{next}})] \quad (3)$$

The state-action value, or Q-value, is the expected return of taking a specific action a_0 in a state s_0 and then following the policy throughout the episode. The relationship between state value and Q-value can be described by Equation (5).

$$V(s) = \sum_{a \in A} \pi(a|s) Q(s, a)$$

Given a policy π that selects action a in state s, a Q-table can be constructed for a Markov Decision Problem (MDP) where all states and actions are known and limited. In this process, the agent takes actions and updates the Q-value in the Q-table based on the return received from the environment. The Q-value is updated using the Equation (6), Where the updated Q value, denoted as Q', is calculated using a learning rate represented by α [48].

$$Q'(s_t, a_t) = Q(s_t, a_t) + \alpha([r_t + \gamma Q \max(s_{t+1}, a_{t+1})] - [Q(s_t, a_t)]) \quad (4)$$


Fig. 2. Reinforcement learning.

Figure 2 illustrates an agent that learns from its environment using a RL algorithm. The algorithm updates the policy based on the actions taken, with the environment providing feedback in the form of rewards and the next state. This information is then used by the RL algorithm to improve the selection of actions.

A. Deep Reinforcement Learning

Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) is a ML approach that combines reinforcement learning with deep neural networks [51]. It differs from traditional methods by learning feature representations directly from raw data, such as images and sensor readings, rather than relying on handcrafted features. Deep neural networks, like Deep Q-Networks (DQN) or policy networks, are used to approximate the value function or policy in RL tasks [52]. This approach has shown great promise in solving complex decision-making problems and has been applied in various fields such as robotics, gaming, and autonomous systems [49, 53].

V. CLASSIFICATION OF EXISTING METHODS

RL has many applications within SLAM, an intersection rich with research endeavors. This study reviews the diverse applications of RL within SLAM, drawing upon an array of articles for insights and analysis. These applications span various domains, including path planning, loop closure detection, and Active SLAM, as delineated in Figure 3, underscoring the multifaceted utility of RL techniques in advancing SLAM methodologies.

A. Path planning

Robot path planning technology, pivotal in robotics research, optimizes criteria such as minimizing work costs and finding the shortest route, ensuring efficient navigation while avoiding obstacles [54]. Path planning methods can generally be categorized into traditional and AI approaches. When considering environmental information, these methods can be further classified into global planning with known environmental data and local planning with unknown environmental

information [55]. Wang [56] developed a visual SLAM system utilizing the ORB-SLAM3 framework. The system's primary function involves the generation of a dense point cloud map. Subsequently, this dense point cloud map from the visual SLAM system is converted into an octomap, followed by a projection transformation to the grid map. The next stage involves the development of a path planning algorithm rooted in RL. Experimental comparisons were conducted among the Q-learning algorithm, the DQN algorithm, and the SARSA algorithm. The outcomes showed that the DQN algorithm exhibits the swiftest convergence rate and superior performance, particularly in intricate environments characterized by high dimensions. Nam et al. [30] introduced a novel framework for the navigation of mobile robots, integrating two established approaches (SLAM and DRL), to improve operational efficiency. The framework leverages SLAM to construct maps and pinpoint the robot's coordinates, while employing an Ant Colony Optimization (ACO) algorithm to formulate a predetermined route. In scenarios characterized by varying obstacles within the environment, the framework adopts DRL-based techniques for localized path planning. Furthermore, the suggested framework conducts a comparative analysis and assessment of the efficacy of three distinct DRL-based navigation algorithms: Deep Generative Network (DGN), Twin Delayed Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (TD3), and Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO).

1) Environment exploration: The robot exploration model integrates various exploration methods and technologies, empowering robots to autonomously navigate, map, and explore unfamiliar environments efficiently. It leverages advancements in robotics, AI, and sensor technology to seamlessly fulfill these objectives [57]. Chen et al. [55] introduced a DRL-based robot exploration model designed for navigating unknown environments without any collisions. This innovative approach integrates SLAM technology and a DRL dual-mode structure to address local-minimum issues. After 30 training rounds, the model successfully achieved zero collisions and minimized repeated exploration. It surpasses existing methods for exploring unknown environments by a margin of less than 5Li et al. [58] examined the concept of automatic exploration within unfamiliar environments through the application of DRL alongside a graph-based SLAM technique known as Karto SLAM. The proposed framework incorporates decision-making, planning, and mapping components that make use of a deep neural network to acquire knowledge pertaining to exploration strategies.

2) Obstacle detection: The obstacle detection model involves the development of algorithms and technologies to enable vehicles to detect obstacles in their surroundings accurately and in real time to ensure safe navigation and collision avoidance [59]. Wen et al. [60] used a fully convolutional residual networks method to identify road obstacles. The dueling DQN algorithm is also used in designing the robot's path. A two-dimensional map of the route is created by FastSLAM. According to Nam et al. study in [61], SLAM algorithms are effective for mapping in the environment and

DRL algorithms can find dynamic obstacles well, but SLAM algorithms and DRL algorithms alone do not perform perfectly. In this method, SLAM algorithms combine data from several sensors, including LiDAR, to make a map of the environment. The ACO algorithm is used for planning to find the shortest optimal global path. DRL algorithms help the robot in planning the local path. In this way, the robot can make decisions based on its current situation and goal. Fayjie et al. [62] used DRL for autonomous navigation and obstacle avoidance in self-driving cars. This study uses camera and laser sensor data and a trained neural network for driving. The deep Q-network approach has also been implemented for autonomous driving simulation tests.

B. Loop closure detection

Loop closure, a crucial process in robotics and autonomous vehicles, addresses inaccuracies in sensor measurements [63]. It also tackles various issues affecting reliability, such as drifting, acceleration changes, and weather conditions. By detecting when a vehicle revisits a previously visited location, loop closure helps to correct any accumulated errors in the system's map or position estimate [64]. This process is essential for ensuring the accuracy and credibility of the vehicle's navigation system and overall performance [65]. Iqbal et al. [66] investigated loop closure detection in simulated environments using a DRL approach. In this study, training was improved with entropy maximization for batch size selection. Furthermore, Bag-of-Words (BOW) method is used for loop closure and localization in maps, which represent an image using locally created features. DRL trains the probabilistic policy for loop closure detection. Furthermore, Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and region-based features are used for landmark proposal and matching. In another study, Iqbal [67] presented two approaches to solve the problem of loop closure detection. The first approach uses statistical and clustering methods. In the second approach using deep reinforcement learning, loop closure detection is considered as a reward-driven optimization process. The proposed structure is implemented in a simulated grid environment. After generating the data, the learning process is done for the agent and the agent learns to detect the loop closure in variant environments.

C. RL in Active SLAM

As mentioned in Section 2, Active SLAM is a method used by robots and autonomous systems to actively explore their surroundings. This approach allows the system to continuously enhance its understanding of the environment while also updating its position in real-time [68]. By making informed decisions on where to move next, the robot can effectively gather the most valuable data for mapping and localization purposes. This dynamic technique enables the system to adapt to changing environments and efficiently navigate through unknown areas [69, 70]. Fang et al. [71] harnessesed the power of MuZero to improve agents' planning abilities for joint Active SLAM and navigation tasks. These tasks involve navigating through unfamiliar environments while creating a

map and determining the agent's location simultaneously. The paper introduces the SLAMuZero framework, which combines SLAM with the tree-search-based MuZero. SLAMuZero employs an explicit encoder-decoder architecture for mapping, along with a prediction function to assess policy and value using the generated map. The integration of SLAMuZero leads to a substantial decrease in training time. Placed et al. [68] utilized deep Q-learning architecture with laser measurements for navigation and focused on reducing uncertainty in robot localization and map representation. Trained agents reduce uncertainty, transfer knowledge to new maps and learn to navigate and explore in simulations. Pei et al. [72] introduced Active relative localization for multi-agent SLAMs. The task allocation algorithm is based on DRL and utilizes a novel Deep Q Network (MAS-DQN) to enhance collaboration efficiency in SLAM. Alcalde et al. [73] used two agents namely completeness-based and uncertainty-based agents. According to the results, these agents completed maps without collisions. The uncertainty-based agent generated longer paths but better maps, and the Active SLAM DRL solution improved performance in complex environments. Table 1 offers a comparative examination of the scrutinized research endeavors utilizing RL in the context of SLAM applications. It delves into the simulation environment, deep learning techniques, SLAM methodologies, and RL algorithms employed in these studies.

VI. CHALLENGES IN APPLYING RL TO SLAM

High-dimensional state and action spaces, sample efficiency, and sensor/actuator delays are some of the difficulties faced by RL implementations in SLAM.

The state space encapsulates all possible states in the environment. This encompasses the intricate array of sensor data vital for SLAM operations. Meanwhile, the action space delineates the spectrum of feasible actions available to the agent [74]. Within SLAM, these actions pertain to the movements, encompassing maneuvers like turning and accelerating. SLAM systems operate amidst a milieu of high-dimensional sensor data, ranging from intricate camera images to intricate LiDAR point clouds, essential for navigating complex environments [75]. However, the efficacy of RL agents in handling such expansive input spaces is challenged by the escalating computational complexity inherent in high-dimensional realms [31].

The ability of a RL algorithm to learn from a small number of interactions (samples) with the environment is known as sample efficiency [76]. Sample efficiency is important since real-world data collecting for autonomous vehicles in SLAM can be costly and time-consuming (e.g., using laser sensors) [77].

Sensor/actuator delays epitomize the temporal gap between perceiving an event and enacting a response. This latency, inherent to the system, poses a critical challenge. In these domains, the journey from sensing to decision-making to action execution encompasses finite intervals, demanding precise synchronization [78]. RL algorithms must grapple with these delays to orchestrate timely and precise responses, ensuring seamless navigation and operation [16]. Within the intricate landscape of SLAM, this temporal precision assumes paramount importance, since the essence of success lies in the precision of real-time processing. This crucial element not only upholds but enhances the quality of localization and mapping, but also ensures a seamless fusion of navigational prowess [31].

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

SLAM is a technique used in robotics and autonomous vehicles to create a map of an unknown environment while simultaneously keeping track of an agent's location within that environment. It is a key technology for enabling MRAD to navigate and operate in real-world settings. SLAM involves the use of various sensors such as cameras, LiDAR, and odometry to gather information about the surrounding environment and then process this data to construct a map and estimate the agent's pose. In this survey, applications that have used RL in SLAM were investigated. According to the searches, the most use of RL in SLAM was in path planning, loop closure detection, environment exploration, obstacle detection, and Active SLAM. In these problems, RL helps the agent to design an intelligent map and facilitate navigation. SLAM methods can be effectively applied in MRAD, but the sensors, and environmental factors may need to be tailored to the respective application domain. In future research on the application of RL in SLAM, several key areas hold promise for advancing the state of the art: • Adaptive sensor fusion: Combining data from various sensors, such as cameras, LiDAR, and inertial measurement units (IMUs), is crucial for achieving robust SLAM. Future work could focus on developing RL agents capable of learning how to adaptively fuse information from these different modalities. By doing so, the overall performance and reliability of SLAM systems could be significantly enhanced, particularly in diverse and dynamic environments. • Self-Supervised learning and data augmentation: The integration of self-supervised learning (SSL) and data augmentation techniques offers substantial potential for improving RL-based SLAM, especially in MRAD applications. Leveraging large amounts of unlabeled data and generating diverse training samples can enhance the robustness and generalization capabilities of SLAM systems. Future research should explore innovative SSL strategies and data augmentation methods to maximize the efficacy of RL in SLAM. • Knowledge transfer across environments: For RL agents to be truly effective in real-world applications, they must be able to transfer knowledge across different maps or environments. Future studies should investigate techniques such as domain adaptation and meta-learning to facilitate better generalization of RL-based SLAM systems. These approaches can enable RL agents to apply learned knowledge from one environment to another, thereby

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF REVIEWED STUDIES.

	Ref	Year	Simulation Environment	Deep learning method	SLAM method	RL algorithm
Path planning	[56]	2024	Simple maze	Deep neural network	ORBSLAM3	- Q-learning - DQN - SARSA
	[30]	2023	- Gazebo - ROS - Turtle Bot	Deep neural network	SLAM-MCL	- Q-learning - DQN - SARSA
Environment Exploration	[55]	2024	- Gazebo - ROS	CNN	-	DQN
	[58]	2019	ROS	CNN	Karto SLAM	DQN
Obstacle detection	[61]	2203	- ROS2 DDS Communication - Gazebo	CNN	SLAM-MCL	- DQN - PPO - TD3
	[60]	2020	Gazebo	Fully convolutional residual network	FastSLAM	Dueling DQN
	[62]	2018	Unity Game Engine	CNN	-	deep Q network
Loop Closure Detection	[66]	2022	Turtlebot	CNN	VSLAM	Markov Decision Process
	[67]	2019	- ZOOX - Autonomous driving platform	Deep neural network CNN	SLAM-MCL VSLAM	Markov decision process
Active Slam	[71]	2024	Habitat	Encoder-Decoder	-	-
	[68]	2020	Gazebo - ROS - Turtle Bot	Deep Neural Network	-	- DQN - DDQN - D3QN
	[72]	2020	- ROS - Telbot	Deep neural network	ORBSLAM	MAS-DQN
	[73]	2022	- Gazebo - ROS - ROBOTIS TurtleBot3-Burger	Deep Neural Network	Lightweight Passive SLAM	Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP)

improving their adaptability and performance in previously unseen settings. By addressing these areas, future research can contribute to the development of more robust, efficient, and versatile RL-based SLAM systems, paving the way for advancements the navigation of MRAD.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Sharma, J. K. Pandey, and S. Mondal, "A review of mobile robots: Applications and future prospect," *International Journal of Precision Engineering and Manufacturing*, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 1695–1706, Sep 2023.

[2] K. Othman, "Public acceptance and perception of autonomous vehicles: a comprehensive review," *AI and Ethics*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 355–387, Aug 2021.

[3] G. Bresson, Z. Alsayed, L. Yu, and S. Glaser, "Simultaneous localization and mapping: A survey of current trends in autonomous driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 194–220, 2017.

[4] M. F. Ahmed, K. Masood, V. Fremont, and I. Fantoni, "Active slam: A review on last decade," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 19, p. 8097, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/23/19/8097

[5] J. Ren and D. Xia, "Slam in autonomous driving," in *Autonomous driving algorithms and Its IC Design*. Springer Nature Singapore, 2023, pp. 127–152.

[6] J. A. Placed *et al.*, "A survey on active simultaneous localization and mapping: State of the art and new frontiers," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 2023.

[7] X. Wu, G. Wang, and N. Shen, "Research on obstacle avoidance optimization and path planning of autonomous vehicles based on attention mechanism combined with multimodal information decision-making thoughts of robots," *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, vol. 17, p. 1269447, 2023.

[8] H. Taheri and Z. C. Xia, "Slam; definition and evolution," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 97, p. 104032, Jan 2021. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2020.104032

[9] R. Zeng, Y. Wen, W. Zhao, and Y.-J. Liu, "View planning in robot active vision: A survey of systems, algorithms, and applications," *Computational Visual Media*, vol. 6, pp. 225–245, 2020.

[10] M. D. Tezerjani, D. Carrillo, D. Qu, S. Dhakal, A. Mirzaeinia, and Q. Yang, "Real-time motion planning for autonomous vehicles in dynamic environments," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02916*, 2024.

[11] M. Diginsa, N. Shafie, and N. Yusuf, "Review: Issues and challenges of simultaneous localization and mapping (slam) technology in autonomous robot," *International Journal of Innovative Computing*, vol. 13, pp. 59–63, Nov 2023.

[12] R. Eyvazpour, M. Shoaran, and G. Karimian, "Hardware implementation of slam algorithms: a survey on implementation approaches and platforms," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 6187–6239, Jul 2023.

[13] S. Li, Z. Li, X. Liu, C. Shan, Y. Zhao, and H. Cheng, "Research on map-slam fusion localization algorithm for unmanned vehicle," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 17, p. 8670, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/12/17/8670

[14] T. Liu, C. Xu, Y. Qiao, C. Jiang, and J. Yu, "Particle filter slam for vehicle localization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07429*, 2024.

[15] C. Fan, Z. Li, W. Ding, H. Zhou, and K. Qian, *Integrating Artificial Intelligence with SLAM Technology for Robotic Navigation and Localization in Unknown Environments*, 2024.

[16] N. Botteghi, B. Kallfelz Sirmacek, R. Schulte, M. Poel, and C. Brune, "Reinforcement learning helps slam: Learning to build maps," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2020, pp. 329–335.

[17] A. Hamza, *Deep Reinforcement Learning for Mapless Mobile Robot Navigation*, 2022.

[18] D. Nister and H. Stewenius, "Scalable recognition with a vocabulary tree," in *2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'06)*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2006, pp. 2161–2168.

[19] S. Saeedi, L. Paull, M. Trentini, and H. Li, "Multiple robot simultaneous localization and mapping," in *2011 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 853–858.

[20] G. Grisetti, R. Kümmerle, C. Stachniss, and W. Burgard, "A tutorial on graph-based slam," *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 31–43, 2010.

[21] S. Frintrop, P. Jensfelt, and H. Christensen, "Simultaneous robot localization and mapping based on a visual attention system," in *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 2007, pp. 417–430.

[22] S. Thrun, "Simultaneous localization and mapping," in *Robotics and cognitive approaches to spatial mapping*. Springer, 2008, pp. 13–41.

[23] S. Zheng, J. Wang, C. Rizos, W. Ding, and A. El-Mowafy, "Simultaneous localization and mapping (slam) for autonomous driving: Concept and analysis," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 15, no. 4, p. 1156, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/15/4/1156

[24] H. Carrillo, I. Reid, and J. A. Castellanos, "On the comparison of uncertainty criteria for active slam," in *2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2080–2087.

[25] W. Burgard, D. Fox, and S. Thrun, "Active mobile robot localization," in *IJCAI*. Citeseer, 1997, pp. 1346–1352.

[26] A. A. Makarenko, S. B. Williams, F. Bourgault, and H. F. Durrant-Whyte, "An experiment in integrated exploration," in *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2002, pp. 534–539.

[27] J. Lin, J. Peng, Z. Hu, X. Xie, and R. Peng, "Orb-slam, imu and wheel odometry fusion for indoor mobile robot localization and navigation," *Academic Journal of Computing and Information Science*, vol. 3, 2020.

[28] A. Kumar, Maneesha, and P. K. Pandey, "Advances in simultaneous localization and mapping (slam) for autonomous mobile robot navigation," in *Proceedings of International Joint Conference on Advances in Computational Intelligence*. Springer Nature Singapore, 2024, pp. 481–493.

[29] E. Reitbauer, C. Schmied, F. Theurl, and M. Wieser, "Liwo-slam: A lidar, imu, and wheel odometry simultaneous localization and mapping system for gnss-denied environments based on factor graph optimization," in *Proceedings of the 36th International Technical Meeting of the Satellite Division of The Institute of Navigation (ION GNSS+ 2023)*, 2023, pp. 1669–1683.

[30] S. Nam, C. Woo, S. Kang, T. A. Nguyen, and D. Min, "Slam-drlnav: A slam-enhanced deep reinforcement learning navigation framework for indoor self-driving," in *2023 International Conference on Mechatronics, Control and Robotics (ICMCR)*, 2023, pp. 44–48.

[31] G. Dulac-Arnold *et al.*, "Challenges of real-world reinforcement learning: definitions, benchmarks and analysis," *Machine Learning*, vol. 110, no. 9, pp. 2419–2468, 2021.

[32] C. Debeunne and D. Vivet, "A review of visual-lidar fusion based simultaneous localization and mapping," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 7, p. 2068, 2020.

[33] J. Tang *et al.*, "Lidar scan matching aided inertial navigation system in gnss-denied environments," *Sensors*, vol. 15, no. 7, pp. 16 710–16 728, 2015.

[34] Y. Yang, D. Tang, D. Wang, W. Song, J. Wang, and M. Fu, "Multi-camera visual slam for off-road navigation," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 128, p. 103505, 2020.

[35] X. Lang *et al.*, "Gaussian-lic: Photo-realistic lidar-inertial-camera slam with 3d gaussian splatting," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06926*, 2024.

[36] L. Chang, X. Niu, and T. Liu, "Gnss/imu/odo/lidar-slam integrated navigation system using imu/odo pre-integration," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 17, p. 4702, 2020.

[37] N. Abdelaziz and A. El-Rabbany, "Ins/lidar/stereo slam integration for precision navigation in gnss-denied environments," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 17, p. 7424, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/23/17/7424

[38] A. Woo, B. Fidan, and W. W. Melek, "Localization for autonomous driving," in *Handbook of position location: theory, practice, and advances, second edition*, 2018, pp. 1051–1087.

[39] M. S. A. Khan *et al.*, "Investigation of widely used slam sensors using analytical hierarchy process," *Journal of Sensors*, vol. 2022, pp. 1–15, 2022.

[40] Z. Hong, Y. Petillot, A. Wallace, and S. Wang, "Radar slam: A robust slam system for all weather conditions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.05347*, 2021.

[41] R. Huang, K. Zhu, S. Chen, T. Xiao, M. Yang, and N. Zheng, "A high-precision and robust odometry based on sparse mmw radar data and a large-range and long-distance radar positioning data set," in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 98–105.

[42] J. Zhu, H. Li, and T. Zhang, "Camera, lidar, and imu based multi-sensor fusion slam: A survey," *Tsinghua Science and Technology*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 415–429, 2023.

[43] Y.-E. Lu, S. Tsai, M.-L. Tsai, and K.-W. Chiang, "A low-cost visual radar-based odometry framework with mmwave radar and monocular camera," in *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, vol. 43, 2022, pp. 235–240.

[44] M. Quan, S. Piao, M. Tan, and S.-S. Huang, "Tightly-coupled monocular visual-odometric slam using wheels and a mems gyroscope," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 97 374–97 389, 2019.

[45] K. Yousif, A. Bab-Hadiashar, and R. Hoseinnezhad, "An overview to visual odometry and visual slam: Applications to mobile robotics," *Intelligent Industrial Systems*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 289–311, 2015.

[46] J. Mahmoud and A. Penkovskiy, "Dynamic environments and robust slam: Optimizing sensor fusion and semantics for wheeled robots," in *2023 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023, pp. 185–191.

[47] I. H. Sarker, "Machine learning: Algorithms, real-world applications and research directions," *SN Computer Science*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 160, 2021.

[48] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT Press, 2018.

[49] R. Singh, J. Ren, and X. Lin, "A review of deep reinforcement learning algorithms for mobile robot path planning," *Vehicles*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1423–1451, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2624-8921/5/4/78

[50] K. Arulkumaran, M. P. Deisenroth, M. Brundage, and A. A. Bharath, "A brief survey of deep reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.05866*, 2017.

[51] X. Wang *et al.*, "Deep reinforcement learning: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2022.

[52] A. Zai and B. Brown, *Deep Reinforcement Learning in Action*. Manning Publications, 2020.

[53] X. Lei, Z. Zhang, and P. Dong, "Dynamic path planning of unknown environment based on deep reinforcement learning," *Journal of Robotics*, vol. 2018, pp. 1–10, 2018.

[54] M. Baziyad, M. Saad, R. Fareh, T. Rabie, and I. Kamel, "Addressing real-time demands for robotic path planning systems: A routing protocol approach," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 38 132–38 143, 2021.

[55] S.-Y. Chen, Q.-F. He, and C.-F. Lai, "Deep reinforcement learning-based robot exploration for constructing map of unknown environment," *Information Systems Frontiers*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 63–74, 2024.

[56] W. Ruiqi, "Research on robot path planning based on reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14077*, 2024.

[57] S.-Y. Chen, Q.-F. He, and C.-F. Lai, "Deep reinforcement learning-based robot exploration for constructing map of unknown environment," *Information Systems Frontiers*, vol. 26, 2021.

[58] H. Li, Q. Zhang, and D. Zhao, "Deep reinforcement learning-based automatic exploration for navigation in unknown environment," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 2064–2076, 2020.

[59] A. Iqbal, *Obstacle Detection and Track Detection in Autonomous Cars*, 2020.

[60] S. Wen, Y. Zhao, X. Yuan, Z. Wang, D. Zhang, and L. Manfredi, "Path planning for active slam based on deep reinforcement learning under unknown environments," *Intelligent Service Robotics*, vol. 13, pp. 263–272, 2020.

[61] S. Nam, C. Woo, S. Kang, T. A. Nguyen, and D. Min, "inavdrlslam: An improved indoor self-driving framework for mobile robots using deep reinforcement learning integrated with slam," in *2023 15th International Conference on Advanced Computational Intelligence (ICACI)*, 2023, pp. 1–8.

[62] A. R. Fayjie, S. Hossain, D. Oualid, and D. J. Lee, "Driverless car: Autonomous driving using deep reinforcement learning in urban environment," in *2018 15th International Conference on Ubiquitous Robots (UR)*, 2018, pp. 896–901.

[63] K. A. Tsintotas, L. Bampis, and A. Gasteratos, "The revisiting problem in simultaneous localization and mapping: A survey on visual loop closure detection," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 19 929–19 953, 2022.

[64] S. Arshad and G.-W. Kim, "Role of deep learning in loop closure detection for visual and lidar slam: A survey," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 4, p. 1243, 2021.

[65] A. Charroud, K. E. Moutaouakil, V. Palade, A. Yahyaouy, U. Onyekpe, and E. U. Eyo, "Localization and mapping for self-driving vehicles: A survey," *Machines*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. 118, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.mdpi.com/2075-1702/12/2/118

[66] A. Iqbal, R. Thapa, and N. R. Gans, "Deep reinforcement learning based loop closure detection," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 106, no. 2, p. 51, 2022.

[67] A. Iqbal, "Classified object localization in slam and loop closure through reinforcement learning," 2019.

[68] J. A. Placed and J. A. Castellanos, "A deep reinforcement learning approach for active SLAM," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 10, no. 23, p. 8386, 2020.

[69] Y. Chen, S. Huang, and R. Fitch, "Active SLAM for mobile robots with area coverage and obstacle avoidance," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1182–1192, 2020.

[70] N. Palomeras, M. Carreras, and J. Andrade-Cetto, "Active SLAM for autonomous underwater exploration," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 11, no. 23, p. 2827, 2019.

[71] B. Fang, X. Chen, Z. Pan, and X. Di, "SLAMuzero: Plan and learn to map for joint SLAM and navigation," in *34th International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 2020.

[72] Z. Pei, S. Piao, M. Quan, M. Z. Qadir, and G. Li, "Active collaboration in relative observation for multi-agent visual simultaneous localization and mapping based on deep Q network," *International Journal of Advanced Robotic Systems*, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 1729881420920216, 2020.

[73] M. Alcalde, M. Ferreira, P. González, F. Andrade, and G. Tejera, "DA-SLAM: Deep active SLAM based on deep reinforcement learning," in *2022 Latin American Robotics Symposium (LARS), 2022 Brazilian Symposium on Robotics (SBR), and 2022 Workshop on Robotics in Education (WRE)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 282–287.

[74] C. Tessler, T. Zahavy, D. Cohen, D. J. Mankowitz, and S. Mannor, "Action assembly: Sparse imitation learning for text based games with combinatorial action spaces," arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.09700, Tech. Rep., 2019.

[75] A. Kudriashov, T. Buratowski, M. Giergiel, and P. Małka, *SLAM techniques application for mobile robot in rough terrain*. Springer, 2020.

[76] J. Buckman, D. Hafner, G. Tucker, E. Brevdo, and H. Lee, "Sample-efficient reinforcement learning with stochastic ensemble value expansion," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.

[77] C. Pang, L. Zhou, and X. Huang, "A low-cost 3d SLAM system integration of autonomous exploration based on fast-ICP enhanced LiDAR-Inertial Odometry," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 16, no. 11, p. 1979, 2024.

[78] T. Hester and P. Stone, "Texplore: Real-time sample-efficient reinforcement learning for robots," *Machine Learning*, vol. 90, pp. 385–429, 2013.