Geometrical Reconstruction using Acoustic Tactile Sensing

Can a Robot Hear Whether It Touches Something?

Georg Wolnik

Robotics Project - Robotics and Biology Laboratory - TU Berlin

2nd February 2026

Motivation

Vision isn't always available

- Robot arm/gripper occludes camera view
- Low-light, dusty, or underwater environments
- Need for contact-based perception

Can we reconstruct surface geometry from acoustic signals?

- Detect contact events during robot motion
- Classify surface shapes acoustically
- Evaluate generalization capabilities

- **Cheap:** Simple contact microphone
- **Non-invasive:** No complex sensor arrays
- **Complementary:** Works with vision & tactile

Full Setup

Sensor Mounting



Close-up



Why Robot-Mounted Data Collection?

- ✔ **Controlled variables:** Consistent angle, pressure, and sweep velocity
- ✔ **Repeatability:** Systematic sweeps for reliable ground truth labels
- ✔ **Scalability:** Automated collection of large datasets
- ✔ **Real-world relevance:** Directly applicable to robotic manipulation tasks

Data Collection: Objects and Workspaces

Test Objects



A: Cutouts — B: Empty — C: Full — D: Big Cutout

Complete Dataset Overview

	Obj A Cutouts	**Obj B** Empty	**Obj C** Full	**Obj D** Big Cut
WS1	✓	✓	✓	
WS2	✓	✓	✓	
WS3	✓	✓	✓	
WS4				✓

Green: Proof of Concept data (A,B,C in WS1-3)

Red: Final Validation data (D in WS4)

?

Can we reconstruct geometric shapes using binary surface classification?

Task	Approach	Target
Binary classification	Hand-crafted features	Geometric reconstruction
Contact vs. No-Contact	**80-dim acoustic features**	**on known data**

Method: Acoustic Feature Classification



80-Dimensional Features

- **MFCCs + Deltas** (39): Frequency content
- **Spectral** (11): Energy distribution
- **Temporal** (15): Contact dynamics
- **Impulse Response** (15): Resonance

Data Augmentation

- Noise injection
- Time shifting
- Pitch variation
- Gain scaling
- Time stretching

Why Hand-Crafted?

- Hand-crafted: **73%**
- Spectrograms: **59%**
- 80 vs 10,240 dims

Result: Excellent Classification on Known Data

~99%

Test Accuracy

(Known surfaces & configurations)

Dataset Split

3 Objects × 3 Workspaces

Training: 80%

Test: 20%

Same distribution



Reconstruction: Excellent Performance on Test Data



What You See

- **Left:** Ground truth surface
- **Right:** Model reconstruction
- Green = Contact detected
- Red = No contact

TEST Accuracy

$\sim$**99%**

Model performs excellently on known surfaces
(same distribution as training)

Now: Testing Generalization

Proof of Concept Achieved!

Acoustic contact classification works on known data

$\sim$100% test accuracy with excellent reconstruction

But does it generalize?

Two critical questions:

What if we test on a **new workspace**?

Train: WS1+WS3 → Test: WS2

Same objects, **different robot positions**

→ **Configuration Generalization**

What if we test on a **new object**?

Train: A,B,C → Test: D (+ new workspace)

Completely unseen object & workspace

→ **Object Generalization**

Challenge 1: Configuration Generalization

Experimental Setup

Training: WS1 + WS3

WS1 WS3

Same objects (A, B, C)

↓

Validation: WS2 (unseen)

WS2

Same objects, different robot configurations

Performance Results

Dataset	**Accuracy**
Training (WS1+WS3)	**100%**
Test (WS1+WS3, 20%)	**∼100%**
Validation (WS2)	**65-75%**

Configuration Entanglement

65-75%

Better than random (50%), but significant drop

Signal = Contact ⊗ Configuration

Model partially learned configuration-specific features.

More diverse workspace data likely needed.

Challenge 2: Object Generalization

Object Generalization Setup

Training: 3 Objects (A, B, C)

A: Cutouts | B: Empty | C: Full

Train: WS1 + WS2 + WS3

↓

Hold-out: Object D

D: Big Cutout

Test: WS4 (new)

New object + new workspace

Complete generalization test

Performance Results

Dataset	Accuracy
Training (A,B,C on WS1-3)	**100%**
Test (A,B,C on WS1-3)	**~100%**
Hold-out (D on WS4)	**50%**

Critical Discovery

50% = Random Chance

Model completely fails on unseen object

Understanding the Failure: The Entanglement Problem



The Core Problem

$$\textbf{Signal} = \textbf{Contact} \otimes \textbf{Object}$$

The acoustic signature contains **BOTH**:

1. Contact state information
2. Object identity information

Physics Explanation

- Each object has unique eigenfrequencies
- Material, size, geometry, mass affect acoustic response
- Model learned **"Object A contact"** not **"contact in general"**

Conclusions

Main Achievement: Proof of Concept

"Acoustic-based geometric reconstruction IS POSSIBLE"
(on known data: $\sim$100% test accuracy, excellent reconstruction)

What Works

- $\sim$**99%** test accuracy (known surfaces & configurations)
- Excellent surface reconstruction
- Hand-crafted features outperform spectrograms (73% vs 59%)
- 128$\times$ fewer features, better results

Discovered Limitations

- **Configuration entanglement:** 65-75% on unseen workspace
  Signal $=$ Contact $\otimes$ Configuration
- **Object entanglement:** 50% on unseen object (random)
  Signal $=$ Contact $\otimes$ Object

Future Directions

- **Configuration invariance:** Collect data from many more diverse workspaces/positions
- **Object invariance:** Train on many varied objects to disentangle contact from object identity

Thank You — Questions?

Questions?

Backup: All Classifiers Comparison



Top Classifiers (Validation)

Classifier	Val Acc.
MLP (Medium-HighReg)	**72.0%**
GPU-MLP (Tuned-HighReg)	71.9%
Ensemble (Top3-MLP)	71.3%
MLP (Large)	68.9%
GPU-MLP (Tuned)	68.6%
Gradient Boosting	65.1%
Random Forest	60.1%

Key Finding

MLPs with regularization outperform tree-based methods on validation data

Backup: 80-Dimensional Feature Set

MFCCs + Deltas (39 dims)

- 13 MFCC coefficients
- 13 MFCC delta (velocity)
- 13 MFCC delta-delta (acceleration)

Spectral Features (11 dims)

- Spectral centroid
- Spectral bandwidth
- Spectral rolloff
- Spectral flatness
- Spectral contrast (7 bands)

Temporal Features (15 dims)

- Zero-crossing rate
- RMS energy
- Mean, std, skewness, kurtosis
- Onset strength
- Tempo estimation

Impulse Response (15 dims)

- Transfer function peaks
- Decay characteristics
- Resonance frequencies
- Damping coefficients

Backup: Object and Workspace Details

Training Objects (A, B, C)

- **Object A:** Cutouts
  Wooden board with geometric cutouts
- **Object B:** Empty
  Plain wooden surface
- **Object C:** Full
  Wooden board with filled shapes

Hold-out Object (D)

- **Object D:** Big cutout
  Larger wooden board with single large cutout
- Tested in WS4 only
- Never seen during training

Configuration Generalization Test

- **Train:** WS1, WS3 (Objects A,B,C)
- **Validate:** WS2 (Objects A,B,C)
- Tests **configuration generalization**
- Result: **65-75%** (partial)

Object Generalization Test

- **Train:** WS1,2,3 (Objects A,B,C)
- **Hold-out:** WS4 (Object D)
- Tests **object generalization**
- Result: **50%** (random)

Backup: The Entanglement Problem Explained



Two Entanglement Problems

1. **Signal = Contact $\otimes$ Configuration**
   Robot pose affects acoustic response
2. **Signal = Contact $\otimes$ Object**
   Object identity entangled with contact

Physics Explanation

- Robot pose affects wave propagation
- Each object has unique eigenfrequencies
- Material, size, geometry affect response

Implications

- Not failures — **discoveries**

Backup: Hand-Crafted Features vs Spectrograms



Metric	Hand-Crafted (80-dim)	Spectrograms (10,240-dim)	Winner
Feature Dimensions	80	10,240	Hand-Crafted (128× smaller)
Best Validation Acc	73.4%	62.2%	Hand-Crafted
MLP Validation Acc	73.4%	59.3%	Hand-Crafted
RF Validation Acc	70.8%	39.3%	Hand-Crafted
Training Samples	10,639	3,546	Hand-Crafted (3× more data)
Overfitting Risk	Lower (smaller model)	Higher (128× more params)	Hand-Crafted

CONCLUSION: Hand-Crafted Features are BETTER for Our Use Case

- **73.4% vs 62.2% validation accuracy (11.3% improvement)**
- **128× fewer features (80 vs 10,240) → faster, less overfitting**
- **More interpretable (MFCCs, spectral, temporal, impulse response)**
- **Better generalization despite smaller model size**

Key Results

Validation Accuracy (WS2+3→WS1):

- **Hand-Crafted: 73.4%**
- Spectrograms: 59.3%
- **+14.1% improvement!**

Why Hand-Crafted Wins

- **128× fewer features** (80 vs 10,240)
- **Less overfitting** with limited data
- **More interpretable** features
- **Faster inference** (¡1ms)
- **Better generalization**