

Hindsight for Foresight: Unsupervised Structured Dynamics Models from Physical Interaction

Iman Nematollahi

Oier Mees

Lukas Hermann

Wolfram Burgard

Abstract—A key challenge for an agent learning to interact with the world is to reason about physical properties of objects and to foresee their dynamics under the effect of applied forces. In order to scale learning through interaction to many objects and scenes, robots should be able to improve their own performance from real-world experience without requiring human supervision. To this end, we propose a novel approach for modeling the dynamics of a robot’s interactions directly from unlabeled 3D point clouds and images. Unlike previous approaches, our method does not require ground-truth data associations provided by a tracker or any pre-trained perception network. To learn from unlabeled real-world interaction data, we enforce consistency of estimated 3D clouds, actions and 2D images with observed ones. Our joint forward and inverse network learns to segment a scene into salient object parts and predicts their 3D motion under the effect of applied actions. Moreover, our object-centric model outputs action-conditioned 3D scene flow, object masks and 2D optical flow as emergent properties. Our extensive evaluation both in simulation and with real-world data demonstrates that our formulation leads to effective, interpretable models that can be used for visuomotor control and planning. Videos, code and dataset are available at <http://hind4sight.cs.uni-freiburg.de>

I. INTRODUCTION

What will happen if the robot shown in Figure 1 moves the arm to the left? We can all foresee that the tape dispenser will move to the left, probably colliding with the banana. Intelligent beings have the remarkable ability to effectively interact with unseen objects by leveraging intuitive models of their environment’s physics learned from experience [1], [2]. Predicting the effect of one’s actions is a cornerstone of intelligent behavior and also enables reasoning about sequences of actions needed to achieve desired goals. Most existing methods for learning the dynamics of physical interactions are based on high-capacity models, such as deep networks, which can learn complex causal relationships directly from raw sensor data. However, these data-driven methods often suffer from poor sample complexity, requiring large amounts of data to train and have weaker interpretability and robustness compared to model-based robotics approaches. In contrast, most real-world robot interaction learning methods require human supervision to collect data. Therefore, these models are trained with small-scale, single-domain data, leading to reduced generalization capabilities. Thus, the ability to learn dynamics models autonomously from physical interaction provides an appealing avenue for improving a robot’s understanding of its physical environment, as robots



Fig. 1: What will happen when the robot arm moves left? Will the tape dispenser collide with the banana? Hind4sight-Net learns an unsupervised structured dynamics model which decomposes the scene into objects and predicts their motion conditioned on an action.

can collect virtually unlimited experience through their own exploration.

Deep learning has enabled deep predictive models that learn directly in the observation space, relating changes in pixels directly to the applied actions [3]–[5]. However, learning to predict physical phenomena from raw video requires handling the high dimensionality of image pixels and discards the knowledge about the structure of the world. Therefore, we explicitly structure our network architecture to decompose the scene into object parts and to predict their dynamics, alleviating the need for predicting pixels. Our formulation is inspired by SE3-Nets [6], [7], but relaxes the requirement of ground-truth point-wise data associations. This enables learning scene dynamics in the real-world without external trackers.

In this paper, we propose a novel approach to learn dynamics of the real-world and present a method that requires neither labeled data nor human supervision, enabling to improve a robot’s understanding of its environment’s physics in a lifelong learning manner. Our approach denoted Hind4sight-Net jointly learns a forward and an inverse dynamics model and decomposes the scene into salient object parts and predicts their 3D motion. Our object-centric formulation allows us to capture several desirable inductive biases that help in learning more efficient and interpretable models - a scene comprises of several objects, actions can affect these objects, and the objects can, in turn, affect each other. Thus, our network outputs action-conditioned 3D scene flow,

All authors are with the University of Freiburg, Germany. Wolfram Burgard is also with the Toyota Research Institute, Los Altos, USA. This work has been supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research under contract number 01IS18040B-OML.

object masks and 2D optical flow as emergent properties. We develop a method that combines the flexibility of deep networks with the advantages of model-based approaches, by constraining the learning problem to a low-dimensional interpretable space, as opposed to regressing pixels. Unlike previous approaches [6]–[11], our method does not require ground-truth point-wise data associations, typically provided by a tracker, or a pre-trained perception network. To learn from unlabeled real-world interaction data, we enforce consistency of estimated 3D clouds, actions and 2D images with observed ones. Our formulation leads to useful, interpretable models that can be used for visuomotor control and planning. We exemplify this, by using our dynamics model for planning poke actions in both simulation and with a real robot manipulator.

II. RELATED WORK

Our work is primarily concerned with learning intuitive physics [1], [2]. The methodologies to study scene dynamics fall into two paradigms: model-based and data-driven. In order to plan towards a goal state, the model-based approach requires an analytic physical model of the environment to perform optimal control [12]. However, as many physical properties such as mass and friction cannot be captured easily, assumptions and approximations are often adopted [3], [4], [13]–[15].

An alternative approach to explicitly modeling the environment via an analytical model is to learn an implicit model of the world using interaction data. There exists a large body of work for understanding intuitive physics from visual cues using deep learning, such as predicting stability of block towers [16], learning physic engines [11], [17], [18], estimating object properties [19], [20] or object dynamics from images [21]. In particular, recent works have looked at mapping raw pixel images to low-dimensional embeddings on top of which standard optimal control methods are applied [22], [23]. In contrast, we use a structured latent representation and predict object masks. Related to our approach Agrawal *et al.* [5] learn a joint forward and inverse model in a feature space where RGB images are encoded, that can be used for poking objects. In comparison, we use an object-centric model that leverages explicit structural constraints and attends to relevant parts of the scene. Several works have shown promising results using deep video prediction models for control, either by directly regressing to pixels [15] or using intermediate flow representations [3], [4], [24]. However, these can typically only handle small motions between frames, and need a large number of samples to overcome this inductive bias.

Our work addresses learning structured scene dynamics without human supervision, thus falling under the category of self-supervised learning. Due to its ability to learn from unlabeled data, self-supervised learning has been studied in different sub-fields in AI, such as in computer vision [25]–[27], machine learning [28] and natural language processing [29]. Previous works on self-supervised learning in robotics mainly focus on object segmentation [30]–[32], pose




Fig. 2: We let a robot interact with objects by randomly poking at them to learn a structured dynamics model. Observational changes in point clouds and images caused by applied actions constitute the sole learning signals, enabling to improve a robot’s understanding of its environment’s physics in a lifelong learning manner.

estimation [33], [34] or skill learning [35], [36]. Compared to these approaches, we learn an object-centric structured dynamics model without human supervision.

Most related to our approach is SE3-Nets [6], [7], a forward model which uses point-wise data associations to approximate 3D rigid object motions for constructing future point clouds. In comparison, our approach is fully unsupervised and therefore enables learning scene dynamics in the real-world without the need of external trackers. To achieve this, our approach adds more explicit structural constraints. Concretely, we force the network to reason over the photometric quality of frame reconstructions resulted from back-projecting the predicted 3D scene flow. Besides combining losses that operate on 3D point clouds and RGB images, we integrate an inverse dynamics model to the network and show that the interplay between both models leads to useful, interpretable models that can be used for visuomotor control and planning.

III. HIND4SIGHT-NET

In this section we describe the technical details of our unsupervised structured dynamics model. The architecture of our system is shown in Figure 3. Our dynamics model consists of both a forward and an inverse model. A forward model predicts the next world state $\hat{s}_{t+1}$ from the current world state s_t and action u_t , i.e., $\hat{s}_{t+1} = F(s_t, u_t; \theta_{fwd})$, and an inverse model estimates the action given the initial state and the target state, i.e., $\hat{u}_t = G(s_t, s_{t+1}; \theta_{inv})$, where θ_{fwd} and θ_{inv} are the parameters of the functions F and G . Predicting which action caused the scene to change is a challenging task for the inverse model, as multiple possible actions can transform the world from one state to another. The inverse model guides the network to construct informative features, which the forward model can then predict and in turn regularize the feature space for the inverse model [5]. Note that in this paper we consider a scenario in which a robot pokes objects on a table and leverages the hindsight from its own interactions to predict dynamics of the scene.




Fig. 3: Structure of Hind4sight-Net: we jointly learn forward and inverse scene dynamics models from unlabeled interaction data. The forward model segments a 3D point cloud P_t of the scene into salient object parts m_t and predicts their $\text{SE}(3)$ motion under the effect of an applied poking action u_t . These are then fed into a differentiable “Transform layer” that generates the predicted next point cloud $\hat{P}_{t+1}$. A “Projection layer” back-projects the predicted 3D scene flow into the 2D image plane to retrieve the optical flow $\hat{w}_t$. The inverse model takes two consecutive 3D point clouds as input and reason over the poking action produced in the form of heat-maps denoting the start $\hat{A}_t$ and end $\hat{B}_t$ point of the poking action.

A. Forward Model: Object-centric 3D Motion

Our forward model is closely related to SE3-Nets [6], [7]. We take a raw point cloud $P_t = (X_t, Y_t, Z_t)$ and an action u_t as inputs and decompose the scene into K objects, predict their mask m_t^k and estimate their motion as a 3D rigid body transform $[R, T] \in \text{SE}(3)$ to generate the next point cloud $\hat{P}_{t+1}$:

$$\hat{P}_{t+1} = \sum_{k=1}^K m_t^k (R_t^k P_t + T_t^k) \quad (1)$$

Note that for points of the scene that lie on the background a mask is assigned as well. Thus, the network learns to attend in which parts of the environment motion occurs. To be more specific, for each point j in the point cloud, m_t^{kj} denotes the probability of the point belonging to the k -th mask, indicating that each point may be assigned to more than one motion mask. We define the poke action by a poke position and direction. The robot selects a target 2D position (a_x, a_y) on the plane and reaches it from angle a_θ with respect to the horizon. Hence the poke action vector u_t is a 3-dimensional vector. Although SE3-Nets showed impressive results, they require ground-truth point-wise data associations as supervision. This means that an external tracking system is needed for acquiring data associations of points in real-world environments. Our approach relaxes this requirement and can be trained without labeled data. Concretely, during training we enforce the consistency of estimated 3D clouds, 2D images and actions with observed ones.

B. 3D Point Cloud Alignment Loss

Unlike SE3-Nets that relies on the known data association between the predicted point cloud $\hat{P}_{t+1}$ and the target point cloud P_{t+1} to penalize prediction error, we use the Chamfer

distance (CD) between the two points sets to enforce geometric consistency. This distance is a differentiable function that takes as input two points sets P_{t+1} and $\hat{P}_{t+1}$ and for each point in each points set, it finds the nearest neighbor in the other set and sums the squared distances up. Thus, the output of the CD are two continuous distance transforms. We define the distance transforms between the clouds in both directions with $D_{\hat{P} \rightarrow P}^{xy} = \min_{x', y'} \|\hat{P}_{t+1}^{x', y'} - P_{t+1}^{x', y'}\|_2^2$ and $D_{P \rightarrow \hat{P}}^{xy} = \min_{x', y'} \|P_{t+1}^{x', y'} - \hat{P}_{t+1}^{x', y'}\|_2^2$ and sum them to define the Chamfer distance loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CD}(\hat{P}_{t+1}, P_{t+1}) = \sum_{x, y} (D_{\hat{P} \rightarrow P}^{xy} + D_{P \rightarrow \hat{P}}^{xy}) \quad (2)$$

C. Image Reconstruction Loss

As learning a dynamics model from scratch without any label or supervision is an ill-posed problem, we reason over the quality of the predicted object motions not only in 3D but also on the image level to better constrain the learning problem. By introducing this constraint, we assume that the brightness of a pixel is not changed by its displacement. Concretely, we back-project the predicted action-conditioned 3D scene flow into the 2D image plane resulting in 2D optical flow between the two consecutive frames and use backward warping to match pixels from frame I_{t+1} to the frame I_t resulting in $\hat{I}_t$. Using known camera intrinsics we project the action-conditioned 3D scene flow into the 2D optical flow $U_t^{xy} = x_{t+1} - x$ and $V_t^{xy} = y_{t+1} - y$. Next, we apply a differentiable inverse image warping and minimize the photometric consistency error:

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec}(I_t, \hat{I}_t) = \sum_{x, y} \|I_t^{xy} - \hat{I}_t^{xy}\|_1 \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{I}_t^{xy} = I_{t+1}^{x', y'}$ with $x' = x + U_t^{xy}$ and $y' = y + V_t^{xy}$. Since image pixels are continuous and back-warped pixels




Fig. 4: The main loss functions operate on observational changes and enable learning scene dynamics in the real-world without the need of data associations provided by a tracker. The image reconstruction loss uses the predicted 2D flow to minimize a photometric consistency error. The Chamfer Distance tries to enforce the geometric consistency between point clouds. The inverse model predicts spatial distributions of the actions that caused the scene to change.

do not always coincide with pixel coordinates, we use a differentiable bilinear sampling [37] mechanism which interpolates four neighboring pixels of $\hat{I}_t^{xy}$ to approximate I_t^{xy} .

D. Edge-aware Smoothness Loss

In the process of minimizing the photometric consistency error the gradients are mainly derived from the pixel intensity difference between the four neighbors of $\hat{I}_t^{xy}$ and I_t^{xy} . As a consequence, this loss is noisy and would inhibit training if the point is far from the current estimate or located in a low-texture region. Thus, we introduce an edge-aware smoothness loss term to measure the difference between spatially neighbouring points in the flow field, adaptively weighted by the image gradients:

$$\mathcal{L}_{fs} = \sum_{x,y} |\nabla U_t^{xy}| e^{-|\nabla I_t^{xy}|} + |\nabla V_t^{xy}| e^{-|\nabla I_t^{xy}|} \quad (4)$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes element-wise absolute value and ∇ is the vector differential operator. By enforcing this regularization, we assume that realistic flow fields are piecewise smooth and have discontinuities at the boundaries of moving objects which is a valid assumption for rigid bodies.

We found it also necessary to apply a similar regularization to the distance transforms computed by the Chamfer Distance. As a nearest neighbor assignment is used to establish a data association between the predicted and the observed point clouds, this method is prone to spurious matches. Concretely, “holes” in the predicted mask for the moving object can be caused by small motions mislead the nearest neighbor assignment to assume that there is no motion in the overlapping region. We therefore regularize the distance transforms calculated by the CD algorithm in the same manner as our optical flow field to be piecewise smooth:

$$\mathcal{L}_{ds} = \sum_{x,y} |\nabla D_{P \rightarrow \hat{P}}^{xy}| e^{-|\nabla I_{t+1}^{xy}|} + |\nabla D_{\hat{P} \rightarrow P}^{xy}| e^{-|\nabla I_{t+1}^{xy}|} \quad (5)$$

E. Inverse Model

Our inverse model takes two consecutive raw point clouds P_t and P_{t+1} as input and predicts the corresponding poke

action $\hat{u}_t$ between them through estimating two heatmaps, $\hat{A}_t$ and $\hat{B}_t$, for the start and end positions of the poke respectively. This helps us preserve the similarity of poke actions which take place in close vicinity to each other and ground the actions spatially. To collect training data without human supervision, the robot discretizes the workspace into a grid and marks the two grid cells in which the robot starts and ends its action as keypoints. The objective of the inverse model $\mathcal{L}_{inv}$ is a sum of two losses. The term $\mathcal{L}_{act}$ is a cross entropy loss on the predicted action heatmaps, while $\mathcal{L}_{sim}$ is the L1 loss between the predicted $\hat{s}_{t+1}$ state embedding and the ground-truth s_{t+1} embedding (see Figure 3). This loss acts as a regularizer between the forward and the inverse model. The inverse model guides the network to construct informative features, which the forward model can then predict and in turn regularize the feature space for the inverse model.

F. Full Model

Our full model combines all aforementioned objectives to learn a dynamics model from unlabeled data. We abbreviate the losses operating on the 2D image domains to $\mathcal{L}_{2D} = \mathcal{L}_{rec} + \mathcal{L}_{fs}$ and the ones operating on the 3D point clouds as $\mathcal{L}_{3D} = \mathcal{L}_{CD} + \mathcal{L}_{ds}$.

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{3D} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{2D} + \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{inv} \quad (6)$$

G. Implementation Details

We adopt a Siamese architecture for the point cloud encoders of our forward and inverse dynamics models. The forward model is based on SE3-Nets [6] with an additional “Projection Layer”. We use ADAM to optimize our model with a learning rate of 10^{-4} . We weight the main losses with $\lambda_1 = 10^5$, $\lambda_2 = 10^3$ and $\lambda_3 = 1$. We train our model for 50 epochs with a mini-batch size of 16. The whole training process of our model is unsupervised and does not need any human annotations. We found that initializing one out of K masks to predict all pixels as background and moreover initializing SE(3) transformations to predict identity transform results in faster convergence.



Fig. 5: Objects from the KIT kitchen object models database [40] used in simulation. The objects differ in geometry, size and texture and have varying physical properties.

H. Model-Predictive Control

Given the learned dynamics model, we can leverage it to find action sequences that lead to a desired goal. We use the cross entropy method (CEM) to search for the best action sequence [38], which is a population-based optimization algorithm that infers a distribution over action sequences that maximize the objective. At every iteration, CEM draws $\mathcal{J}$ trajectories of length $\mathcal{H}$ from a Gaussian distribution, where $\mathcal{H}$ is the planning horizon. We repeatedly evaluate the sampled $\mathcal{J}$ candidate action sequences and re-fit the belief to the top $\mathcal{K}$ action sequences. One advantage of this stochastic optimization procedure is that it allows us to ensure that actions stay within the distribution of actions the model encountered during training. To evaluate a candidate action sequence, we leverage both the 2D and 3D domains our dynamics model has been trained on.

IV. EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our unsupervised structured dynamics model on both simulated and real-world datasets and demonstrate its applicability in a real-world model-predictive control experiment. To the best of our knowledge, there is no publicly available dataset for learning and evaluating dynamics models in the RGB-D domain, as most works consider only RGB images [3], [5], [39]. We therefore evaluate our model on a physics engine and on real interaction data recorded with a robot manipulator.

A. Poking Task Representation

We consider the scenario where a robot is in front of its working arena and a collection of objects lie on top of the arena. The robot collects data by randomly poking objects. The observed scene dynamics are captured with a fixed RGB-D camera. Concretely, before and after each action the depth maps and color images of the scene are stored. Random poking can lead to many poke actions being executed in free space, slowing down the data collection of relevant interaction data. To alleviate this problem, we provide the robot with an observation of the scene without objects and at each interaction perform a background subtraction that discovers actionable parts of the scene. The working arena of the robot is discretized into a 2D grid and at each interaction the robot randomly chooses one occupied cell as the poke target position and one free cell as the poke start position. We define the poke action by a target 2D position on the arena and a poke direction θ , corresponding to the angle between start and target cells.



Fig. 6: Our real-world poking dataset consists of 34 objects different from each other in shape, appearance, material, mass and friction.

B. Dataset

We evaluate our approach on both synthetic and real data. For experiments on synthetic data, we use the Bullet physics engine [41] to collect a dataset of poking interactions. We pick four representative objects from the KIT kitchen object models database [40], which differ in geometry, size and texture. These objects are shown in Fig. 5. We record a dataset of 200K interactions, with randomized object start poses and poke actions. To simulate realistic real-world conditions we also consider noise regarding depth and data association. Concretely, we simulate the noise seen in real depth sensors by adding gaussian noise with a standard deviation (SD) of 1 cm and scaled the noise by the depth (farther points get more noise). To simulate noise in the data association produced by external tracking systems, we allow for spurious ground-truth associations. Each point is allowed to be randomly associated to any other point in a $n \times n$ window around it, as long as their depth differences are no larger than ± 10 cm.

For experiments on real data, we collect 40K of interaction data with a KUKA LBR iiwa manipulator and a fixed Azure Kinect RGB-D camera. We built an arena of styrofoam with walls for preventing objects from falling down. At any given time there were 3-7 objects randomly chosen from a set of 34 distinct objects present on the arena. The objects differed from each other in shape, appearance, material, mass and friction as shown in Fig. 6. Our robot can run autonomously 24/7 without any human intervention, enabling to improve a robot’s understanding of its environments physics in a lifelong learning manner.

C. Evaluation Protocol

For the quantitative evaluation of the learned structured forward dynamics model, we leverage the Bullet physics engine to access ground-truth action-conditioned scene flow. Following SE3-Nets [6], [7], we report the Mean Squared Error (MSE) between the predicted 3D scene flow and ground-truth, averaged across points with non-zero ground-truth flow. This metric takes into account errors in both the mask and 3D motion prediction.

Depth Noise \ Model	SE3-Nets (Fully-Supervised)			Hind4sight-Net (Unsupervised)			
	DA Noise, threshold = ± 10 cm			2D Loss	3D Loss	2D Loss + 3D Loss	Full model
	0	9×9	11×11				
No Noise	1.00 ± 0.37	1.68 ± 0.35	2.07 ± 0.37	1.86 ± 0.46	1.80 ± 0.49	1.52 ± 0.50	1.47 ± 0.49
Gaussian Noise, SD = 1cm	1.07 ± 0.58	1.94 ± 0.45	2.20 ± 0.41	1.93 ± 0.48	31.39 ± 24.08	1.78 ± 0.64	1.63 ± 0.47

TABLE I: Average per-point flow MSE in cm under different noise settings for the simulated dataset. Additionally, we analyze the influence of the different losses of Hind4sight-Net.

D. Comparisons

The main baseline for our experiments on synthetic data is the fully-supervised SE3-Nets [6], as it showed improved performance over SE3-Pose-Nets [7]. To simulate real-world conditions, we evaluate the performance of SE3-Nets also on moderate settings of noise regarding depth and data association. Thus we evaluate following models:

- *SE3-Nets*: The network from [6] which similarly to us receives a point cloud and an action vector and predicts the next point cloud by decomposing the scene into masks and $SE(3)$ transformations of attended objects. This model is supervised by the point to point data association of point clouds across two consecutive scenes.
- *Hind4sight-Net*: Our unsupervised structured dynamics model, which fully exploits available data resources and physically grounded structural constraints by simultaneously learning the forward and inverse models and enforcing the consistency of estimated 3D clouds, actions and 2D images with observed ones.
- *No motion*: This baseline always predicts zero motion.

E. Results on Modeling Scene Dynamics

We start off by evaluating our method on the scene dynamics recorded with the Bullet physics engine. To simulate realistic real-world conditions we report our main results on moderate settings of noise regarding depth and data association. To reproduce noise in the data association, we allow for spurious ground-truth associations in a 11×11 window. Quantitative results of the predicted action-conditioned scene flow are reported in Table II. Our Hind4sight-Net achieves the best 3D scene flow error compared to baselines even though it fully-unsupervised and not directly trained to predict 3D scene flow. Moreover, our network achieves a large error reduction in comparison to the “No Motion” baseline (12.6 cm per point).

Model	Training Paradigm	MSE (cm)
SE3-Nets [6]	supervised	2.20
Hind4sight-Net	unsupervised	1.63
No Motion	x	12.6

TABLE II: Average per-point flow MSE (cm). Our Hind4sight-Net achieves the best 3D scene flow error compared to baselines even though it fully-unsupervised and not directly trained to predict 3D scene flow. The “No Motion” result quantifies the average magnitude of motion in the dataset.

We also evaluate the performance of our implicit action-conditioned 2D optical flow, achieved by projecting the 3D scene flow into the image plane, by comparing it against




Fig. 7: Visualization of the optical flow predicted by FlowNet 2.0 [42] and the implicit action-conditioned flow learned by our model. Hind4sight-Net outperforms FlowNet 2.0 as it shows sharper object masks, models collisions better and is less prone to visual distractors such as shadows.

FlowNet 2.0 [42], a state of the art optical flow prediction network. We outperform this strong baseline, despite FlowNet 2.0 having access to two consecutive images as input and having explicit optical flow supervision. Moreover, we observe even better performance for real data, as FlowNet 2.0 is more prone to visual distractors such as shadows (not present in the simulated dataset), see Figure 7.

Model	Inputs	AEE
FlowNet 2.0 [42]	Images I_t and I_{t+1}	0.11
Hind4sight-Net	Point Cloud P_t and Action u_t	0.05

TABLE III: Average Endpoint Error. Our Hind4sight-Net achieves the best 2D optical flow error compared to FlowNet 2.0 even though it is not directly trained to predict 2D optical flow and has no optical flow supervision during training.

F. Ablation Studies

To analyze the influence of our different building blocks on the learned dynamics model, we conduct several experiments on the simulated dataset (see Table I). Our results indicate that using only a single domain loss is not informative enough to learn an unsupervised dynamics model efficiently. Specially when a realistic noise in the depth is considered, using only the 3D loss leads to large errors due to spurious




Fig. 8: Visualization of executed poking action sequences computed by cross entropy method (CEM) in simulation and real-world: Given the initial configuration and the goal configuration, the arrow shows the sequence of action taken by the robot.

nearest-neighbor associations. Reasoning jointly over the 3D and image domain improves significantly the results and incorporating the action loss of the inverse model for the full model, achieves the best result. We also evaluate the fully-supervised SE3-Nets under a range of moderate depth and data-association noise conditions and overall observe better performance for our model.

G. Control Performance

To evaluate the effectiveness of the learned dynamics model, we use the cross entropy method (CEM) to find poke action sequences that lead to a desired goal on both simulated and real data. We define the planning cost-function by a combination of the 3D and 2D domains the network has been trained on. Concretely, we use a combination of the pixel distance, between user marked object points (one point per object) and the Chamfer distance of the whole scene to the goal scene. We use our implicit optical flow to predict how a pixel will move to the next frame given a poke action. The pixel distance has a high degree of robustness against distractor objects and clutter, since the optimizer can ignore the values of other pixels. However, we found incorporating global reasoning in 3D space achieved best results, specially to fine-tune the orientation of the target objects. This can be seen as a registration method between a current point cloud and a goal point cloud. We perform several experiments by changing the number of objects that need to be moved to reach the goal configuration. We report the average distance of all objects to their respective goal configurations, see Figure 9. We observe that in most cases we can reach the goal configuration with around 10 poke actions. Moreover, even for the challenging case of planning for three different objects, the learned dynamics model allows to attend to the relevant parts of the scene and successfully reach the goal configuration, as shown in Figure 8. For simpler tasks with a single object to be moved, we also observe implicit collision-

avoidance behavior to some extent, as shown in the last row of Figure 8.




Fig. 9: Quantitative results of planning with the learned dynamics model in simulation with variable number of objects to be moved.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we presented a novel approach for learning an “intuitive” and structured model of physics from unlabeled robot interaction data. We showed that our formulation enables learning scene dynamics in the real-world without external trackers, human supervision or a pre-trained perception network. We demonstrated that the learned dynamics can be used for visuomotor control and planning. In this work we modeled actions as small pokes, which are likely to be more predictable than large pushing actions. A downside of this choice is that it becomes challenging to observe latent physical properties such as mass and friction from object motion. This is because with a poke action, changes in object movements are mainly influenced by dynamics of the

manipulator, less so from the object itself. Therefore, investigating an adaptive curriculum learning setup to leverage push actions of variable length and force might be interesting.

Going forward, a natural extension of this work is to try to infer the depth maps directly from the image observations in a self-supervised manner. This would allow to learn structured dynamics model in broader range of applications. Another promising direction for future work is to investigate a tighter coupling of both the inverse and forward dynamics model for planning.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Arunkumar Byravan and Maxim Tatarchenko for their insightful comments during the development of this work. We further thank Markus Merklinger and Leonhard Sommer for their support while recording the real-world interaction dataset.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. W. Battaglia, J. B. Hamrick, and J. B. Tenenbaum, "Simulation as an engine of physical scene understanding," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2013.
- [2] M. McCloskey, "Intuitive physics," *Scientific american*, vol. 248, no. 4, 1983.
- [3] C. Finn, I. Goodfellow, and S. Levine, "Unsupervised learning for physical interaction through video prediction," in *NIPS*, 2016.
- [4] F. Ebert, C. Finn, S. Dasari, A. Xie, A. Lee, and S. Levine, "Visual foresight: Model-based deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00568*, 2018.
- [5] P. Agrawal, A. V. Nair, P. Abbeel, J. Malik, and S. Levine, "Learning to poke by poking: Experiential learning of intuitive physics," in *NIPS*, 2016.
- [6] A. Byravan and D. Fox, "Se3-nets: Learning rigid body motion using deep neural networks," in *ICRA*, 2017.
- [7] A. Byravan, F. Leeb, F. Meier, and D. Fox, "Se3-pose-nets: Structured deep dynamics models for visuomotor planning and control," *ICRA*, 2018.
- [8] Y. Ye, D. Gandhi, A. Gupta, and S. Tulsiani, "Object-centric forward modeling for model predictive control," in *CoRL*, 2020.
- [9] J. K. Li, W. S. Lee, and D. Hsu, "Push-net: Deep planar pushing for objects with unknown physical properties," in *RSS*, 2018.
- [10] M. Kopicki, S. Zurek, R. Stolkin, T. Moerwald, and J. L. Wyatt, "Learning modular and transferable forward models of the motions of push manipulated objects," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 41, no. 5, 2017.
- [11] F. Paus, T. Huang, and T. Asfour, "Predicting pushing action effects on spatial object relations by learning internal prediction models," in *ICRA*, 2020.
- [12] M. Toussaint, "Robot trajectory optimization using approximate inference," in *ICML*, 2009.
- [13] M. Dogar and S. Srinivasa, "A framework for push-grasping in clutter," *RSS*, 2011.
- [14] A. Rodriguez, M. T. Mason, and S. Ferry, "From caging to grasping," *IJRR*, vol. 31, no. 7, 2012.
- [15] F. Ebert, C. Finn, A. X. Lee, and S. Levine, "Self-supervised visual planning with temporal skip connections," *CoRL*, 2017.
- [16] A. Lerer, S. Gross, and R. Fergus, "Learning physical intuition of block towers by example," *ICML*, 2016.
- [17] P. Battaglia, R. Pascanu, M. Lai, D. J. Rezende, *et al.*, "Interaction networks for learning about objects, relations and physics," in *NIPS*, 2016.
- [18] Y. Li, J. Wu, J.-Y. Zhu, J. B. Tenenbaum, A. Torralba, and R. Tedrake, "Propagation networks for model-based control under partial observation," in *ICRA*, 2019.
- [19] Z. Xu, J. Wu, A. Zeng, J. B. Tenenbaum, and S. Song, "Densephysnet: Learning dense physical object representations via multi-step dynamic interactions," *RSS*, 2019.
- [20] D. Zheng, V. Luo, J. Wu, and J. B. Tenenbaum, "Unsupervised learning of latent physical properties using perception-prediction networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.09244*, 2018.
- [21] R. Mottaghi, H. Bagherinezhad, M. Rastegari, and A. Farhadi, "Newtonian scene understanding: Unfolding the dynamics of objects in static images," in *CVPR*, 2016.
- [22] M. Watter, J. Springenberg, J. Boedecker, and M. Riedmiller, "Embed to control: A locally linear latent dynamics model for control from raw images," in *NIPS*, 2015.
- [23] S. Levine, C. Finn, T. Darrell, and P. Abbeel, "End-to-end training of deep visuomotor policies," *JMLR*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2016.
- [24] C. Finn and S. Levine, "Deep visual foresight for planning robot motion," in *ICRA*, 2017.
- [25] C. Doersch, A. Gupta, and A. A. Efros, "Unsupervised visual representation learning by context prediction," in *CVPR*, 2015.
- [26] A. v. d. Oord, Y. Li, and O. Vinyals, "Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.
- [27] S. Vijayanarasimhan, S. Ricco, C. Schmid, R. Sukthankar, and K. Fragkiadaki, "Sfm-net: Learning of structure and motion from video," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.07804*, 2017.
- [28] R. Raina, A. Battle, H. Lee, B. Packer, and A. Y. Ng, "Self-taught learning: transfer learning from unlabeled data," in *ICML*, 2007.
- [29] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [30] A. Eitel, N. Hauff, and W. Burgard, "Self-supervised transfer learning for instance segmentation through physical interaction," in *IROS*, 2019.
- [31] D. Pathak, Y. Shentu, D. Chen, P. Agrawal, T. Darrell, S. Levine, and J. Malik, "Learning instance segmentation by interaction," in *CVPR Workshops*, 2018.
- [32] A. Zeng, K.-T. Yu, S. Song, D. Suo, E. Walker, A. Rodriguez, and J. Xiao, "Multi-view self-supervised deep learning for 6d pose estimation in the amazon picking challenge," in *ICRA*, 2017.
- [33] X. Deng, Y. Xiang, A. Mousavian, C. Eppner, T. Bretl, and D. Fox, "Self-supervised 6d object pose estimation for robot manipulation," *ICRA*, 2019.
- [34] O. Mees, M. Tatarchenko, T. Brox, and W. Burgard, "Self-supervised 3d shape and viewpoint estimation from single images for robotics," in *IROS*, Macao, China, 2019.
- [35] O. Mees, M. Merklinger, G. Kalweit, and W. Burgard, "Adversarial skill networks: Unsupervised robot skill learning from videos," in *ICRA*, Paris, France, 2020.
- [36] C. Lynch, M. Khansari, T. Xiao, V. Kumar, J. Tompson, S. Levine, and P. Sermanet, "Learning latent plans from play," in *CoRL*, 2019.
- [37] M. Jaderberg, K. Simonyan, A. Zisserman, *et al.*, "Spatial transformer networks," in *NIPS*, 2015.
- [38] R. Rubinstein, "The cross-entropy method for combinatorial and continuous optimization," *Methodology and computing in applied probability*, vol. 1, no. 2, 1999.
- [39] S. Dasari, F. Ebert, S. Tian, S. Nair, B. Bucher, K. Schmeckpeper, S. Singh, S. Levine, and C. Finn, "Robonet: Large-scale multi-robot learning," *CoRL*, 2019.
- [40] A. Kasper, Z. Xue, and R. Dillmann, "The kit object models database: An object model database for object recognition, localization and manipulation in service robotics," *IJRR*, vol. 31, no. 8, 2012.
- [41] E. Coumans and Y. Bai, "Pybullet, a python module for physics simulation for games, robotics and machine learning," *GitHub repository*, 2016.
- [42] E. Ilg, N. Mayer, T. Saikia, M. Keuper, A. Dosovitskiy, and T. Brox, "FlowNet 2.0: Evolution of optical flow estimation with deep networks," in *CVPR*, 2017.