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Abstract

Language-guided robots performing home and office tasks must navigate in and interact with the world. Grounding language instructions against visual observations and actions to take in an environment is an open challenge. We present Embodied BERT (EmBERT), a transformer-based model which can attend to high-dimensional, multi-modal inputs across long temporal horizons for language-conditioned task completion. Additionally, we bridge the gap between successful object-centric navigation models used for non-interactive agents and the language-guided visual task completion benchmark, ALFRED, by introducing object navigation targets for EmBERT training. We achieve competitive performance on the ALFRED benchmark, and EmBERT marks the first transformer-based model to successfully handle the long-horizon, dense, multi-modal histories of ALFRED, and the first ALFRED model to utilize object-centric navigation targets.

1 Introduction

Human-agent collaboration is facilitated by agents that interpret and execute natural language instructions from people. Language is grounded in agent experience based on interactions with the world and other actors in it [11, 10]. Task-oriented, instructional language focuses on objects and interactions between objects and actors, as seen in instructional datasets [21, 40], as a function of the inextricable relationship between language and objects [62]. That focus yields language descriptions of object targets for manipulation such as put the strawberries on the cutting board and slice them into pieces [15]. Even descriptions of navigation tasks, which do not involve manipulating or interacting with objects, use navigational landmarks [27], for example head upstairs and walk past the piano through an archway directly in front [3]. In this paper, we demonstrate that predicting navigational object landmarks in addition to manipulation object targets improves the performance of an instruction following agent in a rich, 3D simulated home environment. We posit that object-centric navigation is a key piece of semantic and topological navigation [42] for Embodied AI agents generally.

Embodied AI (EAI) agents take in multi-sensory input, such as vision and language [22] or vision and audio [16] and take actions such as navigation [3], object manipulation [48, 51], or both [30, 66], in a simulated environment. Substantial modeling [50] and benchmark [61] efforts in agent navigation focus on identifying object landmarks [12] and destinations [7]. However, for agent task completion, where agents must navigate an environment and manipulate objects towards a specified goal [30, 66], modeling efforts thus far have predicted movement actions without explicitly identifying object targets [69, 56, 52, 1]. We address this gap, grounding navigation instructions like Head to the sink in the corner by predicting the spatial locations of the goal sink object at each timestep (Figure 1).
EmBERT attends to object detections in a panoramic view around an agent, then predicts an action and both a target object and target object parent for both navigation and manipulation actions. For example, at timesteps $t = 0, 1$ above, the model must predict the sink object target and its parent, the countertop, while at $t = 6$ it predicts both the object potato to pick up and the sink on which it rests. EmBERT uses a decoupled multi-modal transformer embedding network and transformer decoder model to enable both high dimensional language and vision input and conditioning on a long horizon of previous state embeddings.

Large scale, pretrained transformer models like BERT [25] provide powerful language representation capacity for EAI [50, 35] and multimodal language and vision [74, 45, 44, 88, 18, 63, 86] tasks. Transformer-based models in EAI score the alignment between a language instruction and an already-completed path [50] or introduce recurrence by propagating part of the hidden state to the next timestep [35]. The former requires beam search over sequences of environment actions, which is not feasible when actions cannot be undone, such as slicing an apple [66]. The latter introduces a heavy memory requirement, and is feasible only with short trajectories of four to six steps. We overcome both limitations by decoupling the embedding of language and visual features from the prediction of what action to take next in the environment. In particular, we first embed language and visual observations at single timesteps using a multi-modal transformer architecture [35], then train a transformer decoder model to consume sequences of such embeddings to decode actions (Figure 3).

We introduce Embodied BERT (EmBERT), which implements these two key insights:

1. **Object-centric Navigation** unifies the disjoint navigation and interaction action sequences in ALFRED by giving navigation actions per-step object landmarks, removing the need for the separate navigation and interaction pipelines used in existing work [69].
2. **Decoupled Multimodal Transformers** enable extending transformer based multimodal embeddings and sequence-to-sequence prediction from domains with less than ten steps [35] to the hundreds of steps needed for the ALFRED benchmark [66].

EmBERT is the first transformer model for an EAI task that utilizes time-dependent, multi-modal, and object-centric perceptual information. EmBERT achieves competitive performance on the ALFRED benchmark, and we perform ablations that demonstrate adding object-centric navigation and historical memory boost model success rates. We argue that object-centric action taking may be a key ingredient to successful modeling for Embodied AI benchmarks generally.

## 2 Related Work

Robot agents that navigate and perform object manipulation in human spaces have been a long-range goal of AI researchers for decades [53]. Natural language guidance of such agents [75] has been explored in contexts from furniture assembly [76] to quadcopter flight control [14].

**Embodied AI.** Advances in simulators and large-scale data collection have facilitated moving past static language grounding tasks like visual question answering [4, 23] and captioning [80, 65, 36] to embodied benchmarks like Vision-and-Language Navigation (VNL) [49, 17, 3, 61, 41], embodied question answering [22, 30], and language-guided task completion [19, 66, 1, 15, 55]. For task completion benchmarks, actions like `pick up` must be coupled with object targets in the visual
Table 1: Model comparison. EmBERT uses a multimodal transformer to embed language instructions and detected objects in a panoramic view, and a transformer decoder to produce action and object predictions. Ours is the first ALFRED model to add object prediction to navigation steps.

Models for Language-Guided Task Completion. Table 1 summarizes how EmBERT compares to current ALFRED modeling approaches. ALFRED language instructions are given as both a single high level goal and a sequence of step-by-step instructions (Figure 2). At each timestep, we encode the goal instruction and a predicted current step-by-step instruction. We train EmBERT to predict when to advance to the next instruction, a technique introduced by LWIT [52]. EmBERT uses a panoramic view space to see all around the agent, similar in motivation to LWIT. Rather than processing dense, single vector representations [66, 69, 56], EmBERT attends directly over object bounding box predictions embedded with their spatial relations to the agent, inspired by LWIT and a recurrent VLN BERT model [35]. We similarly follow prior work [69, 56, 52] in predicting these bounding boxes as object targets for actions like Pickup, rather than directly predicting a dense object segmentation mask [66].

Historical features or hidden states are necessary observations for ALFRED models. For example, consider the step heat the mug of water in the microwave, where the visual observation before turning the microwave on and after turning the microwave off are identical. To date, transformer encodings of the raw observation history are possible only with shallow networks [56] that cannot take advantage of large scale, pretrained language models that can otherwise be used on short horizons [35]. We decouple multimodal transformer state encoding from sequence to sequence state to action prediction, drawing inspiration from the AllenNLP SQuAD [64] training procedure [29].

Finally, our EmBERT model is the first to utilize an auxiliary, object-centric navigation prediction loss during joint navigation and manipulation tasks, building on prior work that predicted only the direction of the target object [71] or honed in on landmarks during navigation-only tasks [67].

3 The ALFRED Benchmark

The ALFRED benchmark [66] pairs household task demonstrations with written English instructions in 3d simulated rooms [39]. The language annotations were gathered via Mechanical Turk. ALFRED tasks are from seven categories: PICK & PLACE, STACK & PLACE, PICK TWO & PLACE, CLEAN & PLACE, HEAT & PLACE, COOL & PLACE, and EXAMINE IN LIGHT. Each task involves one or more objects that need to be manipulated, for example an apple, and a final receptacle on which they should come to rest, for example a plate. Many tasks involve intermediate state changes, for example HEAT & PLACE requires cooking the target object in a microwave.
We define a navigation object target for all navigation actions. In particular, for navigation actions taken during language instruction $I_j$, we examine the frame $V^F_k$ at time $k$ for $T_{j,k}; m_{ja}(i) = (j,k)$. We identify the object instance $O$ of the class specified in the planning goal $P_{ja}$ in $V^F_k$. We define this object $O$ as the navigation object target for all navigation actions in $T_{j,k}$ by pairing those actions with object mask $M^O$ to be predicted during training. We also add a training objective to predict...
Figure 3: Proposed Embodied BERT model. A multimodal encoder embeds goal- and step-level instructions alongside object detections from a panoramic view around the agent. This encoder produces a temporally independent hidden state $h_t$. A sequence of such hidden states are attended by a segment-level recurrent action decoder to produce time-dependent states $\tilde{h}_t$. EmBERT is trained in segments $s_i$ to balance gradient flow over time with memory constraints, and previous segments are cached to be attended over in future timesteps. Time-dependent state $\tilde{h}_t$ is used to predict the next action, whether to start attending to the next step-by-step instruction, what object to target in the environment, that object’s parent receptacle, and detected object classes.

the parent receptacle $P(O)$ of $O$. This parent box prediction provides additional supervision but is not utilized by the ALFRED API. For navigation target objects, parent prediction enables navigating to landmarks such as the table for instructions like Turn around and head to the box on the table, where the box will be small for many timesteps compared to the table on which it rests (Figure 2).

4 Embodied BERT

EmBERT uses a transformer encoder for jointly embedding language and visual tokens and an transformer decoder for long-horizon planning, and performs object-centric navigation predictions.

4.1 Multimodal encoder

We use OSCAR [45] as a backbone transformer module to fuse language and visual features at each ALFRED trajectory step. We obtain subword tokens for the goal instruction $I_g = \{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n\}$ and the step-by-step instruction $I_j = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m\}$ using the WordPiece tokenizer [85] and process the sequence as: [CLS] $I_g$ [SEP] $I_j$ [SEP]. We rely on different token type ids to allow the model to distinguish the goal and step instructions. We derive token embeddings $L \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n+3) \times d_e}$ using the BERT [25] embedding layer, where $d_e$ is the embedding dimensionality.

We provide EmBERT with object-centric representations by using MaskRCNN [32] features to represent detected objects in every frame of the panorama view. We fix the number of object detections in the front view $V^F$ to 36, while limiting those in the side views to 18, following the intuition that the front view contains small objects that must be manipulated, while the side views contain large landmark objects which are navigation targets. We represent each object $o \in O$ as an embedding $o \in \mathbb{R}^{d_o}$, which is a concatenation of: 1) detection ResNet [33] features; 2) bounding box coordinates; 3) bounding box relative area; and 4) vertical and horizontal heading of the object related to the current agent position, following prior work [71]. These representations make up the observed object embeddings $O$. We use a one layer MLP to map object embeddings of dimensionality $d_o$.
to size $d_e$. The multi-modal transformer backbone consumes the token and object embeddings to produce multi-modal hidden states $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n+|O| \times d_e}$. We obtain these state representations, $h_t$, for each timestep $t$ by computing an element-wise product between $H_0$ and $H_{m+n}$, the hidden state of the [CLS] token and the last [SEP] token placed between language tokens and objects, similar in spirit to the approach described in [88]. In this way, we can generate temporally independent agent states for an entire trajectory resulting in a sequence of states $\{h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_{|T|}\}$ (Figure 3).

### 4.2 Segment-Level Recurrent Action Decoder

The ALFRED challenge requires models to learn to complete action sequences averaging 50 steps and spanning multiple navigation and manipulation sub-goals. Transformer-based architectures use self-attention and positional embeddings to learn effective, long sequence representations. However, due to the quadratic complexity of the self-attention mechanism, feeding long sequences is computationally expensive [8]. Inspired by the TransformerXL model [20], we design the Segment-Level Recurrent Action Decoder architecture that models long trajectories with recurrent segment-level state reuse.

At training time we divide trajectories into temporal segments of size $s$. Given two consecutive segments, $s_t$ and $s_{t+1}$, EmBERT caches the representations generated for segment $s_t$. The computed gradient does not flow from $s_{t+1}$ to $s_t$, but cached representations are used as extended context.

The TransformerXL model is intended as an encoder-only architecture which is not able to perform cross-attention with some encoder hidden states. Therefore, we introduce two novel elements to its architecture: 1) encoder hidden states cache; 2) cross-attention over encoder states. First, our extended context is composed of both agent state representations and hidden states from the previous segment $s_t$. In addition, to perform cross-attention between decoder and encoder hidden states, we modify the TransformerXL self-attention mechanism following common practice in designing transformer decoders [82]. EmBERT encodes the previous actions for the current timestep $a_{t-1}$ and extracts an action embedding $a_t$ from a learnable embedding matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{|A| \times d_a}$. In the TransformerXL’s multi-head self-attention layers, we generate keys and values from the agent state representations (encoder) and queries from the action embeddings (decoder). We obtain time-dependent agent state representations $\{\hat{h}_1, \hat{h}_2, \ldots, \hat{h}_{|T|}\}$ as output.

Given time-dependent hidden states, the model predicts action and object mask outputs. We learn a probability distribution over the agent actions $A$ by using a two layer feedforward network (FFN) with dropout and GeLU activation receiving the hidden state $\hat{h}_t$ for the timestep $t$:

$$\hat{h}_1 = \text{GeLU}(\hat{h}_t W^1) \quad P(a_t|\hat{h}_t) = \text{softmax}(\hat{h}_t W^2), \quad (1)$$

where $W^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times d_e}$ and $W^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times |A|}$ are two weight matrices. We use sequence-based cross-entropy loss [73], $L_A$, to supervise the action prediction task. In addition, we derive time-dependent fine-grained representations of token and object embeddings. We use conditional scaling [20] to fuse the decoder hidden state $\hat{h}_t$ with the embedding $H$ to produce the time-dependent embeddings $\hat{H}$:

$$\tilde{c} = W_t \hat{h} \quad \hat{H}_i = \tilde{c} \cdot H_i, \quad i = \{1, \ldots, (m + n + |O|)\}, \quad (2)$$

where $W_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times d_e}$ is a weight matrix used to adapt the representation of the original decoder hidden state $\hat{h}$. We predict target objects by selecting one bounding box among the detections in $\mathcal{V}^P$ for manipulation actions, or any view for navigation actions. We treat object mask prediction as a classification task where the model first extracts time-dependent object embeddings $\tilde{O} = \hat{H}_t$, $i = \{(m + n), \ldots, (m + n + |O|)\}$, and then generates logits for each object as follows:

$$\tilde{o}_i^1 = \text{GeLU}(\tilde{O} W_o^1) \quad P(o_i|\tilde{o}_i) = \text{softmax}(\tilde{o}_i^1 W_o^2), \quad (3)$$

where $W_o^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times d_e}$ and $W_o^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times 1}$ are two weight matrices. At training time, we determine the target object by using the Intersection-Over-Union score between the predicted object masks generated by MaskRCCNN for each object and the gold object mask. To supervise this classification task, we use sequence-based cross-entropy loss indicated by $L_O$.

### 4.3 Auxiliary tasks

During the EmBERT training, we jointly optimize $L_A$, $L_O$, and several auxiliary tasks.

---

\footnote{In our experiments, in order to reuse the visual embedding available in the OSCAR checkpoint, we use an additional one layer MLP to adapt our visual features to the visual embeddings space learned by OSCAR.}
**Leaderboard Test Fold Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>GC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEQ2SEQ</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.98 (2.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAV</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.35 (6.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;HiTuT&quot;</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.27 (11.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22.05 (15.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLSM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.11 (6.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWIT</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.92 (25.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmBERT</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31.77 (23.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ABP&quot;</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.55 (3.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Test Fold Performance. Path weighted metrics are given in parentheses. *Concurrent work.

Next Instruction Prediction. Several existing models for ALFRED encode the sequence of language instructions $I$ together with the goal (Table 1), or concatenate step-by-step instructions. These simplifications can prevent the model from carefully attending to relevant parts of the visual scene. EmBERT takes the first instruction at time $t = 0$, and performs an auxiliary prediction task to advance from instruction $I_j$ to instruction $I_{j+1}$. Only one such instruction can be attended at a time by the multimodal encoder (Section 4.1). To supervise the next-instruction decision, we create a binary label for each step of the trajectory that indicates whether that step is the last step for a specific sub-goal, as obtained by $m_a(i)$ (Section 5). We use a similar FNN as Equation 1 above that models a Bernoulli variable used to decide when to advance to the next instruction. We denote the binary cross-entropy loss used to supervise this task as $L_{INST}$.

Object Target Predictions. EmBERT predicts a target object for navigation actions, by retrieving the object target at the end of the navigation sequence, then using its bounding box in the panoramic views for preceding timesteps as supervision (Section 3). Additionally, EmBERT predicts the receptacle object containing the target, for example a table on which a box sits (Figure 2). For these tasks, we use an equivalent prediction layer to the one used for object prediction. We denote the cross-entropy loss associated with these task by $L_{NAV}$ and $L_{RECP}$.

Visual Region Classification. Class-conditioned representations are useful for agent manipulation, especially when combined with hand-crafted procedures for object selections [69]. Inspired by masked region modeling tasks [18, 67], we select with $15\%$ probability some objects part of the agent view in a given timestep $t$ and we ask the model to predict their classes. Given the instruction *Turn around and walk to the book on the desk*, at the very first timestep of the trajectory it is likely that none of the mentioned objects are visible. Thus, we assume that at the last step of a sub-goal the agent will have in view the objects associated with the instruction. For the prediction task, we directly use the time-dependent object embeddings $\hat{O}$ and use an FFN (similar to Equation 1) to estimate a probability distribution over the ALFRED object labels. We use a cross-entropy loss denoted by $L_{VRC}$ as supervision for this task. We also explored masked language modeling, masked region modeling, and image-text matching (Appendix A.1).

5 Experiments and Results

EmBERT achieves competitive performance with state of the art models on the ALFRED leaderboard test sets (Table 2), surpassing MOCA [69], LWIT [52], and several concurrent works on Seen test fold performance (Table 5).

Implementation Details. EmBERT is implemented using AllenNLP [29], PyTorch-Lightning[^3] and Huggingface-Transformers [84]. We train using the Adam optimizer with weight fix [46], learning rate $2e^{-5}$, and linear rate scheduler without warmup steps. We use dropout of 0.1 for the hidden layers of the FFN modules and gradient clipping of 1.0 for the overall model weights. Our TransformerXL-based decoder is composed of 2 layers, 8 attention heads, and uses a memory cache.

[^3]: https://www.pytorchlightning.ai/
Table 3: Validation Fold Performance. Ablations adjusting the number of side-view bounding boxes, attended memory length, with and without predicting navigation target \(O\), target parent object \(P(O)\), and visual region classification (VRC) loss. For 9 side view boxes, the highest values per fold and metric are shown in blue. Ablations for 18 side-view boxes can be found in Section A.2.

Action Recovery Module. We generalize the obstacle avoidance module introduced by MOCA [69]. For obstacle avoidance, if a navigation action fails, for example the agent choosing \textit{MoveAhead} when facing a wall, we take the next most confident navigation action at the following timestep. We introduce an analogous object interaction recovery procedure. When the agent chooses an interaction action such as \textit{Slice}, we first select the bounding box of highest confidence to retrieve an object interaction mask. If the resulting API action fails, for example if the agent attempts to \textit{Slice} a \textit{Kettle} object, we choose the next highest confidence bounding box at the following timestep. Note that the ALFRED challenge ends an episode when an agent causes 10 such API action failures.

Comparison to Other Models. Table 2 gives EmBERT performance against the sequence-to-sequence baseline [66] and previous and concurrent models on the ALFRED leaderboard. EmBERT outperforms MOCA [69] on \textit{Unseen} scenes, and several models on \textit{Seen} scenes. The primary leaderboard metric is \textit{Unseen} success rate, measuring models’ generalization abilities. While EmBERT outperforms MOCA at \textit{Unseen} generalization success, it falls short of a number of concurrent modeling approaches. Notably, EmBERT remains somewhat competitive on \textit{Unseen path-weighted} metrics, because it does not perform any kind of exploration or mapping as in some concurrent work [13, 38].

The EmBERT model in Table 2 predicts the parent receptacle but does not perform visual region classification. \textit{Seen} and \textit{Unseen} sets refer to tasks in rooms that were or were not seen by the agent at training time. We report Task success rate and Goal Conditioned (GC) success rate. Task success rate is the average number of episodes completed successfully. Goal conditioned success rate is more forgiving; each episode is scored in [0, 1] based on the number of subgoals satisfied, for example, in a \textit{STACK} & \textit{PLACE} task if one of two \textit{mugs} are put on a \textit{table}, the GC score is 0.5 [66]. Path weighted success penalizes taking more than the number of expert actions necessary for the task.

We do not utilize the MOCA Instance Association in Time module [69] that is mimicked by ET [56]. That module is conditioned based on the object class of the target object selected across timesteps. Because we directly predict object instances without conditioning on a predicted object class, our model must learn instance associations temporally in an implicit manner, rather than using such an inference time “fix”. Compared to ET [56], we do not use any data augmentation for language instructions. Our approach is compatible with the data augmentation in ET, and so we will explore adding ET’s synthetic data to EmBERT training in the future.
**EmBERT Ablations.** We find that our auxiliary losses do not improve performance when EmBERT side views attend to 18 bounding boxes each (Section A.2). Table 3 gives the performance of EmBERT with and without different auxiliary losses and for different sizes of cached memory for the action decoder when considering only 9 bounding boxes per side view, which enables fitting longer training segments in memory and is overall a more lightweight model. We find that predicting the parent receptacle of the target object is an auxiliary loss that helps generalization, while visual region class prediction helps to memorize *Seen* environments. Combining both losses leads to less effective performance; weighting these losses to gain advantage from both remains an area for future work. We find that removing the object-centric navigation prediction leads to fewer successful episodes in the *Seen* fold. Additionally, we show that limiting memory for the action decoder to a single previous timestep decreases performance in both *Seen* and *Unseen* folds.

### 6 Limitations and Impact

We sketch the limits and impact of EmBERT and its evaluation via ALFRED.

#### Limitations.

We evaluated EmBERT only on ALFRED, whose language directives are provided as a one-sided “recipe” accomplishing a task. In future work, we would like to incorporate our model on navigation tasks involving dialogue [77, 24] and real robot platforms [5] where lifelong learning is possible [83, 57]. Low-level physical robot control is more difficult than the abstract locomotion used in ALFRED, and poses a separate set of challenges [12, 2]. By operating only in simulation, our model also misses the full range of experience that can ground language in the world [11], such as haptic feedback during object manipulation [78, 29, 68], and audio [16] and speech [31, 41] features of the environment. Further, in ALFRED an agent never encounters novel object classes at inference time, which represent an additional challenge for successful task completion [72].

#### Potential Negative Societal Impacts.

The ALFRED benchmark, and consequently the EmBERT model, only evaluates and considers written English. EmBERT inherently excludes people who cannot use typed communication. By training and evaluating only on English, we can only speculate whether the object-centric navigation methods introduced for EmBERT will generalize to other languages. We are cautiously optimistic that, with the success of massively multi-lingual language models [57], EmBERT would be able to train with non-English language data. At the same time, we acknowledge the possibility of pernicious, inscrutable priors and behavior [9] and the possibility for targeted, language prompt-based attacks [70] in such large-scale networks.

### 7 Conclusions

We apply the insight that object-centric navigation is helpful for language-guided Embodied AI to a benchmark of tasks in home environments. Our paper is the first to bring object-centric navigation to bear on language-guided, manipulation and navigation-based task completion. Our proposed Embodied BERT (EmBERT) model adapts the pretrained language model transformer OSCAR [45], and we introduce a decoupled transformer embedding and transformer decoder step to enable attending over many features per timestep as well as a history of previous embedded states (Figure 1). We find that EmBERT’s object-centric navigation and ability to attend across a long time horizon both contribute to its competitive performance with state-of-the-art ALFRED models (Table 3).

Moving forward, we will apply EmBERT to other benchmarks involving multimodal input through time, such as vision and audio data [16], as well as wider arrays of tasks to accomplish [58]. To further improve performance on the ALFRED benchmark, we could conceivably continue training the Mask RCNN model from MOCA [69] forever by randomizing scenes in AI2THOR [39] and having the agent view the scene from randomized vantage points with gold-standard segmentation masks available from the simulator. For language supervision, we could train and apply a speaker model for ALFRED to generate additional training data for new expert demonstrations, providing an initial multimodal alignment for EmBERT, a strategy shown effective in VLN tasks [28].
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A Appendix

A.1 Additional Auxiliary Losses

In this section we describe alternative auxiliary losses that we designed for EmBERT training using ALFRED data. After validation, these configurations did not produce results comparable with the best performing model. This calls for a more detailed analysis of how to adequately design and combine such losses in the complex training regime of the ALFRED benchmark.

Masked Language Modeling The task-oriented language in ALFRED differs from the web crawl text used to train large-scale Transformers. We tune our initial model weights using a masked language modeling objective [25]. We mask with a %15 probability a token among the ones in \( I_g \) and \( I_t \) at the very last step of a sub-goal. Differently from captions data or Wikipedia, \( \text{when} \) which such supervision should be provided is crucial. Given the instruction Turn around and walk to the book on the desk, at the very first timestep of the trajectory it is likely that none of the mentioned objects are visible. Thus, we assume that at the last step of a subgoal the agent will have in view the objects associated with the instruction. We apply the same conditional scaling approach to generate time-dependent language representations \( \tilde{L} \) as the one used in Equation 2. We denote the masked language modeling loss used for this task by \( L_{MLM} \).

Masked Region Modeling This is analogous to the Visual Region Classification (VCR) loss that we integrated in the model. The main difference is that 15% of the visual features are entirely masked (i.e., replaced with zero values) and we ask the model to predict them given the time-dependent representations generated by EmBERT for them.

Image-text Matching The masked region and language modeling losses encourage the model to learn fine-grained object and language token representations, respectively. However, we are also interested in global representations that are expressive enough to encode salient information of the visual frames. For this reason, we design an additional loss \( L_{IM} \). Given the state representation for the current timestep \( t \), EmBERT predicts whether the current visual features can be associated with the corresponding language features or not. We maximize the cosine similarity between the visual features of the current timestep \( t \) and the corresponding language features while, at the same time, minimizing the cosine similarity between the current visual features and other language instructions in the same batch. In this task, just like when modeling the robot state, we use \( \tilde{L}_0 \) as the language features and \( \tilde{L}_{m+n} \) as the visual features. We define \( L_{IM} \) the same way as the contrastive loss in CLIP [63]. However, we expect the model to use the time-dependent representation of the agent state in order to truly understand the meaning of a language instruction. In this case the meaning of an instruction can be appreciated only after several timesteps when the corresponding sequence of actions has been executed.

A.2 Full EmBERT Ablations

As shown in Table 4, with 18 bounding boxes per side view, the parent receptacle and vision region modeling auxiliary losses designed for EmBERT no longer improve performance on the validation set. However, predicting the target object during navigation remains a powerful additional loss for EmBERT.

A.3 EmBERT Configuration file

We report the AllenNLP configuration file that we used to train our best performing model:

```plaintext
local gpu_batch_size = 8;
local eval_gpu_batch_size = 4;
local num_gpus = 1;
local effective_batch_size = gpu_batch_size*num_gpus;
local epochs = 20;
local num_workers = 4;
// At training time, trajectories are divided in segments of size 10
local traj_segment_size = 10;
```
Table 4: Validation Fold Performance. We present ablations adjusting the number of side-view bounding boxes, attended memory length, with and without predicting navigation target $O$, target parent object $P(O)$, and visual region classification (VRC) loss. The highest values per fold and metric are shown in blue.

// Training trajectories bigger than 150 are ignored
// There are very few trajectories of that size (average length is 49)
local max_traj_length = 150;
local num_objects_per_view = [36, 18, 18, 18];
{
  "dataset_reader": {
    "type": "embert_supervised_finegrained",
    "splits_path": "storage/data/alfred/splits/oct21.json",
    "data_root_path": "storage/data/alfred/json_feat_2.1.0/",
    "vis_feats_path": "moca_maskrcnn_36_18_18_18",
    "instance_cache_dir": "embert_widest_instance_cache",
    "mask_token_prob": -0.0,
    "mask_object_prob": -0.0,
    "max_traj_length": max_traj_length,
    "num_objects_per_view": num_objects_per_view,
  },
  "train_data_path": "train",
  "validation_data_path": "valid_seen",
  "vocabulary": {
    "type": "from_files",
    "directory": "storage/models/embert/vocab.tar.gz"
  },
  "model": {
    "type": "embert_alfred",
    // Pretrained checkpoint from the official OSCAR repository:
    → https://github.com/microsoft/Oscar/
    "pretrained_model_path": "storage/models/pretrained/oscar-base-no-labels.bin",
    // Feed-forward network used to predict the action
    → conditioned on the decoder hidden state
    "actor": {
      "input_dim": 768,
      "hidden_dims": [768, -1],
      "num_layers": 2,
      "activations": ["gelu", "linear"],
      "dropout": [0.1, 0.0]
    },
    // Feed-forward network used to predict when to go to the
    → next instruction conditioned on the decoder hidden
    → state
"start_instr_predictor": {
  "input_dim": 768,
  "hidden_dims": [768, 1],
  "num_layers": 2,
  "activations": ["gelu", "linear"],
  "dropout": [0.1, 0.0]
},
// Feed-forward network used to score each time-dependent object representation. It is used for both navigation and manipulation object predictions tasks
"object_scorer": {
  "input_dim": 768,
  "hidden_dims": [768, 1],
  "num_layers": 2,
  "activations": ["gelu", "linear"],
  "dropout": [0.1, 0.0]
},
// The TransformerXL-based decoder architecture. Refer to the Huggingface documentation for the configuration
"state_encoder": {
  "n_layer": 2,
  "d_model": 768,
  "d_embed": 100,
  "d_inner": 512,
  "dropout": 0.1,
  "mem_len": 200,
  "n_head": 8
},
// Number of objects associated to each robot view
"num_objects_per_view": num_objects_per_view,
"compute_confusion_matrix": true,
// Defines how to generate the representation of the hidden state
"state_repr_method": "dot_product",
// Enables the receptacle prediction loss
"use_nav_receptacle_loss": false,
"use_lm_loss": false,
"use_vm_loss": false,
"use_itm_loss": false
},
"data_loader": {
  "type": "alfred",
  "batch_sampler": {
    "batch_size": gpu_batch_size,
    "drop_last": false,
    "shuffle": true
  },
  "num_workers": num_workers
},
"validation_data_loader": {
  "type": "alfred",
  "batch_sampler": {
    "batch_size": eval_gpu_batch_size,
    "drop_last": false,
    "shuffle": false
  },
  "num_workers": num_workers
},
// We train on single GPU using 16-bit Mixed precision training
"distributed": {
  "gpus": std.range(0, num_gpus - 1),
  "precision": 16,
  "amp_level": "01"
}
"trainer": {
  "type": "lightning",
  "optimizer": {
    "type": "huggingface_adamw",
    "weight_decay": 0.05,
    "parameter_groups": [
      {"embert.*bias", "embert.*LayerNorm\.weight",
       "embert.*layer_norm\.weight"},
      {"weight_decay": 0}
    ],
    "lr": 2e-5
  },
  "learning_rate_scheduler": {
    "type": "linear_with_warmup",
    "warmup_steps": 0
  },
  "num_serialized_models": 5,
  "grad_clipping": 1.0,
  "traj_segment_size": traj_segment_size,
  "num_epochs": epochs,
  "validation_metric": "+overall"
},

We use the same configuration file as a backbone for all the EmBERT ablations in the paper and change the configuration-specific parameters accordingly.

### A.4 EmBERT Asset Licenses

AI2THOR [39] is released under the Apache-2.0 License, while the ALFRED benchmark [66] is released under the MIT License.