

Continual Embodied Learning Using Developmental Braitenberg Vehicles

Bradly Alicea, Rishabh Chakrabarty, Akshara Gopi, Anson Lim, and Jesse Parent

Abstract

There is much to learn through synthesis of Developmental Biology, Cognitive Science and Computational Modeling. One lesson we can learn from this perspective is that the initialization of intelligent programs cannot solely rely on manipulation of numerous parameters. Our path forward is to present a design for developmentally-inspired learning agents based on the Braitenberg Vehicle. Using these agents to exemplify artificial embodied intelligence, we move closer to modeling embodied experience and morphogenetic growth as components of cognitive developmental capacity. We consider various factors regarding biological and cognitive development which influence the generation of adult phenotypes and the contingency of available developmental pathways. These mechanisms produce emergent connectivity with shifting weights and adaptive network topography, thus illustrating the importance of developmental processes in training neural networks. This approach provides a blueprint for adaptive agent behavior that might result from a developmental approach: namely by exploiting critical periods or growth and acquisition, an explicitly embodied network architecture, and a distinction between the assembly of neural networks and active learning on these networks.

Introduction

The process of biological development provides many novel lessons for machine learning and artificial intelligence. Often, development serves as an inspiration for artificially intelligent processes such as the serial acquisition of linguistic information [1]. This can be summarized as a compositional approach to development. While serial acquisition can capture the linguistic and psychological aspects of information acquisition in a naively intelligent system, it is largely insufficient to properly characterize the developmental process that creates an embodied nervous system. Even when developmental processes are made explicit in the algorithm [2], they often focus on the psychological (particularly constructivist) nature of development [3, 4]. One alternative involves the exploration of developmental changes such as changes in growth and connectivity in the neural network topology [5]. Yet even in this case, such studies do not explicitly leverage embodiment as a fundamental aspect of the developmental process. Here, we use developmental Braitenberg Vehicles (dBVs) [6] to understand the developmental process via two different frames of analysis: 1) the level of network topology and 2) the impact of the external environment on agent phenotype.

Braitenberg Vehicles [7] serve as toy models of an embodied nervous system with a simple input/output relationship between sensors and effectors. In a Braitenberg Vehicle, the relationship between sensor and effector is a white box relationship [8]. A minimal set of connections are made, and conduct a sensorimotor signal that can either be linearly mapped from sensory to effector or experience contralateral cross-talk. This occurs when sensors from one side of the vehicle carry a signal to an effector on the opposite side. dBVs (see Figure 1) refine this basic model in two ways: they enable an increase in representational complexity over developmental time as well as allow for multiple hidden layers between sensor and effector [9]. We will

utilize the dBV approach to explore the nature of developmental learning, the role of spatial embodiment [10] in shaping the development of neural network topologies, and heterogeneous timing of information acquisition. The first aspect of this can be summarized as *developmental freedom*, while the third aspect is better known as the *critical period* of development. Collectively, developmental freedom, spatial embodiment, and critical period regulation contribute to a form of artificial learning with explicit developmental mechanisms.




Figure 1. Three stages of dBV development in a sample vehicle. In A, we observe an internal network with a small set of nodes. Then we observe the birth of new nodes and formation of new connections in B and C (dashed lines define new nodes and connections at each time step).

Development, Learning, and Developmental Freedom

In dBVs, development and learning are nominally independent: development is an anatomical phenomenon, while learning is a representational one. Taken collectively, the process of a dynamic neural network defines the scope of developmental freedom, or the degrees of freedom enabled by the architecture. Developmental freedom is the tendency for information and representations in particular to take advantage of a stable underlying topology. This can be understood in relation to contingency. Developmental contingency restricts the developmental neural network to an increasingly limited set of possible trajectories. Contingency results in earlier developmental events (cell birth or the establishment of connections) to constrain the range of possibilities for future developmental events (formation of a network motif). Furthermore, contingency locks the neural network into an increasingly smaller number of pathways over developmental time, and results in path dependency. Once the network configuration becomes formalized, developmental freedom benefits from the formation of a stable circuit.

Spatially-dependent Embodiment

dBVs also exhibit embodiment by sampling the incoming data through stratification, sampling the environment in a spatiotemporally-explicit manner, and the ability to compare points in a differential manner. It is on the last point (differential comparison) that allows for different frames of reference to be distinguished. In a dBV, we initialize our vehicle with sensors and effectors using a model of the genotype. The sensors can be spatialized so that they form an array of sensory inputs. This array represents different viewpoints which must be integrated into a control signal for control of the effectors. This is fundamentally distinct from the input layer of a neural network because each sensor observes the world at a specific angular perspective and position relative to the vehicle's midline. This constant interaction with an environment of sensory cues allows the agent to keep concepts about the world continuously up to date, and provides a contextual fabric for the internal representation [9].

With respect to the latter, variation in bilateral symmetry may yield some interesting effects. In a conventional BV, bilateral symmetry is thought to allow complex movements as output. Yet when treated as distinct viewpoints of an environment, asymmetrical sensory systems can also be advantageous to learning more about the vehicle's environment. Similarly, a dBVs overall bodily structure (a Braitenberg primitive [7]) allows it to extract more information from a single data point than would be the case than if we simply used a disembodied neural network. In short, changes in the internal relationship between sensor and effector provides context for simple behaviors.

Network Reconfiguration and the Critical Period

Another attribute of development is the unfolding of time-dependent processes. One powerful developmental principle we can draw from is the existence of a critical period [11, 12, 13]. Critical periods can be defined as an enhanced period of learning, which is enabled by a heightened nervous system plasticity [14]. The critical period is also an important time for learning from sensory inputs, and loss of function during this time can radically reconfigure the neural architecture [15, 16]. In the development of touch, delays in development as compared to the normal developmental trajectory can lead to a loss of sensory processing ability [17].

Hensch [11] proposes two potential mechanisms that define enhanced neural reorganization during the critical period in support of learning. First is a functional competition between inputs that might be thought of as developmental allocation. Second is a role for electrical activity in the structural consolidation of selected pathways. This has a number of consequences on the later stages of development and ultimately the adult phenotype [18]. Learning and anatomical change also seem to occur at different time scales [19], but learning in the service of behavior might be dependent on the length of time afforded to developmental growth [20].

According to this view, while both development and learning are mechanisms that induce neural and behavioral plasticity, development is a generative phenotype largely influenced by experience-expectant mechanisms [21]. As the dBV interacts with its environment, these interactions shape the manner in which the network is generated. Learning that occurs independent of large-scale changes in the network is the product of experience-dependent influence, which is an enabling factor behind developmental freedom. Changes in the timing of this transition from a neural network largely influenced by experience-expectancy to one primarily influenced by experience-dependency is key to understanding how developmental processes shape information acquisition and the supervision of learning.

Methodological Perspectives

Artificial Genetics and Environment

Development is captured using a generative process of constructing nervous system nodes and weighted connections, while learning is defined by a process of connectionist plasticity. In this paper, we have instantiated these mechanisms using Genetic Algorithms and Hebbian Learning mechanisms [9] on top of an architecture for developmental innateness. The generalized influence of sensory information is captured using the concept of Gibsonian Information.

Architecture for Developmental Innateness

To specify how the developmental phenotype unfolds, we introduce a formal architecture for the innate basis of a dBV nervous system. This defines the artificial genetics of a dBV, which can be used to implement the various acquisitional techniques presented in this paper. Our approach is based on the biological observations of [22], in which cell behaviors and expressed genes are regulated through weak regulatory linkage. Our approach is shown in Figure 2, where a binary encoding (Figure 2B) is mapped to interneurons born in a vehicle (Figure 2A) over developmental time. These genetic units have identity and regulatory switches, and each one maps to a particular cell order (m) and level (n) combination. This arrangement of cell identities in the binary encoding mimics the arrangement of *Hox* genes, which maintain body segmentation and anatomical order in animal development. Rearrangement of this ordering can in theory provide developmental variety and novel wiring arrangements, and this architecture is extensible to incorporating additional genetic units as instructions that modify both the layers and arrangement of cells. The distribution of birth times and timing of the critical period (fluctuation in birth times and activation strengths) of individual cells can be adjusted across a population or between populations according to the expression of the genetic

units. These cells can be continually reconnected according to their activation strength during the critical period and especially during the developmental learning period.




Figure 2. Demonstration of how morphogenesis and developmental time proceed in a dBV. A: a dBV with four levels of internal nodes (interneurons between the sensor and effect). B: a linear binary encoding that maps to each cell and level combination. C: the behavior of five neurons as they are born (or die) and acquire (or lose) an activation strength over developmental time. Black and gray dotted lines are cells that are born and then die off during development. Black, red, and blue solid lines show birth and increasingly strong activation over developmental time.

A demonstration of how cells are born, die, and activated over developmental time is demonstrated using pseudo-data in Figure 2C. Briefly, a regulatory element is activated to trigger cell birth (a non-zero activation strength), then expresses an activation strength that fluctuates according to a distribution determined by the genetic unit. Once a cell is wired to the sensor, however, the environment and other cells (acting through the sensorimotor signal) can modulate this activation strength. The collective behavior of this internal network determines the state of the canalization function, and with it the specialization of a vehicle's behavior in developmental state space. Our innate model serves as a substrate for behavioral

training, and can be evolved and selected upon using a connectivity matrix of activation strengths for each cell.

dBV Connectivity

This section outlines how developmental freedom is implemented in a dBV [6, 9]. While our architecture for developmental innateness is focused on the specification of the network, Network freedom proceeds through *connectivity-activation encoding*, in which the matrix $W(i,j)$ of potential connections between internal nodes is shaped in a selective manner over developmental time. Expansion of the matrix represents an increase of cell number in the network, and the rate of expansion from the input-output initialization can either be deterministic or stochastic. All non-zero values represent active connections between all cells existing at a given time step. Updating $W(i,j)$ during the morphogenetic growth phase of development is governed by a discrete genetic algorithm and encoding featuring recombination, mutation, and selection (for further technical details about BraGenBrain, see [6]).

Regardless of the exact method of generating variation in cell number expansion and active connections, we still must evaluate a large number of candidate network topologies. Thus, our genetic algorithm utilizes a fitness function that is determined by movement of the vehicle relative to target stimuli. The fitness function evaluating a given dBV's $W(i,j)$ matrix is based on stimulus-to-vehicle distance and force generated by vehicles in response to a given stimulus. Even though evolutionary variety randomizes matrix elements over time, selection nevertheless favors the emergence of networks that enable recognizable cognitive behaviors [7].

Mechanisms of developmental plasticity and learning

Using a genetic algorithm as a training mechanism also generates a variety of topological orderings of matrix $W(i,j)$ through mutation and recombination. For larger dBV neuronal networks, an encoding of coordinated projection identity can be used to more closely mimic a biological nervous system [23]. In the scheme introduced here, the critical period corresponds to a period of accelerated evolution in which the mutation rate is increased. This increases the number of potential configurations, but using a fitness criterion ensures that all of them are capable of learning and exhibiting developmental freedom post-critical period.

At the end of the critical period, the topological mutation rate is set at near zero (or turned off completely). In previous work, it has been demonstrated that associative learning can occur on a stable (post-critical period) $W(i,j)$ matrix [6, 9] using a Generalized Hebbian Algorithm (GHA) [24]. Associative learning in dBVs is instantiated by building associations between sources of multiple senses simultaneously, and is thus the essence of developmental freedom. In [6, 9], olfactory and gustatory stimuli are distributed independently in a multidimensional space. The associative learning process acts to change the connection weights in matrix $W(i,j)$ according to the co-occurrence of the two stimuli. In this way, spatially-explicit multimodal associations can be acquired.

Gibsonian Information as a notion of direct sensation

Unlike a disembodied neural network, dBVs experience sensory flow as they move around their environment with respect to environmental stimuli. This combination of multiple perspectives on the reference frame and the dynamic nature of the reference frame itself involves active direct perception [25] and can be detected using something we call Gibsonian Information. Gibsonian information lies at the roots of the associative learning capacities of our network, and might be identified using quantitative measures that produce lawlike relationships [26].

Aside from taking advantage of changes in timing, our developmental system also exploits relative information, or the continuous difference between multiple sensors. When compared against one another, particularly during the mobile behavior of a vehicle, the current sensory state allows for the detection of coherent motion and spatial differences in a complex scene more generally. For example, we might quantify angular differences in how sensors in different locations across the front and sides of the vehicle capture the intensity or shape of a stimulus. As a dBV receives continuous sensory input from this stimulus, there are a number of ways environmental information contributes to positional information. One way is to integrate the information using the GHA, while another way is to compare incoming sensory information to movement of the vehicle. This latter operation is a recurrent mechanism, and can be fully utilized by implementing other types of learning algorithms.

Upbringing as a Dual Process

Developmental training can be thought of in terms of two parallel processes. One process are the innate elements of our vehicle: the body, its sensors and effectors, and the genetic (or developmental) encoding. Yet there is also a role for the upbringing (or supervised training) of developing vehicles. We propose that upbringing can be enforced by an environment enrichment, where training is enhanced by a wide variety of stimuli and stimulus states. We have previously demonstrated that populations of vehicles can swarm and align themselves around a common stimulus without direct communication [6]. The relative amount of environmental information and its location then serves to provide a minimal means to coordinate social behavior.

Potential for Reinforcement Learning

In general, dBVs are a special case of a reinforcement learning model. Yet there are differences between developmental and reinforcement learning. The first major difference is that feedback through reinforcement is not made explicit during the developmental process. While a dBV receives environmental feedback, this is often decoupled from the expression of an internal set of processes. The dual process of generating a neural network and learning on the network could be formulated as a reinforcement learning problem.

Consideration of RL as a model for developmental learning

We argue that this constant interaction with the environment scaled with time plays a significant role in the development process of the dBVs. Our dBV model can be contrasted with the dual world/self model of [27]. In our case, we can benefit from reinforcement learning through disentangling the intrinsic and learned representations which contribute to the developmental process of adult behaviors.

Rather than the Genetic Algorithm/GHA implementation, implementation of a model-free Reinforcement Learning paradigm is possible, where the continuous sensorimotor space grows temporally; this approach is more continuous across developmental time and work while the agent is learning a policy. In such a case, learning could be optimized as a function of morphogenetic growth. This might improve performance in the adult phenotype. As for the effects of critical period timing, maximizing the consequences of sensory feedback during this time would allow us to take advantage of the correspondingly intense rate of morphogenetic growth.

Developmental Braitenberg vehicles are models of embodied nervous systems that navigate and constantly interact with their environment. To implement an RL model of dBV learning, we can appeal to the principle of parallel, loosely coupled processes. This principle states that intelligence emerges from the agents' interactions with the environment. These interactions are based on loosely coupled processes run in parallel and connected directly to the sensory-motor apparatus of the agent [28]. However this continuous sensorimotor space which is inflated with time along with the large continuous action spaces makes it difficult to learn good strategies (train optimal policies) to perform a task, some approaches have been proposed to counter this problem- for instance, adding developmental layers to the neural networks this could help the agent to learn better policies, embedding information about the source task in the reward function [29] and also applying other curriculum learning [30] techniques which we believe requires further consideration.

Analysis

Contingency Analysis

Aside from being characterized by generativity and plasticity, development is also characterized by contingency. Developmental contingency [31, 32] defines the dynamic nature of dBV architecture. First, we assemble a complex neural network from an initial input/output relationship. Next, each time step is defined by the introduction of components such as an intermediate node or the formation of a new connection between two nodes with no previous direct connection. This ultimately results in a complex nervous system that is irreducible with respect to the initial condition. We hypothesize that this irreducible neural network results in a quasi-representational capacity that does not exist in a traditional BV.

From the initial input-output mapping, every component generated by the developmental process essentially locks the network into a subset of possible future topologies; the topological evolution is an internal embodiment of path dependency. From a design perspective, our choice of critical period timing has an effect on what the Vehicle can learn and how it behaves. To understand this more clearly, we conduct a contingency analysis to better understand which types of changes lead to adaptive outcomes.

Different Scenarios for the Critical Period and Developmental Freedom

We now analyze how dBVs respond to changes in the timing of the critical period and the resulting onset of developmental freedom. We will consider two scenarios: early onset of the critical period and late onset of the critical period. The evaluation of

early and late onset is defined by what proportion of the developmental period witnesses the addition of nervous system elements. Early onset of the critical period means that relatively few nervous system elements are generated before rapid proliferation and ultimately the end of the morphogenetic period. By contrast, late onset allows for a large number of nervous system elements to be added before proliferation and termination of the morphogenetic phase. Early and late developmental freedom are a direct consequence of critical period plasticity timing, but the timing of this process also has unique signatures on the adult neural network. See Figure 3 for more information on how this timing occurs with respect to developmental time.

Early Critical Period and Early Onset of Developmental Freedom. When the critical period occurs early, the adult neural network tends to be more homogeneous, exhibiting the same types of configurations and motifs. In this scenario, there is less time for preliminary or auxiliary nervous subsystems or behavioral traits to develop. There are also fewer varieties of experience prior to maturity, but since the neural topology is more constrained, the capacity for developmental freedom is homogeneous across individual dBVs.

The experience of an early critical period results in a high degree of overall developmental freedom. An early critical period allows for faster ascendance to a fully mature (adult) suite of behaviors suite and capabilities, and thus more exploration of network weights on a stable topology. This enables more refined behaviors and associations to emerge, and for shared experiences between individual dBVs to be more common.

Late Critical Period and Late Onset of Developmental Freedom. When the critical period occurs later, the adult neural network can exhibit a larger number of possible configurations across a population of dBVs. Delaying the onset of the critical period affords more time for exploration. In turn, this results in a slower ascendance to the mature behavioral suite. This provides the adult phenotype with a greater number of alternate network topologies, which can lead to divergent capacity for developmental freedom across individual dBVs.

By contrast, dBVs that experience a later critical period results in a low degree of overall developmental freedom. Due to a later critical period, there is a slower ascendance to adult behaviors and capabilities. The consequence of this is less exploration of weights on a stable network topology, which results in more stereotyped behaviors and associations. However, due to divergent network topologies, we should see a heterogeneity of function, and less shared experience when comparing individual dBVs.

Canalization Function

We propose that the Genetic Algorithmic and Hebbian Learning models can be unified using a developmental loss function based on a canalization function [33, 34]. A canalization function is a binary switch that when triggered by the canalizing selection of a non-uniform environment [35], can shift the developmental state to a new trajectory [36]. This is useful for modeling branching processes that restrict us to certain parts of developmental possibility space given the historical trajectory of a vehicle's nervous system [37]. In a population context, canalization functions might

be used as an innate property to enforce branching after a certain number of morphogenetic events despite the exploration of developmental possibility space in individual vehicles unfolding in slightly different ways [38]. This can lead to vehicles that are developmentally inviable, but also produce novel means to process a vehicle's sensorimotor signal.




Figure 3. Diagram showing the relationship between the morphogenetic period (light and dark gray), the critical period (dark gray), and developmental learning period (black). Developmental freedom is defined by the black squares, while the shifts in the critical period that define our hypotheticals occur along the axis of developmental time.

Feedforward elements and Cybernetic Control

Without assuming the standard role for backpropagation in neural networks, we can nevertheless assume that our network will behave in an adaptive manner. Feedforward configurations rely on a current model state that builds atop future state trajectories. In this way, the current state is determined by both innate features and their active configuration [39]. This forces the system to adapt through the adoption of adaptive capacity rather than specializing towards specific optimal outcomes. In dBVs, morphogenetic events result in two types of feedforward elements: singular

connections from A to B, and composite connections from A and C to B (or from A to B and C). While the singular connection type provides a linear feedthrough of the sensorimotor signal, composite connections provide nonlinearities such as convolution, synthetic effects such as cross-talk, and even the potential for interference that can degrade the sensorimotor signal.

Furthermore, feedforward elements have an advantage over traditional feedback in that they enable a greater capacity for change via a less selective regime of control. This feature may be key to demonstrating our concept of developmental freedom, which relies upon the discovery of multiple viable pathways through the mature morphogenetic network. This provides dBV architectures with a generative approach to regulation that is broadly adaptive. This is particularly important when considering fitness functions based largely on behavioral outcomes.

Discussion

In [9], we have previously argued that dBV architectures are low-representation networks that require other models to compute context and other, more sophisticated representations. Yet it may be that aspects of the dBVs embodied nature may afford Vehicles a more robust comprehension of the transactions made with their environment over developmental time [40]. We have also argued that developmental freedom, spatial embodiment, and critical period regulation play a role in learning that is missed using other types of artificial learning. The dBV approach may also be a means to balance the processing previously unseen information (unsupervised developmental learning) with the need for an innate component.

Despite the lack of explicit feedback mechanisms, certain paths carved into the neural network will nevertheless lead to certain outcomes. These outcomes spring forth during our period of developmental freedom, and refine the network for learning across a potentially wide range of contexts. Aside from our previous example of canalizing selection, in which the environment is the perturbing factor, we can also use sensory deprivation to analyze the potential of dBV neural networks across development and in its mature state. Sensory deprivation allows for environmental inheritance to be disrupted in a way that affects developmental freedom and propagation of the sensorimotor signal more generally. One example of sensory deprivation is the removal of sensors that provide a coherent sensorimotor signal. Blocking the sensory inputs on one side of the vehicle will lead to behaviors that are biased to the non-occluded side. Sensory deprivation does not affect the morphogenetic process, but does affect how sensorimotor signals are conducted. A more indirect example of sensory deprivation with respect to dBVs is a stray cat that does not have the proper socialization experience.

With our toy model of an emerging nervous system, we can show how embodied neural networks are more sensitive to heterogeneous data, particularly in the spatial context. Furthermore, dBVs also teach us about the emergence of behavior as being deeply intertwined with the developmental process [41]. We can see this in the zebrafish visual system, where the maturity of representations and functions go hand in hand with developmental changes in behavior [42]. Future work will explore the potential of strategically shaping a neural network with multiple adaptive mechanisms (such as genetic and Hebbian algorithms), in addition to understanding the potential of using dBVs as a strategy for enabling complex unsupervised learning.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank members of the Saturday Morning NeuroSim and DevoWorm research groups for their ideas and input. Thanks also go to the Google Summer of Code program for their financial support in helping to develop the developmental Braitenberg Vehicles approach.

References:

- [1] Saxe, A.M., McClelland, J.J., and Ganguli, S. (2019). A mathematical theory of semantic development in deep neural networks. *PNAS*, 116(23), 11537–11546.
- [2] Lungarella, M., Mettay, G., Pfeiferz, R., and Sandiniy, G. (2003). Developmental robotics: a survey. *Connection Science*, 15(4), 151–190.
- [3] Smith, L.B. and Slone, L.K. (2017). A Developmental Approach to Machine Learning? *Frontiers in Psychology*, doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02124.
- [4] Munakata, Y. and McClelland, J.L. (2003). Connectionist models of development. *Developmental Science*, 6(4), 413–429.
- [5] Kohli, M., Magoulas, G.D., and Thomas, M.S.C. (2020). Evolving Connectionist Models to Capture Population Variability across Language Development: modeling children’s past tense formation. *Artificial Life*, 26, 217–241.
- [6] Dvoretzkii, S., Gong, Z., Gupta, A., Parent, J., and Alicea, B. (2020). Braitenberg Vehicles as Developmental Neurosimulation. *arXiv*, 2003.07689.
- [7] Braitenberg, V. (1984). *Vehicles: experiments in synthetic Psychology*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- [8] Glanville, R. (1982). Inside every white box there are two black boxes trying to get out. *Behavioral Science*, 27.
- [9] Alicea, B., Dvoretzkii, S., Felder, S., Gong, Z., Gupta, A., and Parent, J. (2020). Developmental Embodied Agents as Meta-brain Models. *DevoNN Workshop*, Artificial Life Conference.
- [10] Schettler, A., Raja, V., and Anderson, M.L. (2019). The Embodiment of Objects: Review, Analysis, and Future Directions. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 13, 1332.
- [11] Hensch, T.K. (2004). Critical period regulation. *Annual Reviews in Neuroscience*, 27, 549–579.
- [12] Sengpiel, F. (2007). The critical period. *Current Biology*, 17(17), R742.
- [13] Frankenhuys, W.E. and Walasek, N. (2020). Modeling the evolution of sensitive periods. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 41, 100715.

- [14] Takesian, A.E. and Hensch, T.K. (2013). Balancing Plasticity/Stability Across Brain Development. *Progress in Brain Research*, 207, 3-34.
- [15] Chang, E.F. and Merzenich, M.M. (2003). Environmental Noise Retards Auditory Cortical Development. *Science*, 300(5618), 498-502.
- [16] Kahn, D.M. and Krubitzer, L. (2002). Massive cross-modal cortical plasticity and the emergence of a new cortical area in developmentally blind mammals. *PNAS*, 99(17), 11429-11434.
- [17] Ardiel, E.L. and Rankin, C.H. (2010). The importance of touch in development. *Paediatric Child Health*, 15(3), 153-156.
- [18] Galvan, A. (2010). Neural Plasticity of Development and Learning. *Human Brain Mapping*, 31, 879–890.
- [19] Smith, L.B. and Thelan, E. (2003). Development as a dynamic system. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 7, 343–348.
- [20] Charvet, C.J. and Striedter, G.F. (2011). Developmental Modes and Developmental Mechanisms can Channel Brain Evolution. *Frontiers in Neuroanatomy*, 5, 4.
- [21] Greenough, W.T., Black, J.E., and Wallace, C.S. (1987). Experience and Brain Development. *Child Development*, 58, 539-559.
- [22] Kirschner, M.W. and Gerhart, J.C. (2005). *The Plausibility of Life: resolving Darwin's dilemma*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- [23] Li, H., Shuster, S.A., Li, J., and Luo, L. (2018). Linking neuronal lineage and wiring specificity. *Neural Development*, 13(5).
- [24] Sanger, T.D. (1989). Optimal Unsupervised Learning in a Single-Layer Linear Feedforward Neural Network. *Neural Networks*, 2, 459-473.
- [25] Raja, V. (2019). J. J. Gibson's most radical idea: The development of a new law-based psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, 29(6), 789-806.
- [26] Gibson, J.J. (1979). *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Psychology Press, Sussex, UK.
- [27] Haber, N., Mrowca, D., Wang, S., Fei-Fei, L., and Yamins, D.L.K. (2018). Learning to Play With Intrinsically-Motivated, Self-Aware Agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 8398–8409.
- [28] Blynel, J. (2000). Reinforcement learning on real robots. Master's thesis, University of Aarhus.

- [29] Gillespie, J., Rano, I., Siddique, N., Santos, J., and Khamassi, M. (2017). Reinforcement Learning for Bio-Inspired Target Seeking. *Annual Conference Towards Autonomous Robotic Systems*, 18, 637-650.
- [30] Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., Collobert, R., and Weston, J. (2009). Curriculum learning. *Journal of the American Podiatry Association*, 60. 6.
- [31] Oyama, S. (2000). *The Ontogeny of Information: Developmental Systems and Evolution*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- [32] Nonoyama, T. and Chiba, S. (2019). Phenotypic determinism and contingency in the evolution of hypothetical tree-like organisms. *PLoS One*, 14(10), e0211671.
- [33] Kauffman, S.A. (1993). *Origins of Order*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- [34] Paul, E., Pogudin, G., Qin, W., and Laubenbacher, R. (2020). The Dynamics of Canalizing Boolean Networks. *Complexity*, 3687961, 1-14.
- [35] Kuo, Z.-Y. (1976). *The dynamics of behavior development: an epigenetic view*. Springer, Berlin.
- [36] Moreira, A.A. and Amaral, L.A.N. (2005). Canalizing Kauffman Networks: nonergodicity and its effect on their critical behavior. *Physical Review Letters*, 94(21), 218702.
- [37] Li, Y., Adeyeye, J.O., Murrugarra, D., Aguilar, B., Laubenbacher, R. (2013). Boolean nested canalizing functions: A comprehensive analysis. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 481, 24–36.
- [38] Just, W., Shmulevich, I., Konvalina, J. (2004). The number and probability of canalizing functions. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 197(3–4), 211-221.
- [39] Louie, A. H. (2010). Robert Rosen's anticipatory systems. *Foresight*, 12(3), 18-29.
- [40] Di Paolo, E.A. (2020). Picturing Organisms and Their Environments: Interaction, Transaction, and Constitution Loops. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1912. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01912
- [41] Alicea, B. (2020). Raising the Connectome: the emergence of neuronal activity and behavior in *C. elegans*. *Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience*, 14, 524791.
- [42] Avitan, L., Pujic, Z., Molter, J., McCullough, M., Zhu, S., Sun, B., Myhre1, A-E., and Goodhill, G.J. (2020). Behavioral signatures of a developing neural code. *Current Biology*, 30(17), 3491-3493.