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ABSTRACT
Object navigation tasks require agents to locate specific objects in unknown environments based on visual information. Previously, graph convolutions were used to implicitly explore the relationships between objects. However, due to differences in visibility among objects, it is easy to generate biases in object attention. Thus, in this paper, we propose a directed object attention (DOA) graph to guide the agent in explicitly learning the attention relationships between objects, thereby reducing the object attention bias. In particular, we use the DOA graph to perform unbiased adaptive object attention (UAOA) on the object features and unbiased adaptive image attention (UAIA) on the raw images, respectively. To distinguish features in different branches, a concise adaptive branch energy distribution (ABED) method is proposed. We assess our methods on the AI2-Thor dataset. Compared with the state-of-the-art (SOTA) method, our method reports 7.4%, 8.1% and 17.6% increase in success rate (SR), success weighted by path length (SPL) and success weighted by action efficiency (SAE), respectively.
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1 INTRODUCTION
The object navigation [16, 24, 25, 39] is a challenging research problem which requires an agent to navigate in previously unseen environments and find a specified target by executing a sequence of actions. Since the scene maps cannot be obtained in unseen environments in advance, the agent can only use visual observation and target information as inputs and predict actions by deep reinforcement learning in each step.

Most prior works [20, 22, 23] have directly used global image features to recursively train agents based on egocentric observations. Nevertheless, if the target is invisible, it is difficult to efficiently navigate to the object position with these methods. Therefore, some recent works [6, 38, 41] have focused on establishing specific prior knowledge with object graphs and zone graphs. Yang et al. [38] first proposed the use of graph convolutional networks (GCNs) to learn graph representations of object features. However, their object graph is too generic to adapt to specific environments. To address this problem, Du et al. [6] used a graph attention layer to improve the adaptability of object graphs. Zhang et al. [41] proposed a hierarchical object-to-zone (HOZ) graph to guide agents in a coarse-to-fine manner. The above methods used object features to better understand complete scenes and predict possible target locations.

However, the agent may not treat all items equally, preferring to focus on more conspicuous objects. Therefore, we propose the object attention bias problem, which refers to the situations in which agents focus on objects with high visibility during navigation. For example, when looking for a cell phone, an agent may focus on a closer, clearer TV while ignoring a distant, blurrier laptop that has a higher correlation with the cell phone (Figure 1). In principle, this phenomenon occurs mainly because neural networks prefer features with higher information entropy. Therefore, the direct use of graph convolutions to implicitly learn relationships between objects can lead to considerable object attention bias.

To address the above problem, it is necessary to explicitly learn the relationships between objects. Thus, we propose a learnable two-layer directed object attention (DOA) graph that represents the relationships between objects in view and the target object to address the object attention bias problem. The first graph layer is an intrinsic attention graph (IG) that establishes the basic object attention relationships. The second graph layer is a view adaptive attention graph (VAG) that changes based on the observations of the agent. The DOA graph, which is produced by the weighted average of the two graph layers, can guide an agent to reasonably assign attention to each object in view while searching for the target.

Based on the DOA graph, we further design two novel cross-attention modules: the unbiased adaptive image attention (UAIA) module for the image branch and the unbiased adaptive object attention (UAOA) module for the object branch. As illustrated in Figure 1, the target is the arrival point, and the objects in view are the starting points for the directed edges in the DOA graph. The weight of a directed edge from an object node to a target node is the object’s attention while searching for this target. The UAOA module uses object attention in the DOA graph to directly distribute weights to different objects. The UAIA module uses the DOA graph to realize the weighted average aggregation of the object semantic features.
Figure 1: Previous object feature-based methods are biased due to differences in object visibility. In the previous biased method [6], since the nearby TV is clearer than the distant laptop, the agent focuses more on the TV, resulting in an incorrect decision. Our proposed unbiased DOA graph allocates more reasonable attention to objects according to the target and the current view. The agent learns that the cell phone is more likely to be near the laptop and can thus make the correct judgment.
reduce this bias, the agent should focus on what and where the object is rather than its size and clarity. The experiment that involved eliminating the GCN module, shown in Table 1, demonstrates that the GCN module only slightly improves the navigation ability of the agent, implying that a biased GCN module cannot be used to effectively and unbiasedly model relationships among objects.

3.2 Duality of Bias
We cannot criticize biased training because our visual world is inherently biased; people simply prefer to trust objects that are easier to identify. For example, when looking for a computer mouse, we often pre-search for a table instead of a laptop, and when looking for a plate, we often pre-search for a cabinet instead of a knife or fork. In fact, some biased decisions allow agents to avoid some weird mistakes and make the agent’s overall actions more robust. However, excessive bias can cause an agent to overfit the training dataset, resulting in the agent ignoring critical navigation information. In general, there are two reasons for object attention bias: (i) endogenous cause (Figure 2 (a)), the network’s own preference towards objects with richer visual features; (ii) exogenous cause (Figure 2 (b)), inequalities in the frequency each object are present in the dataset. This paper mainly starts from the endogenous cause, and does not change the number of objects in the AI2-Thor dataset. Our proposed DOA graph corrects the agent’s neglect of small and ambiguous objects (bad bias) while maintaining the agent’s trust in high-confidence objects (good bias).

4 PROPOSED METHOD
Our goal is to propose an attention allocation strategy without object attention bias and a more reasonable cross-information aggregation method among different branches for a target-driven visual navigation system. To achieve this goal, our navigation system contains four major components, as illustrated in Figure 3: (i) directed object attention (DOA) graph generator; (ii) unbiased adaptive object attention (UAOA) module; (iii) unbiased adaptive image attention (UAIA) module; (iv) adaptive branch energy distribution (ABED) method. (ii) and (iii) are based on the object attention in the DOA graph.

4.1 Task Definition
Initially, the agent is given a random target from a group of $N$ objects $P = \{\text{Pan}, \ldots, \text{Cellphone}\}$, and starts from a random state $s = \{x, y, \theta_x, \theta_y\}$ in a random house. Here, $(x, y)$ represents the coordinates of the agent relative to the entire room, $(\theta_x, \theta_y)$ represents the yaw and pitch angles of the agent. After the state and target are initialized, the agent begins to navigate based on its own observations. At each timestamp $t$, the agent only receives the RGB image $o_t$ from a single perspective and the target $p \in P$. Neither the panoramic view nor the topological map can be used during navigation. According to $o_t$ and $p$, the agent learns a navigation strategy $\pi(a_t|o_t, p)$, where $a_t \in A = \{\text{MoveAhead; RotateLeft; RotateRight; LookDown; LookUp; Done}\}$ and Done is the output if the agent believes it has navigated to the target location. The successful episode is defined as: an agent selects the termination action Done when the distance between the agent and the target...
is less than a certain threshold (i.e., 1.5 meters) and the target is in the field of view.

4.2 Directed Object Attention (DOA) Graph

DOA graph is a graphical representation of the correlation degree between identifiable objects and the target being sought. In previous works, networks have implicitly learned the internal relationships between objects through graph convolutional networks (GCNs). However, according to the analysis presented in Section 3.1, object GCNs alone cannot learn unbiased relationships between objects in object navigation tasks. In contrast, our proposed DOA graph provides an explicit yet flexible representation of the relationships between objects. The DOA graph is obtained through a weighted summation of the intrinsic object graph and the view adaptive graph.

4.2.1 Intrinsic Object Graph. The intrinsic object graph represents the ubiquitous intrinsic relationships between objects. For example, a mouse and a laptop have a strong inherent relationship. When we see a laptop, we can deduce that a mouse is likely near it. Here, we define a learnable fixed-size matrix \( G_n \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \) to represent the intrinsic object graph, where \( N \) is the number of objects. As the agent uses reinforcement learning to continuously explore a large number of different environments, \( G_n \) gradually tends to be reasonable and stable. \( G_n \) is fixed during testing. Each edge between objects in \( G_n \) is bidirectional. The end node of an edge represents the target object being sought, while the start node of the edge represents the object that needs to be assigned attention. Therefore, the weight of each directed edge represents the intrinsic correlation between an object \( q \in P \) and the target object \( p \in P \). Each row of \( G_n \) is normalized using SoftMax, as in [35], to ensure that the sum of all edge values connected to a target node is 1.

4.2.2 View Adaptive Graph. The view adaptive graph represents the real-time adaptive relationships between objects. For example, when the agent recognizes the target object, the self-connection weight of the target object is multiplied. The agent generates the global image features \( I_t \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 512} \) (from ResNet18 [10]) and object features \( S_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 518} \) (from Faster-RCNN [29]) after observing the current scene. Here, \( M \) is the pixel number of the image feature map encoded by ResNet18. The shallow image features obtained from ResNet18 preserve more local features, which is more favorable for cross-attention with the object branch. \( S_t \) is concatenated by the object visual features \( s_{\text{visual}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 512} \), object position features \( s_{\text{pos}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 4} \), confidence \( s_{\text{conf}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1} \) and target indicator \( s_{\text{target}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1} \). Since low-confidence object detection results often contain excessive noise, we filter \( S_t \) with the confidence criterion \( s_{\text{conf}} > \text{threshold} \) to obtain \( \tilde{S}_i \).

Since the agent needs to have different motion strategies when looking for different objects, we introduce target information to the image features \( I_t \). Here, we encode the object index using the one-hot method and two fully connected layers to obtain \( OI \). The input image query \( I_t \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 576} \) can be formulated as:

\[
\tilde{I}_t = \text{Concat}(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{M} I^P_t, OI^P)
\]  

where \( OI^P \) refers to the \( p \)-th object (target) semantics in \( OI \) and \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} I^P_t \) is squeezing global spatial information into a channel descriptor using global average pooling. The agent grounds the current overall environmental characteristics \( I_t \) to the object features \( S_t \) via multi-head score calculation [34] to produce the view adaptive graph \( G_v \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \):

\[
\tilde{Q}_i = \tilde{I}_t \tilde{W}^Q_t \quad \tilde{K}_i = \tilde{S}_i \tilde{W}^K_t \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, NH
\]

\[
\text{head}_i = \text{softmax}(\tilde{Q}_i \tilde{K}_i) \quad (2)
\]

\[
G_v = \text{Concat}((\text{head}_1, \ldots, \text{head}_N)) \tilde{W}^O_t \quad (3)
\]

where \( HD \) and \( NH \) denote the hidden dimensionality and number of heads in the multi-head score calculation. \( \tilde{W}^Q_t \in \mathbb{R}^{576 \times HD} \) and \( \tilde{W}^K_t \in \mathbb{R}^{518 \times HD} \) map \( \tilde{I}_t \) and \( \tilde{S}_i \) to the same dimension HD. \( \tilde{W}^O_t \in \mathbb{R}^{NH \times 1} \) aggregate the various subgraphs calculated by the scaled dot-product of the multiple heads to generate the graph \( G_v \).

4.2.3 Object Attention. According to the searched target \( p \), we take the edge weight \( G_v^p \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N} \) from the intrinsic object graph \( G_n \) with the \( p \)-th node as the end point. With the weighted summation of the intrinsic weight and the view adaptive weight, we can obtain the attention:

\[
G_t = G_v^p w_n + G_v w_v \quad (5)
\]

that each object requires. The learnable \( w_n \) and \( w_v \) are the weights of the two graphs.

4.3 Unbiased Adaptive Attention

4.3.1 Unbiased Adaptive Object Attention (UAOA). The purpose of unbiased adaptive object attention (UAOA) is to use the object attention \( G_t \) obtained in Section 4.2 to assign attention to different object features. To balance the information integrity and computational complexity, we apply two fully connected layers around the ReLU [26] to map the object features \( S_t \) to a lower-dimensional representation \( S'_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 64} \). Finally, the attention weight of each object \( q \) is multiplied by the object features \( S'_t \):

\[
\tilde{S}^q_t = F_{\text{scale}}(S^q_t, G^q_t) = S^q_t G^q_t \quad q = 1, 2, \ldots, N \quad (6)
\]

where \( S'_t = \{S'_1, S'_2, \ldots, S'_N\} \), \( S^q_t \) is the low dimensional feature of the \( q \)-th object. \( G^q_t \) is the weight of the \( q \)-th object in DOA graph at time \( t \).

4.3.2 Unbiased Adaptive Image Attention (UAIA). We use the DOA graph to focus more attention on the areas around important objects in the image. We use the encoded object index \( OI \) rather than word embeddings trained by other networks to represent the object semantic information (what the object is). The object index embeddings learned by our network are more coupled to our dataset than word embeddings trained on other tasks. We use the object attention \( G_t \) to generate the attention-aware object semantics \( D \):

\[
D = \sum_{q=1}^{N} \mathbb{I}(s_{\text{conf}}^q > \text{threshold})G^q_t \times OI^q \quad (7)
\]
Figure 3: Model overview. PI: pixel index embedding, TS: target semantics, OS: object semantics, CF: confidence filter. VAG: view adaptive graph, IG: intrinsic graph, Avg Pool: average pooling. Our model consists of three branches: Image branch, Object branch, and Action branch. We perform UAIA on Image branch and UAOA on Object branch, respectively, based on directed object attention (DOA) graph. The joint features of the re-integrated branches after adaptive branch energy distribution (ABED) are input into an LSTM network to predict the next action.

Table 1: We obtain a strong and concise baseline by comparing the roles of different modules in previous methods [6, 28, 41] (%) These modules include the object GCN (GCN), the row image branch (Image), the zone branch (Zone), the room branch (Room), the previous action branch (Action) and the object branch (Object).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GCN</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where I(·) is the indicator function. The confidence filter $S_{\text{conf}}^{i,\text{conf}}>\text{threshold}$ indicates that only the semantics of objects whose detection confidence exceeds threshold are used. Unlike the convolution operation in CNNs, the muti-head attention operation is permutation-invariant [5], which cannot leverage the order of the tokens in an input sequence. To mitigate this issue, our work adds absolute positional encodings to each pixel in the input sequence, such as in [5, 34], enabling order awareness. We use standard learned 1D pixel index embedding $PI \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 64}$ since we have not observed any significant performance gains when using more complicated 2D position embeddings. The resulting sequence of embedded vectors serves as input to the encoder.

$$I_i' = \delta(S(I_iW_1)W_2) + PI$$

where $\delta$ refers to the ReLU function, $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{512 \times 128}$ and $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{128 \times 64}$ reduce the dimension of the global image features $I_i$ and the pixel index embedding $PI$ is introduced to generate position-aware image features $I_i' \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 64}$. We use the attention-aware object semantics $D$ as the query and the position-aware image features $I_i'$ as the key and value in the muti-head image attention $(HD = 64, NH = 4)$ to generate the final image embedding $\hat{I}_i$.

$$Q_i = DW_i^Q$$

$$K_i = I_i'W_i^K$$

$$V_i = I_i'W_i^V$$

$$i = 1, 2, \cdots, NH$$

$$\text{head}_i = \text{softmax}(\frac{Q_iK_i}{\sqrt{HD}})V_i$$

$$\hat{I}_i = \text{Concat}(\text{head}_1, \cdots, \text{head}_{NH})W_i^O$$
4.4 Adaptive Branch Energy Distribution (ABED)

Previous works [6, 41] have input the directly concatenated embedded features of the three branches (object, image and previous action branches) into LSTM networks to establish time series models. However, there are two issues with this simple feature stitching: (i) It is difficult for the network to distinguish between the different information types of the three branches during training; (ii) It is difficult to guarantee that the data distribution of the concatenated vector is rational. Therefore, we propose the adaptive branch energy distribution (ABED) method to provide additional tokens to each branch without introducing extra parameters, and optimize the data distribution of the concatenated vector. We establish a learnable vector $R = \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ with only three parameters. The final output vector $H_t$ can be expressed as:

$$H_t = F_{pw}(\text{Concat}(r_1\tilde{S}_t, r_2\tilde{S}_t, r_3PA))$$ (12)

where $PA$ is the previous action embedding and $F_{pw}$ refers to the pointwise convolution. The operation, which is similar to the energy distribution of the input signal, uses the significant differences between the feature distributions of the three branches to explicitly distinguish the branches and learn a more reasonable distribution of the concatenated vector. Although our method is quite simple, experiments have proven that it can significantly improve the navigation ability of the agent. When compared to the process of directly adding branch semantic (BS) embeddings to each branch, this method is unique in that it can provide the model with a strong scene understanding without destroying the other modules in complex models.

4.5 Policy Learning

Previous works [36, 38] have used direct observations to learn a strategy $\pi(a_i|o_0, p)$. Our work uses unbiased object graph relationships to learn an LSTM action policy $\pi(a_i|H_t, p)$, where $H_t$ is the joint representation of the global image embedding $r_1\tilde{S}_t$, object embedding $r_2\tilde{S}_t$ and previous action embedding $r_3PA$. Based on previous works [7, 20], we treat this task as a reinforcement learning problem and utilize the asynchronous advantage actor-critic (A3C) algorithm [22], which applies policy gradients to assist the agent in choosing an appropriate action $a_i$ in the high-dimensional action space $A$. In accordance with the done reminder operation presented in [41], when the agent detects the target, we use the target detection confidence to explicitly probabilize the completion of the $Done$ action in the action domain $A_e \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 6}$.

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 Experimental Setup

5.1.1 Dataset. We choose the AI2-Thor [13] dataset and its corresponding simulator as the experimental platform. The AI2-Thor dataset includes 30 different floorplans for each of 4 room layouts: kitchen, living room, bedroom, and bathroom. For each scene type, we use 20 rooms for training, 5 rooms for validation, and 5 rooms with a strong scene understanding without destroying the other.

5.1.2 Evaluation Metrics. We use the success rate (SR), success weighted by path length (SPL) [1], and success weighted by action efficiency (SAE) [41] metrics to evaluate our method. SR indicates the success rate of the agent in completing the task, which is formulated as $SR = \frac{1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^{E} Suc_i$, where $E$ is the number of episodes and $Suc_i$ indicates whether the $i$-th episode succeeds.
SPL considers the path length more comprehensively and is defined as \( \text{SPL} = \frac{1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^{E} \text{Suc}(i) \frac{L_i \max(L_i, L^*_i)}{L^*_i} \), where \( L_i \) is the path length taken by the agent and \( L^*_i \) is the theoretical shortest path. SAE considers the effects of unnecessary rotations and is defined as
\[
\text{SAE} = \frac{1}{E} \sum_{i=1}^{E} \text{Suc}(i) \frac{\sum_{t=0}^{T} (a^t_I \in \text{change})}{\sum_{t=0}^{T} (I(a^t_E) \in \text{all})},
\]
where \( I(\cdot) \) is the indicator function, \( a^t_I \) is the agent’s action at time \( t \) in episode \( i \), \( A_{\text{all}} \) is the set of all actions, and \( A_{\text{change}} \) is the set of actions that can change the position of the agent.

5.1.3 Implementation Details. We train our model with 18 workers on 2 RTX 2080Ti Nvidia GPUs. The Adam optimizer [12] is used to update the network parameters with a learning rate of \( 10^{-4} \). We introduce a dropout of 0.3 to the multi-head attention mechanism and global image embedding. The confidence threshold for filtering objects is set to 0.6. Faster-RCNN [29] is fine-tuned on 50% [41] of the training data from the AI2-Thor dataset. For evaluation, our results take the average value of the test for 3 times. We report the results for all targets (ALL) and for a subset of targets (L>=5) with optimal trajectory lengths greater than 5.

5.2 Strong and Concise Baseline

The methods presented in [6, 28, 41] include five kinds of branches (image, zone, room, previous action and object) that are concatenated into a vector before being input into the LSTM network. To evaluate the influence of the five branches separately on the object navigation task, we eliminate each branch in turn, as shown in Table 1. The object branch has the greatest impact on the experimental results, and the removal of the object branch drops 20.27/24.27, 17.62/19.38, 8.40/11.02 in SR, SPL and SAE (ALL/L>=5, %). This confirms the importance of object features in object navigation task. In this perspective, the adequate exploration of object relationships is necessary. Moreover, the image and previous action branches also have significant impacts on the agent’s navigation ability. Whereas, the elimination of the room branch or the zone branch reduces the SR by only approximately 1% and has little effect on the SPL. The both ablation operations do not affect the performance due to the difficulty in predicting the room type, which is the premise of these two branches. Accordingly, our baseline abandons the room and zone branches, and retains only the image, object and previous action branches.

The last row in Table 1 shows our simplified baseline. The removal of the object GCN, room branch and zone branch reduces the agent’s exploration time by 27.2% while leaving the SR, SPL and SAE essentially unchanged. This more concise baseline allows us to observe the advantages of the added modules more clearly and increases the upper limit of the model.

5.3 Ablation Experiments

We verify the effectiveness of each proposed module with extensive experiments. Table 2, Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5 show the results of ablation experiments on the UAIA, DOA graph, ABED and overall model. More ablation experiments are provided in the Supplementary Material.

5.3.1 UAIA. As shown in Table 2, the UAIA module has two main components: the confidence filter (CF), which is used to eliminate outlier objects; the pixel index (PI) embedding, which is used to increase the order-awareness of the global image features. The UAIA module with CF (confidence > 0.6) outperforms the UAIA module without CF by 1.64/1.11 in SR (ALL/L >= 5, %). This result shows that reducing the influence of irrelevant objects in the UAIA module can effectively improve the navigation ability. The UAIA module with PI embedding outperforms the UAIA module without PI embedding by 1.78/2.25 in SPL (ALL/L >= 5, %), demonstrating that adding positional encoding to each pixel in the image can optimize the agent’s path. The two components complement each other to improve the effectiveness of the UAIA module.

5.3.2 DOA Graph. As shown in Table 3, we explore the role of intrinsic graph (IG) and view adaptive graph (VAG) in DOA graph. The DOA graph with only IG outperforms the DOA graph without IG by 2.90/1.96, 1.47/1.19 and 2.25/3.24 in SR, SPL and SAE (ALL/L >= 5, %). However, the DOA graph with only VAG brings a blow to the agent’s navigation ability. This result implies that it is difficult to directly perform fully adaptive autonomous learning in object relationships, requiring the use of extensive prior knowledge to narrow the learning domain. During the calculation of VAG, the multi-head attention (MA) allows for more reasonable object graph relationships, while the use of target semantics (TS) allows the agent to be more specific about the target, thereby improving the navigation efficiency.

5.3.3 ABED. In Table 4, We compare two methods of providing identities for the branches: branch semantics (BS), which use the embedding of one-hot vectors; energy distribution (ED), which uses only three energy distribution coefficients. Without cross-attention (UAIA and UAOA), adding BS and ED to the original model improves the agent’s navigation ability well. Notably, with cross-attention (UAIA and UAOA), adding BS to the complex model affects the learning of the other modules, causing the model to crash. In contrast, the simple ED method improves the complex model with cross-attention by 0.88/0.87, 0.72/1.02 and 0.67/2.01 in SR, SPL and SAE (ALL/L >= 5, %). The results demonstrate the significant advantage of the ED method with only three parameters in complex models. This is consistent with our intuition that due to the complexity of object navigation tasks, the learning model must be simplified; otherwise, the strong coupling of the complex...
5.3.4 Overall Model. The ablation experiments on the overall model with UAOA, UAIA and ABED are shown in Table 5. Compared with our proposed baseline, applying the complete model increases SR, SPL and SAE by 5.18/7.46, 2.40/3.08 and 2.02/3.86 (ALL/L >= 5, %). The experimental results indicate that our method is capable of effectively guiding agents to navigate in unseen environments. Compared with the UAIA and ABED methods, the UAOA method improves the model more significantly. This is because the UAOA method essentially solves the object attention bias problem, increasing the agent’s understanding of the relationships between objects.

5.4 Elimination of Object Attention Bias
Object attention bias is the phenomenon in which objects with low visibility are ignored. Figure 4 shows the average attention of the agent on all objects before and after using the DOA graph for all test floorplans. Without the use of our DOA graph approach, the agent suffers from severe long-tail distribution in the object attention. The average attention difference between the most popular object and the most neglected object is more than tenfold. Objects with high visibility, such as the floor lamp, fridge and sink, dominate the agent’s decision-making, while objects with low visibility, such as the cell phone and remote control, cannot play their proper guiding roles. The proposed DOA graph significantly improves the rationality of attention allocation for most objects, indicating that the improvement in SR, SPL and SAE is indeed from solving the object attention bias problem. We emphasize that DOA graph is a model-agnostic object attention representation method that can be applied to a variety of models and fusion modules.

5.5 Comparisons to the State-of-the-art
As shown in Table 6, we compare the test results of our method and other similar methods on the AI2-Thor dataset. All of the random decision navigation indicators are close to 0. Notably, our baseline model outperforms the SOTA method by 0.61/0.15, 0.37/0.67 and 1.97/1.02 in SR, SPL and SAE (ALL/L >= 5, %). The redundant operations in previous networks aggravate the object attention bias, which explains why the subtraction in our baseline model facilitates learning. Finally, our model with DOA graph-based modules and ABED method outperforms the SOTA with the gains of 5.79/7.61, 2.77/3.75 and 3.81/4.88 in SR, SPL and SAE (ALL/L >= 5, %).

5.6 Qualitative Analysis
We visualize the navigation effect of the agent in Figure 5. The direction and stop timing of the rotation are critical, as seen in the trajectories of the success and failure cases. These two decisions are mainly determined by the agent’s interpretation of the scene at keyframes when multiple objects can provide rich information. Our DOA graph-based method provides the agent with a more
reasonable and unbiased attention allocation at these keyframes, allowing the algorithm to choose the correct rotation direction and stop timing.

6 CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the network structure and the failed navigation of previous methods, we identify the agent’s object attention bias problem in navigation tasks. To address this problem, we use a directed object attention (DOA) graph, which allows the agent to unbiasedly redistribute object attention. Cross-attention modules (UAIA and UAOA) between the object branch and image branch are designed according to the DOA graph. Our experimental results show that our approach can effectively address the object attention bias problem, greatly improving the agent’s navigation ability. Furthermore, we propose an adaptive branch energy distribution (ABED) method for optimizing the aggregation of branch features that performs well in complex models. It is worth noting that we prioritize simplicity in our approach. In our future work, we will attempt to determine more concrete relationships between objects so that the agent’s navigation can be more clearly interpreted.
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Table 7 summarizes the most commonly used datasets for object navigation tasks. We compare these datasets in terms of the instructions given, the views used, the variety and realism of the scenes, the ability of the agent to interact, the presence or absence of a predefined navigation map, and the ability to map the environment to reality. Since our method is based on the input of object names and single views, in addition to using the AI2-Thor dataset discussed in the main text, we also conduct experiments on the RoboTHOR dataset.

**B OBJECT ATTENTION BIAS**

We discover the object attention bias problem during our research on object features GCN, as discussed in [6, 41]. In the main text, we briefly analyzed this problem. Here, we elaborate on why GCNs have issues with object attention bias. As shown in Figure 6, the object GCN is divided into two stages: (i) Generating the adjacency matrix, and (ii) Transferring information between objects using the adjacency matrix. The object attention bias problem arises in both stages.

**B.1 Bias in Generating the Adjacency Matrix**

The adjacency matrix is generated based on the relationships between the bounding boxes of objects, which defines the correlation between objects. However, after training, the network determines the importance of an object based on the size of its bounding box and its confidence score, thereby ignoring the category and position of the object, which are both more important features. In Table 8, we explicitly add the object semantics and position to the GCN node features of the HOZ [41] method and find that the agent’s navigation performance improves slightly. The results show that it is important for the agent to pay more attention to what the object is and where the objects are; however, this feature introduction cannot effectively resolve the object attention bias generated during training the GCN. Furthermore, since the agent usually can view only a few objects at a time, the object features graph is sparse and thus more susceptible to bias. Figure 7 shows the weights on the edge connecting some specified objects and other objects in the adjacency matrix when searching for different targets in the same bedroom scene. Due to the sparsity of the objects, most edge weights are 0. It is worth noting that regardless of what object is being searched for, the floor lamp has a high connection weight with the other objects. This illustrates that the volume and clarity of the floor lamp cause the agent to overestimate its importance in the bedroom scene.

**B.2 Bias in Convolutional Object Visual Features**

The convolution of object visual features with a biased adjacency matrix clearly leads to biased results. However, in this section, we discuss that even if the object bias in the adjacency matrix is not considered, the convolution of the object visual features can also generate this bias. Figure 8 shows the original images of the objects and their information entropy calculated by the k-nearest neighbor (KNN) method [14]. As a result, even if an object is recognized, it is likely to be ignored due to the disadvantage of its feature information richness.

**C MORE ABLATION EXPERIMENTS**

**C.1 Choice of Backbone**

In the main text, we use ResNet18 as the backbone network for extracting the global image features. Additionally, we also experiment with backbones of different depths. Table 9 shows the results after we replace the backbone with ResNet50 and ResNet101. Compared to ResNet18, the use ResNet50 decreases the SR, SPL and SAE by 0.20/1.11, 4.29/6.86 and 1.03/0.22 (ALL/L=>5,%). The losses in the
Table 7: Goal-driven navigation datasets. The attributes include: Instruction: type of instruction; Observation: views that the agent can use; Scenes: number of different scenes in the simulation; Real-Picture: pictures taken in real environments; Interaction: whether the agent moves or changes the object state; Navigation Graph: the presumptions of the known environmental topologies; and Realistic: resemblance to real-world environments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Scenes</th>
<th>Real-Picture</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Navigation Graph</th>
<th>Realistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House3D (2018)</td>
<td>room name</td>
<td>single view</td>
<td>45622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat (2019)</td>
<td>object name</td>
<td>single view</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI2-Thor (2019)</td>
<td>object name</td>
<td>single view</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoboTHOR (2020)</td>
<td>object name</td>
<td>single view</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVERIE (2020)</td>
<td>task language</td>
<td>panoramas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO (2021)</td>
<td>locate language</td>
<td>panoramas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Visualization of object attention bias in object GCN. A_B represents the weight of object B and all 22 objects in the adjacency matrix while searching for target A.

Table 8: Comparison of introducing object semantics and position into the GCN node features (%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GCN</th>
<th>Semantics</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>L&gt;=5</th>
<th>Episode Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>SPL</td>
<td>SAE</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>SPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>68.53±1.32</td>
<td>37.50±1.01</td>
<td>25.98±0.96</td>
<td>60.27±1.67</td>
<td>36.14±1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>69.45±0.76</td>
<td>37.36±0.99</td>
<td>27.65±1.31</td>
<td>61.02±1.09</td>
<td>37.15±0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>69.12±0.90</td>
<td>38.19±0.56</td>
<td>27.23±0.88</td>
<td>60.76±1.78</td>
<td>37.94±1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Navigation performance after replacing some modules in the model (%). Our Best Model represents the model used in our main text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module Replacement</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>SPL</th>
<th>SAE</th>
<th>L&gt;=5</th>
<th>SPL</th>
<th>SAE</th>
<th>Episode Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our Best Model</td>
<td>74.32±0.89</td>
<td>40.27±1.01</td>
<td>29.79±0.80</td>
<td>67.88±1.05</td>
<td>40.36±1.23</td>
<td>32.56±1.76</td>
<td>22.86±1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backbone</td>
<td>74.12±1.23</td>
<td>35.98±1.15</td>
<td>28.76±0.90</td>
<td>66.77±1.12</td>
<td>33.50±1.27</td>
<td>32.34±1.52</td>
<td>27.96±0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Detector</td>
<td>70.21±1.45</td>
<td>35.56±1.07</td>
<td>26.77±1.34</td>
<td>65.43±0.81</td>
<td>31.45±1.23</td>
<td>29.70±0.99</td>
<td>28.21±1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixel Index Emb.</td>
<td>76.12±1.48</td>
<td>59.12±1.10</td>
<td>30.98±1.27</td>
<td>69.07±0.65</td>
<td>54.93±1.35</td>
<td>35.15±0.93</td>
<td>17.45±1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA Graph</td>
<td>74.54±1.20</td>
<td>38.14±0.82</td>
<td>29.13±1.93</td>
<td>67.76±1.38</td>
<td>38.55±1.07</td>
<td>32.67±1.21</td>
<td>24.21±0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-D</td>
<td>74.29±1.22</td>
<td>40.54±0.79</td>
<td>29.38±1.62</td>
<td>67.81±1.09</td>
<td>40.35±1.67</td>
<td>32.29±1.24</td>
<td>22.59±0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>74.10±0.85</td>
<td>40.34±1.07</td>
<td>29.33±1.55</td>
<td>67.45±1.38</td>
<td>40.19±1.43</td>
<td>31.90±1.33</td>
<td>23.45±0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undirected</td>
<td>73.15±1.17</td>
<td>38.44±1.26</td>
<td>27.43±1.63</td>
<td>66.33±1.44</td>
<td>37.60±1.10</td>
<td>30.95±1.28</td>
<td>26.94±1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SR, SPL and SAE when using ResNet101 as the backbone network are even greater. It is clear that the SPL and the episode length are most severely affected. The explanation may be that excessive high-level global image information degrades local information, thereby weakening the effect of cross-attention with the object branch and impairing the action selection at each step in the overall path. As a result, the navigation distance is greatly increased, which affects the SPL.
C.2 Importance of Accurate Object Information

In our model, we apply Faster-RCNN [29], which was trained on 50% [41] of the training data from the AI2-Thor dataset, to extract the object information. Table 9 shows the results when the ground truth object information is used as the input of the object branch, improving the SR, SPL and SAE by 1.80/1.19, 18.85/14.57 and 1.19/2.59 (ALL/L >=5, %). Similar to the conclusion presented in [41], the ground truth object information has a strong effect on the optimization of navigation path. Notably, our DOA graph method significantly increases the upper bound of the model, and when more accurate and efficient features are used, our model performs better.

C.3 Pixel Index Embedding

In the UAIA module, the pixel index embeddings provide each pixel’s position token, which is important in the multi-head attention mechanism. In Table 9, we compare the results of the following encodings:

1) Providing no positional information (No): Considering the image feature maps as a bag of pixel vectors.

2) 1-dimensional pixel index embedding (Our Best Model): Considering the image feature maps as a sequence of pixel vectors in order.

3) 2-dimensional pixel index embedding (2-D): Considering the image feature maps as a grid of pixel vectors in two dimensions.

4) Relative pixel index embedding (Relative): Considering the relative distance between pixels rather than their absolute position to encode the spatial information.

The results show that without pixel index embeddings, the SPL is reduced by approximately 2%. However, when using 1-D, 2-D or relative pixel index embeddings, the effect is essentially the same. We speculate that this occurs because we perform position embeddings on feature maps with smaller spatial dimensions instead of on the original image, which has larger spatial dimensions. Hence, the process of learning the spatial relations at this resolution is equally easy for the different positional encoding strategies.

C.4 Directivity in DOA Graph

In the main text, we repeatedly emphasize that our proposed DOA graph is a directed graph; thus, the correlation between object B and object A when searching for object A is different from the correlation between object A and object B when searching for object B. Table 9 illustrates that the navigation improvement decreases significantly when the DOA graph is an undirected graph. Fundamentally, the directed object graph follows the relative relationships between objects, while the undirected object graph follows the absolute relationships between objects. The absolute object relationships reduce the adaptability of the agent in modeling object relationships in different scenes, thus reducing its performance in unseen environments.

C.5 Hyperparameters

The hyperparameters are also an important factor in determining the final navigation performance of the agent. However, due to the complexity of the object navigation task, small changes in the network structure have a considerable impact on the selection of the hyperparameters. Therefore, as shown in Figure 9, we conduct extensive experiments on the final model with different dropout rates and confidence filter thresholds. The experimental results show that when a hyperparameter changes, the change rules of the three metrics (SR, SPL and SAE) differ. Thus, we consider all three metrics when choosing the most appropriate hyperparameters for our model.

D QUALITATIVE RESULTS

D.1 The DOA Graph Visualization

Our proposed DOA graph has two parts: the intrinsic object graph, which represents the ubiquitous inherent relationship between the objects, and the view adaptive graph, which changes adaptively according to the input at each timestep. A weighted sum of the two graphs gives the attention score assigned to each object at this timestep. Figure 10 shows the adjacency matrix of the two graphs. For the adjacency matrix of the intrinsic object graph, the largest value is on the diagonal, indicating that the self-connecting edge has the largest weight. This result is consistent with our assumption that when the target object is identified, most of the attention is focused on the target object. For the adjacency matrix of the view adaptive graph, we randomly select the view adaptive attention
In Figure 10, the learned adjacency matrices of the intrinsic object graph and view adaptive graph are visualized. The intrinsic object graph captures the static relationships between objects, while the view adaptive graph adjusts its attention weights dynamically based on the current viewpoint.

Figure 11 illustrates the navigation trajectory of the agent using the RoboTHOR dataset. The green arrows indicate the start of the trajectory, while blue arrows indicate the end. The red value in each object detection box represents the attention weight of the respective object.

When looking for different targets as a column, at each timestamp in the view adaptive graph, only one object's attention weight is close to 1, while the other object's attention weight is close to 0. We speculate that because there are often very few objects observed at each timestamp and most of these objects are essentially irrelevant to the target object, the view adaptive graph directs all attention to the most important object. In the weighted sum of the two graphs, the weight of the intrinsic object graph is 0.95, while the weight of the view adaptive graph is only 0.05. Therefore, although the attention distribution of the view adaptive graph is extreme, it does not affect the robustness of the overall attention distribution. In contrast, the attention concentration in the view adaptive graph reasonably increases the weight of important objects in view.

D.2 Training Process

Figure 12 shows the agent's navigation success rate (SR) on the training and validation datasets during reinforcement learning. We observe that after the agent has learned 0.5 M episodes, the navigation success rate greatly improved, and the SR curve converged after 2.5 M episodes. Due to computational resource constraints,
we train our models on 3 M navigation episodes in our usual experiments. To obtain the best model of the current network structure, we can increase the number of training episodes to 6 M.

**D.3 Navigation Trajectory in RoboTHOR**

Since the AI2-Thor dataset only includes simple room constructions, we also use the RoboTHOR dataset, which includes more complex indoor environments, to verify the effectiveness of our model. As shown in Figure 11, in the RoboTHOR environment, the agent spends more time searching for the target object. Compared with the baseline, the agent can approach the target step-by-step in a continuous exploration with our proposed DOA graph.