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Fig. 1: We demonstrate the performance of our customized legged robot learns to perform basic locomotion tasks using only gray-scale images. The robot is successfully able to walk on different terrains that never have seen before. All tasks are using the same model trained in the simulation with domain randomization and directly deployed in the real world. (Video)

Abstract—Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) is ubiquitous in robotic research. It provides posture information for robots to realize balance and navigation. However, humans and animals can perceive the movement of their bodies in the environment without precise orientation or position values. This interaction inherently involves a fast feedback loop between perception and action. This work proposed an end-to-end approach that uses high dimension visual observation and action commands to train a visual self-model for legged locomotion. The visual self-model learns the spatial relationship between the robot body movement and the ground texture changes from image sequences. We demonstrate that the robot can leverage the visual self-model to achieve various locomotion tasks in the real-world environment that the robot does not see during training. With our proposed method, robots can do locomotion without IMU or in an environment with no GPS or weak geomagnetic fields like the indoor and urban canyons in the city.

I. INTRODUCTION

Visual information in the surrounding environment such as colors and textures can provide rich signals for human locomotion [1]. For instance, by sensing the relative motion of the ground and our joint states, we can easily tell the direction of our body movement. Such skills enable humans to perform a variety of locomotion tasks and adapt to different environments. However, despite great progress in legged robot locomotion [2], [3], [4], [5], leveraging visual observations in locomotion has remained exclusive for legged robotics.

Majority of existing legged robots [6], [7], [8] still rely on Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) sensors to measure the body angular rate and orientation. However, IMU sensors often suffer from sensor drifting [9]. To compensate the errors, it normally requires additional sensory inputs from a camera or GPS system [10], [11], [12] introducing delicate algorithm designs and extra computations. Particularly, for legged robots, the yaw measurement from IMU can quickly become inaccurate and has been directly ignored in previous research [8], [2], [13]. Moreover, transferring the learning-based policy from simulation to the real world can be highly challenging due to the difficulty to precisely simulate the IMU sensor drifting in the physical world. Alternative options like motion capture systems or visual fiducial markers are hard to scale to different indoor and outdoor settings.

In this paper, we propose to apply raw visual observations from a first-person RGB camera to guide legged robot locomotion, without having extra sensors (e.g., IMU or fiducial markers). The entire observation space of our robot only contains the joint positions and the egocentric images. Visual
observations contain rich information of the ground such as surface and texture which will further provide motion clues of the robot body with a sequence of frames. Additionally, due to the recent advances in computer graphics, modern simulations have been shown [14], [15], [16] to offer effective image renderings for robust sim-to-real policy transfer.

We introduce a visual egocentric self-modeling approach for legged robot locomotion. The self-model learns the computational kinematics of the robot body through a data-driven framework in a self-supervised manner. During the modeling process, the self-model takes in a sequence of egocentric images as well as current and future joint positions, and learns to predict the future states of the robot. If the model can make robust and accurate predictions, our self-modeling formulation has to automatically capture sufficient information of the robot bodies from interaction data, namely, motor positions, mass distributions, body kinematics and dynamics. Once acquired, the self-model can receive different objectives of locomotion tasks and generate action plans with Model Predictive Control algorithms in real time.

Our experiments demonstrate that legged robots with visual egocentric self-model can predict future position and orientation changes of the robot body more accurately than robots without visual inputs. The learned model can achieve strong performance when being utilized for planning on multiple primitive locomotion tasks. Our system trains purely in simulation and transfers to the real-world setup without any additional learning. Key to such zero-shot transfer is our domain randomization on both the simulated environments and robot dynamics, as well as data augmentation for neural network training.

Our key contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We demonstrate the effectiveness of egocentric visual observations without IMU sensors or fiducial markers for legged robot locomotion on a physical robot platform.
- We propose a visual egocentric self-model network to effectively fuse sequences of high-dimensional visual observations and robot actions to predict future robot states.
- We present a domain randomization and data augmentation pipeline that enable effective zero-shot sim-to-real transfer on a 3D printed legged robot with noisy and uncalibrated sensors in unseen environments.

## II. RELATED WORKS

### A. Robot Locomotion without Visual Observation

Traditional legged robot locomotion methods require accurate kinematic modeling and human efforts for parameters tuning[17], [18], [19], [6], [7]. Other works relying on optimization methods also needed humans to design features for controllers [20], [21]. Some previous work developed robust controllers for legged robots to achieve walking on uneven terrains [3], [22], [2], [4], [23]. Hwangbo et al.[24] proposed a method that models the motors in the real world and combines the policy in the simulation to achieve robot agile locomotion and recovering from falling. Lee et al. [25] only use IMU and joint encoders and apply random disturbance during the training procedure to train a robust controller that can handle a wide range of scenarios and diverse terrain properties. Wang et al. [26] proposed a method to optimize locomotion with biologically-motivated control laws. Some previous works apply deep reinforcement learning (deep RL) methods to train legged robots to perform locomotion tasks [27], [8], [28], [4], [29], [30]. Yang et al. [31] devise a hierarchical learning framework that uses a high-level gait policy to generate gait patterns and a low-level convex MPC controller to optimize the motor commands. These methods all require precise knowledge of the mechanical structure, the actuation property and state of the robot that relies heavily on proprioceptive sensors. In contrast to our approach, we train the self-model to learn what it needs to perform locomotion tasks automatically by perceiving the visual information.
B. Visual Observation for Robot Locomotion.

While a number of methods were proposed for legged robot locomotion utilizing proprioceptive sensors like IMU and motor encoders, using vision to directly train robots to walk remains a less-targeted problem because pictures belong to the high dimensional data and are very difficult to deal with. In 2000, researchers used vision to detect some features designed manually in the images for legged robots localization[32]. Most of the robot systems apply vision information for high-level planning and navigation using the environment built in point cloud representation [33], [34], [5], [35], [5]. Park et al. [36] presented an approach that uses LIDAR for MIT Cheetah 2 to realize running and jumping over obstacles. Some other past work combined depth images and robot proprioceptive states to train robots end-to-end to achieve crossing challenge terrains [37], [38]. David Wisth et al. [39] proposed a multi-sensor fusion method involving four different sensory modalities on the AnyMal robot to achieve reliable legged robot locomotion. Yu et al.[40] trained a high-level vision policy using deep RL to realize a legged robot to cross uneven environments. Recently, Miki et al [41] proposed a method integrating exteroceptive and proprioceptive perception for legged locomotion. Unlike these methods, we only use the RGB image sequence and action commands as observation.

C. Robot Self-Modeling.

Robot self-modeling takes a model-based approach to robotic systems modeling by decoupling the embodied self and the external environment. The key idea is a computational representation of the robot morphology, kinematics and dynamics through data-driven approaches. Overall, there are two categories of self-modeling approach known as forward kinematics self-modeling [42], [43], [44], [45], [46] and query-based self-modeling [47]. In particular, forward kinematics self-modeling learns to predict the future robot states from the current robot state and action, while query-based self-modeling models the entire robot morphology and kinematics to answer space occupancy queries. Our work aims to learn a forward kinematics self-model for a legged robot. In contrast to previous works, rather than using low-dimensional robot state vectors or third-person camera inputs, we incorporate high-dimensional egocentric visual observations into the input of our self-model. Once acquired, our visual egocentric self-model can be deployed in various downstream locomotion tasks on a physical legged robot.

D. Domain Randomization for Sim2Real Transfer.

Physics simulations, such as Mujoco, Pybullet and Gazebo [48], [49], [50] can accelerate robot learning, but simulations cannot provide exactly the same as real-world environment, and the discrepancies between them are named “reality gap”. To bridge the gap, domain randomization is proposed by Tobin et al. [51] that randomizes the rendering images in the simulation to train a model that can perform the same tasks in the real world. In these works [52], [53], [54], [55], authors leverage variant physical parameters to train a robust policy in simulation that can be deployed in the real world. OpenAI [15], [16] developed a visual system to train a dexterous robotic hand to perform in-hand manipulation with randomization in both physics and vision. Recently, researchers also proposed delay randomization to solve the latency issue in real-world controllers [56]. In this work, we use both vision randomization, physics randomization, and also data augmentation during the training process in the simulation.

III. METHODS

Traditionally, vision data are used for high-level control of legged robotic systems, such as planning, localization, and object detection, as we discussed above. Usually, the motion controller is a separate module that operates at a higher frequency than the camera. Our goal is to demonstrate the effectiveness of using egocentric visual observations for legged robot motion and propose a way to directly control the robot locomotion using vision, even though the overall controller operates at a lower frequency. An intuitive way to address these problems is to train a network that takes images as input and outputs action commands. However, the main challenges of using RGB images as observations are the high computational cost of visual information and various environmental changes, resulting in incoherent actions and the inability to perform locomotion. Here, we propose a method for training a visual self-model that takes a sequence of images with a list of commands produced by a prior action generator as inputs and outputs the future state of the robot. Specifically, we use convolutional neural networks and memory-based networks to process sequential visual data and map action commands into a high-dimensional latent space. Finally, we can use the objective function to access different action commands to perform various tasks.

A. Legged Robot Hardware

We designed a four-leg robot with 12 degree of freedom from 3D printed and commonly available electronic parts shown in Fig. 1. Specifically, each leg contains three Hi-wonder LX-224 serial bus servos with a 0.3 degree accuracy and 20 kg·m torque at 7.4 voltage. We used position control to command the actuators from a onboard Raspberry Pi 4 controller. We equipped the robot with a front RGB camera with 87° × 58° field of view and 60 frames per seconds facing down to the ground by 41 degree. Both the onboard controller and the camera are connected to a desktop with one NVIDIA 3090 GPU through USB cables.

B. Data Representation

The robot observation includes five most recent visual images from the front camera. Instead of directly using the camera readings, we crop the input RGB images from 320×240×3 to 240×240×3 and resize them to 128×128×3. Furthermore, we only use the gray-scale image rather than the raw RGB input to reduce the dimension of the visual observation by a large margin. Such process is critical for real-time control of the physical robot. This is because all
program steps are serial. By having smaller network to process the reduced visual inputs, we can save the cost of decision making process during inference time, thus to avoid losing too much information about the robot states while the robot moves constantly.

In addition to the egocentric visual observations, the robot also takes its next-step action as inputs. Since we use position control for the robot, the action commands are encoded as a vector with 12 numbers representing the angular displacement for each motor. Our egocentric visual self-model aims to predict the robot states from its visual observation and next-step action. However, since we do not rely on any GPS-like systems to localize the robot, we do not have the pose of the robot in the global world coordinate. We therefore define the robot state as the change of the robot position and orientation in the robot coordinate frame known as $\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z, \Delta \text{roll}, \Delta \text{pitch}, \Delta \text{yaw}$.

We collect data in the Pybullet [1] which is a physics simulation in robotics. As we presented above, the objective of the visual self-model is to predict the future robot state given the latest sequence of five frames and action commands. The robot needs to have the capability to figure out the motion from the five frames captured by the first-person camera aiming to the ground and predict the influence of the action commands it will take. In the beginning, we use a random policy that uniformly samples actions in an action space normalized to [-1,1] representing robot joints -90 degrees to 90 degrees and record images as well as robot state. However, this method is ineffective in reducing the loss of the model during training because the data we collected does not match that of the data required for the robot to achieve locomotion.

Besides, the high dimensional observation space combined with action space is too large and even more extensive when we transfer the trained model to the real world using domain randomization.

C. Robot Gait Generator

In order to allow the model to be trained on data that is more representative of the robot locomotion, we design a gait generator to produce the action sequences for our robot to select for locomotion. The gait generator is based on Central Pattern Generator (CPG), used widely in the legged robot system [57], [58]. Each motor action $\theta_i$ is generated by a single sinusoidal function with the same period as shown below:

$$\theta_i(t) = a_i \times \sin(t/T \times 2\pi + b_i) + c_i.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

We use a mathematical optimization algorithm Hill Climbing [59] to optimize the parameters $a_i, b_i, c_i$ in sinusoidal gait functions. Initially, we randomize the coefficients and test the gait in the simulation using 200 steps. The best gait parameters will be replicated into 20 copies. Among 16 copies, one of the coefficients is initialized randomly, and the other four individuals are initialized entirely from scratch. After each epoch, the rewards of all individuals are computed, and the set of parameters that can reach the highest reward is selected to iterate this process. The formal objective function is:

$$R(\Delta x, \Delta y) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} (100 \times \Delta y - 50 \times |\Delta x|).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)
By 2 hour parallel computation on a 16 cores CPU core computer, we finish the optimization and obtain a ideal sinusoidal gait that can make the robot move forward in the simulation.

We applied Gaussian [60] noise to our sinusoidal gait to produce new action $a_n$ close to our optimized sinusoidal gait action $a_o$. These new gaits can be written as:

$$a_n(i, t) = \text{Gaussian}(mean = a_o(i, t), \text{std} = 0.2)$$

(3)

Compared to random motor babbling, using the optimized sinusoidal function with Gaussian provides action sequences that are closed to the optimized gait during training and avoid the robot submerging in useless movement data, like crawling on the ground or flipping its body. This gait generator is not only for collecting data for training visual self-model but also for sampling action during the testing procedure.

D. Environments Details

In this work, we have seven different environment domains as shown in Figure 3. All these environments have flat ground. In order to reduce the gap between the simulation and the real-world environment, we use the same outer morphology of the main body CAD of our physical robot. Other robot CAD parts are simplified when building our URDF files to speed up the simulation computation. Also, we measure the mass of all the components and set the same number in the file. Besides, we calibrate the number of simulation timestamps in each step by running the same motor trajectories in both the real world and the simulation. The trajectories are hand-designed to move each joint from a lower limited position to a limited upper position. We set 60 simulated steps for each action command to ensure the motor commands can be fully executed in the simulation. We collect 100 thousand steps for each texture (A-D) in the simulation to train the visual-self model.

E. Randomization and Data Augmentation

To perform better results, we randomize three aspects of the simulated environment: observation, action, and friction and use data augmentation during the training procedure.

Observation noise: The rug picture contains many features that our model can learn to utilize, but we only have one rug picture. Therefore, we randomly crop the original image into 1000 images and scale them to the same size. When collecting the data from the simulation, we sample these 1000 cropped images and also rotate and translate them randomly. During the training, the brightness of five observation images is changed arbitrarily. Apart from the brightness, we also blur the images by adding Gaussian noise. The details of noise levels are described in Table I. Except for reducing the gap between simulation and the real environment, all of these processes are designed to force our model to learn the relationships among the five pictures rather than the patterns within the pictures.

Action noise: The robot is powered by a battery in the physical robot platform. The battery cannot always provide constant voltage due to its property, which means motors are not performed flawlessly like in the simulation. We add the noise to the robot joint position and torque in the simulation during data collection. The specific values of action noise can be found in Table I.

Friction noise: The robot foot is built by a soft rubber knob, so it should be a relatively high friction coefficient. We randomize the friction coefficient (shown in Table I) in the simulation when the robot starts a new epoch during data collection.

IV. TRAINING VISUAL SELF-MODEL

A. Model Architecture

The model is implemented as a hybrid of residual networks and recurrent neural networks [61]. First, five robot first-person-view images are fed into 48-convolutional layers and followed by five LSTM modules [62]. The way to coordinate action commands with the images is to map the action vectors into a high dimension through the fully-connected layer networks and allow the networks to learn the relationship between robot state and vision with action commands. Therefore, 12 action values are taken as input into 3 fully connected layers and the output is concatenated together with the output from LSTM modules. And then, both outputs from image networks and action networks are concatenated and pass through 5 fully connected layers. Each layer is followed by a layer of Leak ReLU activation function and the output is six numbers representing robot future state. The hyperparameters for the visual self-model architecture are listed in Table II.

B. Training

Before training the model, we normalized the ground-truth value to the same standard deviation since the output values contain both positive and negative numbers and different ranges. This pre-process effectively avoids model bias, which may predict certain specific output values better than others that do not significantly impact the loss. We use Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 1e-4 at the beginning and would be scaled by 0.1 if the validation loss does not decrease over 20 epochs. The hyperparameters used for training the visual self-model are listed in Table II. The loss function can be written as:

$$L = MSE(f_p(I_t, A_t) - S_{t+1}).$$

(4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I: Details of the Randomization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation Noise Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop range (ratio of the original image)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightness Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian Blur Kernel Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian Blur Kernel Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Torque Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Position Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction Range</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friction Range uniform [0.5,0.99]
Fig. 4: Evaluation in the simulation. We compare our method with three baselines. Baseline Sin Gait: an optimized trajectory using sinusoidal function. Baseline Action Only: we replace the visual input with empty images, only observing the action commands. Baseline IMU only: we replace the visual encoder with MLP, taking robot roll, pitch and yaw data as input.

TABLE II: Hyperparameters for training visual self-model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyperparameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimizer</td>
<td>Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial learning rate</td>
<td>1e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch size</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input size</td>
<td>$5 \times 128 \times 128.$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output size</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian Blur Kernel Std</td>
<td>uniform [0.1,5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware configuration</td>
<td>16 cores CPU + 1 GPU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. EXPERIMENTS AND EVALUATION

In this section, we evaluate our method in both the simulation and the real world and design baseline comparisons to evaluate the vision components. We conducted the experiments with four basic locomotion tasks: Moving forward, moving backward, turning right, and turning left.

A. Baselines

Our method uses high-dimensional images data and action to predict future robot states. The vision module in our model built by convolutional neural networks processes image sequences and learns the motion of the same features in different images. We train a baseline using the same model but only using action data to demonstrate that the vision modular is crucial to predict future states in the model. Specifically, we use the same dataset to train our model but use black images as input. This baseline is supposed to learn the robot body model through interaction with the physical environment and have an ability to predict future robot state based on the action produced by the gait generator. This baseline assumes the environment is unchanged, so it cannot predict as precisely as our approach which has visual input to assist the model in predicting. Another baseline is to replace the IMU data with image data as input, which remains consistent with our model in the action module. With this baseline, we can compare the visual feedback with the feedback from the IMU and analyze whether generalizing visual information can perform better results than using the IMU only. The last baseline is our sinusoidal gait generator, it is an open loop control and consists of a fixed sinusoidal gait and Gaussian noise.

B. Simulation

In simulation experiments, we test our model in 4 different terrain textures in Figure 3. We compare our method to the baselines using mean prediction loss and evaluation metrics for each task. The L2 metric is utilized for the prediction error. In moving forward and backward tasks, the robot obtains scores by moving along the y axis and reduces scores if there is an offset on the yaw axis. The robot needs to rotate its body on the yaw axis in the rotation tasks. The results indicate that our approach is better than any other baselines in four tasks across all terrains. Colored dots and grids terrain have higher prediction errors than other terrains. This is because most of the visual observations in these two terrains are blank, resulting in the visual model not obtaining rich features like the other two terrains.

C. Real-world

In the real-world experiments, we deployed the visual self-model to the legged robot and conducted experiments on different terrains. The texture of the rug is used in the simulation for training the model. To demonstrate the robustness of the model, in the real-world test, we also add some slippy scrap of paper (terrain G in the Figure 3) on the ground to provide challenging terrain. Since our model is trained in a simulation with friction noise, the robot can still complete the tasks even if the robot’s foot slips on a slippery piece of paper. We also test our robot on the checkerboard that has entirely different patterns from the simulation environment during training. As shown in Table III our method outperforms all baselines.

VI. CONCLUSION

We present a visual self-model that learns to predict future robot states by incorporating a sequence of images
and action commands and how it can be utilized for a legged robot to perform basic locomotion tasks. Our visual self-model can leverage high-dimensional vision data to infer the motion of this body and use it to predict future states and realize locomotion. We demonstrate that visual self-model can provide better generalization results using domain randomization and data augmentation and can be successfully deployed to unseen real-world environments.

Limitation: The main limitation of the presenting method is that the robot can only predict precisely when the ground is static. The other limitation is that the robot cannot predict a long-term future state.

Future Work: Humans use much information from the vision when locomotion. We can quickly identify objects as our world coordinate system. For example, we use the ground instead of a moving car as the origin. In the future, we will continue to improve our learning framework so that the robot will no longer only focus on the static texture of the ground but "raise its head" and learn to walk by extracting valid information from the forward-looking camera, which may contain moving objects or obstacles that prevent movement.
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TABLE III: Real-World Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Move Forward Score</th>
<th>Move Backward Score</th>
<th>Turn Right Score</th>
<th>Turn Left Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinusoidal Gait (Open loop)</td>
<td>0.1 ± 5.8</td>
<td>-24.9 ± 2.6</td>
<td>17.4 ± 3.8</td>
<td>17.4 ± 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinusoidal Gait (Open loop + noise)</td>
<td>3.9 ± 6.6</td>
<td>-15.0 ± 2.2</td>
<td>20.5 ± 4.6</td>
<td>20.5 ± 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Method (Only input IMU)</td>
<td>4.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>-0.7 ± 3.5</td>
<td>23.8 ± 5.5</td>
<td>22.7 ± 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Method (Rug – seen in the simulation)</td>
<td>18.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>5.5 ± 2.5</td>
<td>31.1 ± 2.9</td>
<td>32.2 ± 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Method (Checkerboard - not seen in the simulation )</td>
<td>18.8 ± 0.8</td>
<td>7.5 ± 1.8</td>
<td>27.2 ± 3.5</td>
<td>32.5 ± 2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


