Learning Visible Connectivity Dynamics for Cloth Smoothing

Anonymous Author(s)

Abstract: Robotic manipulation of cloth remains challenging due to the complex dynamics of cloth, lack of a low-dimensional state representation, and self-occlusions. In contrast to previous model-based approaches that learn a pixel-based dynamics model or a compressed latent vector dynamics, we propose to learn a particle-based dynamics model from a partial point cloud observation. To overcome the challenges of partial observability, we infer which visible points are connected on the underlying cloth mesh. We then learn a dynamics model over this visible connectivity graph. Compared to previous learning-based approaches, our model poses strong inductive bias with its particle based representation for learning the underlying cloth physics; it can generalize to cloths with novel shapes; it is invariant to visual features; and the predictions can be more easily visualized. We show that our method greatly outperforms previous state-of-the-art model-based and model-free reinforcement learning methods in simulation. Furthermore, we demonstrate zero-shot sim-to-real transfer where we deploy the model trained in simulation on a Franka arm and show that the model can successfully smooth cloths of different materials, geometries and colors from crumpled configurations. Videos can be found in the supplement and on our anonymous project website.[1]

Keywords: Deformable Object Manipulation, Dynamics Modeling

1 Introduction

Robotic manipulation of cloth has wide applications across both industrial and domestic tasks such as laundry folding and bed making. However, cloth manipulation remains challenging for robotics due to the complex cloth dynamics. Further, like most deformable objects, cloth cannot be easily described by low-dimensional state representations when placed in arbitrary configurations. Self-occlusions make state estimation especially difficult when the cloth is crumpled.

One approach to cloth manipulation explored by previous work, which we also adopt, is to learn a cloth dynamics model and then use the model for planning to determine the robot actions. However, given that a crumpled cloth has many self-occlusions and complex dynamics, it is unclear how to choose the appropriate state representation. One possible state representation is to use a mesh model of the entire cloth [1]. However, fitting a full mesh model to an arbitrary crumpled cloth configuration is difficult. Recent work have approached fabric manipulation by either compressing the cloth representation into a fixed-size latent vector [2, 3, 4] or directly learning a visual dynamics model in pixel space [5]. However, these representations do not enforce any inductive bias of the cloth physics, leading to suboptimal performance and generalization.

In contrast to a pixel-based or latent dynamics model, particle-based models have recently been shown to be able to learn dynamics for fluid and plastics [6, 7, 8]. A particle-based dynamics representation has the following benefits: first, it captures the inductive bias of the underlying physics, since real-world objects are composed of underlying atoms that can be modeled on the micro-level by particles. Second, we can incorporate inductive bias by directly applying the effect of the robot gripper on the particle being grasped (though the effect on the other particles must still be inferred). Last, particle-based models are invariant to visual features such as object colors or patterns. As such, in this paper we aim to learn a particle-based dynamics model for cloth. However, the challenges in applying the particle-based model to cloth are that we cannot directly observe the underlying

[1] https://sites.google.com/view/vcd-cloth

Submitted to the 5th Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL 2021). Do not distribute.



Figure 1: Cloth smoothing by planning using a dynamics model with a visible connectivity graph.

particles composing the cloth nor their mesh connections. The problem is made even more challenging due to the partial observability of the cloth from self-occlusions when it is in a crumpled configuration.

Our insight into this problem is that, rather than fitting a mesh model to the observation, we should learn the *visible connectivity dynamics (VCD):* a dynamics model based on the connectivity structure of the visible portion of the cloth. To do so, we first learn to estimate the *visible connectivity graph*: we estimate which points in the point cloud observation are connected in the underlying cloth mesh. Estimating the mesh connectivity of the observation is a simplification of the problem of fitting a single full mesh model of the entire cloth to the observation; however, it is significantly easier to learn, since we do not need to find a globally consistent explanation of the observation which requires reasoning about occlusion; to estimate the mesh connectivity of the observation, we only need to consider the visible local cloth structure.

The downside of inferring the visible connectivity graph is that it cannot be used with a physics simulator during the execution of the task, since it does not capture the occluded part of the object. We overcome this limitation by learning a dynamics model directly on the inferred visible connectivity graph (see Figure 1). Unlike a physics simulator, the learned dynamics model can be trained to be robust to the partial observability of the cloth.

In this work, we focus on the task of smoothing a piece of cloth from a crumpled configuration. We propose a method that infers the observable particles and their connections from the point cloud, learns a visible connectivity dynamics model for the observable portion of the cloth, and uses it for planning to smooth the cloth. We show that for smoothing, planning with a visible connectivity dynamics model greatly outperforms state-of-the-art model-based and model-free reinforcement learning methods that use a fixed-size latent vector representation or learn a pixel-based visual dynamics model. Furthermore, we demonstrate zero-shot sim-to-real transfer where we deploy the model trained in simulation on a Franka arm and show that the learned model can successfully smooth cloths of different materials, geometries, and colors from crumpled configurations.

2 Related Work

There has been a long history of cloth manipulation in robotics research.

Vision-based Cloth Manipulation: Some papers on cloth manipulation assume that the cloth is already lying flat on the table [9, 10, 11]. If the cloth starts in an unknown configuration, then one approach is to perform a sequence of actions that are designed to move the cloth into a set of known configurations from which perception can be performed more easily [12, 13, 14]. For example, the robot might first grasp the cloth by an arbitrary point and raise it into the air; it can then detect the lowest point, either while the cloth is held in the air [12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] or after throwing the cloth on the table [14]. By constraining the cloth to this configuration set, the task of perceiving the cloth or fitting a mesh model [1] is greatly simplified. However, these funneling actions are usually scripted and are not generalizable to different cloth shapes or configurations. In contrast, our work aims to enable a robot to interact with cloth from arbitrary configurations and shapes.

Other early works designed vision systems for detecting cloth features that can be used for downstream tasks, such as a Harris Corner Detector [20] or a wrinkle-detector [21]. More examples of such approaches are described in a recent review article [1]. However, these approaches require a task-specific manual design of vision features and are typically not robust to different variations of the cloth configuration.

Policy Learning for Cloth Manipulation: Recently, there have been a number of learning based approaches to cloth folding and smoothing. One approach is to learn a policy to achieve a given manipulation task. Some papers approach this using learning from demonstration. The demonstrations can be obtained using a heuristic expert [22] or a scripted sequence of actions based on cloth descriptors [23]. Another approach to policy learning is model-free reinforcement learning (RL), which has been applied to cloth manipulation [4, 3, 24]. However, policy learning approaches often lack the ability to generalize to novel situations; this is especially problematic for cloth manipulation in which the cloth can be in a wide variety of crumpled configurations. We compare our method to a state-of-the-art policy learning approach [3] and show greatly improved performance.

Model-based RL for Cloth Manipulation: Model-based RL methods learn a dynamics model and then use it for planning. Model-based reinforcement learning methods have many benefits such as sample efficiency, interpretability, and generalizability to multiple tasks. Previous works have tried to learn a pixel-based dynamics model that directly predict the future cloth images after an action is applied [25, 5]. However, learning a visual model for image prediction is difficult and the predicted images are usually blurry, unable to capture the details of the cloth. Another approach is to represent the cloth with a fixed-size latent vector representation [2] and to plan in that latent space. However, cloth has an intrinsic high dimension state representation; thus, such compressed representations typically lose the fine-grained details of their environment and are unsuitable for capturing the low-level details of the cloth's shape, such as folds or wrinkles, which can be important for folding or other manipulation tasks. Our method also falls into the model-based RL category; unlike previous works, we learn a particle based dynamics model [6, 7], which can better capture the cloth dynamics due to the inductive bias of the particle representation. Additionally, the particle representation is invariant to visual features and enables easier sim-to-real transfer.



Figure 2: (a) Overview of our visible connectivity dynamics model. It takes in the voxelized point cloud, constructs the mesh and predicts the dynamics for the point cloud. (b) Architecture for the edge prediction GNN which takes in the point cloud connected by the collision edges and predicts for each collision edge whether it is a mesh edge. (c) Architecture for the dynamics GNN which takes in the point cloud connected by both the collision edges and the mesh edges and predict the acceleration of each point in the point cloud.

3 Method

An overview of our method, VCD (Visible Connectivity Dynamics), can be found in Figure 2. We represent the cloth using a Visible Connectivity Graph, in which we infer the collision and mesh edges between points of a partial point cloud. Next, we learn a dynamics model over this graph, and finally we use this dynamics model for planning robot actions.

3.1 Graph Representation of Cloth Dynamics

We represent the state of a cloth with a graph $\langle V, E \rangle$. The nodes $V = \{v_i\}_{i=1...N}$ represent the particles that compose the cloth, where $v_i = (x_i, \dot{x}_i)$ denotes the particle's current position and velocity, respectively. There are two types of edges E in the graph, representing two types of interactions between the particles: mesh edges and collision edges. The mesh edges, E^M, represent the connections among the particles on the underlying cloth mesh. The mesh connectivity is determined by the structure of the cloth and does not change throughout time. Each edge $e_{ij} = (v_i, v_j) \in E^M$ connects nodes v_i to v_j and models the mesh connection between them. The other type of edges are collision edges, E^C, which model the collision dynamics among two particles that are nearby in space. These can be different from the mesh edges due to the folded configuration of the cloth, which can bring two particles close to each other even if they are not connected by a mesh edge. Unlike the mesh edges which stay the same throughout time, these collision edges are dynamically constructed at each time step based on the following criteria:

$$E_t^C = \{e_{ij} \big| \, ||x_{i,t} - x_{j,t}||_2 < R\}, \tag{1}$$

where R is a distance threshold and $x_{i,t}, x_{j,t}$ are the positions of particles i, j at time step t. Throughout the paper, we use the subscript t to denotes the state of a variable at time step t if the variable changes with time. Additionally, we assume that $E^M \subset E^C$, since a mesh edge connects nodes that are close to each other and hence should also satisfy Eqn. 1.

3.2 Inferring Visible Connectivity from a Partial Point Cloud

In the real world, we observe the cloth in the form of a partial point cloud. In this case, we represent the nodes of the graph using the partial point cloud and infer the connectivity among these observed points. We denote the raw point cloud observation as $P_{raw} = \{x_i\}_{i=1..N_{raw}}$, where x_i is the position of each point and N_{raw} is the number of points. We first pre-process the point cloud by filtering it with a voxel grid filter: we overlay a 3d voxel grid over the observed point cloud and then take the centroid of the points inside each voxel to obtain a voxelized point cloud $P = \{x_i\}_{i=1,...,N_p}$. This preprocessing step is done both in simulation training and in the real world, which makes our method agnostic to the density of the observed point cloud and more robust during sim2real transfer.

We create a graph node v_i for each point x_i in the voxelized point cloud P. The collision edges are then inferred by applying the criterion from Eqn. 1. However, inferring the mesh edges is less straightforward, since in the real world we cannot directly perceive the underlying cloth mesh connectivity. To overcome this challenge, we use a graph neural network (GNN) [26] to infer the mesh edges from the voxelized point cloud. Given the positions of the points in P, we first construct a graph $\langle P, E^C \rangle$ with only the collision edges based on Eqn. 1. As we assume $E^M \subset E^C$, we then train a classifier, which is a GNN, to estimate whether each collision edge $e \in E^C$ is also a mesh edge. We denote this edge GNN as G_{edge}. It takes as input the graph $\langle P, E^C \rangle$, and outputs a binary label for each edge $e \in E^C$. The edge GNN is trained in simulation, where we obtain labels for the mesh edges based on the ground-truth mesh of the simulated cloth. After training, it can then be deployed in the real world to infer the mesh edges from the point cloud. We defer the description of how we obtain the ground-truth mesh labels in Sec. 3.5.

3.3 Modeling Visible Connectivity Dynamics with a GNN

In order to predict the effect of a robot's action on the cloth, we must model the cloth dynamics. While there exists various physics simulators that support simulation of cloth dynamics [27, 28, 29], applying these simulators for a real cloth is still challenging due to two difficulties: first, only a partial point cloud of a crumpled cloth is observed in the real world, usually with many self-occlusions. Second, the estimated mesh edges from Sec. 3.2 may not all be accurate. To handle these challenges, we learn a dynamics model based on the voxelized partial point cloud and its inferred visible connectivity (Sec. 3.2). Formally, given the cloth graph $G_t = \langle V, E \rangle$, a dynamics GNN G_{dyn} predicts the particle accelerations in the next time step, which can then be integrated to update the particle positions and velocities. Here, V refers to the voxelized point cloud, and E refers to inferred visible connectivity that includes both the predicted mesh edges E^M as well as the collision edges. We take the network architecture in previous work [7] (referred to as GNS) for our dynamics GNN G_{dyn}. A similar architecture is used for the edge GNN. See the appendix for the detailed network architecture.

3.4 Planning with Pick-and-place Actions

We plan in a high-level, pick-and-place action space over the VCD model. For each action $a = \{x_{pick}, x_{place}\}$, the gripper grasps the cloth at x_{pick}, moves to x_{place}, and then drops the cloth. As the GNN dynamics model is only trained to predict the changes of the particle states in small time intervals in order to accurately model the interactions among particles, we decompose each high-level action into a sequence of low-level movement, where each low-level movement is a small delta movement of the gripper and can be achieved in a short time. Specifically, we generate a sequence of small delta movements $\Delta x_1, ..., \Delta x_H$ from the high-level action, where $x_{pick} + \sum_{i=1}^{H} \Delta x_i = x_{place}$. Each delta movement Δx_i moves the gripper a little along the pick-and-place direction and the motion can be predicted by the dynamics GNN in a single step. When the gripper is grasping the cloth, we denote the picked point as u. We assume that the picked point is rigidly attached to the gripper, thus, when considering the effect of the tth low-level movement, we modify the graph by directly setting the picked point u's position $x_{u,t} = x_{pick} + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \Delta x_i$ and velocity $\dot{x}_{u,t} = \Delta x_i / \Delta t$, where Δt is the time for one low-level movement step. For the initial steps where the historic velocities are not available, we pad them with zeros for input to the dynamics GNN. If no point is picked, e.g., after the gripper releases the picked point, then the dynamics model is rolled out without manually setting any particle state.

Our goal is to smooth a piece of cloth from a crumpled configuration. To compute the reward r based on either the observed or the predicted point cloud, we treat each point in the point cloud as a sphere with radius R and compute the covered area of these spheres when projected onto the ground plane. Due to computational limitations, we greedily optimize this reward over the predicted states of the point cloud after a one-step high-level pick-and-place action rather than optimizing over a sequence of pick-and-place actions. Given the current voxelized point cloud of a crumpled cloth P, we first estimate the mesh edges using the edge predictor $E^M = G_{edge}(\langle P, E^C \rangle)$. We keep the mesh edges fixed throughout the rollout of a pick-and-place trajectory since the structure of the cloth is fixed. In theory, it could be helpful to update the mesh edges based on the newly observed point cloud at each low-level step, but this is challenging due to the heavy occlusion from the robot's arm during the execution of a pick-and-place action. After the execution of each pick-and-place action, new particles may be revealed and we update the mesh edges when re-planning the next action. The pseudocode of the planning procedure can be found in appendix.

3.5 Training in Simulation

The simulator we use for training is Nvidia Flex, a particle-based simulator with position-based dynamics [30, 31], wrapped in SoftGym [28]. In Flex, a cloth is modeled as a grid of particles, with spring connections between particles to model the bending and stretching constraints.

One challenge that we must address is that the points in the observed partial point cloud do not directly correspond to the underlying grid of particles in the cloth simulator. This presents a challenge for obtaining the ground-truth labels used for training the dynamics GNN and the edge GNN, including the acceleration for each point in the observed point cloud and the mesh edges among them. To address this issue, we perform bipartite graph matching to match each point in the voxelized point cloud to a simulated particle by minimizing the Euclidean distance between the matched pairs. Details about the matching can be found in the appendix. After we get the mapping from the points to the simulator particles, the ground-truth acceleration of each point is simply assigned to be the acceleration of its mapped particle, which is used for training the dynamics GNN. For training the edge GNN, a collision edge is assumed to be a mesh edge if the mapped simulation particles of the edge's both end points are connected by a spring in the simulator.

3.6 Shape Specific Training

When a shape prior of the cloth is known, we further introduce two techniques to leverage such information to improve the performance. The first is graph-based privileged imitation learning, which transfers features from a teacher model trained on the full cloth to a student model trained on the partial cloth observation, to better allow our model to reason about occlusions. This idea is related to other recent work which trains a student with partial observations to imitate a teacher with full-state information [32, 33, 34]. Specifically, we first train a privileged teacher dynamics model with ground-truth information of the particle state of the full cloth, i.e., it takes as input all particles

(including the occluded particles). Next, we train the student model, which takes a partial point cloud as input. The student is trained to imitate the features of the corresponding nodes in the teacher [33]. Graph imitation offers direct supervision on the intermediate features and enables the student model to implicitly reason about the occluded part of the cloth, by imitating the features from the teacher which has full state information. This approach is shape-specific, since the occluded parts of the cloth can only be inferred if the cloth shape is known. The second shape-specific approach that we introduce is adding an auxiliary task of reward prediction [35], where the reward is the covered area of the cloth after taking the current action. Details on our shape specific training methods can be found in the Appendix. Since both methods are shape-specific, we only use them when we train and test on the same (or similar) cloth shape; on the other hand, we remove them when we want to train on one shape (e.g. square cloth) and test on a very different shape (e.g. T-shirt).

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Simulation Setup As mentioned, we use the Nvidia Flex simulator wrapped in SoftGym [28] for training. The robot gripper is modeled as a spherical picker that can move freely in 3D space and can be activated so the nearest particle will be attached to it. For training, we generate random pick-and-place trajectories on a square cloth. The side length of the cloth varies from 25 to 28 cm. For evaluation, we consider three different shapes: 1) the same type of square cloth as used in training; 2) Rectangular cloth, with its length and width sampled from $[19, 21] \times [31, 34]$ cm. 3) Two layered T-shirt (the square cloth used for training was single-layered). For all shapes, we test on 40 initial configurations and report the 25%, 50% and 75% (Q_{25}, Q_{50}, Q_{75}) percentiles of the performance. For all our quantitative results, numbers after $\pm$ denotes $max(|Q_{50} - Q_{25}|, |Q_{75}, -Q_{50}|)$.

Our goal for cloth smoothing is to maximize the covered area of the cloth in the top-down view. We report two performance metrics: Normalized improvement (NI) and normalized coverage (NC). NI computes the increased covered area normalized by the maximum possible improvement $NI = \frac{s - s_0}{s_{max} - s_0}$, where s_0, s, s_{max} are the initial, achieved, and maximum possible covered area of the cloth. Similarly, $NC = \frac{s}{s_{max}}$ computes the achieved covered area normalized by the maximum possible covered area. We report NI in the main paper and NC in the appendix.

We evaluates two variants of our method: Visible Connectivity Dynamics (VCD) and VCD with shape-specific training. We compare with previous state-of-the art methods for cloth smoothing: VisuoSpatial Foresight (VSF) [5], which learns a visual dynamics model using RGBD data; Contrastive forward model (CFM) [2], which learns a latent dynamics model via contrastive learning; Maximal Value under Placing (MVP) [3], which uses model-free reinforcement learning with a specially designed action space. More implementation details can be found in the appendix.

Real World Setup We use our dynamics model trained in simulation to smooth cloth in the real world with a Franka Emika Panda robot arm and a standard panda gripper. We obtain RGBD images from a side view Azure Kinect camera. We use color thresholding for segmenting the cloth and obtain the cloth point cloud. We evaluate on three pieces of cloth: Two square towels made of cotton and silk respectively, and one t-shirt made of cotton. We use our dynamics model trained in simulation without any fine-tuning. More details are in the appendix.

4.2 Simulation Results

For each method, we report the NI after different numbers of pick-and-place actions. A smoothing trajectory ends early when NI>0.95. We note that the edge GNN can achieve a high prediction accuracy of 0.91 on the validation dataset. See appendix for visualizations of the edge GNN prediction.

We first test all methods on the same type of square cloth used in training. The results are shown in Figure 3 (left). Under any given number of pick-and-place actions, VCD greatly outperforms all of the baselines. The shape-specific training approaches described in Section 3.6 further improves the performance. To test the generalization of these methods to novel cloth shapes that are not seen during training, we further evaluate on a rectangular cloth and a t-shirt. For this experiment we only compare VCD to VSF, since VSF achieves the best performance on the square cloth among all the baselines. The results are summarized in Figure 3 (middle and right). VCD shows a larger



Figure 3: Normalized improvement on square cloth (left), rectangular cloth (middle), and t-shirt (right) for varying number of pick-and-place actions. For detailed numbers, see the appendix.

improvement over VSF on the rectangular cloth. T-shirt is more different from the training square cloth and VSF completely fails, while VCD still shows good generalization. The shape specific training still leads to marginal improvement and better stability on rectangular since it has a similar shape to the square cloth. However, as the t-shirt has very different shape compared to the square cloth, VCD-shape-specific cannot generalize to it.

Since VCD learns a particle-based dynamics model, it incorporates the inductive bias of the cloth structure, which leads to better performance and stronger generalization across cloth shapes, compared to RGB based method like VSF. Please see the appendix for examples of some planned pick-and-place action sequences of our method on all cloth shapes as well as visualizations of the predictions of our model.



Figure 4: Smoothing cloths of different colors, materials and shapes with our method on a Franka robot: square cotton (top), square silk (middle), cotton t-shirt (bottom). Each row shows one trajectory. Frame 0 shows the initial configuration of the cloth, and each frame after shows the observation after some number of pick-and-place actions, with the number labeled on the frame. The green arrow shows the 2D projection of the pick and place action executed.

Material \ # of pick-and-place actions	5	10	20	Best
Cotton Square Cloth	0.342 ± 0.265	0.725 ± 0.445	0.941 ± 0.360	0.941 ± 0.153
Silk Square Cloth	0.456 ± 0.197	0.643 ± 0.391	0.952 ± 0.229	0.952 ± 0.095
Cotton T-Shirt	0.265 ± 0.119	0.356 ± 0.096	0.502 ± 0.135	0.619 ± 0.155

Table 1: Normalized improvement of VCD in the real world.

4.3 Real-world Results

We also evaluate our method for smoothing in the real world. We only evaluate VCD (i.e., without shape specific training) since it works well on all cloth shapes in simulation. Unfortunately, we were not able to evaluate the baselines in the real world due to the difficulties of transferring their RGB-based policies from simulation. All of the baselines use RGB data as direct input to the dynamics

model or the learned policy, making them sensitive to the camera view and visual features. In contrast, our method uses a point cloud as input, which makes it robust to the camera position as well as variation in visual features such as the cloth color or patterns. The point cloud representation allows our method to easily transfer to the real world.

We evaluate 12 trajectories for each cloth. The quantitative results are in Table 1 and a visualization of smoothing sequences is shown in Figure 4. Despite the drastic differences of the cotton and silk cloths in visual appearances, shapes, as well as the different dynamics, our model is able to smooth the cotton and silk cloths and generalize well to t-shirt. We also report the performance if our method is able to terminate optimally in hindsight and choose the frame with the highest performance in each trajectory; the result is shown in the last column of Table 1. Videos of complete trajectories and the model predicted rollouts can be found on our project website.

4.4 Ablation Studies

We perform the following ablations to study the contribution of each component of our method. The first ablation replaces the learned GNN dynamics model with the Flex simulator to test whether a learned dynamics model performs better for our task than the physical simulator. In more detail, after we use the edge GNN to infer the mesh edges on the point cloud, we create a cloth using Flex where a particle is created at each location of the voxelized points and a spring connection is added for each inferred mesh edge. The results is shown in Table 2, row 2. We see that using the Flex simulator instead of the dynamics GNN produces significantly worse performance. The main reason is that the cloth created from the partial point cloud with the inferred mesh edges deviates from the common cloth mesh structure used in Flex; thus, using the Flex simulator under this condition does not create realistic dynamics. On the other hand, the dynamics GNN is trained directly on the partial point cloud; therefore it can learn to compensate for the partial observability when predicting the cloth dynamics. This ablation validates the importance of using a dynamics GNN to learn the dynamics of the partially observable point cloud.

Algorithm	Normalized Improvement
VCD (Our method)	$\mathbf{0.770 \pm 0.206}$
Replace GNN with Flex	0.371 ± 0.144
Use only collision edges	0.605 ± 0.183
Use only mesh edges	0.405 ± 0.252
Remove edge GNN at test time	0.189 ± 0.102

Table 2: Normalized improvement of all ablations in simulation after 10 pick-and-place actions.

The next set of ablations aims to test whether using an edge GNN to infer the mesh edges as described in Section 3.1 is necessary for learning a good dynamics model. First, we train a dynamics GNN without using the edge GNN, where the edges are constructed solely based on distance by Eqn. (1). Since this ablation does not use an edge GNN, it cannot have two different edge types (collision vs mesh edges). Thus at test time, all edges can either be kept fixed throughout the trajectory (similar to the mesh edges in our model), or dynamically reconstructed using Eqn. (1) at each time step (similar to the collision edges in our model). The results of these two ablations are shown in Table 2, rows 3 and 4. As can be seen, the performance is worse without the edge GNN.

Additionally, we perform another ablation where we train with both collision and mesh edges, but at test time, we do not use an edge GNN to infer the edge type; instead we consider the edges that satisfy the criteria of Eqn. (1) in the first time step as the mesh edges. The result of this ablation is shown in Table 2, row 5. The performance is again much worse. All these ablations validate the importance of using an edge GNN to infer the mesh edges.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose the visible connectivity dynamics (VCD) model, under a framework that infers a visibility connectivity graph from the partial point cloud and learns a particle-based dynamics model over the graph for planning to perform cloth smoothing. VCD has the advantage of posing strong inductive bias that fits the underlying cloth physics, being invariant to visual features, and being interpretable. We show that VCD greatly outperforms previous state-of-the-art methods for cloth smoothing, and achieves zero-shot sim-to-real transfer on a Franka arm for smoothing various types of cloth. In the future, we hope to extend our VCD framework to different deformable object manipulation tasks.

References

[1] P. Jiménez and C. Torras. Perception of cloth in assistive robotic manipulation tasks. pages 1–23. Springer, 2020.

[2] W. Yan, A. Vangipuram, P. Abbeel, and L. Pinto. Learning predictive representations for deformable objects using contrastive estimation. 2020.

[3] W. Wu, Yilin adn Yan, T. Kurutach, L. Pinto, and P. Abbeel. Learning to manipulate deformable objects without demonstrations. *Robotics Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2020. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.13439.

[4] J. Matas, S. James, and A. J. Davison. Sim-to-real reinforcement learning for deformable object manipulation. *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2018. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.07851.

[5] R. Hoque, D. Seita, A. Balakrishna, A. Ganapathi, A. Tanwani, N. Jamali, K. Yamane, S. Iba, and K. Goldberg. VisuoSpatial Foresight for Multi-Step, Multi-Task Fabric Manipulation. In *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2020. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.09044.

[6] Y. Li, J. Wu, R. Tedrake, J. B. Tenenbaum, and A. Torralba. Learning particle dynamics for manipulating rigid bodies, deformable objects, and fluids. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01566*, 2018.

[7] A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, J. Godwin, T. Pfaff, R. Ying, J. Leskovec, and P. Battaglia. Learning to simulate complex physics with graph networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8459–8468. PMLR, 2020.

[8] T. Pfaff, M. Fortunato, A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, and P. W. Battaglia. Learning mesh-based simulation with graph networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

[9] S. Miller, M. Fritz, T. Darrell, and P. Abbeel. Parametrized shape models for clothing. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 4861–4868. IEEE, 2011.

[10] J. Stria, D. Prusa, and V. Hlavac. Polygonal models for clothing. In *Conference Towards Autonomous Robotic Systems*, pages 173–184. Springer, 2014.

[11] J. Stria, D. Prusa, V. Hlavac, L. Wagner, V. Petrik, P. Krsek, and V. Smutny. Garment perception and its folding using a dual-arm robot. In *2014 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 61–67. IEEE, 2014.

[12] M. Cusumano-Towner, A. Singh, S. Miller, J. F. O'Brien, and P. Abbeel. Bringing clothing into desired configurations with limited perception. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 3893–3900. IEEE, 2011.

[13] J. Maitin-Shepard, M. Cusumano-Towner, J. Lei, and P. Abbeel. Cloth grasp point detection based on multiple-view geometric cues with application to robotic towel folding. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 2308–2315. IEEE, 2010. URL https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/5509439.

[14] D. Triantafyllou and N. A. Aspragathos. A vision system for the unfolding of highly non-rigid objects on a table by one manipulator. In *International Conference on Intelligent Robotics and Applications*, pages 509–519. Springer, 2011.

[15] F. Osawa, H. Seki, and Y. Kamiya. Unfolding of massive laundry and classification types by dual manipulator. *Journal of Advanced Computational Intelligence and Intelligent Informatics*, 11(5):457–463, 2007.

[16] Y. Kita and N. Kita. A model-driven method of estimating the state of clothes for manipulating it. In *Sixth IEEE Workshop on Applications of Computer Vision, 2002.(WACV 2002). Proceedings.*, pages 63–69. IEEE, 2002.

[17] Y. Kita, F. Saito, and N. Kita. A deformable model driven visual method for handling clothes. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, 2004. Proceedings. ICRA'04. 2004*, volume 4, pages 3889–3895. IEEE, 2004.

[18] Y. Kita, T. Ueshiba, E. S. Neo, and N. Kita. Clothes state recognition using 3d observed data. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 1220–1225. IEEE, 2009.

[19] I. Mariolis, G. Peleka, A. Kargakos, and S. Malassiotis. Pose and category recognition of highly deformable objects using deep learning. In *2015 International conference on advanced robotics (ICAR)*, pages 655–662. IEEE, 2015.

[20] B. Willimon, S. Birchfield, and I. Walker. Model for unfolding laundry using interactive perception. In *2011 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 4871–4876. IEEE, 2011. URL https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6095066.

[21] L. Sun, G. Aragon-Camarasa, P. Cockshott, S. Rogers, and J. P. Siebert. A heuristic-based approach for flattening wrinkled clothes. In *Conference Towards Autonomous Robotic Systems*, pages 148–160. Springer, 2013.

[22] D. Seita, A. Ganapathi, R. Hoque, M. Hwang, E. Cen, A. K. Tanwani, A. Balakrishna, B. Thananjeyan, J. Ichnowski, N. Jamali, K. Yamane, S. Iba, J. Canny, and K. Goldberg. Deep Imitation Learning of Sequential Fabric Smoothing From an Algorithmic Supervisor. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2020. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.04854.

[23] A. Ganapathi, P. Sundaresan, B. Thananjeyan, A. Balakrishna, D. Seita, J. Grannen, M. Hwang, R. Hoque, J. Gonzalez, N. Jamali, K. Yamane, S. Iba, and K. Goldberg. Learning Dense Visual Correspondences in Simulation to Smooth and Fold Real Fabrics. In *ICRA*, 2021.

[24] R. Lee, D. Ward, A. Cosgun, V. Dasagi, P. Corke, and J. Leitner. Learning arbitrary-goal fabric folding with one hour of real robot experience. *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2020.

[25] F. Ebert, C. Finn, S. Dasari, A. Xie, A. Lee, and S. Levine. Visual foresight: Model-based deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00568*, 2018. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.00568.

[26] P. W. Battaglia, J. B. Hamrick, V. Bapst, A. Sanchez-Gonzalez, V. Zambaldi, M. Malinowski, A. Tacchetti, D. Raposo, A. Santoro, R. Faulkner, et al. Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01261*, 2018.

[27] E. Coumans and Y. Bai. Pybullet, a python module for physics simulation for games, robotics and machine learning. http://pybullet.org, 2016–2019.

[28] X. Lin, Y. Wang, J. Olkin, and D. Held. Softgym: Benchmarking deep reinforcement learning for deformable object manipulation. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2020.

[29] R. Narain, A. Samii, and J. F. O'brien. Adaptive anisotropic remeshing for cloth simulation. *ACM transactions on graphics (TOG)*, 31(6):1–10, 2012.

[30] M. Müller, B. Heidelberger, M. Hennix, and J. Ratcliff. Position based dynamics. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation*, 18(2):109–118, 2007.

[31] M. Macklin, M. Müller, N. Chentanez, and T.-Y. Kim. Unified particle physics for real-time applications. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, 33(4):1–12, 2014.

[32] D. Chen, B. Zhou, V. Koltun, and P. Krähenbühl. Learning by cheating. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 66–75. PMLR, 2020.

[33] J. Lee, J. Hwangbo, L. Wellhausen, V. Koltun, and M. Hutter. Learning quadrupedal locomotion over challenging terrain. *Sci Robot*, 5(47), Oct. 2020.

[34] A. Warrington, J. W. Lavington, A. Scibior, M. Schmidt, and F. Wood. Robust asymmetric learning in pomdps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15566*, 2020.

[35] M. Jaderberg, V. Mnih, W. M. Czarnecki, T. Schaul, J. Z. Leibo, D. Silver, and K. Kavukcuoglu. Reinforcement learning with unsupervised auxiliary tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.05397*, 2016.