

# SLAM-Safe Planner: Preventing Monocular SLAM Failure using Reinforcement Learning

Vignesh Prasad<sup>1</sup>, Saurabh Singh<sup>2</sup>, Nahas Pareekutty<sup>1</sup>, Balaraman Ravindran<sup>3</sup>, Madhava Krishna<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—Effective SLAM using a single monocular camera is highly preferred due to its simplicity. However, when compared to trajectory planning methods using depth-based SLAM, Monocular SLAM in loop does need additional considerations. One main reason being that for the optimization, in the form of Bundle Adjustment (BA), to be robust, the SLAM system needs to scan the area for a reasonable duration. Most monocular SLAM systems do not tolerate large camera rotations between successive views and tend to breakdown. Other reasons for Monocular SLAM failure include ambiguities in decomposition of the Essential Matrix, feature-sparse scenes and more layers of non linear optimization apart from BA. This paper presents a novel formulation based on Reinforcement Learning (RL) that generates fail safe trajectories wherein the SLAM generated outputs (scene structure and camera motion) do not deviate largely from their true values. Quintessentially, the RL framework successfully learns the otherwise complex relation between motor actions and perceptual inputs that result in trajectories that do not cause failure of SLAM, which are almost intractable to capture in an obvious mathematical formulation. We show systematically in simulations how the quality of the SLAM map and trajectory dramatically improves when trajectories are computed by using RL.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Simultaneous Planning Localization and Mapping (SPLAM) or Active SLAM has been a popular area of research over the years [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. The main theme is to compute a set of control actions for the mobile robot such that either the uncertainty of the robot or the combined uncertainty of robot and map states are bounded. Traditionally, SPLAM frameworks have been approached through either Model Predictive Control [1], [2] or Information Gain [3] paradigms. In recent times, Belief Space planning paradigms have tended to compute the control law in continuous domain [4], [5] taking a leaf out of SLAM frameworks that model it as a least squares problem [6].

However, all of the above works assume the availability of immediate range data and uncertainty estimates for the map. Some of them, such as [5], also assume the availability of dense range data transposed to an occupancy grid map. In contrast, in a monocular SLAM setting, the following complexities get accrued:

- Sparse depth estimates, which are highly inaccurate in textureless or low texture scenes

- Degeneracies in camera motion estimation such as in planar scenes or for in-place rotation of the camera
- Highly non linear nature of the camera projection operation since a monocular camera is not a depth sensor but a projective sensor




Fig. 1: Robot Trajectory estimate and Map (a) with a RL-based planner and (c) without the RL-based planner. The corresponding Monocular SLAM feedback is shown in (b) and (d) respectively.

In contrast, this paper formulates the SPLAM problem through a Reinforcement Learning paradigm in a map agnostic fashion. Instead of learning outright an optimal action policy, the current framework learns actions detrimental to SLAM. Essentially, it can be seen as filtering out bad actions. This action filter is learnt through Temporal Difference Learning methods[7]. We learn an optimal action-value function, also known as Q function or Q values, with respect to SLAM failure. This is what is used to filter out potentially unsafe actions. The optimal action filter which is learnt can be seamlessly used across a variety of maps with significant reduction in Monocular SLAM breakages.

Analysis shows significant reduction in SLAM failures, or breakages, as well as a overall reduction in trajectory error

<sup>1</sup>Robotics Research Centre, International Institute of Information Technology - Hyderabad, India

<sup>2</sup>Mechanical Engineering Department, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India

<sup>3</sup>The Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, India

as a consequence of actions taken based on the learned Q values vis-a-vis trajectories generated by routine trajectory generation methods such as those computed using sampling based planners [11] or trajectory optimization routines [12]. Qualitative and quantitative analysis and comparisons with state-of-the-art planners and supervised learning methods showcase the superior performance of the proposed method.

The keynote is that almost all monocular SLAM results have been shown with a handheld camera or on a monocular camera mounted robot that is controlled or teleoperated by the user. In such scenarios, human intuition and experience is often responsible for the success of SLAM. For example, with handheld cameras it is common for the user to repeatedly scan the same area to improve the quality of results whereas with a robot turns are negotiated through a sequence of back and forth motions tacitly avoiding a one shot acute turning or bending. RL based methods are amenable to learn such experience and intuition and dovetail it to a SLAM-Safe planner forming the essential theme of this work. This is precisely captured in the non breaking trajectory of Fig. 1a, where a sharp turn is decomposed into a sequence of back and forth maneuvers that has been learned by RL. Such a maneuver provides for SLAM stability by attenuating a sharp turn and allowing the vehicle to look at an area for a longer time. This helps to ensure feature persistence over multiple frames thereby improving the accuracy of the estimates of both the pose and the sparse map.

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Monocular SLAM

Monocular Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (Monocular SLAM) refers to the estimation of camera pose and trajectory while performing a 3D reconstruction of the environment using only a monocular camera. A real time Monocular SLAM algorithm requires:

- Robust initialization of the camera pose and map.
- Accurate mapping of real world points among a subset of frames seen (keyframes).
- Reliable tracking of points over multiple frames to estimate camera trajectory.

**PTAM (Parallel Tracking and Mapping)** [8] was one of the first such system developed by Klein and Murray. As the name suggests, it parallelly maps features points from the world and tracks them over multiple frames to provide a 6 DoF pose estimate. **ORB-SLAM** [9] is a similar feature based monocular SLAM that builds on the main ideas of PTAM. It uses different features for tracking as compared to PTAM and incorporates real time loop closure along with mapping and tracking. **LSD-SLAM** [10] is a state-of-the-art monocular SLAM system that, unlike the above 2 methods, creates a much denser 3D reconstruction of the environment. Rather than working with features, it works directly with image intensity differences. It tracks using the image as a whole, rather than some abstraction in the form of features. Mapping is done using pixel depth estimation rather than feature depth estimation.

While these methods have shown effective SLAM capabilities, feature based monocular SLAM methods are susceptible to errors in pose estimates due to insufficient feature tracking or motion induced errors such as in-place rotation or steep change in heading angle. Motion-induced errors can be mitigated to an extent by severely restricting robot motion, but this may lead to inefficiencies in navigation. Moreover, literature that has used these to autonomously navigate with stable pose estimates are sparse. A promising solution would therefore be based on automatically learning robot behavior that can perform navigation while keeping SLAM tracking failures to a minimum. Considering the requirements of self-learning and adaptability, Reinforcement Learning forms a good candidate for such a solution.

### B. Reinforcement Learning

Reinforcement Learning (RL) is a learning method based on Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) where actions are performed based on the current state of the system. The correspondence between states and the actions performed from each state is determined by the policy. The aim of the decision process is to optimize the policy, which in turn is performed by maximizing the return from each state. This return is called the value and denoted by  $V(s)$ , where  $s$  is the state. Here,  $V(s)$  is affected by both the immediate return, i.e. the effect of the immediate action  $a$ , and the state transitions that follow in the future. The effectiveness of an action is defined by the Q value of the action and the state from which it is performed i.e. state-action pair, denoted by  $Q(s, a)$ . The Q value gives the expected value that can be achieved by performing an action  $a$  from a state  $s$ .

In RL, the learning process involves interaction with the system and updating the values and qualities based on the results of these interactions. This learning process involves both random explorative actions to probe the system and 'greedy' exploitative actions that aims to maximize returns. The ratio of explorative to exploitative actions ( $\epsilon$ ) is varied to maximize learning during the initial stages and maximize returns after some information about the system is acquired.

Q learning [13][14] is a widely used Temporal Difference (TD) prediction method for control problems. It is an off-policy TD learning method, i.e. it learns an optimal action-value function, irrespective of the policy followed. Starting with an initial value, the values are updated incrementally through learning episodes or samples, in a way similar to dynamic programming. The update for performing an action  $a$  from a state  $s$ , reaching a new state  $s'$  and obtaining a reward  $r$  is as follows:

$$Q(s, a) \leftarrow Q(s, a) + \alpha[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s', a') - Q(s, a)] \quad (1)$$

where  $a'$  is the action that would be performed from the next state  $s'$ ,  $\alpha$ , the learning rate and  $\gamma$ , the discount factor. Once the Q values are learnt, the optimal action would be that which maximizes the Q value from the current state.

## III. SLAM-SAFE BEHAVIOR USING RL

As described in Section II-A, the motivation for this paper is to devise navigational methodology for a robot that




Fig. 2: Overview of the SLAM-Safe Navigational Planner

prevents the failure of Monocular SLAM. This is ensured by using RL to learn the relationship between robot actions and SLAM failure.

Common RL methods used in navigation involve use of value functions to trace optimal trajectories to a desired goal position. Here, since the focus is on SLAM-Safe behavior and not optimal trajectory planning, we use RL only to avoid potentially unsafe movements that can lead to SLAM failure. Fig. 2 shows a flowchart of the complete navigational planner. A more detailed explanation follows in Section III-C

#### A. State-Action Parameter Selection

To effectively design the Action Filter, the quality of an action should be primarily dependent on the probability of it causing a SLAM failure and should be independent of the map(s) being used for learning. The RL method should also be designed to ignore parameters that are map-specific. The system comprising the robot and the environment is characterized by a state-action pair  $(s, a)$  which is parametrized into  $(x, y)$ ,  $(V_x, V_y)$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $N_{feat}$ , and  $\%_{feat}$  representing the location, velocity, heading angle, angular velocity, feature point visibility and feature point visibility percentage respectively. Relevant parameters were selected by first performing a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) on state-action samples classified based on failure/non-failure of SLAM. The eigenvalues indicate the effectiveness of that parameter in distinguishing between failure and non-failure actions. The results of PCA can be seen in table I.

It can be observed from the eigenvalues that  $dir$  is most important parameter followed by  $\Delta\theta$  and  $\Delta N_{feat}$  while the eigenvalue of  $\%_{feat}$  is very small. We abstract the state and actions to include only parameters that are relevant to SLAM-Safe behavior, viz.  $dir$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $N_{feat}$ , where  $dir$  represents the direction of motion (forward or reverse) and

TABLE I: PCA of Parameters

Parameter	Eigenvalue
Heading Direction ( $dir$ )	0.843
Change in Heading Angle ( $\Delta\theta$ )	0.090
Common visible features ( $\Delta N_{feat}$ )	0.060
Percentage change in features ( $\%_{feat}$ )	0.007

$N_{feat}$  represents the number of features visible from that state. Instead of using the absolute values of  $\theta$  and  $N_{feat}$ , we use  $\Delta\theta$ , and  $\Delta N_{feat}$ , where  $\Delta\theta$  represents the change in heading angle and  $\Delta N_{feat}$  represents the common visible features between two subsequent poses.

Monocular SLAM systems tend to fail in areas of low feature density as a lesser number of features can lead to a high error in the pose estimate. This is evident from Fig. 3a which shows the distribution of field of view (FOV) overlap for breakages. There are higher numbers of breakages for lower FOV overlap, which is mostly what causes monocular SLAM failure. The pose estimate of SLAM deteriorates even in case of large rotations without adequate translation. This is a problem with feature-based monocular SLAM algorithms. A large rotation can, in some cases, get mapped to a translatory motion, causing large deviation in the pose estimate. In such cases, the tracking quality decreases causing a SLAM failure. This is captured in Fig. 3b where we can see an increasing trend in the frequency of breakages as the change in heading angle between two views increases. While training, consecutive views for which parameters were calculated were at a distance of 1m on average. We restricted our learning to a maximum of  $27^\circ$  as angles above this cause extremely large deviations in pose. While discretizing, we kept a cap of 600 features on the overlap of features between two views.




Fig. 3: Frequency of SLAM breakage w.r.t (a) Field of View and (b) Heading Angle change.

Since  $\Delta N_{feat}$  is not a directly measurable value, it is indirectly estimated from the map. In PTAM, the reconstructed world points are first reprojected onto the image plane of the camera and those that lie outside the image boundary are pruned. This set of points form the set of potentially visible points, which are then searched for in the current image. In order to calculate the exact number of points tracked from one frame to the next, we require the camera image at the next predicted pose. This requires 3D knowledge about the scene, which is not available in a real world setting. Thus, in order to get an estimate of the number of features in our predicted pose, we use the set of potentially visible points at that pose. We essentially compute the overlap of the potentially visible sets of points between the two frames.

### B. Learning using RL

The objective of the RL method is to evaluate an action performed from a state with respect to the SLAM pose estimate. The model was trained by generating sample trajectories from the robot in a simulated environment. Each sample trajectory is abstracted into a state-action pair which is used to update the Q value for that particular state-action pair. We use a lookup table representation for the Q function, by discretizing the states and actions as described in Section III-A. Details of this discretization is given in table II.

TABLE II: Discretization of State-Action pairs

Parameter	Range	No. of values
$dir$	1 or 2	2
$\Delta\theta$	0° to 30°	20
$\Delta N_{feat}$	0 - 600	20

The Q values were learnt by performing Q learning with a handcrafted reward function. The reward function was created by using a few assumptions on the way Monocular SLAM Systems behave. Since  $\Delta\theta$  and  $\Delta N_{feat}$  were found to adversely affect SLAM pose estimates, negative rewards were given proportional to these values. The reward function that we used in our model is given in Alg. 1. Other than rewards for change in heading angle and overlap of points, an additional penalty of -10 is given if PTAM breaks due to a

particular action. There is no separate reward for successfully reaching the goal state as our aim is not to optimally reach the goal location, but to avoid monocular SLAM failure along the way.

---

### Algorithm 1 Calculation of Reward

---

```

procedure GETREWARD(  $\Delta N_{feat}$ ,  $\Delta\theta$ ,  $Status_{PTAM}$  )
   $Reward_{feat} \leftarrow -10 + \max(600, N_{feat})/60$ 
   $Reward_{angle} \leftarrow -|\Delta\theta|/10$ 
  if  $Status_{PTAM} == BROKEN$  then
     $Reward_{PTAM} \leftarrow -10$ 
  else
     $Reward_{PTAM} \leftarrow 0$ 
  return  $Reward_{feat} + Reward_{angle} + Reward_{PTAM}$ 

```

---

Since the Q values are expected to be agnostic to maps and goal locations, random exploration methods like random walk can be used in addition to map and goal-specific trajectory planners such as Rapidly-exploring Random Trees (RRT) [11]. Independent of the method used, each step executed by robot is converted into an abstracted state from which the transition was initiated and an abstracted action performed from that state, as described in Section III-A. The number of samples to be used in training depends on the coverage of the state-action space and convergence of the Q values. Minor deficiencies in coverage can be mitigated using approximation and interpolation.

### C. SLAM-Safe Navigational Planner

Once the Q values have been learned, the navigational planner can be designed. In the SLAM-Safe planner, a trajectory from the current location to a waypoint using Bernstein curves [12] is devised. The waypoints are chosen such that they are either part of open frontiers in the map or are in areas of low feature visibility but having enough overlap with the current set of features so as to prevent PTAM failure. The action filter evaluates the immediate part of trajectory to check if it will cause a SLAM failure or not. The action filter converts the action into its corresponding parameters, as described in Section III-A, and checks the Q value of the action against a safety threshold. If it is above the threshold, the robot continues along its current path. If it falls below the threshold, i.e. if an unsafe motion is predicted, candidate trajectories are generated by the action filter from the current location of the robot. Among those trajectories that are predicted as safe, the one that best aligns it with the next waypoint is chosen and executed. Once this recovery action is executed, a new trajectory is generated from the new location to the goal. This process is cyclically repeated until the goal state is achieved.

## IV. EXPERIMENTATION AND RESULTS

In this section, we present experimental results for both training and SLAM-Safe navigation and perform an analysis of the results.

### A. Training

Gazebo [15] provides a realistic framework for robot testing and accurately reproduces dynamic environments a robot may encounter in the real world. Robots and objects behave realistically when they interact with other objects. Gazebo allows us to easily and quickly create multiple complex maps. Since use of PTAM ruled out restarts from random nodes, tree-based exploration methods could not be implemented here and therefore episodic learning methods were used. Indoor environments were created in Gazebo to simulate real-life maps. A sample environment is shown in Fig. 4.



Fig. 4: A map of the simulation environment in Gazebo.

Navigation during episodic learning consisted of random walks along with an action filter derived from the current Q values. An episode is defined as the sequence of steps until failure indicated by breakage in PTAM pose estimates. Initially, since there was no fixed policy, motions were generated at random to learn an initial set of Q values. Once the initial Q values were learnt, we used Q learning after each episode to efficiently learn Q values in an iterative fashion (Alg. 2). As mentioned in Section II-B, Q learning is an off policy method that is used to learn an optimal policy. This holds true as long as there is enough exploration that is done in the state space, which is why we chose our actions at random. Once the Q values were initialized, we used an incremental  $\epsilon$ -Greedy policy to reinforce the learnt Q values (Alg. 3). By  $\epsilon$ -Greedy policy, we mean that we would be choosing the action with the best Q value with a probability  $\epsilon$  and a random action with a probability  $1 - \epsilon$ .

---

#### Algorithm 2 Random Walk Training

---

Repeat (for each episode):

Initialize state  $s$

Repeat (for each step in the episode):

Choose  $a$  randomly at  $s$

Execute action  $a$  and get reward  $r$  and next state  $s'$

$Q(s, a) \leftarrow Q(s, a) + \alpha[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s', a') - Q(s, a)]$

$s \leftarrow s'$

---

Once the Q values are learnt, we use it in the action filter to classify actions as breaking or non breaking. The optimal quality threshold for the Action Filter would be the value that can precisely classify state-action pairs into pose estimate

---

#### Algorithm 3 Incremental $\epsilon$ -Greedy Training

---

$\epsilon \leftarrow 0.1$

Repeat (until  $\epsilon < 1$ ):

Repeat (for  $n$  episodes):

Initialize state  $s$

Repeat (for each step in the episode):

Choose action  $a$  at  $s$  using an  $\epsilon$ -Greedy policy

Execute  $a$  and get reward  $r$  and next state  $s'$

$Q(s, a) \leftarrow Q(s, a) + \alpha[r + \gamma \max_{a'} Q(s', a') - Q(s, a)]$

$s \leftarrow s'$

$\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon + 0.1$

---

failures and non-failures. The quality threshold was chosen based on the primary objective of minimizing false positives (unsafe actions classified as safe) and a secondary objective of minimizing false negatives (safe actions classified as unsafe). Analysis of incidence of PTAM breakages and non-breakages for various Q values is shown in Fig. 5 along with the chosen threshold of -10. Classification of actual breakages and non-breakages of PTAM is compared with classification using the quality threshold, which can be seen in Fig. 6. The chosen threshold of -10 captures a majority of the actual breakages that occur, along with some that do not break, implying that our method is a more towards the conservative side.




Fig. 5: Frequency of PTAM Breakages (green) and Non-Breakages(blue) vs Q Values. A Q Value threshold of -10 marked with a black line

The most important validation of the learning process is the effectiveness of the Action Filter in avoiding SLAM breakages. This is seen in Fig. 7. The figure shows the increase in the average number of steps to SLAM failure with respect to the number of steps used during the incremental  $\epsilon$ -greedy training phase. Initially the variance is high due to a high level of randomness. As the exploitation increases, the variance in the data also decreases. It can also be seen that as the steps used for training increase, the number of steps till SLAM failure increase as well. This implies that






Fig. 6: (a) Actual PTAM breakage frequency (b) Predicted PTAM breakage frequency using Action Filter with a Q Value threshold of -10. Dark blue regions indicate low frequency of PTAM breakages while red represents higher incidence of breakages.

the Action Filter becomes increasingly effective at avoiding breakages and the probability of executing an unsafe action drops significantly.




Fig. 7: The average steps to taken by the robot until SLAM failure in the training phase.

### B. Comparison with Supervised Learning

In order to get further insight into the effectiveness of our method, we substitute RL methods of detecting SLAM failure and choosing appropriate recovery actions with supervised learning methods. We decided to use support vector machines (SVM) [17] over other classifiers like artificial neural networks, decision trees etc. due to better average performance tested using Monte Carlo cross-validation [18]. We trained a SVM with a radial basis function (rbf) kernel. The trained SVM classifies trajectories as breaking or non breaking and uses the distance of samples from the decision boundary to score the trajectories. We use the same representation used by RL for the SVM. The SVM implementation was done using the scikit-learn module [19].

In the training phase, we compare the average steps taken till PTAM failure as our metric to evaluate the performance of our method as compared to a SVM. As seen in Fig. 8, our method performs better than a SVM by using an exploitation-exploration ratio of just 60%, which translates to having  $\epsilon$  as 0.6. The performance increases as we increase




Fig. 8: Variation of average steps to SLAM failure using SVM, RL with 60%, 80% and 95% exploitation respectively

the value of  $\epsilon$  i.e. increase the exploitation. Since the the RL model is episodically trained, the result of each breakage gets propagated back through the episode, making the predictions of future breakages more likely in the earlier stages. Hence the predictions are more accurate than an SVM, which was trained by just a single breaking/non breaking label for each step.

### C. Result of SLAM-Safe Navigation

To verify the working of our method, experiments were conducted on different maps in Gazebo environment by navigating a Turtlebot. For the physical implementation, we used a Pioneer 3-DX. In all the experiments, the color image output of a Microsoft Kinect was used as the video source. Experiments were carried out on a laptop with Intel Core i7-5500U 2.40GHz CPU running Ubuntu 14.04 using Robot Operating System (ROS) [16] for controlling the robot and performing SLAM.

Trajectory planning was performed from predefined start to goal positions on a blue-print map in Gazebo environment. This is merely to initialize a trajectory, as the robot is unaware of the actual map. The robot then navigates along the planned trajectory by constructing the map and localizing itself using monocular SLAM. The trajectory to the goal is recomputed once in every fixed number of frames from SLAM estimated pose of the robot.

Table III summarizes the results of our experiments which can be seen qualitatively in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10. Maps 1-4 are of the experiments done in gazebo and map 5 is of an exploratory run in a real world environment. The first column in Fig. 9 shows the four simulation environments. The start and goal locations are shown in these environments as blue and green circles and marked with the letters "S" and "G" respectively. The second column shows failure runs due to a state-of-the-art planner as the robot fails to reach the goal due to SLAM breakage or large state errors. The third column shows the trajectories executed by the proposed SLAM-Safe planner. Fig. 10 depicts images from an exploration run in a real environment. The robot was made to enter a room from the adjoining corridor and explore the area in the room. Both the regular planner and SLAM-Safe planner use 5th order




Fig. 9: Results of Goal based trajectory navigation in Gazebo. The first column shows the environment used for experiments. The second column shows the Trajectory estimate and Map Point Cloud generated by PTAM when using a state-of-the-art planner until the point of failure. The last column is the Trajectory estimate and Map Point Cloud when using SLAM-Safe Planner.

Bernstein curves for path planning.

Interestingly, the trajectories generated by the SLAM-Safe planner in Fig. 9 show significant number of motions in reverse near regions of low feature continuity. This is similar to manual motions employed for 3D mapping in SLAM when using handheld cameras. Thus, effectiveness of the RL method in learning recovery actions has also been shown.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a Reinforcement Learning based SLAM-Safe navigational planner that learns to identify robot motions that can lead to failures in SLAM pose estimation and avoid such motions during trajectory planning. The method was expected to generate trajectories that have minimal failures and pose estimation errors over varying maps. Through various experiments we have proven the effectiveness of a SLAM-Safe planner that predicts failures




Fig. 10: Results of an exploratory experiment in a real world setting. (a) The robot can be seen trying to navigate from a corridor into a room. (b) The robot is trying to explore the room it entered. (c) Trajectory estimate and Map Point Cloud generated by PTAM when using a state-of-the-art planner until the point of PTAM failure or till the goal. (d) Trajectory estimate and Map Point Cloud when using SLAM-Safe Planner.

TABLE III: Results for Goal Based Trajectory Planning

Map	Planner Type	No. of Trajectories	Success	Failures	Success %
1	Bernstein	10	2	8	20.00
1	SVM	10	4	6	40.00
1	RL	10	9	1	90.0
2	Bernstein	10	1	9	10.00
2	SVM	10	4	6	40.00
2	RL	10	8	2	80.0
3	Bernstein	10	0	10	0.00
3	SVM	10	3	7	30.00
3	RL	10	8	2	80.00
4	Bernstein	10	0	10	0.00
4	SVM	10	3	7	30.00
4	RL	10	6	4	60.00
5	Bernstein	5	1	4	20.00
5	RL	5	4	1	80.00

and executes recovery actions to continue the navigation task. In terms of learning SLAM-Safe behaviour, our method showed an increase in performance by about 50% as compared to Supervised Learning methods. In terms of SLAM recovery during trajectory planning, our methods showed about 70% improvement in comparison with a state-of-the-art trajectory planner and about 45% in comparison with Supervised Learning based planners.

Autonomous navigation with a monocular camera has always been challenging due to reasons mentioned earlier. This paper establishes that a RL framework is able to learn precisely those actions resorted by humans when they use a handheld camera or teleoperate a robot for SLAM. For example this involves slow transitions to newer scenes avoiding sharp turns by repeated back and forth motions, which was well captured by the learning framework.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Leung, Cindy, Shoudong Huang, and Gamini Dissanayake. "Active SLAM using Model Predictive Control and Attractor Based Exploration." *In Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2006 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, pp. 5026-5031. IEEE, 2006.
- [2] Leung, Cindy, Shoudong Huang, Ngai Kwok, and Gamini Dissanayake. "Planning under Uncertainty using Model Predictive Control for Information Gathering." *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 54, no. 11 (2006): 898-910. Harvard
- [3] Kollar, Thomas, and Nicholas Roy. "Efficient Optimization of Information-Theoretic Exploration in SLAM." *In AAAI*, vol. 8, pp. 1369-1375. 2008.
- [4] Indelman, Vadim, Luca Carlone, and Frank Dellaert. "Planning in the Continuous Domain: A Generalized Belief Space Approach for Autonomous Navigation in Unknown Environments." *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 34, no. 7 (2015): 849-882.
- [5] Charrow, Benjamin, Gregory Kahn, Sachin Patil, Sikang Liu, Ken Goldberg, Pieter Abbeel, Nathan Michael, and Vijay Kumar. "Information-Theoretic Planning with Trajectory Optimization for Dense 3D Mapping." *Proceedings of the Robotics: Science and System (RSS)* (2015).
- [6] Kaess, Michael, Ananth Ranganathan, and Frank Dellaert. "iSAM: Incremental Smoothing and Mapping." *Robotics, IEEE Transactions on* 24, no. 6 (2008): 1365-1378.
- [7] R.S. Sutton and A.G. Barto, "Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction", MIT Press, 1998.
- [8] Klein, Georg, and David Murray. "Parallel Tracking and Mapping for Small AR Workspaces." *In Mixed and Augmented Reality, 2007. ISMAR 2007. 6th IEEE and ACM International Symposium on*, pp. 225-234. IEEE, 2007.
- [9] Mur-Artal, Raul, J. M. M. Montiel, and Juan D. Tardos. "ORB-SLAM: a versatile and accurate monocular SLAM system." *Robotics, IEEE Transactions on* 31, no. 5 (2015): 1147-1163.
- [10] Engel, Jakob, Thomas Schps, and Daniel Cremers. "LSD-SLAM: Large-scale direct monocular SLAM." *In Computer VisionECCV 2014*, pp. 834-849. Springer International Publishing, 2014.
- [11] LaValle, Steven M., and James J. Kuffner. "Randomized Kinodynamic Planning." *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 20, no. 5 (2001): 378-400.
- [12] Gopalakrishnan, Balasubramanian, Arun Kumar Singh, and K. Madhava Krishna. "Time Scaled Collision Cone Based Trajectory Optimization Approach for Reactive Planning in Dynamic Environments." *In Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS 2014), 2014 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*, pp. 4169-4176. IEEE, 2014.
- [13] Watkins, Christopher John Cornish Hellaby. "Learning from delayed rewards.", *PhD diss., University of Cambridge*, 1989.
- [14] Watkins, Christopher JCH, and Peter Dayan. "Q-learning.", *Machine learning* 8.3-4 (1992): 279-292.
- [15] Koenig, Nathan, and Andrew Howard. "Design and use paradigms for gazebo, an open-source multi-robot simulator." *Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2004.(IROS 2004). Proceedings. 2004 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on*. Vol. 3. IEEE, 2004.
- [16] Quigley, Morgan, et al. "ROS: an open-source Robot Operating System." *ICRA workshop on open source software*. Vol. 3. No. 3.2. 2009.
- [17] Cortes, Corinna, and Vladimir Vapnik. "Support-vector networks." *Machine learning* 20.3 (1995): 273-297.
- [18] Xu, Qing-Song, and Yi-Zeng Liang. "Monte Carlo cross validation." *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* 56.1 (2001): 1-11.
- [19] Pedregosa, Fabian, et al. "Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python." *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12.Oct (2011): 2825-2830.