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Question: Tensegrity Robots can use Machine Learning to learn how to move efficiently. Can we make them learn better and faster, especially in new, unseen conditions?
Proposed Solution: Use Transfer Learning, a subfield of Machine Learning, to have the robots use previous learning experiences to adapt better and learn faster.
0. Background
0.1 Tensegrity Robots

- A class of soft robots composed of intertwined springs and rigid struts.
- **Tensegrity** = **Tensile** + **Integrity**
0.1 Tensegrity Robots

- Can carry payloads in the center and can be dropped from heights.
- NASA exploring use for planetary missions.
0.1 Tensegrity Robots

- Can be made to move using vibrations from attached motors.
- **Tensegrity Gait** = Configuration of Motors

\[
\text{Gait} = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n), \text{ where } n = \text{No. of Motors}
\]
and
\[
m_i = (\text{phase, frequency, amplitude})
\]

- **Gait Performance** = Speed / Distance Travelled / ...
0.2 Bayesian Optimization

- A Sequential Model-based Optimization (SMBO) algorithm for optimizing expensive functions using a Gaussian Process.
- Works by evaluating the function systematically at different points and trying to update it’s prediction of what the function looks like at each step.
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- Bayesian Optimization can be used to train a Tensegrity Robot Gait to make it move as fast as possible.
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0.3 Transfer Learning

Transfer learning = Improvement of learning in a new task using knowledge from related task that has been learned previously. [2]
0.3 Transfer Learning

- **Source Task** = Task that has been previously learnt
- **Target Task** = New task to learn
- Use Source Task to improve learning in Target Task
0.4 Proposed Solution

- Use Transfer Learning along with Bayesian Optimization.
- Framework proposed by T.T Joy, et. al. [3]
- Model observations from source task as noisy outputs of target task:

\[ y_i^s = f^t(x_i^s) + \epsilon_i^s \]

where \( x_i^s \) is the source observation, \( f^t \) the target function, and \( \epsilon_i^s \) the noise.

- Modify the Gaussian Process to incorporate this noise during optimization.
1. Tools
1.1 Tensegrity Simulation

- Homegrown C++ and ODE-based Tensegrity physics simulator.
- Models struts as capsule and springs as forces following Hooke’s Law.
- Models each motor as a perpendicular force applied periodically at points along the circumference of the strut.
1.1 Tensegrity Simulation
1.3 Bayesian Optimization and Transfer Learning

- Used the Python PyGPGO library for Bayesian Optimization.
- Re-engineered it to implement the Transfer Learning framework.

---

**pyGPGO: Bayesian Optimization for Python**

- Fitted Gaussian process
  - Posterior mean

- Acquisition function
  - Found optima

*pyGPGO is a simple and modular Python (>3.5) package for bayesian optimization.*
2. Methodology
2.1 Simulator + Optimizer System

- The optimizer program communicates with the simulator using Sockets.
- Optimizer sends out gaits to evaluate. Simulator evaluates and sends back performance of the gait.
2.2 Experiment

- Perform the optimization process for **Source Task**, **Target Task without Transfer Learning**, and **Target Task with Transfer Learning**.
- Perform $n = 50$ optimization cycles for each task. Perform 10 experiments.
3. Results
3.1 Learning Improvement
3.1.1 Experiment 1 - Difference in Gravity and Friction

- **Source Task:**
  - Gravity = -0.1
  - Friction = 0.5

- **Target Task:**
  - Gravity = -0.5
  - Friction = 0.75

- **40 Optimization Trials**

- **Metric:** Max Speed Achieved

- **10% Improvement**
3.1.1 Experiment 2 - Flat vs. Hilly Terrain

- **Source Task:**
  - Flat Surface
  - Gravity = -0.1
  - Friction = 0.5

- **Target Task:**
  - Hilly Surface
  - Gravity = -0.1
  - Friction = 0.75

- **60 Optimization Trials**
- **Metric:** Max Speed Achieved
- **12.1% Improvement**
3.2 Learnt Gaits
3.2.1 Experiment 1 - Difference in Gravity and Friction
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3.2.2 Experiment 2 - Flat vs. Hilly Terrain
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3.3 Statistical Significance

Using **Mann–Whitney U test**

**Experiment 1**

- **Max Speed Achieved**
- **p-value < 0.05**
- 95% Confidence Interval

**Experiment 2**

- **Max Speed Achieved**
- **p-value < 0.01**
- 99% Confidence Interval
4. Conclusion
In conclusion, my research shows that previous learning experiences indeed can be leveraged to improve new learning tasks for Tensegrity Robots in the context of locomotion.
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May the force be with you!