

### Efficient Policy Adaptation with Contrastive Prompt Ensemble for Embodied Agents

Wonje Choi, Wookyung Kim, Seunghyun Kim, Honguk Woo Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Sungkyunkwan University wjchoi1995, kwk2696, kimsh571, hwoo@skku.edu

# Overall approach

#### 1. Prompt-based Contrastive Learning

- For domain-invariant representations with respect to a specific domain factor
- Propose a prompt-based optimization technique using a few expert data across various domain factors

#### 2. Guided-Attention-based Prompt Ensemble

- To generate robust state representations for complex domain variations
- Propose a cosine similarity-guided attention-based prompt ensemble architecture



#### Figure 1. CONPE Framework

# Prompt-based Contrastive Learning

- Objective
- To construct domain-invariant representations for a specific domain factor
- Procedure
- 1. Adopt several contrastive tasks for visual prompt learning
- 2. Conduct prompt-based contrastive learning on different domain factors
- 3. Each visual prompt encapsulates domain-invariant knowledge for a specific domain factor
- 4. Obtain a visual prompt pool



Figure 2. Prompt-based Contrastive Learning with Different Contrastive Tasks

## Guided-Attention-based Prompt Ensemble

- Objective
- To integrate individual prompted embeddings into a task-specific state representation
- Procedure
- 1. Compute guidance score based on the cosine similarity between the observation and visual prompted embeddings
- 2. Train jointly attention module and policy for the robust state representations



Figure 3. Guided-Attention-based Prompt Ensemble

## **Evaluation: Simulation Environment**

#### • AI2-THOR

- Evaluate for Visual Navigation Tasks
- Use camera fields of view, stride length, rotation degrees, and illumination as domain factors
- egocentric-Metaworld
- Evaluate for Reaching Tasks
- Use camera positions, gravity, wind speeds, and illuminations as domain factors
- CARLA
- Evaluate for Autonomous Driving Tasks
- Use camera positions, camera field of views, weather conditions, times of day, and control sensitivity as domain factors



(a) Source Domain

(b) Seen Target Domain

(c) Unseen Target Domain

Figure 4. Examples from the Source, Seen Target, and Unseen Target Domains

#### **Evaluation:** Performance

- Zero-shot Evaluation
- Policies of each method are learned on 4 source domains
- Use 30 seen target domains and 10 unseen target domains
- Experiment results
- ConPE shows 5.2 ~ 24.0% improvement over other baselines for seen target domains
- ConPE shows 6.9 ~ 20.0% improvement over other baselines for unseen target domains

(a)	Zero-shot Per	formance in AI ObjectNav.	2THOR with Obj	ect and Point Goal Navigation Tasks PointNav.			
Method	Source	Seen Target	Unseen Target	Source	Seen Target	Unseen Target	
LUSR	$53.3 \pm 1.1$	$21.3 \pm 1.9$	$15.1 \pm 1.8$	$85.6 \pm 4.6$	$71.8 \pm 3.8$	$62.4 \pm 5.8$	
CURL	$51.3 \pm 1.0$	$8.0 \pm 0.1$	$6.9 \pm 1.3$	$70.8 \pm 7.4$	$55.2 \pm 2.7$	$54.8 \pm 3.0$	
ATC	$82.2 \pm 9.7$	$72.3 \pm 3.3$	$51.3 \pm 8.6$	$95.0 \pm 3.3$	$89.1 \pm 1.9$	$81.9 \pm 3.6$	
ACO	$55.0 \pm 23.8$	$39.6 \pm 21.5$	$35.8 \pm 5.8$	$91.1 \pm 6.3$	$73.4 \pm 2.0$	$67.5 \pm 2.8$	
EmbCLIP ConPE	89.3±3.0 96.3±1.0	77.6±1.3 83.3±0.3	59.0±6.4 <b>79.7±6.4</b>	$95.3 \pm 4.6$ 97.8 $\pm 1.0$	84.5±1.9 89.7±1.6	77.4±1.4 84.3±2.0	

(b) Zero-shot Performance in egocentric-Metaworld with Reach and Reach-wall Tasks

Method	Reach			Reach-Wall			
	Source	Seen Target	Unseen Target	Source	Seen Target	Unseen Target	
LUSR	$100.0 \pm 0.0$	$46.0 \pm 15.1$	44.7±2.3	$50.0 \pm 10.0$	$33.3 \pm 6.1$	$30.7 \pm 6.4$	
CURL	$100.0 \pm 0.0$	$53.3 \pm 5.0$	$46.7 \pm 3.1$	$43.3 \pm 15.3$	$2.0\pm0.0$	$0.7 \pm 1.2$	
ATC	$100.0 \pm 0.0$	$71.3 \pm 8.1$	$72.0\pm2.0$	$66.7 \pm 5.8$	$5.3 \pm 1.2$	$4.0 \pm 0.0$	
ACO	$100.0 \pm 0.0$	$52.0 \pm 2.0$	$44.0 \pm 3.5$	$63.3 \pm 15.3$	8.7±2.3	$4.7 \pm 1.2$	
EmbCLIP	$100.0 \pm 0.0$	$64.7 \pm 6.1$	$66.7 \pm 4.2$	$100.0 \pm 0.0$	$58.0 \pm 7.2$	$49.3 \pm 5.0$	
CONPE	$100.0\pm0.0$	$88.7 \pm 3.1$	$86.7 \pm 3.1$	$100.0\pm0.0$	$75.3 \pm 3.1$	$67.3 \pm 2.3$	

(c)	Zero-shot	Performance	in	CARLA	with	Different	Maps
-----	-----------	-------------	----	-------	------	-----------	------

Method		Map 1		Map 2			
	Source	Seen Target	Unseen Target	Source	Seen Target	Unseen Target	
LUSR	2141.9	$635.1 \pm 606.2$	$1073.9 \pm 212.6$	2279.6	$1173.7 \pm 914.3$	$2159.4 \pm 146.5$	
CURL	945.4	$864.2 \pm 638.0$	$1256.0 \pm 61.6$	1050.1	$1089.9 \pm 824.0$	$2190.3 \pm 10.2$	
ATC	2280.5	$1684.4 \pm 368.2$	$1073.7 \pm 618.8$	2272.2	$2253.9 \pm 218.7$	$2200.1 \pm 307.8$	
ACO	2265.8	$1545.6 \pm 596.1$	$1330.0 \pm 144.5$	2270.6	$2360.9 \pm 88.0$	$2415.5 \pm 53.0$	
EmbCLIP	2235.7	$1732.2 \pm 588.6$	$1415.1 \pm 669.9$	2262.7	$2139.1 \pm 655.9$	$2401.3 \pm 12.3$	
CONPE	2237.5	$1738.0{\pm}163.5$	$1933.4{\pm}29.7$	2277.2	$2422.5 {\pm} 79.6$	$2512.9 {\pm} 15.7$	

Table 1. Zero-shot Performance

### Conclusion

- We presented the CONPE framework, a novel approach that allows embodied RL agents to adapt in a zero-shot manner across diverse visual domains
- The ensemble facilitates domain-invariant and task-specific state representations
- We will adapt the framework with semantic knowledge based on pretrained language models
- Language model improves the policy generalization capability for embodied agents in dynamic complex environments