

# Embodied Robot Manipulation in the Era of Foundation Models: Planning and Learning Perspectives

Shuanghao Bai<sup>1\*</sup> Wenxuan Song<sup>2\*</sup> Jiayi Chen<sup>2</sup> Yuheng Ji<sup>3</sup> Zhide Zhong<sup>2</sup> Jin Yang<sup>1</sup> Han Zhao<sup>4,5</sup>  
 Wanqi Zhou<sup>1</sup> Zhe Li<sup>6</sup> Pengxiang Ding<sup>4,5</sup> Cheng Chi<sup>7</sup> Chang Xu<sup>6</sup> Xiaolong Zheng<sup>3</sup>  
 Donglin Wang<sup>4</sup> Haoang Li<sup>2†</sup> Shanghang Zhang<sup>8†</sup> Badong Chen<sup>1†</sup>  
<sup>1</sup> Xi'an Jiaotong University, <sup>2</sup> Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou),  
<sup>3</sup> Chinese Academy of Sciences, <sup>4</sup> Westlake University, <sup>5</sup> Zhejiang University,  
<sup>6</sup> University of Sydney, <sup>7</sup> BAAI, <sup>8</sup> Peking University

\* Equal Contributors † Corresponding Authors  
 Github: [Awesome-Robotics-Manipulation](https://github.com/Awesome-Robotics-Manipulation)

**Abstract**—Recent advances in vision, language, and multimodal learning have substantially accelerated progress in robotic foundation models, with robot manipulation remaining a central and challenging problem. This survey examines robot manipulation from an algorithmic perspective and organizes recent learning-based approaches within a unified abstraction of high-level planning and low-level control. At the high level, we extend the classical notion of task planning to include reasoning over language, code, motion, affordances, and 3D representations, emphasizing their role in structured and long-horizon decision making. At the low level, we propose a training-paradigm-oriented taxonomy for learning-based control, organizing existing methods along input modeling, latent representation learning, and policy learning. Finally, we identify open challenges and prospective research directions related to scalability, data efficiency, multimodal physical interaction, and safety. Together, these analyses aim to clarify the design space of modern foundation models for robotic manipulation.

**Index Terms**—Robot manipulation, robotic foundation model, high-level planner, imitation learning, reinforcement learning, vision-language-action models, latent learning, policy learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, embodied intelligence has attracted increasing attention, driven by advances in computer vision and natural language processing, particularly the emergence of large-scale foundation models. These developments have substantially improved perceptual and semantic representations, enabling robotic systems to operate in less structured environments and to accept high-level task specifications expressed in natural language. Building on this progress, large-scale language and multimodal models [2]–[4] have begun to reshape robotic manipulation by enhancing generalization, supporting compositional reasoning, and providing a unified interface for perception, decision making, and execution.

Robot manipulation is a core problem in embodied intelligence and has been extensively studied in recent years, especially in the context of data-driven learning. It refers to a robot's ability to perceive, plan, and control its effectors to

physically interact with and modify the environment, such as grasping, moving, or using objects. Recent progress has been largely driven by deep learning approaches that leverage large-scale data and expressive function approximators to learn visuomotor policies [5]–[7] and robotic foundation models [8]–[10]. These advances have been further accelerated by the widespread adoption of imitation learning (IL) and reinforcement learning (RL), which provide principled frameworks for learning manipulation behaviors from demonstrations and interaction [11], [12]. More recently, large language models and vision-language models have been integrated into IL and RL pipelines to support structured task specification and long-horizon decision making [8], [9]. In this survey, we focus on learning-based approaches to robot manipulation and provide a structured analysis of recent methodological progress and emerging trends.

This survey aims to develop a structured understanding of robot manipulation by examining the algorithmic principles underlying modern learning-based approaches. Rather than organizing methods by task instances or specific model classes, we structure the literature along two complementary levels: high-level planning and low-level learning-based control. As detailed in Section II and Section III, high-level planners are responsible for structuring and reasoning over task execution, while low-level controllers generate precise and stable actions. Although this abstraction is introduced in the context of basic manipulation, it naturally generalizes across a wide range of manipulation settings, including robotic foundation models that jointly couple high-level reasoning with low-level control.

We position our survey relative to existing literature and clarify its contributions as follows. **First, we adopt a perspective centered on planning and learning abstractions, rather than on individual modeling paradigms.** Recent surveys often focus on specific classes of models, such as vision-language-action frameworks [13]–[16], diffusion-based policies [17], or generative approaches [18]. While these paradigms have driven significant progress, they are typically treated as separate lines of work. In contrast, our perspective situates these methods within a unified abstraction, viewing them as different instantiations of high-level planning mechanisms, low-level learning strategies, or their combinations.

<sup>0</sup>This is a short version of “Towards a Unified Understanding of Robot Manipulation: A Comprehensive Survey [1]”. We concentrate specifically on the planning and learning aspects of robot manipulation, and have updated the content with recent relevant publications.




Fig. 1. Overview of the survey. We provide an extensive introduction to embodied manipulation, including high-level planner and low-level controller. Our introduction to the low-level controller mainly focuses on the learning-based strategy.

**Second, we introduce a systematic framework that reorganizes robot manipulation methods through the lens of planning and learning abstractions.** At the high level, we broaden the notion of planning (Section II) to encompass reasoning over language, code, motion, affordances, and 3D representations. At the low level, we propose a training-paradigm-oriented taxonomy for learning-based control (Section III), decomposing existing approaches into input modeling, latent representation learning, and policy learning. This abstraction-driven organization facilitates principled comparison across methods and clarifies the relationships between different learning and planning strategies.

**Finally, building on this structured analysis, we identify emerging research trends and outline four prospective directions for future work.** These directions include the development of general-purpose architectures for robotic foundation models, addressing data bottlenecks in robot learning, advancing multimodal perception and interaction with complex objects, and ensuring safety in human–robot coexistence. Together, they highlight the key challenges that must be addressed to enable robust and scalable robotic manipulation in real-world environments.

## II. HIGH-LEVEL PLANNER

High-level planning plays a central role in the construction of robotic foundation models by providing structured guidance for low-level execution. It determines action intent, temporal organization, and attentional focus over the environment, thereby shaping how perception and control are coordinated. Large language models (LLMs) and multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) have become increasingly influential at this level, supporting task decomposition, skill sequencing, and adaptive reasoning grounded in language and perception. Complementarily, affordance learning and 3D scene representations supply actionable mid-level abstractions that highlight relevant regions, relations, and constraints within a scene. Together, these components establish high-level planning as a unifying guidance layer that integrates reasoning, attention, and scene understanding to enable robust manipulation across diverse tasks. We summarize this taxonomy in Figure 2 and provide an illustrative overview in Figure 3.

### A. LLM-based Task Planning

Early approaches to high-level planning followed a symbolic grounding paradigm, where neural networks mapped demonstrations and observations into symbolic states and goals expressed as predicate truth values [59]. With the emergence of large language models, this paradigm has largely shifted toward language-centric planning. SayCan [19] marked an early milestone by using an LLM as a global planner that selects executable skills based on language-level task relevance and learned affordance-based success estimates. Grounded Decoding [20] further relaxed the reliance on a fixed skill library by enabling joint token-level decoding between language and grounding models, supporting open-vocabulary planning.

A key limitation of early LLM-based planners is the lack of feedback during execution. Inner Monologue [60] addresses this by introducing a closed-loop framework that incorporates real-time task feedback, scene descriptions, and human input into the LLM reasoning process, enabling dynamic plan revision in unstructured environments. Related feedback-driven planning mechanisms have also been explored in subsequent work [21]. Beyond grounding and feedback, several studies investigate how to improve the robustness and scope of LLM-based planning. Methods such as LLM+P and REFLECT enhance long-horizon reasoning by explicitly modeling planning constraints and failures [22], [23], while multi-agent formulations leverage collaboration among multiple LLMs to improve decision making [24]. Extensions to more open-ended and interactive settings [25], [61] and to multi-robot coordination [62] further demonstrate the versatility of LLMs as high-level planners for complex manipulation tasks.

### B. MLLM-based Task Planning

Early large language models are inherently unimodal, operating solely on textual inputs, with perception handled by separate vision modules whose outputs are serialized into text. Recent multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [4], [63] relax this separation by jointly reasoning over vision and language, and have increasingly been adopted in robotic manipulation to improve planning performance while simplifying system design.




Fig. 2. Taxonomy of high-level planner approaches, organized by main directions (LLM-based and MLLM-based task planning, code generation, and motion planning) and supporting capabilities (affordance learning and 3D Representations).

A first line of work adapts general-purpose MLLMs for embodied decision making. PaLM-E [26] co-trains a vision–language model on robot embodiment data alongside standard VLM objectives, enabling end-to-end task reasoning at the cost of substantial data and computation. In contrast, VILA [27] demonstrates that off-the-shelf GPT-4V can be directly leveraged for manipulation planning without fine-tuning, exploiting strong visual grounding and language reasoning. PG-InstructBLIP [64] offers a lighter alternative by injecting physical priors through object-centric fine-tuning, improving manipulation-relevant reasoning with modest supervision.

Beyond model adaptation, several studies enhance MLLM-based planning through auxiliary reasoning and structure. Chain-of-thought reasoning is extended to embodied settings in EmbodiedGPT [29] and reward-guided variants [65], improving long-horizon task decomposition. Explicit spatial structure is incorporated via scene graphs to strengthen geometric reasoning [66], while multi-agent formulations such as Socratic Models [67] coordinate multiple LLM or MLLM agents for zero-shot control. Complementarily, failure-aware planning is explored by teaching models to detect and explain execution errors, as in AHA [68].

More recently, robotics-specific MLLMs trained on large-scale, robot-centric data have emerged. Models such as RoboBrain [30], Gemini Robotics [31], and RynnEC [69] are designed for manipulation planning and reasoning, consistently outperforming general-purpose MLLMs on embodied benchmarks. By tightly coupling perception, affordance understand-

ing, and long-horizon reasoning, these models represent a step toward foundation models tailored for robotic manipulation.

### C. Code Generation

While LLMs and MLLMs have demonstrated strong capability in task decomposition and high-level reasoning, purely language-based plans may lack the precision and flexibility required for reliable execution in diverse environments. To bridge this gap, an emerging line of work explores *code generation* as an intermediate abstraction between high-level reasoning and low-level control. By expressing plans as executable programs, code-based approaches provide explicit structure, conditional logic, and compositionality, enabling finer-grained and more adaptive control.

Early efforts investigated translating natural language instructions into programmatic representations without modern foundation models [70]. With the advent of LLMs, Code as Policies [32] formalized this paradigm by exposing perception and control APIs as prompts, allowing an LLM to generate executable code that directly governs robot behavior. Similar ideas were explored in ProgPrompt [33], demonstrating the generality of code-driven control for manipulation.

Building on this foundation, subsequent work has expanded the scope and robustness of code-based manipulation. Instruct2Act [71] improves zero-shot generalization by coupling code generation with strong visual foundation models, while Demo2Code [34] summarizes long-horizon demonstrations




Fig. 3. Overview of the taxonomy of high-level planners, highlighting six core components: LLM-based task planning, MLLM-based task planning, code generation, motion planning, affordance learning, and 3D scene representations. Figure are adapted from [21], [29], [32], [37], [43], [55].

into compact, executable programs. SHOWTELL [35] further removes textual intermediates by directly translating visual demonstrations into policy code. To address limitations in context length and feedback, Statler [36] maintains an explicit world state for program execution, and HyCodePolicy [72] integrates symbolic execution traces with perceptual feedback, enabling more robust closed-loop control in dynamic settings.

Together, these approaches position code generation as a powerful complement to language-based task planning, offering a structured and interpretable interface that tightly couples high-level reasoning with low-level execution.

#### D. Motion Planning

Beyond task decomposition and code generation, a growing body of work explores using LLMs and VLMs to directly guide robot motion planning. Rather than outputting discrete skills or programs, these approaches generate continuous motion objectives that can be optimized by classical planners. VoxPoser [37] exemplifies this direction by constructing a language- and vision-conditioned 3D value map that serves as

an objective for end-effector motion optimization, producing smooth and dense trajectories. Subsequent work enriches this formulation with stronger physical and geometric grounding. CoPa [38] incorporates concrete visual priors to improve physical feasibility, while ManipLLM [39] adopts an object-centric perspective, learning contact-aware representations to guide interaction at appropriate contact points. ReKep [40] further introduces relational keypoint constraints to enforce spatial consistency, enabling fully autonomous trajectory generation without human annotation. Complementarily, GeoManip [41] leverages explicit geometric constraints to improve the interpretability and reliability of planned motions. In parallel, related studies investigate using vision foundation models or diffusion-based generative models to support motion planning [42], [73]. Collectively, these methods position LLMs and VLMs not only as symbolic planners, but also as sources of continuous, geometry-aware objectives that bridge high-level reasoning and low-level motion generation.

## E. Affordance as Planner

A unified understanding of robot manipulation requires shifting the focus from recognizing *what objects are* to reasoning about *what actions they afford*. Originating from Gibson’s theory of affordances [74], the concept characterizes the action possibilities that objects or environments offer relative to an agent’s capabilities, thereby intrinsically linking perception to action. In robotics, affordances provide a principled abstraction for grounding manipulation decisions in both physical structure and functional intent. Early studies emphasized model-based geometric reasoning, while recent advances in deep learning have enabled data-driven affordance learning directly from raw sensory inputs, often through self-supervised interaction or foundation-model priors. In this chapter, we examine affordance learning from four complementary perspectives—geometric, visual, semantic, and multimodal—reflecting the primary sources of information used to infer actionable structure in modern robotic manipulation.

**Geometric Affordance.** Geometric affordance theory posits that an object’s functional possibilities are determined by its three-dimensional shape, structure, and kinematics. Accordingly, this line of work focuses on inferring part-level geometry and kinematic constraints directly from 3D observations [43], [44]. Ditto [43], for example, recovers articulation models through physical interaction, grounding affordances in observed object dynamics. A key principle enabling generalization is *compositionality*, which models complex object functionality as compositions of reusable functional parts [44], [45]. GAPartNet [44] operationalizes this idea via cross-category part taxonomies, while CPM [45] further represents manipulation skills as structured compositions of geometric constraints rather than monolithic actions.

**Visual Affordance.** Visual affordance learning focuses on inferring interaction possibilities directly from raw 2D visual observations, typically by predicting dense, and highly informative, pixel-wise affordance maps that indicate where actions can be executed most effectively [46], [47]. Transporter Networks [46] established this paradigm by using spatially equivariant feature matching to predict pick-and-place heatmaps, grounding manipulation decisions directly in pixel space without explicit object models. Subsequent work, such as VAPO [47], improved scalability by learning affordance maps from unstructured play data in a self-supervised manner, significantly reducing reliance on expert demonstrations.

**Semantic Affordance.** Semantic affordance explores how high-level symbolic concepts can guide robotic actions, providing an early link between symbolic reasoning and physical interaction. Before the emergence of foundation models, this line of work relied on human-defined semantic labels, such as object categories or part names, to structure manipulation. An example is affordance-based imitation learning [48], which associates semantic object parts (e.g., *handles* or *lids*) with manipulation trajectories, enabling generalization across objects sharing similar semantic structure. Although constrained by predefined semantics, these approaches highlight the value of abstract, human-interpretable priors in robot learning.

**Multimodal Affordance.** Recent advances in affordance

learning increasingly emphasize multimodal fusion, driven by the reasoning and grounding capabilities of multimodal large language models. By integrating visual appearance, linguistic instruction, spatial context, and geometric structure, these approaches move beyond unimodal cues toward a more holistic understanding of interaction potential. A representative line of work combines language and vision to ground high-level instructions in scenes, exemplified by CLIPort [49], which decouples semantic reasoning from spatial localization and has been extended to part-level affordances [75], [76]. Complementary efforts incorporate explicit 3D spatial reasoning to capture metric relations such as distance and orientation for precise grounding [50], [77]. More recent work seeks unified and transferable affordance representations across objects and tasks [78], [79], moving toward general-purpose affordance reasoning in open-world manipulation.

## F. 3D Representation as Planner

Although 3D representations such as Gaussian Splatting and neural descriptor fields do not directly output control commands, they function as mid-level planning modules by transforming perception into structured action proposals, including grasp candidates, spatial relations, or optimization objectives. In this sense, they bridge perception and action and are naturally categorized under high-level planning. Recent manipulation research increasingly converges on such 3D scene representations that prioritize actionable structure over complete task plans. Two complementary trends drive this direction: editable, real-time Gaussian Splatting representations that integrate geometry, semantics, and motion for interactive scene reasoning, and implicit descriptor fields that lift features from 2D foundation models into 3D for correspondence and language grounding.

**Gaussian Splatting for Scene Representation and Editing.** Recent work leverages Gaussian Splatting as an editable and semantically enriched scene representation for manipulation. Splat-MOVER [80] distills open-vocabulary semantics into a 3DGS scene to propose grasp candidates for downstream planning, while object-aware and physically embodied variants extend GS with object-centric reconstruction and physics coupling to support dynamic interaction [81], [82]. Building on the editability of GS, RoboSplat [53] synthesizes diverse demonstrations by directly manipulating reconstructed scenes, improving one-shot generalization of visuomotor policies.

**Implicit Descriptor Fields and Structured World Models.** A complementary line of work represents scenes as implicit or descriptor fields that encode action-relevant geometry and semantics in a continuous 3D space. Neural Descriptor Fields (NDF) learn SE(3)-equivariant representations that enable few-shot pose transfer across objects, and their extensions support relational rearrangement by reasoning over inter-object geometry [54], [83]. Building on foundation models, F3RM distills CLIP features into 3D descriptor fields for language-conditioned grasping and placing [55], while  $D^3$ Fields extend this idea to dynamic scenes, enabling zero-shot rearrangement from image-specified goals [56].

Beyond static representations, generative and structured world models further elevate 3D fields into planning substrates.




Fig. 4. Comparison of learning paradigms for low-level robotic manipulation. RL optimizes policies through trial-and-error interaction using reward signals, IL learns direct policy mappings from expert demonstrations, and auxiliary task learning shapes representations via self-supervised objectives such as world modeling and goal abstraction.

Imagination Policy treats action inference as a local generative process by imagining target point clouds and aligning them with observed geometry to produce keyframe actions [57]. In a complementary direction, RoboEXP incrementally constructs action-conditioned scene graphs through interaction, explicitly encoding object relations and affordances to support downstream manipulation [58].

### III. LOW-LEVEL LEARNING-BASED CONTROL

Low-level learning-based control concerns how perceptual inputs are transformed into executable actions, serving as the mechanism that grounds high-level planning in physical execution. While high-level planners reason about task structure and action sequencing, low-level controllers determine how actions are realized through learned visuomotor mappings, making the two layers inherently complementary. Focusing on the learning perspective, we organize low-level control into three core components: *input modeling*, which specifies the choice and encoding of sensory modalities; *latent learning*, which constructs compact and transferable representations; and *policy learning*, which decodes these representations into executable actions. This decomposition provides a unified lens for understanding low-level control as an integrated process that couples perception, representation, and action, thereby forming a principled interface between high-level reasoning and real-world robotic execution.

#### A. Learning Strategy

Learning strategy characterizes how supervision, feedback, and optimization signals are used to acquire manipulation policies. Rather than specifying what is perceived or how actions are parameterized, it determines how experience is transformed into behavior, directly affecting data efficiency, generalization, and robustness. In robotic manipulation, different learning strategies rely on interaction, demonstrations, or auxiliary objectives to varying degrees, leading to distinct trade-offs in scalability and adaptability, as illustrated in

Figure 4. Accordingly, we organize existing methods into three categories: reinforcement learning, imitation learning, and learning with auxiliary tasks.

1) *Reinforcement Learning*: In robotic manipulation, reinforcement learning (RL) has emerged as a central paradigm for acquiring complex skills. By leveraging high-dimensional perceptual inputs (e.g., vision or proprioception) and reward signals as feedback, RL enables agents to learn control policies through trial-and-error interaction with the environment. This section reviews RL methods for robotic manipulation from both theoretical and application perspectives. We categorize existing approaches into two main classes: model-free and model-based algorithms, depending on whether the agent exploits an explicit or learned dynamics model to guide the learning process. Representative methods across these categories are summarized in Table I.

a) *Model-free Methods*: Model-free reinforcement learning (RL) learns manipulation policies directly from interaction without relying on explicit environment models. While expressive and broadly applicable to high-dimensional control, these methods are often constrained by poor sample efficiency, motivating research on scalable pre-training and efficient post-training strategies. Early large-scale efforts such as QT-Opt [84] demonstrated that self-supervised RL can be effective for vision-based grasping when paired with massive data collection. Building on this, offline RL pre-training frameworks, including PTR [85] and V-PTR [86], showed that value functions or visual representations learned from large robotic or human demonstration datasets can substantially accelerate adaptation to downstream manipulation tasks. Beyond pre-training, a growing body of work explores modular fine-tuning mechanisms that refine pretrained policies with minimal architectural assumptions, ranging from residual policy learning [87] to inference-time value-guided action selection and refinement [89], [90]. More recently, Vision–Language–Action (VLA) models have further motivated RL-based post-training to improve adaptability through online interaction, with approaches that integrate reinforcement learning and imitation learning or enforce consistency across offline and online stages [91], [92], [94]. Collectively, these developments indicate a shift in model-free RL from task-specific policy learning toward scalable adaptation atop pretrained generalist models.

b) *Model-based Methods*: Model-based reinforcement learning improves data efficiency by leveraging explicit or learned models of environment dynamics for imagination, planning, and gradient-based optimization. A central paradigm learns compact latent world models that enable imagined rollouts for policy learning, as exemplified by the Dreamer framework [95] and its extension to real-world robotic manipulation in DayDreamer [102]. Complementary to imagination-based learning, several approaches incorporate learned models directly into planning loops. Guided Policy Search [5] combines local trajectory optimization with supervised policy learning, while TD-MPC [98] jointly learns dynamics, value, and policy to optimize future trajectories through model-predictive control. When dynamics are differentiable, policy optimization can further exploit analytic gradients, as demonstrated by differentiable simulation-based methods such as

TABLE I  
REPRESENTATIVE RL METHODS FOR MANIPULATION TASKS.

Category	Subcategory	Representative Methods
Model-Free RL	Pre-Training	QT-Opt [84], PTR [85], V-PTR [86]
	Fine-Tuning	Residual RL [87], RLDG [88], V-GPS [89], PA-RL [90]
	VLA-RL	iRe-VLA [91], RIPT [92], VLA-RL [93], ConRFT [94]
Model-Based RL	Imagination Trajectory Generation	Dreamer [95], MWM [96]
	Planning	GPS [97], TD-MPC [98]
	Differentiable RL	SAPO [99], SAM-RL [100], DiffTORI [101]

SAPO [99] and gradient-refined planners like DiffTORI [101]. Although model-based methods offer clear advantages in sample efficiency and interpretability, their effectiveness ultimately hinges on model accuracy, which remains challenging in contact-rich and high-dimensional manipulation settings.

2) *Imitation Learning*: Imitation learning (IL) acquires manipulation behaviors from expert demonstrations, avoiding explicit reward design and extensive trial-and-error interaction common in reinforcement learning [103]. While early work emphasized control-theoretic skill transfer, modern IL has evolved toward deep visuomotor policies and large-scale pre-training. Recent approaches increasingly exploit foundation-model priors to enable multimodal perception, improved generalization, and transfer across tasks and embodiments [104]. We focus here on state-based and vision-based IL; language-centric approaches are discussed separately in Section III-B2.

**Imitation from Action.** When expert state-action pairs are available, behavior cloning (BC) remains the most direct and widely used approach, fitting policies that map observations to low-level actions [105], [106]. To mitigate compounding errors in long-horizon tasks, BC is often augmented with hierarchical structure or skill decomposition [107]. For contact-sensitive or high-precision manipulation, pose-level imitation predicts SE(3) end-effector targets and delegates execution to lower-level controllers, yielding robust insertion-style behaviors [108]. Classical movement-primitive methods encode demonstrations as stable dynamical systems, enabling compact representation and smooth generalization [109], [110]. More recent formulations integrate search or trajectory optimization into imitation, distilling planner rollouts or constrained optimizers into executable policies for long-horizon manipulation [111], [112]. Beyond direct cloning, reward-based IL seeks to recover the objectives underlying expert behavior. In manipulation, inverse optimal control infers task costs and constraints from demonstrations via optimality conditions [113], while adversarial imitation learning matches expert and learner state distributions through discriminator-based objectives, with modern variants improving robustness by operating in learned latent spaces [114], [115].

**Imitation from Observation.** Imitation from observation (LfO) removes action supervision and learns from state or visual trajectories alone, requiring the agent to infer control strategies from observed transitions. One class of methods recovers rewards or occupancy measures from observation-only demonstrations and optimizes policies via RL or plan-

ning [116]. Another aligns expert and agent trajectories in learned representation spaces, enabling cross-view or cross-embodiment transfer without action labels [117]. Complementary approaches exploit physical structure by projecting videos into dynamically or contact-consistent trajectories using differentiable physics models [118]. Finally, goal-driven LfO extracts intermediate targets, such as keypoints, from visual demonstrations and trains executable controllers without access to expert actions [119].

3) *Learning with Auxiliary Tasks*: Auxiliary-task learning enriches manipulation policies with additional self-supervised or weakly supervised objectives, providing structured signals beyond sparse task rewards or demonstrations. A prominent direction is *world modeling*, where agents learn predictive representations of environment evolution to support planning and policy optimization. Recent work explores *action-conditioned visual prediction*, enabling latent rollouts for closed-loop control and MPC-style planning, as exemplified by VLMPC [120]. Complementary approaches incorporate *geometry- or physics-consistent representations* to encode 3D structure and physically grounded dynamics, improving predictive fidelity in contact-rich manipulation [121]. Related lines of work treat image or video prediction as a visual surrogate for planning, where imagined future observations implicitly guide action selection without explicit dynamics modeling [27].

Another major class of auxiliary tasks focuses on *goal extraction and representation shaping*. Vision-based methods transform raw observations into compact, actionable goal abstractions, including spatial masks for grounding actions [122], geometric keypoints or waypoints that summarize manipulation into a small set of SE(3) subgoals [123], [124], and motion-centric representations such as tracks or flow fields that bridge perception and control [125], [126]. Language-grounded variants further decompose instructions into structured subgoals or intermediate reasoning steps to support long-horizon execution [127]. Beyond explicit goal interfaces, auxiliary objectives such as contrastive multimodal alignment [128] and reconstruction-based pretraining [129], [130] encourage spatially and temporally consistent representations. Collectively, these auxiliary tasks convert weak or sparse supervision into rich learning.

### B. Input Modeling

Input modeling defines how a robot perceives the world by specifying which sensory modalities are used and how their

signals are encoded before policy learning. It encompasses the selection, alignment, and fusion of multimodal observations—such as vision, language, touch, and force—and the transformation of raw sensory inputs into structured representations suitable for control and decision making. Effective input modeling preserves essential spatial, temporal, and semantic information, providing a reliable perceptual foundation for robust manipulation across diverse tasks.

1) *Vision–Action Models*: Vision–Action models aim to tightly couple visual perception with action generation, learning direct mappings from visual observations to motor commands. Rather than relying on explicit symbolic planning or intermediate representations, these models encode task-relevant information implicitly within end-to-end visuomotor policies. Recent advances in deep learning have substantially expanded this paradigm, evolving from convolutional architectures toward transformer- and diffusion-based frameworks that better capture temporal structure and multimodal context.

a) *2D Vision as Input*: Most Vision–Action models are built upon 2D visual observations, typically RGB images from single or multi-view cameras, which serve as the primary perceptual input [131]–[135]. Architecturally, these methods span convolutional, transformer-based, and diffusion-based designs. A representative milestone is Diffusion Policy [131], which formulates visuomotor control as a conditional denoising process, enabling multimodal trajectory generation and strong generalization across manipulation tasks. Building on this foundation, hierarchical extensions such as HDP [136] decompose control into high-level keypoint generation and low-level tracking, while transformer-based models like HPT [133] explicitly align vision and proprioception across different embodiments. Despite their scalability and empirical success, 2D Vision–Action models fundamentally lack explicit geometric grounding. The absence of 3D structure limits their ability to reason about spatial relationships, contact geometry, and occlusions, which in turn constrains robustness and out-of-distribution generalization in complex physical environments.

b) *3D Vision as Input*: To address these limitations, a growing line of work incorporates explicit 3D visual information into Vision–Action models [137]–[142]. By lifting 2D observations into 3D representations, these approaches align action generation more directly with the underlying geometry of the scene. RVT [137] and its successor RVT-2 [138] employ multi-view transformations to infer 3D action targets, improving execution accuracy and real-world generalization. GenDP [139] further enhances diffusion-based policies by conditioning on 3D semantic fields reconstructed from multi-view RGB-D observations, enabling category-level generalization to unseen objects. DP3 [140] integrates point cloud representations and robot state into the diffusion process, demonstrating effective control in complex, contact-rich manipulation, including dexterous and deformable object tasks. While 3D Vision–Action models substantially improve spatial reasoning compared to their 2D counterparts, most remain purely perception-driven and lack explicit semantic grounding. The absence of language or symbolic context limits their ability to leverage high-level task knowledge, leaving generalization across goals, instructions, and open-world scenarios

an open challenge.

2) *Vision–Language–Action Models*: Recent advances in VLA models have established a unified paradigm for mapping multimodal perception to executable robotic behaviors. Unlike earlier vision-only or language-conditioned controllers, VLAs integrate semantic grounding, spatial reasoning, and sequential action generation within a single architecture. We summarize this landscape in Figure 5, organizing prior work by input modality (2D vs. 3D) and by methodological orientation, distinguishing model-oriented approaches from model-agnostic ones. This taxonomy highlights key design trade-offs and clarifies the evolution of VLAs toward scalable and general-purpose robotic intelligence.

a) *2D Vision as Input*: Most VLA models primarily rely on 2D RGB images, occasionally combined with multi-view observations, as their main perceptual modality. Under this setting, a variety of methods have been developed to improve visuomotor reasoning and policy performance. Broadly, these methods fall into two categories: i) model-oriented approaches, which explicitly redesign the policy architecture, and ii) model-agnostic strategies, which improve training or inference procedures without modifying the core model. We first review the *model-oriented approaches*:

**Non-LLM-based VLA.** Early VLA systems mapped visual observations and textual commands directly to low-level actions via language-conditioned sequence models. RT-1 [143] introduced a transformer-based discretized action policy that scaled to thousands of demonstrations, enabling diverse manipulation skills. Subsequent works such as VIMA [145] and HULC [146] extended this paradigm to compositional instructions and multimodal imitation. While effective in closed settings, these approaches lacked strong semantic priors, resulting in limited generalization and weak cross-domain transfer.

**LLM/VLM-based VLA.** The emergence of LLMs and VLMs introduced powerful semantic priors into VLA systems. RT-2 [8] co-trained web-scale vision–language data with robot trajectories, enabling zero-shot and cross-embodiment transfer. RoboFlamingo [154] and OpenVLA [9] showed that frozen or lightly tuned VLMs can serve as perceptual front-ends paired with lightweight action heads, while  $\pi_0$  [10] and  $\pi_{0.5}$  [156] further improved robustness via flow-matching action experts and scalable prompting. Despite their strengths, these models expose a persistent gap between symbolic reasoning and continuous motor execution, motivating additional mechanisms to bridge semantics and control.

**Latent Learning for VLA.** A parallel line of work introduces latent action spaces that compress task-relevant motion into compact representations between perception and control. UniVLA [157] learns language-conditioned latent actions in a visual feature space and decodes them into embodiment-specific controls. villa-X [164] jointly trains vision-based latent actions and proprioceptive forward dynamics within a diffusion framework. AgiBot-GO1 [163] inserts a latent-action planner between a vision–language backbone and low-level controllers, enabling learning from heterogeneous human and robot data. Collectively, these methods treat latent actions as abstractions that improve efficiency and transferability.




Fig. 5. A taxonomy of VLA models organized by input modality (2D vs. 3D) and methodological orientation (model-oriented architectures vs. model-agnostic strategies), highlighting representative approaches across both architectural design and training or inference enhancements.

**Action Quantization for VLA.** Another line of work discretizes continuous trajectories into action tokens, reducing action-space complexity and stabilizing training. VQ-VLA [165] and MiniVLA [166] learn quantized motor codebooks, while Fast [167] maps control signals into frequency-domain tokens. Such quantized interfaces bridge high-level intent and continuous execution, supporting scalable learning and cross-robot transfer, though maintaining semantic consistency and avoiding codebook collapse remains challenging.

**Dual- and Multi-System VLA.** Inspired by dual-process cognitive theories, recent work proposes VLA architectures that separate fast reactive control from slower deliberative reasoning. Typically, a lightweight policy handles low-latency execution, while a larger vision–language model performs high-level planning, reasoning, or memory management. Examples include LCB [168], HiRT [172], RationalVLA [173], HiRobot [177], and OpenHelix [176], which coordinate reactive and deliberative streams, as well as multi-system extensions such as TriVLA [174] and G0 [175]. These architectures improve robustness and flexibility under uncertainty, but raise new challenges in arbitration, credit assignment, and cross-system consistency. More broadly, dual- and multi-system VLAs reflect a shift toward explicitly modeling heterogeneous cognitive roles within robotic agents.

Second, we consider *model-agnostic strategies*, which improve training or inference without modifying the policy architecture, as follows:

**Inference-Time Optimization.** Methods such as RoboMon-

key [179], and CronusVLA [180] refine action selection at inference through strategies like voting, sampling, or calibration. These approaches are particularly appealing as they enhance robustness without requiring retraining and can be seamlessly integrated with diverse model backbones.

**Reinforcement Learning and Post-training.** Recent work explores interactive post-training of pretrained VLAs by introducing RL signals tailored to multimodal, long-horizon policies. SimpleVLA-RL [217] adopts verifiable outcome-based rewards together with group-level policy optimization, enabling stable and scalable refinement from sparse task feedback. VLA-RL [93] further emphasizes large-scale rollout-based RL to align pretrained action decoders with execution-level requirements in generalist manipulation. RIPT-VLA [92] formulates post-training as lightweight interaction, leveraging rollout feedback to improve performance without critic dependence. ConRFT [94] bridges offline imitation and online reinforcement learning through a consistency-based objective, reducing distribution shift during interactive refinement.

**Learning with Auxiliary Tasks.** Auxiliary-task designs introduce structured supervision beyond action prediction to enrich intermediate reasoning and decision-making. Representative examples include chain-of-thought-style reasoning modules that expose intermediate plans [159], [188], goal extraction mechanisms that distill demonstrations into explicit subgoals [189], [190], and reconstruction-based objectives that enforce consistency between perception and action [191]. By making intermediate structure explicit, these approaches ex-

tend the effective reasoning horizon and improve transparency during execution.

#### **Efficiency, Robustness, and Long-Horizon Generalization.**

Recent studies increasingly focus on making VLAs viable for real-world deployment along three tightly coupled dimensions. First, computational efficiency is improved through compact visual and action representations, lightweight architectures such as TinyVLA [200], adaptive computation mechanisms as in VLA-Cache [202], and parallel decoding with streamlined designs exemplified by CEED-VLA [183], collectively reducing FLOPs, memory usage, and inference latency. Second, robustness is strengthened by incorporating safety-aligned objectives [203], explicit failure-awareness mechanisms [205], and defenses against environmental or adversarial perturbations [204]. Nevertheless, sensitivity to distribution shift and observation noise remains a persistent limitation. Third, long-horizon and compositional manipulation is addressed by approaches such as Long-VLA [206], which enhance temporal consistency and memory to support extended reasoning. Taken together, these efforts underscore that the core challenge of VLA deployment lies less in single-step accuracy than in sustaining stable and reliable behavior over prolonged horizons.

*b) 3D Vision as Input:* Compared with 2D observations, 3D representations offer richer spatial grounding for contact-rich manipulation and long-horizon planning. However, most vision–language backbones are pre-trained on large-scale 2D image–text corpora and therefore lack intrinsic 3D understanding. This mismatch has motivated increasing interest in equipping VLA systems with explicit 3D perception. Existing efforts can be broadly grouped into two categories: *model-oriented* approaches, which redesign policy architectures to directly incorporate 3D information, and *model-agnostic* strategies, which introduce auxiliary mechanisms without modifying the backbone. *We first review representative model-oriented approaches.*

**3D Embedding and Fusion.** A primary model-oriented direction augments VLAs with explicit 3D embeddings, such as point clouds, depth maps, or voxel grids, and fuses them with 2D vision–language features. SpatialVLA [207] introduces 3D positional encodings and adaptive action grids to capture transferable spatial priors, while GeoVLA [209] employs point-based geometric embeddings to improve manipulation precision. Other works explore alternative representation scales and data regimes: FP3 [210] trains a foundation policy on large-scale 3D data, and RoboMM [211] integrates multimodal pretraining with explicit 3D inputs. Together, these methods demonstrate that architectural integration of 3D representations substantially enhances spatial awareness and robustness, albeit at increased data and computational cost.

**Spatial Alignment and Multi-View Guidance.** Another model-oriented line of work tackles occlusion and viewpoint ambiguity through explicit spatial alignment and multi-view reasoning. BridgeVLA [212] aligns point clouds across viewpoints via cross-view heatmap prediction, while Learning to See and Act [213] jointly optimizes view selection and manipulation performance through task-aware viewpoint planning. By explicitly reasoning over camera geometry and visibility within the policy architecture, these approaches im-

prove grounding accuracy, but also expose a trade-off between viewpoint diversity and inference efficiency.

**3D World Models and Prediction.** A third model-oriented direction integrates predictive world modeling into 3D VLAs to support long-horizon reasoning. 3D-VLA [218] leverages language-guided point-cloud diffusion to forecast future scene states, whereas Evo-0 [214] performs implicit spatial rollouts to anticipate feasible action sequences. Earlier works such as ChainedDiffuser [215] and SGR [216] similarly show that generative 3D world models can amortize planning into learned predictive priors. Collectively, these methods highlight how architectural incorporation of world modeling mitigates error accumulation over extended horizons.

**Model-Agnostic Strategies.** In contrast to the rapidly expanding model-oriented literature, model-agnostic enhancements for 3D VLAs remain relatively underexplored. Existing efforts primarily focus on inference-time view selection or feasibility filtering of candidate actions, as exemplified by Learning to See and Act [213]. Systematic advances in calibration, consensus decoding, caching, or lightweight reasoning for 3D settings are still scarce. This gap underscores both the challenge and the opportunity: while 3D inputs provide essential spatial grounding, efficient inference-time and post-training strategies for 3D VLAs remain an open research frontier.

Across both 2D and 3D modalities, recent VLA research exhibits converging design trends. Model-oriented approaches primarily enhance representational capacity by incorporating LLM and VLM priors, latent abstractions, and hierarchical reasoning in 2D settings, as well as learned spatial embeddings, alignment mechanisms, and explicit world models in 3D. In contrast, model-agnostic strategies focus on improving robustness and efficiency at inference time, typically with minimal architectural modification. Looking ahead, several directions appear particularly important, including the standardization of 3D representations, the development of hybrid architectures that couple reactive control with deliberative planning through safety-aware dual-system designs, and joint training across 2D and 3D modalities to better align large-scale semantic priors with explicit spatial grounding. Collectively, these efforts point beyond simply scaling backbone models toward more structured VLA systems that explicitly integrate perception, memory, planning, and control, and that can be evaluated under long-horizon, cross-embodiment, and real-world deployment settings.

*3) Tactile-based Action Models:* Tactile sensing provides fine-grained feedback on contact, geometry, and material properties, and is essential for precise, contact-rich manipulation. Unlike vision, tactile signals directly reflect physical interaction, remaining informative under occlusion, slippage, and uncertainty. Recent advances in tactile sensing and representation learning have therefore motivated a growing body of work that integrates tactile feedback into action models, substantially improving robustness, accuracy, and adaptability in manipulation. We summarize this line of work in Figure 6. **Tactile Latent Learning.** A first line of work focuses on learning transferable tactile representations. CLTP [219] aligns tactile geometry with language through contrastive pretraining, enabling semantic grounding of contact. Sparsh [220]




Fig. 6. A structured overview of tactile-based action models.

learns generalizable tactile embeddings via large-scale self-supervised visuotactile data, improving robustness across objects and tasks.

**Tactile-Action Models.** Another line directly incorporates tactile feedback into action generation. Feel the Force [221] uses human tactile-glove demonstrations to transfer contact-force patterns to robot policies. Seq2Seq Imitation [222] models tactile signals as temporal sequences to support manipulation under partial observability. RoboPack [223] integrates tactile sensing into learned dynamics for MPC, achieving precise control in dense packing. MimicTouch [224] further shows that multimodal human tactile demonstrations can effectively teach contact-rich manipulation strategies.

**Tactile-Vision-Action Models.** A growing body of work actively studies visuotactile fusion for robotic manipulation. T-DEX [225] and RotateIt [226] combine vision and touch to enable dexterous in-hand manipulation and generalization. Multimodal-SeeThrough [227] exploits transparent visuotactile sensing and force-matched demonstrations to improve imitation learning. VTTB [228] and VITaL [229] show that joint visuotactile pretraining benefits both tactile-based and vision-only policies. Reactive Diffusion Policy [230] further introduces a slow-fast visuotactile diffusion architecture for responsive contact-rich control.

**Tactile-Language-Action Models.** Several influential works explore aligning tactile perception with natural language. TLA [231] learns tactile–language–action mappings from sequential tactile signals, while Octopi [232] leverages tactile–language models to reason about object physical properties beyond visual appearance.

**Tactile-Vision-Language-Action Models.** Most recently, tactile sensing has been integrated into full VLA pipelines. Tactile-VLA [233] extends VLA models with tactile inputs to improve generalization in physical interaction. VTLA [234] combines tactile and vision with language-conditioned preference learning for robust insertion. Touch Begins [235] adopts a two-stage strategy, using vision-language models for localization and tactile feedback for execution. Earlier work, such as Medicine Bottles [236], highlighted the importance of force and tactile cues for learning compliant manipulation behaviors.

4) *Extra Modalities as Input:* Beyond vision and language, force and audio provide complementary physical cues that are crucial for contact-rich and partially observable manipulation. Force sensing captures fine-grained interaction dynamics, from early imitation learning that jointly modeled motion and force [237] to bilateral teleoperation for accurate position–force coordination [238], and more recently to force-

aware visuomotor policies and VLA extensions for physically grounded control [239], [240]. Audio offers an orthogonal sensing channel that reveals contact and state changes invisible to vision, enabling manipulation under occlusion [241], sound-guided feedback for hidden events [242], and audio–visual imitation from in-the-wild demonstrations [243]. Together, these modalities enrich visuomotor policies with physically informative signals, improving robustness and precision in real-world manipulation.

### C. Latent Learning

Latent learning examines how robotic models can acquire robust and generalizable representations from input data, and how these representations can be effectively leveraged by the policy head to decode actions. We categorize existing work into two directions: pretrained latent learning, which focuses on learning high-quality representations for downstream tasks, and latent action learning, which addresses not only representation learning but also how to optimize the decoding of these representations into actions. We summarize these in Figure 7.

1) *Pretrained Latent Learning:* Learning encoder-grounded and generalizable visual representations—often referred to as *robotic representations*—is a prerequisite for robust real-world visuomotor control. Motivated by the success of large-scale pre-training in computer vision [244] and natural language processing [245], recent work in robotics increasingly relies on pre-training visual encoders on diverse, domain-relevant data. Depending on the data source, robotic representations can be broadly grouped into three categories: models trained on general-purpose image datasets (*e.g.*, ImageNet [246]), human–object interaction datasets that capture rich manipulation priors (*e.g.*, Ego4D [247]), and robot-centric datasets collected from embodied interaction (*e.g.*, BridgeV2 [248]).

**Training on General Datasets.** General-purpose visual pre-training offers a scalable alternative to task- or robot-specific data collection. Parisi *et al.* [249] show that multi-layer feature fusion from vision models pre-trained on large image datasets can yield representations well suited for control, in some cases rivaling state-based inputs. Building on this idea, Theia [250] distills knowledge from multiple vision foundation models trained on diverse visual tasks into a single compact representation, producing rich and transferable features for downstream robot learning. Together, these works suggest that appropriately adapted general visual representations can serve as effective perceptual backbones for robotic manipulation.

**Training on Human Egocentric Datasets.** Human egocentric video provides rich priors about object interaction, hand mo-




Fig. 7. Overview of Latent Learning. **Top Left:** Robotic encoders are pretrained on general datasets, human egocentric datasets, and robotic datasets to produce latents for policies. **Bottom Left:** In the dual system, system 2 outputs latent to guide system 1 to generate action. **Right:** Latent action learning is conducted through discretized (yellow) or continuous latents (pink).

tion, and task structure, making it a valuable source for learning transferable robotic representations. VC-1 [251] demonstrates that large-scale masked pre-training on egocentric video can yield a general visual backbone for embodied tasks, while R3M [128] shows that time-contrastive and video–language objectives enable few-shot real-robot learning from such data. Beyond generic representation learning, Voltron [252] integrates language grounding to capture higher-level semantics, and HRP [253] injects affordance priors derived from human interactions to improve cross-view and cross-embodiment generalization. Together, these works illustrate how large-scale egocentric pre-training can bridge human demonstrations and robot manipulation through transferable visual representations.

**Training on Robotic Datasets.** The increasing availability of large-scale robot-collected datasets has enabled representation learning directly grounded in embodied interaction. RPT [254] demonstrates that masked sensorimotor pre-training over full robot trajectories yields transferable world models for downstream manipulation. Building on this direction, Premier-TACO [255] improves multitask representation learning via temporally contrastive objectives, substantially enhancing few-shot policy learning from limited demonstrations. Complementing these approaches, manipulation-centric analysis [256] formalizes the alignment between visual representations and manipulation performance and introduces manipulation-centric representations that explicitly optimize for this criterion through large-scale robotic pre-training.

2) *Latent Action Learning*: Recent advances in latent action learning have introduced diverse paradigms that connect video representation, world modeling, and policy generation, allowing robots to acquire action abstractions beyond explicit supervision. In addition to the methods discussed in Section III-B2 on multi-system VLA with intermediate latent structures, latent learning for VLAs can also be grouped under

this category. Broadly, latent actions can be categorized into two forms: discrete representations, often obtained through quantization, and continuous vector representations. The following sections review these two classes in detail.

a) *Discretization and Vector Quantization*: Discretization and vector quantization map continuous action or representation spaces into discrete tokens, yielding compact and reusable action primitives that simplify policy learning and improve stability. Early work explored latent action discovery from weak supervision. ILPO [257] and LAPO [258] inferred latent action structure from observation-only demonstrations via inverse dynamics. Building on this idea, vector-quantized policies discretize continuous control into latent tokens to enable efficient generative control and scalable multitask learning [259]–[261]. More recent approaches integrate discretized latent actions with vision–language models. LAPA [262] learns latent actions from visual transitions and trains a VLM to infer them from perception, while DreamGen [263] scales this paradigm using video world models and inverse dynamics to synthesize large robotic datasets. Overall, discretization serves as an abstraction layer between perception and control, trading fine-grained continuity for compositionality, robustness, and scalability.

b) *Continuous Latent Action Representations*: Continuous latent action representations encode actions as vectors in a continuous space, providing a compact interface between perception and control. By abstracting low-level motor commands into smooth latent trajectories, these methods support interpolation, generalization, and transfer across behaviors, embodiments, and task contexts.

**Latent Dynamics Representations.** A first line of work embeds critical task-relevant dynamics into latent variables that condition action generation. MimicPlay [264] learns long-horizon imitation by predicting latent actions conditioned on

goal images from human play. CLAM [265] infers continuous latent actions robustly aligned with motor commands from unlabeled demonstrations, while CoMo [266] scales latent motion embeddings learned from internet videos to enable robust cross-domain generalization.

**Implicit World Modeling.** Another class exploits latent predictions from learned world models to guide control. VPP [267] adapts a video foundation model for manipulation and aggregates predicted visual latents to condition a diffusion policy. FLARE [268] aligns future latent predictions with implicit world models to improve generalization from human demonstrations, while Genie Envisioner [269] enforces consistency between video-diffusion latents and action-diffusion policies, strengthening prediction-control coupling.

**Latent Diffusion Policies.** Several approaches integrate continuous latent spaces directly into diffusion-based control. LAD [270] trains diffusion policies in a shared latent action space to enable cross-embodiment transfer, while KOAP [271] combines diffusion planners with Koopman-based controllers for stable long-horizon execution. LaDi-WM [272] further learns a latent diffusion world model whose predicted semantics and geometry condition downstream action generation.

**Koopman-based Latent Dynamics.** Koopman-based methods learn linear latent dynamics that approximate nonlinear manipulation processes. KoDex [273] studies Koopman representations for dexterous manipulation, while KOROL [274] learns interpretable object-centric latents through Koopman rollouts to support stable and explainable control.

**Goal- and Instruction-conditioned Latents.** Finally, some methods jointly encode visual observations and instructions into task-centric latent actions. Procedure Cloning [275] introduces latent procedural abstractions inspired by chain-of-thought reasoning for long-horizon tasks. UniVLA [157] learns task-centric latent actions in an unsupervised manner from cross-embodiment data, enabling a VLA to predict latent action tokens without requiring action labels.

#### D. Policy Learning

Policy learning specifies how learned representations are decoded into executable robot actions, defining the functional interface between perception, internal representations, and motor execution.

1) *MLP-based Policy*: Early learning-based manipulation policies adopt multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) to directly map encoded observations to actions, serving as simple and efficient visuomotor controllers when paired with strong representations [128], [254].

2) *Transformer-based Policy*: Transformer-based policies leverage self- and cross-attention to model temporal dependencies and multimodal context, enabling sequence-to-sequence action generation with variable-length history. Within this paradigm, ACT [276] introduced action chunking by predicting short action sequences to mitigate error accumulation and enable stable bimanual manipulation, with subsequent extensions scaling skills and incorporating richer supervision [151], [277]. In parallel, autoregressive policies formulate manipulation as next-token prediction over action sequences, supporting

in-context imitation and long-horizon reasoning, as exemplified by ICRT [278] and CARP [279], which demonstrate strong generalization from few demonstrations and structured spatial reasoning.

3) *Diffusion Policy*: Diffusion Policies (DP) reformulate action generation as an iterative denoising process, enabling multimodal trajectory synthesis and strong generalization in robotic manipulation [131]. Building on this formulation, subsequent work has extended DP along several key dimensions. To enhance spatial grounding, 3D-aware variants incorporate explicit geometric or scene representations to support contact-rich manipulation and long-horizon reasoning [140]. Multi-task generalization and structural inductive bias are further improved through mixture-of-experts designs and equivariant architectures that encode task structure and symmetry priors [280], [281]. In parallel, DP has been integrated with video prediction and world modeling to couple action generation with future state imagination, enabling planning-oriented and data-efficient learning [282]. Collectively, these advances establish diffusion policy as a flexible and extensible paradigm for modern robot manipulation.

4) *Flow Matching Policy*: Flow matching (FM) policies replace stochastic denoising with deterministic transport dynamics, yielding faster inference and smoother action trajectories. Early work demonstrated FM as a stable and efficient alternative to diffusion for imitation learning [283]. Building on this foundation, RTC [284] enables real-time execution by overlapping action generation with ongoing control, further improving efficiency and temporal consistency.

5) *Other Policy Paradigms*: Beyond the above families, alternative designs explore different inductive biases. State-space-model-based policies leverage long-sequence modeling for efficient control [285], while frequency-domain policies encode actions spectrally to improve long-horizon stability [286]. These approaches highlight complementary directions for structuring action generation.

Across these paradigms, policy learning has evolved from direct regression models toward structured sequence generators that explicitly model uncertainty, temporal dependencies, and long-horizon coherence. While MLP- and Transformer-based policies emphasize representation decoding and context aggregation, diffusion and flow-based methods frame action generation as a generative process over trajectories, improving robustness and multimodality. Collectively, these advances reflect a trend toward policies that integrate perception, memory, and planning within a unified generative framework, forming a key foundation for scalable and reliable robotic manipulation.

## IV. PROSPECTIVE FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

To bring robotic manipulation from controlled labs to open, dynamic real-world environments, a central goal is to build robotic foundation models with autonomous perception, decision-making, and execution, and the ability to improve through continual interaction. Achieving this vision requires resolving several fundamental challenges spanning foundation models, data and simulation, physical interaction, and safety.

#### A. Core Challenge 1: Building a True Robot Brain

Robotics is moving from task-specific policies toward general-purpose foundation models that can control diverse embodiments and operate across heterogeneous observation/action spaces. Key research directions include: (i) *general-purpose architectures* that support flexible modality and embodiment interfaces and scale with data and compute; (ii) *continual and lifelong learning* that mitigates forgetting while enabling positive transfer through memory, replay, and efficient representation updates; (iii) *robust long-horizon execution* that maintains behavior within a “funnel of success” via tighter coupling of high-level planning (e.g., task decomposition) and low-level closed-loop control; and (iv) *stable and smooth motion generation* with dynamics-consistent trajectories and compliance, integrating learning with control priors (e.g., impedance-like behaviors) to support safe physical interaction.

#### B. Core Challenge 2: Data Bottleneck and Sim-to-Real Gap

Modern robot learning is constrained by both limited real-world data and imperfect simulation. A primary challenge is establishing a scalable “data flywheel,” where robots autonomously collect experience and models selectively distill high-value signals via reliable filtering, automated labeling, and data valuation under noisy, heterogeneous trajectories. In parallel, closing the sim-to-real gap demands higher-fidelity simulation for contact-rich and deformable interactions, as well as differentiable or gradient-informed simulation pipelines that can optimize policies more efficiently than pure trial-and-error, ultimately enabling robust transfer from synthetic training to real deployment.

#### C. Core Challenge 3: Multimodal Physical Interaction

Vision-centric manipulation is insufficient for real-world physical intelligence. Future robotic foundation models must fuse richer sensory streams (e.g., touch, audition, proprioception) into unified, temporally coherent representations, despite heterogeneous rates and noise profiles. A major frontier is manipulation of deformable and complex materials (cloth, cables, fluids, granular media), where state spaces are effectively high-dimensional and contact dynamics dominate. Progress will likely require new object representations (e.g., graph- or field-based models), stronger physics-informed inference, and learning algorithms that remain stable under partial observability and uncertain contact.

#### D. Core Challenge 4: Safety and Collaboration

As robots enter human environments, safety becomes a first-class design constraint rather than a secondary feature. Future robotic foundation models must provide *intrinsic safety* through self-constrained control that respects kinematic/dynamic limits and regulates smoothness and force/energy in real time, alongside *inter-robot safety* via predictive coordination and shared protocols for multi-agent operation. For effective human–robot collaboration, robots should support natural intent inference and shared autonomy through multimodal cues. Finally, robust deployment requires

autonomous fault detection and recovery with continuous monitoring and safe fallback policies, and practical systems will likely adopt *hybrid paradigms* that combine learning-based adaptability with the stability of classical methods (e.g., rule-based logic or MPC) in safety-critical regimes.

## V. CONCLUSION

This survey has examined recent progress in robot manipulation through a unified abstraction of high-level planning, low-level learning-based control, and prospective research directions. By organizing existing methods along planning and learning dimensions, we aim to clarify the algorithmic structure underlying modern learning-based manipulation systems and robotic foundation models. Despite substantial advances, robotic manipulation remains far from achieving robust, general-purpose capability. Several fundamental challenges persist, including the development of unified architectures that integrate perception, reasoning, and control, the mitigation of data and perception bottlenecks that limit scalability and generalization, and the assurance of safety and reliability in human–robot collaboration. Addressing these challenges is critical for extending learning-based manipulation beyond controlled laboratory settings toward diverse and dynamic real-world environments. We hope that the abstraction-driven perspective presented in this survey provides a useful reference for understanding current methods and framing future research in robot manipulation and next-generation foundation models.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Bai, W. Song, J. Chen, Y. Ji, Z. Zhong, J. Yang, H. Zhao, W. Zhou, W. Zhao, Z. Li *et al.*, “Towards a unified understanding of robot manipulation: A comprehensive survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10903*, 2025.
- [2] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [3] H. Touvron, T. Lavigra, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar *et al.*, “Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [4] H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Lee, “Visual instruction tuning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, pp. 34 892–34 916, 2023.
- [5] S. Levine, C. Finn, T. Darrell, and P. Abbeel, “End-to-end training of deep visuomotor policies,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 39, pp. 1–40, 2016.
- [6] L. Pinto and A. Gupta, “Supersizing self-supervision: Learning to grasp from 50k tries and 700 robot hours,” in *2016 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 3406–3413.
- [7] Y. Yang, H. Yu, X. Lou, Y. Liu, and C. Choi, “Attribute-based robotic grasping with data-efficient adaptation,” *Trans. Rob.*, vol. 40, p. 1566–1579, Jan. 2024.
- [8] B. Zitkovich, T. Yu, S. Xu, P. Xu, T. Xiao, F. Xia, J. Wu, P. Wohlhart, S. Welker, A. Wahid *et al.*, “Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 2165–2183.
- [9] M. J. Kim, K. Pertsch, S. Karamcheti, T. Xiao, A. Balakrishna, S. Nair, R. Rafailov, E. P. Foster, P. R. Sanketi, Q. Vuong *et al.*, “Openvila: An open-source vision-language-action model,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 2679–2713.
- [10] K. Black, N. Brown, D. Driess, A. Esmail, M. Equi, C. Finn, N. Fusai, L. Groom, K. Hausman, B. Ichter *et al.*, “ $\pi^0$ : A vision-language-action flow model for general robot control,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2025.

[11] Y. Duan, M. Andrychowicz, B. Stadie, O. Jonathan Ho, J. Schneider, I. Sutskever, P. Abbeel, and W. Zaremba, “One-shot imitation learning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.

[12] A. Rajeswaran, V. Kumar, A. Gupta, G. Vezzani, J. Schulman, E. Todorov, and S. Levine, “Learning complex dexterous manipulation with deep reinforcement learning and demonstrations,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2018.

[13] Y. Ma, Z. Song, Y. Zhuang, J. Hao, and I. King, “A survey on vision-language-action models for embodied ai,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14093*, 2024.

[14] Y. Zhong, F. Bai, S. Cai, X. Huang, Z. Chen, X. Zhang, Y. Wang, S. Guo, T. Guan, K. N. Lui *et al.*, “A survey on vision-language-action models: An action tokenization perspective,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.01925*, 2025.

[15] T.-Y. Xiang, A.-Q. Jin, X.-H. Zhou, M.-J. Gui, X.-L. Xie, S.-Q. Liu, S.-Y. Wang, S.-B. Duan, F.-C. Xie, W.-K. Wang *et al.*, “Parallels between vla model post-training and human motor learning: Progress, challenges, and trends,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.20966*, 2025.

[16] H. Li, Y. Chen, W. Cui, W. Liu, K. Liu, M. Zhou, Z. Zhang, and D. Zhao, “Survey of vision-language-action models for embodied manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.15201*, 2025.

[17] R. P. Wolf, Y. Shi, S. Liu, and R. Rayyes, “Diffusion models for robotic manipulation: A survey,” *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 12, p. 1606247, 2025.

[18] K. Zhang, P. Yun, J. Cen, J. Cai, D. Zhu, H. Yuan, C. Zhao, T. Feng, M. Y. Wang, Q. Chen *et al.*, “Generative artificial intelligence in robotic manipulation: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.03464*, 2025.

[19] A. Brohan, Y. Chebotar, C. Finn, K. Hausman, A. Herzog, D. Ho, J. Ibarz, A. Irpan, E. Jang, R. Julian *et al.*, “Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances,” in *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 287–318.

[20] W. Huang, F. Xia, D. Shah, D. Driess, A. Zeng, Y. Lu, P. Florence, I. Mordatch, S. Levine, K. Hausman *et al.*, “Grounded decoding: Guiding text generation with grounded models for embodied agents,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 59 636–59 661, 2023.

[21] C. H. Song, J. Wu, C. Washington, B. M. Sadler, W.-L. Chao, and Y. Su, “Llm-planner: Few-shot grounded planning for embodied agents with large language models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2023, pp. 2998–3009.

[22] B. Liu, Y. Jiang, X. Zhang, Q. Liu, S. Zhang, J. Biswas, and P. Stone, “Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*, 2023.

[23] Z. Liu, A. Bahety, and S. Song, “Reflect: Summarizing robot experiences for failure explanation and correction,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 3468–3484.

[24] H. Singh, R. J. Das, M. Han, P. Nakov, and I. Laptev, “Malm: Multi-agent large language models for zero-shot robotics manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.17636*, 2024.

[25] T. Wang, H. Lin, J. Yu, and Y. Fu, “Polaris: Open-ended interactive robotic manipulation via syn2real visual grounding and large language models,” in *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 9676–9683.

[26] D. Driess, F. Xia, M. S. Sajjadi, C. Lynch, A. Chowdhery, B. Ichter, A. Wahid, J. Tompson, Q. Vuong, T. Yu *et al.*, “Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 8469–8488.

[27] Y. Du, S. Yang, P. Florence, F. Xia, A. Wahid, P. Sermanet, T. Yu, P. Abbeel, J. B. Tenenbaum, L. P. Kaelbling *et al.*, “Video language planning,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

[28] W. Dai, J. Li, D. Li, A. Tiong, J. Zhao, W. Wang, B. Li, P. N. Fung, and S. Hoi, “Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, 2023, pp. 49 250–49 267.

[29] Y. Mu, Q. Zhang, M. Hu, W. Wang, M. Ding, J. Jin, B. Wang, J. Dai, Y. Qiao, and P. Luo, “Embodiedgpt: Vision-language pre-training via embodied chain of thought,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, pp. 25 081–25 094, 2023.

[30] Y. Ji, H. Tan, J. Shi, X. Hao, Y. Zhang, H. Zhang, P. Wang, M. Zhao, Y. Mu, P. An *et al.*, “Robobrain: A unified brain model for robotic manipulation from abstract to concrete,” in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 1724–1734.

[31] G. R. Team, S. Abeyruwan, J. Ainslie, J.-B. Alayrac, M. G. Arenas, T. Armstrong, A. Balakrishna, R. Baruch, M. Bauza, M. Blokzijl *et al.*, “Gemini robotics: Bringing ai into the physical world,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20020*, 2025.

[32] J. Liang, W. Huang, F. Xia, P. Xu, K. Hausman, B. Ichter, P. Florence, and A. Zeng, “Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 9493–9500.

[33] I. Singh, V. Blukis, A. Mousavian, A. Goyal, D. Xu, J. Tremblay, D. Fox, J. Thomason, and A. Garg, “Progrompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 11 523–11 530.

[34] Y. Wang, G. Gonzalez-Pumariega, Y. Sharma, and S. Choudhury, “Demo2code: From summarizing demonstrations to synthesizing code via extended chain-of-thought,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2023, pp. 14 848–14 956.

[35] M. Murray, A. Gupta, and M. Cakmak, “Teaching robots with show and tell: Using foundation models to synthesize robot policies from language and visual demonstration,” in *8th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2024.

[36] T. Yoneda, J. Fang, P. Li, H. Zhang, T. Jiang, S. Lin, B. Picker, D. Yunis, H. Mei, and M. R. Walter, “Statler: State-maintaining language models for embodied reasoning,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 15 083–15 091.

[37] W. Huang, C. Wang, R. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Wu, and L. Fei-Fei, “Voxposer: Composable 3d value maps for robotic manipulation with language models,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 540–562.

[38] H. Huang, F. Lin, Y. Hu, S. Wang, and Y. Gao, “Copa: General robotic manipulation through spatial constraints of parts with foundation models,” in *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 9488–9495.

[39] X. Li, M. Zhang, Y. Geng, H. Geng, Y. Long, Y. Shen, R. Zhang, J. Liu, and H. Dong, “Maniplm: Embodied multimodal large language model for object-centric robotic manipulation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 18 061–18 070.

[40] W. Huang, C. Wang, Y. Li, R. Zhang, and L. Fei-Fei, “Rekep: Spatio-temporal reasoning of relational keypoint constraints for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 4573–4602.

[41] W. Tang, J.-H. Pan, Y.-H. Liu, M. Tomizuka, L. E. Li, C.-W. Fu, and M. Ding, “Geomanip: Geometric constraints as general interfaces for robot manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09783*, 2025.

[42] H. Huang, B. Sundaralingam, A. Mousavian, A. Murali, K. Goldberg, and D. Fox, “Diffusionseeder: Seeding motion optimization with diffusion for rapid motion planning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 4392–4409.

[43] Z. Jiang, C.-C. Hsu, and Y. Zhu, “Ditto: Building digital twins of articulated objects from interaction,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 5616–5626.

[44] H. Geng, H. Xu, C. Zhao, C. Xu, L. Yi, S. Huang, and H. Wang, “Gapartnet: Cross-category domain-generalizable object perception and manipulation via generalizable and actionable parts,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 7081–7091.

[45] W. Liu, J. Mao, J. Hsu, T. Hermans, A. Garg, and J. Wu, “Composable part-based manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 1300–1315.

[46] A. Zeng, P. Florence, J. Tompson, S. Welker, J. Chien, M. Attarian, T. Armstrong, I. Krasin, D. Duong, V. Sindhwani *et al.*, “Transporter networks: Rearranging the visual world for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 726–747.

[47] J. Borja-Diaz, O. Mees, G. Kalweit, L. Hermann, J. Boedecker, and W. Burgard, “Affordance learning from play for sample-efficient policy learning,” in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6372–6378.

[48] M. Lopes, F. S. Melo, and L. Montesano, “Affordance-based imitation learning in robots,” in *2007 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 1015–1021.

[49] M. Shridhar, L. Manuelli, and D. Fox, “Clipoint: What and where pathways for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 894–906.

[50] W. Yuan, J. Duan, V. Blukis, W. Pumacay, R. Krishna, A. Murali, A. Mousavian, and D. Fox, “Robopoint: A vision-language model for spatial affordance prediction in robotics,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 4005–4020.

[51] F. Liu, K. Fang, P. Abbeel, and S. Levine, “Moka: Open-world robotic manipulation through mark-based visual prompting,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[52] Y. Sheng, R. Lin, L. Wang, Q. Qiu, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, B. Hua, and J. Ji, “Msgfield: A unified scene representation integrating motion, semantics, and geometry for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15730*, 2024.

[53] S. Yang, W. Yu, J. Zeng, J. Lv, K. Ren, C. Lu, D. Lin, and J. Pang, “Novel demonstration generation with gaussian splatting enables robust one-shot manipulation,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[54] A. Simeonov, Y. Du, A. Tagliasacchi, J. B. Tenenbaum, A. Rodriguez, P. Agrawal, and V. Sitzmann, “Neural descriptor fields: Se (3)-equivariant object representations for manipulation,” in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6394–6400.

[55] W. Shen, G. Yang, A. Yu, J. Wong, L. P. Kaelbling, and P. Isola, “Distilled feature fields enable few-shot language-guided manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 405–424.

[56] Y. Wang, M. Zhang, Z. Li, T. Kelestemur, K. R. Driggs-Campbell, J. Wu, L. Fei-Fei, and Y. Li, “D<sup>3</sup>-fields: Dynamic 3d descriptor fields for zero-shot generalizable rearrangement,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 272–298.

[57] H. Huang, K. Schmeckpeper, D. Wang, O. Biza, Y. Qian, H. Liu, M. Jia, R. Platt, and R. Walters, “Imagination policy: Using generative point cloud models for learning manipulation policies,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 5150–5165.

[58] H. Jiang, B. Huang, R. Wu, Z. Li, S. Garg, H. Nayyeri, S. Wang, and Y. Li, “Roboexp: Action-conditioned scene graph via interactive exploration for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 3027–3052.

[59] D.-A. Huang, D. Xu, Y. Zhu, A. Garg, S. Savarese, L. Fei-Fei, and J. C. Niebles, “Continuous relaxation of symbolic planner for one-shot imitation learning,” in *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2635–2642.

[60] W. Huang, F. Xia, T. Xiao, H. Chan, J. Liang, P. Florence, A. Zeng, J. Tompson, I. Mordatch, Y. Chebotar *et al.*, “Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608*, 2022.

[61] X. Zhao, M. Li, C. Weber, M. B. Hafez, and S. Wermter, “Chat with the environment: Interactive multimodal perception using large language models,” in *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3590–3596.

[62] Z. Mandi, S. Jain, and S. Song, “Roco: Dialectic multi-robot collaboration with large language models,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 286–299.

[63] J. Li, D. Li, S. Savarese, and S. Hoi, “Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 19730–19742.

[64] J. Gao, B. Sarkar, F. Xia, T. Xiao, J. Wu, B. Ichter, A. Majumdar, and D. Sadigh, “Physically grounded vision-language models for robotic manipulation,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 12462–12469.

[65] K. Zhang, Z.-H. Yin, W. Ye, and Y. Gao, “Learning manipulation skills through robot chain-of-thought with sparse failure guidance,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13573*, 2024.

[66] Z. Qi, W. Zhang, Y. Ding, R. Dong, X. Yu, J. Li, L. Xu, B. Li, X. He, G. Fan *et al.*, “Sofar: Language-grounded orientation bridges spatial reasoning and object manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13143*, 2025.

[67] A. Zeng, M. Attarian, K. M. Choromanski, A. Wong, S. Welker, F. Tombari, A. Purohit, M. S. Ryoo, V. Sindhwani, J. Lee *et al.*, “Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language,” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

[68] J. Duan, W. Pumacay, N. Kumar, Y. R. Wang, S. Tian, W. Yuan, R. Krishna, D. Fox, A. Mandlekar, and Y. Guo, “Aha: A vision-language-model for detecting and reasoning over failures in robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.00371*, 2024.

[69] R. Dang, Y. Yuan, Y. Mao, K. Li, J. Liu, Z. Wang, X. Li, F. Wang, and D. Zhao, “Rynnec: Bringing mllms into embodied world,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.14160*, 2025.

[70] S. G. Venkatesh, R. Upadrashta, and B. Amrur, “Translating natural language instructions to computer programs for robot manipulation,” in *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1919–1926.

[71] S. Huang, Z. Jiang, H. Dong, Y. Qiao, P. Gao, and H. Li, “Instruct2act: Mapping multi-modality instructions to robotic actions with large language model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11176*, 2023.

[72] Y. Liu, Z. Liang, Z. Chen, T. Chen, M. Hu, W. Dong, C. Xu, Z. Han, Y. Qin, and Y. Mu, “Hycodepolicy: Hybrid language controllers for multimodal monitoring and decision in embodied agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02629*, 2025.

[73] T. Li and N. Figueiroa, “Task generalization with stability guarantees via elastic dynamical system motion policies,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 3485–3517.

[74] J. J. Gibson, “The theory of affordances:(1979),” in *The people, place, and space reader*. Routledge, 2014, pp. 56–60.

[75] Y. Yin, Z. Han, S. Aarya, J. Wang, S. Xu, J. Peng, A. Wang, A. Yuille, and T. Shu, “Partinstruct: Part-level instruction following for fine-grained robot manipulation,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[76] H. Geng, S. Wei, C. Deng, B. Shen, H. Wang, and L. Guibas, “Sage: Bridging semantic and actionable parts for generalizable manipulation of articulated objects,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[77] B. Chen, Z. Xu, S. Kirmani, B. Ichter, D. Sadigh, L. Guibas, and F. Xia, “Spatialvlm: Endowing vision-language models with spatial reasoning capabilities,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 14455–14465.

[78] Y. Tang, W. Huang, Y. Wang, C. Li, R. Yuan, R. Zhang, J. Wu, and L. Fei-Fei, “Uad: Unsupervised affordance distillation for generalization in robotic manipulation,” in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2025.

[79] Y. Kuang, J. Ye, H. Geng, J. Mao, C. Deng, L. Guibas, H. Wang, and Y. Wang, “Ram: Retrieval-based affordance transfer for generalizable zero-shot robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 547–565.

[80] O. Shorinwa, J. Tucker, A. Smith, A. Swann, T. Chen, R. Firooz, M. D. Kennedy, and M. Schwager, “Splat-mover: Multi-stage, open-vocabulary robotic manipulation via editable gaussian splatting,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 4748–4770.

[81] Y. Li and D. Pathak, “Object-aware gaussian splatting for robotic manipulation,” in *ICRA 2024 Workshop on 3D Visual Representations for Robot Manipulation*, 2024.

[82] J. Abou-Chakra, K. Rana, F. Dayoub, and N. Suenderhauf, “Physically embodied gaussian splatting: A visually learnt and physically grounded 3d representation for robotics,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 513–530.

[83] A. Simeonov, Y. Du, Y.-C. Lin, A. R. Garcia, L. P. Kaelbling, T. Lozano-Pérez, and P. Agrawal, “Se (3)-equivariant relational rearrangement with neural descriptor fields,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 835–846.

[84] K. Dmitry, I. Alex, P. Peter, I. Julian, H. Alexander, J. Eric, Q. Deirdre, H. Ethan, K. Mrinal, V. Vincent *et al.*, “Qt-opt: scalable deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint*, 2018.

[85] A. Kumar, A. Singh, F. Ebert, M. Nakamoto, Y. Yang, C. Finn, and S. Levine, “Pre-training for robots: Offline rl enables learning new tasks from a handful of trials,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.05178*, 2022.

[86] C. A. Bhateja, D. Guo, D. Ghosh, A. Singh, M. Tomar, Q. Vuong, Y. Chebotar, S. Levine, and A. Kumar, “Robotic offline rl from internet videos via value-function pre-training,” in *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*, 2023.

[87] T. Johannink, S. Bahl, A. Nair, J. Luo, A. Kumar, M. Loskyll, J. A. Ojea, E. Solowjow, and S. Levine, “Residual reinforcement learning for robot control,” in *2019 international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 6023–6029.

[88] C. Xu, Q. Li, J. Luo, and S. Levine, “Rldg: Robotic generalist policy distillation via reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09858*, 2024.

[89] M. Nakamoto, O. Mees, A. Kumar, and S. Levine, “Steering your generalists: Improving robotic foundation models via value guidance,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 4996–5013.

[90] M. S. Mark, T. Gao, G. G. Sampaio, M. K. Srirama, A. Sharma, C. Finn, and A. Kumar, “Policy-agnostic rl: Offline rl and online rl fine-tuning of any class and backbone,” in *7th Robot Learning Workshop: Towards Robots with Human-Level Abilities*, 2024.

[91] Y. Guo, J. Zhang, X. Chen, X. Ji, Y.-J. Wang, Y. Hu, and J. Chen, “Improving vision-language-action model with online reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.16664*, 2025.

[92] S. Tan, K. Dou, Y. Zhao, and P. Krahenbuehl, “Interactive post-training for vision-language-action models,” in *Workshop on Foundation Models Meet Embodied Agents at CVPR 2025*, 2025.

[93] G. Lu, W. Guo, C. Zhang, Y. Zhou, H. Jiang, Z. Gao, Y. Tang, and Z. Wang, “Vla-rl: Towards masterful and general robotic manipulation with scalable reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18719*, 2025.

[94] Y. Chen, S. Tian, S. Liu, Y. Zhou, H. Li, and D. Zhao, “Conrft: A reinforced fine-tuning method for vla models via consistency policy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.05450*, 2025.

[95] D. Hafner, T. Lillicrap, J. Ba, and M. Norouzi, “Dream to control: Learning behaviors by latent imagination,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

[96] Y. Seo, D. Hafner, H. Liu, F. Liu, S. James, K. Lee, and P. Abbeel, “Masked world models for visual control,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 1332–1344.

[97] S. Levine and V. Koltun, “Guided policy search,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2013, pp. 1–9.

[98] N. A. Hansen, H. Su, and X. Wang, “Temporal difference learning for model predictive control,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 8387–8406.

[99] E. Xing, V. Luk, and J. Oh, “Stabilizing reinforcement learning in differentiable multiphysics simulation,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.

[100] J. Lv, Y. Feng, C. Zhang, S. Zhao, L. Shao, and C. Lu, “Sam-rl: Sensing-aware model-based reinforcement learning via differentiable physics-based simulation and rendering,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, p. 02783649241284653, 2023.

[101] W. Wan, Z. Wang, Y. Wang, Z. Erickson, and D. Held, “Difftrori: Differentiable trajectory optimization for deep reinforcement and imitation learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 109430–109459, 2024.

[102] P. Wu, A. Escontrela, D. Hafner, P. Abbeel, and K. Goldberg, “Day-dreamer: World models for physical robot learning,” in *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 2226–2240.

[103] S. Schaal, “Is imitation learning the route to humanoid robots?” *Trends in cognitive sciences*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 233–242, 1999.

[104] M. Dalal, A. Mandlekar, C. R. Garrett, A. Handa, R. Salakhutdinov, and D. Fox, “Imitating task and motion planning with visuomotor transformers,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 2565–2593.

[105] Y. Huang, L. Rozo, J. Silvério, and D. G. Caldwell, “Non-parametric imitation learning of robot motor skills,” in *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5266–5272.

[106] S. Bai, W. Zhou, P. Ding, W. Zhao, D. Wang, and B. Chen, “Rethinking latent redundancy in behavior cloning: An information bottleneck approach for robot manipulation,” in *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.

[107] G. Katz, D.-W. Huang, R. Gentili, and J. Reggia, “Imitation learning as cause-effect reasoning,” in *International Conference on Artificial General Intelligence*. Springer, 2016, pp. 64–73.

[108] H. Sun, Y. Wang, Z. Zhou, S. Wang, H. Yang, J. Sun, and Q. Cao, “Exploring pose-guided imitation learning for robotic precise insertion,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09424*, 2025.

[109] S. Schaal, A. Ijspeert, and A. Billard, “Computational approaches to motor learning by imitation,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, vol. 358, no. 1431, pp. 537–547, 2003.

[110] A. Paolillo, P. R. Giordano, and M. Saveriano, “Dynamical system-based imitation learning for visual servoing using the large projection formulation,” in *ICRA 2023-IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–7.

[111] M. J. McDonald and D. Hadfield-Menell, “Guided imitation of task and motion planning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 630–640.

[112] Z. Xu and Y. She, “Leto: Learning constrained visuomotor policy with differentiable trajectory optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024.

[113] P. Englert, N. A. Vien, and M. Toussaint, “Inverse kkt: Learning cost functions of manipulation tasks from demonstrations,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 36, no. 13-14, pp. 1474–1488, 2017.

[114] J. Ho and S. Ermon, “Generative adversarial imitation learning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 29, 2016.

[115] R. Rafailov, T. Yu, A. Rajeswaran, and C. Finn, “Visual adversarial imitation learning using variational models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 3016–3028, 2021.

[116] M. Alakuijala, G. Dulac-Arnold, J. Mairal, J. Ponce, and C. Schmid, “Learning reward functions for robotic manipulation by observing humans,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 5006–5012.

[117] Y. J. Ma, S. Sodhani, D. Jayaraman, O. Bastani, V. Kumar, and A. Zhang, “Vip: Towards universal visual reward and representation via value-implicit pre-training,” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

[118] S. Chen, X. Ma, and Z. Xu, “Imitation learning as state matching via differentiable physics,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2023, pp. 7846–7855.

[119] S. Haldar and L. Pinto, “Point policy: Unifying observations and actions with key points for robot manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.20391*, 2025.

[120] W. Zhao, J. Chen, Z. Meng, D. Mao, R. Song, and W. Zhang, “Vlmpc: Vision-language model predictive control for robotic manipulation,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[121] G. Lu, S. Zhang, Z. Wang, C. Liu, J. Lu, and Y. Tang, “Manigaussian: Dynamic gaussian splatting for multi-task robotic manipulation,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 349–366.

[122] A. Kirillov, E. Mintun, N. Ravi, H. Mao, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, T. Xiao, S. Whitehead, A. C. Berg, W.-Y. Lo *et al.*, “Segment anything,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2023, pp. 4015–4026.

[123] J. Gao, Z. Tao, N. Jaquier, and T. Asfour, “K-vil: Keypoints-based visual imitation learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 3888–3908, 2023.

[124] L. X. Shi, A. Sharma, T. Z. Zhao, and C. Finn, “Waypoint-based imitation learning for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 2195–2209.

[125] H. Bharadhwaj, R. Mottaghi, A. Gupta, and S. Tulsiani, “Track2act: Predicting point tracks from internet videos enables generalizable robot manipulation,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 306–324.

[126] M. Xu, Z. Xu, Y. Xu, C. Chi, G. Wetzstein, M. Veloso, and S. Song, “Flow as the cross-domain manipulation interface,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 2475–2499.

[127] Z. Jia, V. Thumuluri, F. Liu, L. Chen, Z. Huang, and H. Su, “Chain-of-thought predictive control,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 21768–21790.

[128] S. Nair, A. Rajeswaran, V. Kumar, C. Finn, and A. Gupta, “R3m: A universal visual representation for robot manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 892–909.

[129] T. Xiao, I. Radosavovic, T. Darrell, and J. Malik, “Masked visual pre-training for motor control,” *arXiv:2203.06173*, 2022.

[130] Y. Ze, G. Yan, Y.-H. Wu, A. Macaluso, Y. Ge, J. Ye, N. Hansen, L. E. Li, and X. Wang, “Gnfactor: Multi-task real robot learning with generalizable neural feature fields,” in *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 284–301.

[131] C. Chi, Z. Xu, S. Feng, E. Cousineau, Y. Du, B. Burchfiel, R. Tedrake, and S. Song, “Diffusion policy: Visuomotor policy learning via action diffusion,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, p. 02783649241273668, 2023.

[132] Y. Jing, X. Zhu, X. Liu, Q. Sima, T. Yang, Y. Feng, and T. Kong, “Exploring visual pre-training for robot manipulation: Datasets, models and methods,” in *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 11390–11395.

[133] L. Wang, X. Chen, J. Zhao, and K. He, “Scaling proprioceptive-visual learning with heterogeneous pre-trained transformers,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 37, 2024, pp. 124420–124450.

[134] X. Li, V. Belagali, J. Shang, and M. S. Ryoo, “Crossway diffusion: Improving diffusion-based visuomotor policy via self-supervised learning,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 16841–16849.

[135] A. Prasad, K. Lin, J. Wu, L. Zhou, and J. Bohg, “Consistency policy: Accelerated visuomotor policies via consistency distillation,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[136] D. Wang, C. Liu, F. Chang, and Y. Xu, “Hierarchical diffusion policy: manipulation trajectory generation via contact guidance,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 2025.

[137] A. Goyal, J. Xu, Y. Guo, V. Blukis, Y.-W. Chao, and D. Fox, “Rvt: Robotic view transformer for 3d object manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 694–710.

[138] A. Goyal, V. Blukis, J. Xu, Y. Guo, Y.-W. Chao, and D. Fox, “Rvt-2: Learning precise manipulation from few demonstrations,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[139] Y. Wang, G. Yin, B. Huang, T. Kelestemur, J. Wang, and Y. Li, “Gendp: 3d semantic fields for category-level generalizable diffusion policy,” in *8th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, vol. 2, 2024.

[140] Y. Ze, G. Zhang, K. Zhang, C. Hu, M. Wang, and H. Xu, “3d diffusion policy: Generalizable visuomotor policy learning via simple 3d representations,” 2024.

[141] S. Noh, D. Nam, K. Kim, G. Lee, Y. Yu, R. Kang, and K. Lee, “3d flow diffusion policy: Visuomotor policy learning via generating flow in 3d space,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.18676*, 2025.

[142] T.-W. Ke, N. Gkanatsios, and K. Fragkiadaki, “3d diffuser actor: Policy diffusion with 3d scene representations,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 1949–1974.

[143] A. Brohan, N. Brown, J. Carbajal, Y. Chebotar, J. Dabis, C. Finn, K. Gopalakrishnan, K. Hausman, A. Herzog, J. Hsu *et al.*, “Rt-1: Robotics transformer for real-world control at scale,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2023.

[144] D. Ghosh, H. R. Walke, K. Pertsch, K. Black, O. Mees, S. Dasari, J. Hejna, T. Kreiman, C. Xu, J. Luo *et al.*, “Octo: An open-source generalist robot policy,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[145] Y. Jiang, A. Gupta, Z. Zhang, G. Wang, Y. Dou, Y. Chen, L. Fei-Fei, A. Anandkumar, Y. Zhu, and L. Fan, “Vima: General robot manipulation with multimodal prompts,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.

[146] O. Mees, L. Hermann, and W. Burgard, “What matters in language conditioned robotic imitation learning over unstructured data,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 11205–11212, 2022.

[147] S. Wang, S. Liu, W. Wang, J. Shan, and B. Fang, “Roborobert: An end-to-end multimodal robotic manipulation model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.07837*, 2025.

[148] Z. Hou, T. Zhang, Y. Xiong, H. Duan, H. Pu, R. Tong, C. Zhao, X. Zhu, Y. Qiao, J. Dai *et al.*, “Dita: Scaling diffusion transformer for generalist vision-language-action policy,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2025.

[149] H. Huang, F. Liu, L. Fu, T. Wu, M. Mukadam, J. Malik, K. Goldberg, and P. Abbeel, “Otter: A vision-language-action model with text-aware visual feature extraction,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.

[150] H. Huang, X. Chen, Y. Chen, H. Li, X. Han, Z. Wang, T. Wang, J. Pang, and Z. Zhao, “Roboground: Robotic manipulation with grounded vision-language priors,” in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 22540–22550.

[151] S. Haldar, Z. Peng, and L. Pinto, “Baku: An efficient transformer for multi-task policy learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 141208–141239, 2024.

[152] M. Reuss, Ö. E. Yağmurlu, F. Wenzel, and R. Lioutikov, “Multimodal diffusion transformer: Learning versatile behavior from multimodal goals,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[153] H. Wu, Y. Jing, C. Cheang, G. Chen, J. Xu, X. Li, M. Liu, H. Li, and T. Kong, “Unleashing large-scale video generative pre-training for visual robot manipulation,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

[154] X. Li, M. Liu, H. Zhang, C. Yu, J. Xu, H. Wu, C. Cheang, Y. Jing, W. Zhang, H. Liu *et al.*, “Vision-language foundation models as effective robot imitators,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

[155] M. J. Kim, C. Finn, and P. Liang, “Fine-tuning vision-language-action models: Optimizing speed and success,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[156] P. Intelligence, K. Black, N. Brown, J. Darpinian, K. Dhabalnia, D. Driess, A. Esmail, M. Equi, C. Finn, N. Fusai *et al.*, “\(\pi\_{\{0.5\}}\): a vision-language-action model with open-world generalization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.16054*, 2025.

[157] Q. Bu, Y. Yang, J. Cai, S. Gao, G. Ren, M. Yao, P. Luo, and H. Li, “Univla: Learning to act anywhere with task-centric latent actions,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[158] J. Wen, Y. Zhu, J. Li, Z. Tang, C. Shen, and F. Feng, “Dexvla: Vision-language model with plug-in diffusion expert for general robot control,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2025.

[159] Q. Zhao, Y. Lu, M. J. Kim, Z. Fu, Z. Zhang, Y. Wu, Z. Li, Q. Ma, S. Han, C. Finn *et al.*, “Cot-vla: Visual chain-of-thought reasoning for vision-language-action models,” in *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025, pp. 1702–1713.

[160] J. Wen, M. Zhu, Y. Zhu, Z. Tang, J. Li, Z. Zhou, C. Li, X. Liu, Y. Peng, C. Shen *et al.*, “Diffusion-vla: Generalizable and interpretable robot foundation model via self-generated reasoning,” 2025.

[161] Z. Liang, Y. Li, T. Yang, C. Wu, S. Mao, T. Nian, L. Pei, S. Zhou, X. Yang, J. Pang *et al.*, “Discrete diffusion vla: Bringing discrete diffusion to action decoding in vision-language-action policies,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20072*, 2025.

[162] J. Chen, W. Song, P. Ding, Z. Zhou, H. Zhao, F. Tang, D. Wang, and H. Li, “Unified diffusion vla: Vision-language-action model via joint discrete denoising diffusion process,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.01718*, 2025.

[163] Q. Bu, J. Cai, L. Chen, X. Cui, Y. Ding, S. Feng, S. Gao, X. He, X. Hu, X. Huang *et al.*, “Agibot world colosseo: A large-scale manipulation platform for scalable and intelligent embodied systems,” in *2025 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2025.

[164] X. Chen, H. Wei, P. Zhang, C. Zhang, K. Wang, Y. Guo, R. Yang, Y. Wang, X. Xiao, L. Zhao *et al.*, “Villa-x: enhancing latent action modeling in vision-language-action models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.23682*, 2025.

[165] Y. Wang, H. Zhu, M. Liu, J. Yang, H.-S. Fang, and T. He, “Vq-vla: Improving vision-language-action models via scaling vector-quantized action tokenizers,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2025.

[166] S. Belkhale and D. Sadigh, “Minivla: A better vla with a smaller footprint,” 2024.

[167] K. Pertsch, K. Stachowicz, B. Ichter, D. Driess, S. Nair, Q. Vuong, O. Mees, C. Finn, and S. Levine, “Fast: Efficient action tokenization for vision-language-action models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09747*, 2025.

[168] Y. Shentu, P. Wu, A. Rajeswaran, and P. Abbeel, “From llms to actions: Latent codes as bridges in hierarchical robot control,” in *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 8539–8546.

[169] K. Zhang, P. Ren, B. Lin, J. Lin, S. Ma, H. Xu, and X. Liang, “Pivot-r: Primitive-driven waypoint-aware world model for robotic manipulation,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 54105–54136, 2024.

[170] S. Belkhale, T. Ding, T. Xiao, P. Sermanet, Q. Vuong, J. Tompson, Y. Chebotar, D. Dwibedi, and D. Sadigh, “Rt-h: Action hierarchies using language,” *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2024.

[171] Q. Bu, H. Li, L. Chen, J. Cai, J. Zeng, H. Cui, M. Yao, and Y. Qiao, “Towards synergistic, generalized, and efficient dual-system for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08001*, 2024.

[172] J. Zhang, Y. Guo, X. Chen, Y.-J. Wang, Y. Hu, C. Shi, and J. Chen, “Hirt: Enhancing robotic control with hierarchical robot transformers,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 933–946.

[173] W. Song, J. Chen, W. Li, X. He, H. Zhao, C. Cui, P. D. S. Su, F. Tang, X. Cheng, D. Wang *et al.*, “Rationalvla: A rational vision-language-action model with dual system,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.10826*, 2025.

[174] Z. Liu, Y. Gu, S. Zheng, X. Xue, and Y. Fu, “Trivla: A unified triple-system-based unified vision-language-action model for general robot control,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2025.

[175] T. Jiang, T. Yuan, Y. Liu, C. Lu, J. Cui, X. Liu, S. Cheng, J. Gao, H. Xu, and H. Zhao, “Galaxea open-world dataset and g0 dual-system vla model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.00576*, 2025.

[176] C. Cui, P. Ding, W. Song, S. Bai, X. Tong, Z. Ge, R. Suo, W. Zhou, Y. Liu, B. Jia *et al.*, “Openhelix: A short survey, empirical analysis, and open-source dual-system vla model for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.03912*, 2025.

[177] L. X. Shi, B. Ichter, M. Equi, L. Ke, K. Pertsch, Q. Vuong, J. Tanner, A. Walling, H. Wang, N. Fusai *et al.*, “Hi robot: Open-ended instruction following with hierarchical vision-language-action models,” 2025.

[178] J. Bjorck, F. Castañeda, N. Cherniadev, X. Da, R. Ding, L. Fan, Y. Fang, D. Fox, F. Hu, S. Huang *et al.*, “Gr0ot n1: An open foundation model for generalist humanoid robots,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.14734*, 2025.

[179] J. Kwok, C. Agia, R. Sinha, M. Foutter, S. Li, I. Stoica, A. Mirhoseini, and M. Pavone, “Robomonkey: Scaling test-time sampling and verification for vision-language-action models,” in *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2025.

[180] H. Li, S. Yang, Y. Chen, Y. Tian, X. Yang, X. Chen, H. Wang, T. Wang, F. Zhao, D. Lin *et al.*, “Cronusvla: Transferring latent motion across

time for multi-frame prediction in manipulation,” in *The 40th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2026.

[181] T. Zhang, H. Duan, H. Hao, Y. Qiao, J. Dai, and Z. Hou, “Grounding actions in camera space: Observation-centric vision-language-action policy,” in *The 40th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2026.

[182] W. Song, J. Chen, P. Ding, H. Zhao, W. Zhao, Z. Zhong, Z. Ge, J. Ma, and H. Li, “Accelerating vision-language-action model integrated with action chunking via parallel decoding,” in *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2025.

[183] W. Song, J. Chen, P. Ding, Y. Huang, H. Zhao, D. Wang, and H. Li, “Ceed-vla: Consistency vision-language-action model with early-exit decoding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13725*, 2025.

[184] C.-P. Huang, Y.-H. Wu, M.-H. Chen, Y.-C. F. Wang, and F.-E. Yang, “Thinkact: Vision-language-action reasoning via reinforced visual latent planning,” 2025.

[185] D. Huang, Z. Fang, T. Zhang, Y. Li, L. Zhao, and C. Xia, “Co-rft: Efficient fine-tuning of vision-language-action models through chunked offline reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02219*, 2025.

[186] Y. Chen and X. Li, “Rlrc: Reinforcement learning-based recovery for compressed vision-language-action models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.17639*, 2025.

[187] A. Amin, R. Aniceto, A. Balakrishna, K. Black, K. Conley, G. Connors, J. Darpinian, K. Dhabalia, J. DiCarlo, D. Driess *et al.*, “pi0.6: a vla that learns from experience,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.14759*, 2025.

[188] M. Zawalski, W. Chen, K. Pertsch, O. Mees, C. Finn, and S. Levine, “Robotic control via embodied chain-of-thought reasoning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 3157–3181.

[189] R. Zheng, Y. Liang, S. Huang, J. Gao, H. Daumé III, A. Kolobov, F. Huang, and J. Yang, “Tracevla: Visual trace prompting enhances spatial-temporal awareness for generalist robotic policies,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.

[190] Y. Tian, S. Yang, J. Zeng, P. Wang, D. Lin, H. Dong, and J. Pang, “Predictive inverse dynamics models are scalable learners for robotic manipulation,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.

[191] W. Song, Z. Zhou, H. Zhao, J. Chen, P. Ding, H. Yan, Y. Huang, F. Tang, D. Wang, and H. Li, “Reconvla: Reconstructive vision-language-action model as effective robot perceiver,” in *The 40th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2026.

[192] Z. Zhong, H. Yan, J. Li, X. Liu, X. Gong, W. Song, J. Chen, and H. Li, “Flowvla: Thinking in motion with a visual chain of thought,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18269*, 2025.

[193] S. Deng, M. Yan, S. Wei, H. Ma, Y. Yang, J. Chen, Z. Zhang, T. Yang, X. Zhang, W. Zhang *et al.*, “Graspvla: a grasping foundation model pre-trained on billion-scale synthetic action data,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2025.

[194] J. Zhang, Y. Guo, Y. Hu, X. Chen, X. Zhu, and J. Chen, “Up-vla: A unified understanding and prediction model for embodied agent,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.

[195] D. Niu, Y. Sharma, G. Biamby, J. Quenum, Y. Bai, B. Shi, T. Darrell, and R. Herzig, “LLARVA: Vision-action instruction tuning enhances robot learning,” in *8th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2024.

[196] J. Lee, J. Duan, H. Fang, Y. Deng, S. Liu, B. Li, B. Fang, J. Zhang, Y. R. Wang, S. Lee *et al.*, “Molmoact: Action reasoning models that can reason in space,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.07917*, 2025.

[197] H. Zhao, J. Zhang, W. Song, P. Ding, and D. Wang, “Vla<sup>2</sup>: Empowering vision-language-action models with an agentic framework for unseen concept manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.14902*, 2025.

[198] M. Lin, P. Ding, S. Wang, Z. Zhuang, Y. Liu, X. Tong, W. Song, S. Lyu, S. Huang, and D. Wang, “Hif-vla: Hindsight, insight and foresight through motion representation for vision-language-action models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.09928*, 2025.

[199] Y. Wang, P. Ding, L. Li, C. Cui, Z. Ge, X. Tong, W. Song, H. Zhao, W. Zhao, P. Hou, S. Huang, Y. Tang, W. Wang, R. Zhang, J. Liu, and D. Wang, “Vla-adapter: An effective paradigm for tiny-scale vision-language-action model,” in *The 40th Annual AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2026.

[200] J. Wen, Y. Zhu, J. Li, M. Zhu, Z. Tang, K. Wu, Z. Xu, N. Liu, R. Cheng, C. Shen *et al.*, “Tinyvla: Towards fast, data-efficient vision-language-action models for robotic manipulation,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2025.

[201] Y. Yang, Y. Wang, Z. Wen, L. Zhongwei, C. Zou, Z. Zhang, C. Wen, and L. Zhang, “Efficientvla: Training-free acceleration and compression for vision-language-action models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.

[202] S. Xu, Y. Wang, C. Xia, D. Zhu, T. Huang, and C. Xu, “Vla-cache: Towards efficient vision-language-action model via adaptive token caching in robotic manipulation,” 2025.

[203] Q. Gu, Y. Ju, S. Sun, I. Gilitschenski, H. Nishimura, M. Itkina, and F. Shkurti, “Safe: Multitask failure detection for vision-language-action models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.09937*, 2025.

[204] X. Zhou, G. Tie, G. Zhang, H. Wang, P. Zhou, and L. Sun, “Badvla: Towards backdoor attacks on vision-language-action models via objective-decoupled optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16640*, 2025.

[205] C. Xu, T. K. Nguyen, E. Dixon, C. Rodriguez, P. Miller, R. Lee, P. Shah, R. Ambrus, H. Nishimura, and M. Itkina, “Can we detect failures without failure data? uncertainty-aware runtime failure detection for imitation learning policies,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[206] Y. Fan, P. Ding, S. Bai, X. Tong, Y. Zhu, H. Lu, F. Dai, W. Zhao, Y. Liu, S. Huang *et al.*, “Long-vla: Unleashing long-horizon capability of vision language action model for robot manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2025.

[207] D. Qu, H. Song, Q. Chen, D. Wang, Y. Yao, X. Ye, Y. Ding, Z. W. J. Gu, B. Zhao, and X. Li, “Spatialvla: Exploring spatial representations for visual-language-action model,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[208] F. Li, W. Song, H. Zhao, J. Wang, P. Ding, D. Wang, L. Zeng, and H. Li, “Spatial forcing: Implicit spatial representation alignment for vision-language-action model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.12276*, 2025.

[209] L. Sun, B. Xie, Y. Liu, H. Shi, T. Wang, and J. Cao, “Geovla: Empowering 3d representations in vision-language-action models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.09071*, 2025.

[210] R. Yang, G. Chen, C. Wen, and Y. Gao, “Fp3: A 3d foundation policy for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08950*, 2025.

[211] F. Yan, F. Liu, L. Zheng, Y. Zhong, Y. Huang, Z. Guan, C. Feng, and L. Ma, “Robomm: All-in-one multimodal large model for robotic manipulation,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2025.

[212] P. Li, Y. Chen, H. Wu, X. Ma, X. Wu, Y. Huang, L. Wang, T. Kong, and T. Tan, “Bridgevla: Input-output alignment for efficient 3d manipulation learning with vision-language models,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025.

[213] Y. Bai, Z. Wang, Y. Liu, W. Chen, Z. Chen, M. Dai, Y. Zheng, L. Liu, G. Li, and L. Lin, “Learning to see and act: Task-aware view planning for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05186*, 2025.

[214] T. Lin, G. Li, Y. Zhong, Y. Zou, and B. Zhao, “Evo-0: Vision-language-action model with implicit spatial understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.00416*, 2025.

[215] Z. Xian and N. Gkanatsios, “Chaineddiffuser: Unifying trajectory diffusion and keypose prediction for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning/Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2023.

[216] T. Zhang, Y. Hu, H. Cui, H. Zhao, and Y. Gao, “A universal semantic-geometric representation for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 3342–3363.

[217] H. Li, Y. Zuo, J. Yu, Y. Zhang, Z. Yang, K. Zhang, X. Zhu, Y. Zhang, T. Chen, G. Cui *et al.*, “Simplevla-rl: Scaling vla training via reinforcement learning,” 2025.

[218] H. Zhen, X. Qiu, P. Chen, J. Yang, X. Yan, Y. Du, Y. Hong, and C. Gan, “3d-vla: a 3d vision-language-action generative world model,” in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024, pp. 61229–61245.

[219] W. Ma, X. Cao, Y. Zhang, C. Zhang, S. Yang, P. Hao, B. Fang, Y. Cai, S. Cui, and S. Wang, “Cltp: Contrastive language-tactile pre-training for 3d contact geometry understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08194*, 2025.

[220] C. Higuera, A. Sharma, C. K. Bodduluri, T. Fan, P. Lancaster, M. Kalakrishnan, M. Kaess, B. Boots, M. Lambeta, T. Wu *et al.*, “Sparsh: Self-supervised touch representations for vision-based tactile sensing,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 885–915.

[221] A. Adeniji, Z. Chen, V. Liu, V. Pattabiraman, R. Bhirangi, S. Haldar, P. Abbeel, and L. Pinto, “Feel the force: Contact-driven learning from humans,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01944*, 2025.

[222] W. Yang, A. Angleraud, R. S. Pieters, J. Pajarin, and J.-K. Kämäräinen, “Seq2seq imitation learning for tactile feedback-based manipulation,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 5829–5836.

[223] B. Ai, S. Tian, H. Shi, Y. Wang, C. Tan, Y. Li, and J. Wu, “Robopack: Learning tactile-informed dynamics models for dense packing,” *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[224] K. Yu, Y. Han, Q. Wang, V. Saxena, D. Xu, and Y. Zhao, “Mimictouch: Leveraging multi-modal human tactile demonstrations for contact-rich manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 4844–4865.

[225] I. Guzey, B. Evans, S. Chintala, and L. Pinto, “Dexterity from touch: Self-supervised pre-training of tactile representations with robotic play,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 3142–3166.

[226] H. Qi, B. Yi, S. Suresh, M. Lambeta, Y. Ma, R. Calandra, and J. Malik, “General in-hand object rotation with vision and touch,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 2549–2564.

[227] T. Ablett, O. Limoyo, A. Sigal, A. Jilani, J. Kelly, K. Siddiqi, F. Hogan, and G. Dudek, “Multimodal and force-matched imitation learning with a see-through visuotactile sensor,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 2024.

[228] Y. Gu and Y. Demiris, “Vttb: A visuo-tactile learning approach for robot-assisted bed bathing,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 5751–5758, 2024.

[229] A. George, S. Gano, P. Katragadda, and A. B. Farimani, “Vital pretraining: Visuo-tactile pretraining for tactile and non-tactile manipulation policies,” in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 258–264.

[230] H. Xue, J. Ren, W. Chen, G. Zhang, Y. Fang, G. Gu, H. Xu, and C. Lu, “Reactive diffusion policy: Slow-fast visual-tactile policy learning for contact-rich manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.02881*, 2025.

[231] P. Hao, C. Zhang, D. Li, X. Cao, X. Hao, S. Cui, and S. Wang, “Tla: Tactile-language-action model for contact-rich manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08548*, 2025.

[232] S. Yu, K. Lin, A. Xiao, J. Duan, and H. Soh, “Octopi: Object property reasoning with large tactile-language models,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[233] J. Huang, S. Wang, F. Lin, Y. Hu, C. Wen, and Y. Gao, “Tactile-vla: Unlocking vision-language-action model’s physical knowledge for tactile generalization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09160*, 2025.

[234] C. Zhang, P. Hao, X. Cao, X. Hao, S. Cui, and S. Wang, “Vtla: Vision-tactile-language-action model with preference learning for insertion manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09577*, 2025.

[235] Z. Zhao, S. Haldar, J. Cui, L. Pinto, and R. Bhirangi, “Touch begins where vision ends: Generalizable policies for contact-rich manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13762*, 2025.

[236] M. Edmonds, F. Gao, X. Xie, H. Liu, S. Qi, Y. Zhu, B. Rothrock, and S.-C. Zhu, “Feeling the force: Integrating force and pose for fluent discovery through imitation learning to open medicine bottles,” in *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 3530–3537.

[237] P. Kormushev, S. Calinon, and D. G. Caldwell, “Imitation learning of positional and force skills demonstrated via kinesthetic teaching and haptic input,” *Advanced Robotics*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 581–603, 2011.

[238] T. Adachi, K. Fujimoto, S. Sakaino, and T. Tsuji, “Imitation learning for object manipulation based on position/force information using bilateral control,” in *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 3648–3653.

[239] Z. He, H. Fang, J. Chen, H.-S. Fang, and C. Lu, “Foar: Force-aware reactive policy for contact-rich robotic manipulation,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2025.

[240] J. Yu, H. Liu, Q. Yu, J. Ren, C. Hao, H. Ding, G. Huang, G. Huang, Y. Song, P. Cai *et al.*, “Forcevla: Enhancing vla models with a force-aware moe for contact-rich manipulation,” 2025.

[241] M. Du, O. Y. Lee, S. Nair, and C. Finn, “Play it by ear: Learning skills amidst occlusion through audio-visual imitation learning,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2022.

[242] H. Li, Y. Zhang, J. Zhu, S. Wang, M. A. Lee, H. Xu, E. Adelson, L. Fei-Fei, R. Gao, and J. Wu, “See, hear, and feel: Smart sensory fusion for robotic manipulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 1368–1378.

[243] Z. Liu, C. Chi, E. Cousineau, N. Kuppuswamy, B. Burchfiel, and S. Song, “Maniwav: Learning robot manipulation from in-the-wild audio-visual data,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 947–962.

[244] K. He, X. Chen, S. Xie, Y. Li, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick, “Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 16 000–16 009.

[245] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.

[246] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, “Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database,” in *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. Ieee, 2009, pp. 248–255.

[247] K. Grauman, A. Westbury, E. Byrne, Z. Chavis, A. Furnari, R. Girdhar, J. Hamburger, H. Jiang, M. Liu, X. Liu *et al.*, “Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 18 995–19 012.

[248] H. R. Walke, K. Black, T. Z. Zhao, Q. Vuong, C. Zheng, P. Hansen-Estruch, A. W. He, V. Myers, M. J. Kim, M. Du *et al.*, “Bridgedata v2: A dataset for robot learning at scale,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 1723–1736.

[249] S. Parisi, A. Rajeswaran, S. Purushwalkam, and A. Gupta, “The unsurprising effectiveness of pre-trained vision models for control,” in *international conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 17 359–17 371.

[250] J. Shang, K. Schmeckpeper, B. B. May, M. V. Minniti, T. Kelestemur, D. Watkins, and L. Herlant, “Theia: Distilling diverse vision foundation models for robot learning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 724–748.

[251] A. Majumdar, K. Yadav, S. Arnaud, J. Ma, C. Chen, S. Silwal, A. Jain, V.-P. Berges, T. Wu, J. Vakil *et al.*, “Where are we in the search for an artificial visual cortex for embodied intelligence?” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2023, pp. 655–677.

[252] S. Karamchetti, S. Nair, A. S. Chen, T. Kollar, C. Finn, D. Sadigh, and P. Liang, “Language-driven representation learning for robotics,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2023.

[253] M. K. Srirama, S. Dasari, S. Bahl, and A. Gupta, “Hrp: Human affordances for robotic pre-training,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

[254] I. Radosavovic, T. Xiao, S. James, P. Abbeel, J. Malik, and T. Darrell, “Real-world robot learning with masked visual pre-training,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 416–426.

[255] R. Zheng, Y. Liang, X. Wang, S. Ma, H. Daumé III, H. Xu, J. Langford, P. Palanisamy, K. S. Basu, and F. Huang, “Premier-taco: Pretraining multitask representation via temporal action-driven contrastive loss,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.

[256] G. Jiang, Y. Sun, T. Huang, H. Li, Y. Liang, and H. Xu, “Robots pre-train robots: Manipulation-centric robotic representation from large-scale robot datasets,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.

[257] A. Edwards, H. Sahni, Y. Schroecker, and C. Isbell, “Imitating latent policies from observation,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 1755–1763.

[258] D. Schmidt and M. Jiang, “Learning to act without actions,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

[259] S. Lee, Y. Wang, H. Etukuru, H. J. Kim, N. M. M. Shafullah, and L. Pinto, “Behavior generation with latent actions,” in *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024, pp. 26 991–27 008.

[260] K. Wu, Y. Zhu, J. Li, J. Wen, N. Liu, Z. Xu, and J. Tang, “Discrete policy: Learning disentangled action space for multi-task robotic manipulation,” in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 8811–8818.

[261] H. Li, Q. Lv, R. Shao, X. Deng, Y. Li, J. HAO, and L. Nie, “Star: Learning diverse robot skill abstractions through rotation-augmented vector quantization,” in *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.

[262] S. Ye, J. Jang, B. Jeon, S. J. Joo, J. Yang, B. Peng, A. Mandlekar, R. Tan, Y.-W. Chao, B. Y. Lin *et al.*, “Latent action pretraining from videos,” in *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

[263] J. Jang, S. Ye, Z. Lin, J. Xiang, J. Bjorck, Y. Fang, F. Hu, S. Huang, K. Kundalia, Y.-C. Lin *et al.*, “Dreamgen: Unlocking generalization in robot learning through video world models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.12705*, 2025.

[264] C. Wang, L. Fan, J. Sun, R. Zhang, L. Fei-Fei, D. Xu, Y. Zhu, and A. Anandkumar, “Mimicplay: Long-horizon imitation learning by watching human play,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 201–221.

[265] A. Liang, P. Czempin, M. Hong, Y. Zhou, E. Biyik, and S. Tu, “Clam: Continuous latent action models for robot learning from unlabeled demonstrations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.04999*, 2025.

[266] K. Jiang, Z. Fu, J. Guo, W. Zhang, and H. Chen, “Learning whole-body loco-manipulation for omni-directional task space pose tracking with a wheeled-quadrupedal-manipulator,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024.

[267] Y. Hu, Y. Guo, P. Wang, X. Chen, Y.-J. Wang, J. Zhang, K. Sreenath, C. Lu, and J. Chen, “Video prediction policy: A generalist robot policy with predictive visual representations,” in *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.

[268] R. Zheng, J. Wang, S. Reed, J. Bjorck, Y. Fang, F. Hu, J. Jang, K. Kundalia, Z. Lin, L. Magne *et al.*, “Flare: Robot learning with implicit world modeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15659*, 2025.

[269] Y. Liao, P. Zhou, S. Huang, D. Yang, S. Chen, Y. Jiang, Y. Hu, J. Cai, S. Liu, J. Luo *et al.*, “Genie envisioner: A unified world foundation platform for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05635*, 2025.

[270] E. Bauer, E. Nava, and R. K. Katzschmann, “Latent action diffusion for cross-embodiment manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.14608*, 2025.

[271] J. Bi, K. Lim, K. Chen, Y. Huang, and H. Soh, “Imitation learning with limited actions via diffusion planners and deep koopman controllers,” in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 4861–4868.

[272] Y. Huang, J. Zhang, S. Zou, X. Liu, R. Hu, and K. Xu, “Ladi-wm: A latent diffusion-based world model for predictive manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.11528*, 2025.

[273] Y. Han, M. Xie, Y. Zhao, and H. Ravichandar, “On the utility of koopman operator theory in learning dexterous manipulation skills,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 106–126.

[274] H. Chen, A. Abduweili, A. Agrawal, Y. Han, H. Ravichandar, C. Liu, and J. Ichnowski, “Korol: Learning visualizable object feature with koopman operator rollout for manipulation,” in *CoRL*, 2024.

[275] M. S. Yang, D. Schuurmans, P. Abbeel, and O. Nachum, “Chain of thought imitation with procedure cloning,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, 2022, pp. 36366–36381.

[276] T. Z. Zhao, V. Kumar, S. Levine, and C. Finn, “Learning fine-grained bimanual manipulation with low-cost hardware,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13705*, 2023.

[277] H. Bharadhwaj, J. Vakil, M. Sharma, A. Gupta, S. Tulsiani, and V. Kumar, “Roboagent: Generalization and efficiency in robot manipulation via semantic augmentations and action chunking,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 4788–4795.

[278] L. Fu, H. Huang, G. Datta, L. Y. Chen, W. C.-H. Panitch, F. Liu, H. Li, and K. Goldberg, “In-context imitation learning via next-token prediction,” in *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2025.

[279] Z. Gong, P. Ding, S. Lyu, S. Huang, M. Sun, W. Zhao, Z. Fan, and D. Wang, “Carp: Visuomotor policy learning via coarse-to-fine autoregressive prediction,” in *International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2025.

[280] Y. Wang, Y. Zhang, M. Huo, T. Tian, X. Zhang, Y. Xie, C. Xu, P. Ji, W. Zhan, M. Ding *et al.*, “Sparse diffusion policy: A sparse, reusable, and flexible policy for robot learning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 649–665.

[281] J. Yang, Z. Cao, C. Deng, R. Antonova, S. Song, and J. Bohg, “Equibot: Sim (3)-equivariant diffusion policy for generalizable and data efficient learning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2025, pp. 1048–1068.

[282] C. Zhu, R. Yu, S. Feng, B. Burchfiel, P. Shah, and A. Gupta, “Unified world models: Coupling video and action diffusion for pretraining on large robotic datasets,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2025.

[283] F. Zhang and M. Gienger, “Affordance-based robot manipulation with flow matching,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.01083*, 2024.

[284] K. Black, M. Y. Galliker, and S. Levine, “Real-time execution of action chunking flow policies,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07339*, 2025.

[285] X. Jia, Q. Wang, A. Donat, B. Xing, G. Li, H. Zhou, O. Celik, D. Blessing, R. Lioutikov, and G. Neumann, “Mail: Improving imitation learning with mamba,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08234*, 2024.

[286] Y. Zhong, Y. Liu, C. Xiao, Z. Yang, Y. Wang, Y. Zhu, Y. Shi, Y. Sun, X. Zhu, and Y. Ma, “Freqpolicy: Frequency autoregressive visuomotor policy with continuous tokens,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01583*, 2025.