

Structure-Preserving Learning Using Gaussian Processes and Variational Integrators

Jan Brüdigam

JAN.BRUEDIGAM@TUM.DE

Martin Schuck

MARTIN.SCHUCK@TUM.DE

Alexandre Capone

ALEXANDRE.CAPONE@TUM.DE

Stefan Sosnowski

SOSNOWSKI@TUM.DE

Sandra Hirche

HIRCHE@TUM.DE

*Chair of Information-oriented Control
Technical University of Munich, Germany*

Abstract

Gaussian process regression is often applied for learning unknown systems and specifying the uncertainty of the learned model. When using Gaussian process regression to learn unknown systems, a commonly considered approach consists of learning the residual dynamics after applying some standard discretization, which might however not be appropriate for the system at hand. Variational integrators are a less common yet promising approach to discretization, as they retain physical properties of the underlying system, such as energy conservation or satisfaction of explicit constraints. In this work, we propose the combination of a variational integrator for the nominal dynamics of a mechanical system and learning residual dynamics with Gaussian process regression. We extend our approach to systems with known kinematic constraints and provide formal bounds on the prediction uncertainty. The simulative evaluation of the proposed method shows desirable energy conservation properties in accordance with the theoretical results and demonstrates the capability of treating constrained dynamical systems.

Keywords: Gaussian process, regression, variational integrator, dynamical system, constraint

1. Introduction

Control of complex mechanical systems such as robots typically requires good knowledge of the system dynamics to achieve satisfactory control behaviour. In this regard, learning-based approaches have become increasingly promising, as they can accurately model additional influences on top of the nominal dynamics, such as friction or external forces. One learning-based method for such scenarios is Gaussian process regression, which allows for efficient generalization from only few training samples (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). In addition, uncertainty bounds for the learned dynamics can be given, rendering the regression useful for safety-critical control applications, as shown in, for example, Umlauf et al. (2017) and Capone and Hirche (2019).

While much attention has been devoted to the theoretical properties of GP regression, the appropriate discretization of continuous-time systems in combination with GPs for actual use on computers has found little attention. Marsden and West (2001) proposed variational (symplectic) integrators as generally suitable discretization methods for mechanical systems, as they retain certain structural properties, such as energy or momentum conservation, and constraint satisfaction. Vari-

ational integrators are obtained by discretizing the derivation of the equations of motion instead of just discretizing the resulting continuous-time differential equations with standard methods, such as explicit Runge-Kutta integrators.

Therefore, our contribution in this paper is the combination of nominal model dynamics that have been discretized with a variational integrator and Gaussian process regression to include initially unknown dynamics information. In this way, we retain physical properties of the known system dynamics and augment them by the learned residual dynamics. This concept is also extended to learning system dynamics with known explicit kinematic constraints—for which variational integrators are particularly well suited—since parametrization retaining explicit kinematic constraints of mechanical systems, namely maximal-coordinate descriptions, have demonstrated numerical and control-theoretical advantages, as described in [Brüdigam and Manchester \(2021\)](#) and [Brüdigam et al. \(2021\)](#). In addition, formal uncertainty bounds for learning unconstrained and constrained dynamical systems in combination with variational integrators are provided. Since the theoretical and numerical properties of variational integrators have been investigated thoroughly in [Marsden and West \(2001\)](#), [Junge et al. \(2005\)](#), and [Wenger et al. \(2017\)](#), among others, we give a brief examples of energy conservation and constraint satisfaction and focus the evaluation on the comparison of different coordinate descriptions. Hence, we compare several mechanical systems in minimal and maximal coordinates to demonstrate the applicability of the approach to treating kinematic constraints.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: in [Sec. 2](#) we summarize the key concepts of Gaussian process regression and variational integrators and list related work. [Section 3](#) derives the integrators for unconstrained and constrained dynamical systems in combination with Gaussian process regression, which are then evaluated and discussed in [Sec. 4](#). Finally, we present our conclusions in [Sec. 5](#).

2. Background

We briefly revisit the relevant concepts of Gaussian process regression and describe a first-order variational integrator. A more thorough treatment of Gaussian processes and variational integrators can be found in [Rasmussen and Williams \(2006\)](#) and [Marsden and West \(2001\)](#), respectively. We conclude this section with a review of selected related literature.

2.1. Gaussian Process Regression

We employ a Gaussian process (GP) to model a function $f(\cdot)$. A GP is a collection of random variables, of which any finite subset is jointly normally distributed. As such, GPs generalize the notion of Gaussian distributions to infinite-dimensional vectors. A GP, denoted $f(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(m(\cdot), k(\cdot, \cdot))$, is fully specified by its mean function $m(\cdot)$ and covariance function $k(\cdot, \cdot)$.

By conditioning a GP on measurement data pairs $(z_i, f(z_i))_{i=1\dots N} =: (\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{y})$, with $\mathbf{Z} = (z_i)_{i=1\dots N}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (f(z_i))_{i=1\dots N}$, we can model an unknown function $f(\cdot)$. The resulting posterior mean and variance are then given by

$$\mu(\mathbf{z}) = \bar{m}(\mathbf{z}) + \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z})\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z})^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{Z})), \quad (1a)$$

$$\sigma^2(\mathbf{z}) = k(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z})\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z})^{-1}\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z})^T, \quad (1b)$$

where $\bar{m}(\cdot)$ is the prior mean function, $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) = [k(\mathbf{z}, z_1) \cdots k(\mathbf{z}, z_N)]$, and the entries of the posterior covariance matrix are given by $\mathbf{K}_{ij}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z}) = k(z_i, z_j)$.

While there exist different methods for predicting multidimensional function values, in this paper we model each entry of a vector-valued function with a separate GP. This is a standard procedure in GP-based literature [Deisenroth et al. \(2013\)](#). Therefore, in the following, a vector-valued GP $f(\cdot) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mathbf{m}(\cdot), \mathbf{k}(\cdot, \cdot))$ corresponds to a vector of independent GPs.

2.2. Variational Integrators

Solving differential equations, for example the equations of motion of a dynamical system, requires numerical integration. Variational integrators, as described in [Marsden and West \(2001\)](#), are symplectic integrators for mechanical systems that are able to preserve certain physical properties of the underlying system, such as energy conservation or satisfaction of explicit constraints without drift.

Given a continuous-time mechanical system with Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$, where \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{v} are the generalized position and velocity of the system, respectively, as well as kinematic constraints $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}(t))$, we can write the action integral of the system as

$$S = \int_{t_0}^{t_N} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{v}(t)) dt + \int_{t_0}^{t_N} \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}(t)) dt, \quad (2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is a Lagrange multiplier (constraint force) enforcing the adherence to constraints \mathbf{g} .

According to the principle of least action, minimizing (2) by varying the trajectory $\mathbf{x}(t)$ yields the continuous-time differential equations of the system that could then be discretized. To obtain a variational integrator instead, (2) is discretized directly. For clarity, we will derive and use a first-order integrator throughout this paper, but higher-order discretizations are possible.

A first-order variational integrator can be obtained by discretizing (2) over three time steps:

$$S_d = \sum_{k=0}^1 (\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{v}_k) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_k^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_k)) \Delta t, \quad (3)$$

with time step Δt and where

$$\mathbf{v}_k = \frac{\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_k}{\Delta t}. \quad (4)$$

Least action for fixed start and end points \mathbf{x}_0 and \mathbf{x}_2 , i.e., minimizing (3) with respect to the center point \mathbf{x}_1 , yields the implicit discretized equations of motion:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_1} S_d = -\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (5)$$

The resulting implicit nonlinear equations of motion (variational integrator) take the form

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k \Delta t, \quad (6a)$$

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{v}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}) = \mathbf{d}_0(\mathbf{v}_{k+1}) - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})^T \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (6b)$$

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k+2}) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (6c)$$

where \mathbf{d}_0 are the unconstrained dynamics, and $\mathbf{G} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ is the Jacobian of constraints \mathbf{g} , mapping the constraint forces into the dynamics. Note that the constraints must be enforced for \mathbf{x}_{k+2} .

Besides the typical parameterization of mechanical systems in minimal coordinates (joint coordinates), so-called maximal coordinates can be used as well. In this case, each body of a system is described with its six degrees of freedom and kinematic constraints represent joints connecting the bodies. The general idea for the derivation of the variational integrator remains the same, and details, including treating quaternion-based orientation representations, are given in [Brüdigam and Manchester \(2020\)](#).

2.3. Related Work

Theoretical results for variational integrators have been presented in Marsden and West (2001) with numerous extensions in the literature, and efficient algorithms for minimal coordinates in Lee et al. (2020); Fan et al. (2020) and maximal coordinates in Brüdigam and Manchester (2020) have been described recently. With respect to learning-based approaches, variational integrators have found increasing attention in the works of Saemundsson et al. (2020), Desai et al. (2021), and Zhong and Leonard (2020) in combination with neural networks.

Structured learning has gained increasing attention in learning system dynamics, especially in combination with Gaussian process regression. A common approach is to include as much information as possible about the system in the prior mean, making the residual easier to learn, for example as shown in Koller et al. (2018) and Capone and Hirche (2019). Alternatively, several methods have been proposed to construct kernel functions of a Gaussian process such that they generate predictions obeying certain physical constraints or properties. This principle has been employed in Cheng and Huang (2016) to generate kernels spanning a subspace that captures the Lagrangian’s projection as inverse dynamics. In a similar spirit, Umlauf and Hirche (2019) proposed a composite kernel that captures the control-affine structure of systems where feedback linearization can be applied. However, these approaches make use of standard discretization techniques, and there exist no approaches that enable for the advantages of variational integrators to be leveraged. Alternatively, constrained GPs can be considered. Swiler et al. (2020) provided a survey of approaches for additionally treating constraints with Gaussian process regression. Amongst others, boundary constraints can be satisfied with so-called warping, where values are transformed to and from the constrained set with a monotone warping function described in Snelson et al. (2004). Constraints in the form of (partial) differential equations can be incorporate in Gaussian process regression as well, for example as shown in Raissi et al. (2017) and Owhadi (2015). Geist and Trimpe (2020) incorporate knowledge of the constraints of a continuous-time system to linearly transform a Gaussian process of the unconstrained accelerations such that the accelerations adhere to constraints linear in the accelerations. A disadvantage of these methods is that they require the system at hand to satisfy strict requirements or are formulated in continuous time which might not apply in practice.

3. Combining Variational Integrators and Gaussian Process Regression

Our goal is to predict the next state $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = [\mathbf{x}_{k+1}^T \ \mathbf{v}_{k+1}^T]^T$ of a dynamical system given the current state $\mathbf{z}_k = [\mathbf{x}_k^T \ \mathbf{v}_k^T]^T$, the nominal dynamics model (6), and training data (\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{y}) . In the following, we first present an approach for predicting the next state for unconstrained and constrained systems, after which we state corresponding formal uncertainty bounds.

3.1. One-Step Prediction

The next position \mathbf{x}_{k+1} is directly obtained from the variational integrator (cf. (6a)) without requiring any dynamics information:

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k \Delta t. \tag{7}$$

Therefore, we only require the GP for computing the next velocity \mathbf{v}_{k+1} . Hence, we use a posterior GP mean to model the one-step predictive model, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{v}_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k) := \mu(\mathbf{z}_k), \tag{8}$$

where $\mu(\mathbf{z}_k)$ is computed as in (1a).

3.1.1. UNCONSTRAINED SYSTEMS

After training the GP with the training data, a posterior mean function for the unconstrained velocity $\mathbf{v}_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k)$ is obtained and we can construct the integrator for the unconstrained dynamics:

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k \Delta t, \quad (9a)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{d}_0(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}), \quad (9b)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1} + \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{Z})K(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z})^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}(\mathbf{Z})), \quad (9c)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}$ is obtained by solving the (implicit) nominal dynamics (9b) resulting from the variational integrator (6).

With integrator (9), unmodeled and potentially nonconservative dynamics, such as friction, can be described by the learned regression, and the desirable properties of the variational integrator are retained for the nominal and correctly learned dynamics. More specifically:

Theorem 1 *Given an underlying Lagrangian system and assuming for all \mathbf{z}_k the velocity $\mathbf{v}_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k)$ obtained from the integrator (9) matches the velocity obtained from the variational integrator (6) directly derived for the underlying system, then the integrators (9) and (6) are equivalent variational (symplectic) integrators.*

Proof By assumption, the velocity obtained from the integrator (9) matches the velocity obtained from the variational integrator (6). Therefore, both integrators will produce the same next state $\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = [\mathbf{x}_{k+1}^T \ \mathbf{v}_{k+1}^T]^T$. Since both integrators produce the same next position and velocity, they are equivalent. ■

Deviations of the prediction (9c) from the system's true velocity no longer allow for a direct statement regarding the equivalence of the integrator (9) and variational integrator (6). Nonetheless, we obtained satisfying results in practice, for example regarding conservation of energy.

3.1.2. CONSTRAINED SYSTEMS

We now consider systems with kinematic constraints $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x})$ which we assume to know correctly in advance, i.e., the kinematic constraints need not be learned. Such constraints can be obtained by measurement or are known by design.

The general approach for kinematically constrained systems remains the same, but now an additional projection of the predicted state onto the constraint manifold is required to satisfy the constraints. As before, a velocity $\mathbf{v}_{u,k+1}$ is calculated with (9c) from the modelled dynamics and the Gaussian process regression. However, this velocity will not satisfy $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{v}_{u,k+1}) = \mathbf{0}$ in general, since the constraints were not explicitly incorporated in the Gaussian process regression. Note that the regression was trained with data from the actual constrained system and therefore the regression prediction will still lie close to the constraint-satisfying velocity.

The constraint-fulfilling velocity \mathbf{v}_{k+1} is calculated with a nonlinear constrained least-squares optimization, resulting in the following integrator for constrained dynamics:

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{v}_k \Delta t, \quad (10a)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{d}_0(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}) - \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{k+1}, \quad (10b)$$

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}), \quad (10c)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{u,k+1}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1} + \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{Z}) \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z})^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{k+1}(\mathbf{Z})), \quad (10d)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \underset{\mathbf{v}_{k+1}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{v}_{k+1} - \mathbf{v}_{u,k+1}\|^2, \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (10e)$$

The integrator (10) consists of the variational integrator of the nominal model (10a) - (10c), the prediction from the GP regression (10d), and the projection of the predicted velocity onto the constraint manifold (10e). The optimization problem (10e) can be solved with a variety of approaches, for example with numerical methods described in [Nocedal and Wright \(2006\)](#).

As before, if the predicted velocity $\mathbf{v}_{u,k+1}$ matches the velocity obtained from the variational integrator (6) for the underlying system, Theorem 1 holds. Otherwise, no direct statement regarding the equivalence can be made.

Due to the projection (10e), technically, the resulting velocity \mathbf{v}_{k+1} no longer follows a jointly Gaussian distribution and therefore is not a GP anymore. However, we will recover a probabilistic interpretation of the output after projection in the next section and, following [Swiler et al. \(2020\)](#), we still refer to the overall regression as GP regression.

3.2. Prediction Error Bound

One of the major advantages of GP regression is the availability of an error bound for the posterior mean, which comes in the form of the posterior variance multiplied by a scalar ([Chowdhury and Gopalan, 2017](#); [Lederer et al., 2019](#); [Capone et al., 2021](#)).

In general, the projection (10e) is a nonlinear optimization problem which is not monotone and, hence, its inverse does not necessarily exist. Therefore, warping approaches maintaining a measure of the variance, such as those described by [Snelson et al. \(2004\)](#), cannot be applied to obtain uncertainty bounds on the velocity \mathbf{v}_{k+1} .

However, we can give a formal upper bound for the uncertainty under the following assumption.

Assumption 1 *The projection (10e) corresponds to a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant L .*

Assumption 1 would be violated if a predicted velocity lies close to multiple possible constraint-satisfying velocities, in which case the argmin value would be discontinuous. However, the same issue would occur in the nominal variational integrator if the initial guess for solving the implicit dynamics is far off. That is to say, for reasonable predictions of the GP, Assumption 1 will be fulfilled, just as the the nominal variational integrator finds the correct velocity for a reasonable initial guess. Note that in practice the Lipschitz constant L can be estimated by sampling the gradient of the function (10e) at several points in the interval of interest.

Theorem 2 *Let Assumption 1 hold. For all \mathbf{z} , let $\mathbf{v}_u(\mathbf{z})$ denote a sample from a GP with posterior mean $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_u(\mathbf{z})$ and variance $\sigma_u^2(\mathbf{z})$, and consider a least-squares projection with nonlinear constraints*

g of the form

$$\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{v}_u) = \underset{\boldsymbol{\nu}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{v}_u\|^2, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \mathbf{0},$$

for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a $\gamma > 0$, such that

$$|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{v}_u) - \mathbf{v}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_u)| < \sqrt{\gamma} \sigma_u(\mathbf{z})$$

holds for all augmented states \mathbf{z} with a probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Proof We provide a proof for the one-dimensional case, which extends straightforwardly to the multi-dimensional setting. Due to the Lipschitz continuity of the least-squares projection $\mathbf{v}(\cdot)$, we have $|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{v}_u) - \mathbf{v}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_u)| \leq L|\mathbf{v}_u - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_u|$. Due to Lederer et al. (2019), for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a $\beta > 0$, such that

$$|\mathbf{v}_u(\mathbf{z}) - \bar{\mathbf{v}}_u(\mathbf{z})| \leq \sqrt{\beta} \sigma_u(\mathbf{z})$$

holds for all augmented states \mathbf{z} with probability at least $1 - \delta$. The result then follows by setting $\gamma = L^2\beta$. ■

Theorem 2 allows us to obtain an error bound for the prediction error that holds with high probability. In addition, as the position \mathbf{x}_{k+1} is a linear function of the velocity, the bound can be applied straightforwardly for the entire trajectory prediction.

4. Evaluation and Discussion

We tested our methods in several simulations to verify the theoretical results and evaluate the integrator’s performance. Besides showing the structure-preserving behavior of our method, we also compare errors for multi-step predictions that could be used in, for example, model-predictive control.

4.1. Energy conservation

The desirable structure preserving properties of the combination of variational integrators and Gaussian process regressions is demonstrated on a single and double pendulum with link masses $m = 1\text{kg}$ and lengths $l = 1\text{m}$. For the simulations, we trained a Gaussian process in maximal coordinates on a single recorded trajectory of two seconds and constructed an integrator without any prior dynamics knowledge according to (10). For the single pendulum, the total energy error of the integrator (10) is compared to that of an explicit Euler integration of the real conservative system dynamics. Both integrators have a time step of $\Delta t = 10\text{ms}$. The double pendulum is used for comparing the constraint drift for the explicit Euler method, and the integrator (10) with projection onto the constraints. The results are displayed in Fig. 1.

The energy error for the explicit Euler integration in Fig. 1 a) increases over time as is typical for explicit Runge-Kutta methods. In contrast, the learned dynamics models conserve the energy of the system even for longer time periods. For fewer training samples, a certain level of energy error is reached before conservation occurs. One possible explanation is that a trained area of the state space has to be reached for conservation. The small oscillations in the energy error are typical for variational integrators (see Marsden and West (2001)). In Fig. 1 b), the constraint drift of the explicit Euler method for the double pendulum becomes clearly visible. Drift occurs because constraints are formulated on an acceleration level and not a position level. In contrast, no drift occurs for the trained integrator (10).




Figure 1: Structure-preserving properties of the proposed integration method even without prior dynamics model. a) Energy error for an explicit Euler integrator (black), integrator (10) with 10 training samples (blue), and integrator (10) with 20 training samples (red). b) Constraint drift for an explicit Euler integrator (black), and integrator (10) with projection (blue).

4.2. Prediction Performance

The performance of the proposed integration methods is evaluated by comparing it to integrating a nominal dynamics model and calculating the error to the ground-truth simulation of a perturbed system. The ground-truth simulation with a symplectic Euler method uses a time step of $\Delta t = 0.1\text{ms}$, whereas the other integrators use a time step of $\Delta t = 10\text{ms}$. As test systems we selected a pendulum, a cartpole, a double pendulum, and a fourbar segment (closed kinematic chain). The systems are shown in Fig. 2. All links of the systems have a mass $m = 1\text{kg}$, length $l = 1\text{m}$, and inertia $J = \frac{1}{12}ml^2$.

For the Gaussian-process-based integrators, three coordinate descriptions are compared: minimal (joint) coordinates, a complex-number representation of joint angles, i.e., $[\sin(\theta) \ \cos(\theta)]^T$ instead of θ , and maximal coordinates. The training and test data sets are generated from 100 simulated two-second trajectories each with random initial system states. Each training sample consists of the full state input z_k and the velocity targets v_{k+1} . We use a squared exponential kernel of suitable dimensions for all experiments. Optimal hyperparameters are determined with 100 runs of maximizing the marginal likelihood with varying initial guesses for the hyperparameters. We perform 20-step ahead predictions in all cases.

4.2.1. PREDICTION WITH PRIOR MEAN

For the evaluation with a prior mean, a single pendulum and cartpole were used. The masses and inertias of the links of the nominal system models were distorted by random uniformly distributed $([0.9, 1.1])$ perturbation factors. Additionally, viscous friction was added for the joints (see uniformly distributed coefficients c in Fig. 2). Each observed state is disturbed with additive zero mean Gaussian noise ($\sigma = 1e-3$) for training. The results are shown in Fig. 2 a) and b).

As expected, the results in Figure 2 a) and b) indicate that including a prior mean model yields reasonable results for the proposed integrators even despite noise and distortion. The uncertainty




Figure 2: Median mean-square position error and 10 and 90 percentiles for 20-step predictions of perturbed systems (top, with friction coefficients) trained on varying sample numbers and integrated with different integrators: variational integrator of the nominal dynamics model without learning (black), integrator (9) trained in minimal coordinates (blue), integrator (9) trained in sin/cos coordinates (red), integrator (10) trained in maximal coordinates (green). a) Error for a single pendulum with known prior mean dynamics. b) Error for a cartpole with known prior mean dynamics, c) Error for a double pendulum without prior mean dynamics, d) Error for a fourbar segment without prior mean dynamics.

and error decreases (log scale!) with additional training samples, highlighting the advantage of including Gaussian process regression for learning residual dynamics compared to just using the nominal model. Minimal and maximal coordinates achieve similar results, justifying the use of the projection for systems with explicit constraints, while the sin/cos parameterization outperforms the other two coordinate descriptions. It appears that no further improvement is achieved once a certain number of training samples are used. One possible explanation for this result could be that the optimization of hyperparameters gets stuck in local minima.

4.3. Prediction without Prior Mean

We also compare the performance of the learning-augmented integrator without a prior dynamics model on a double pendulum and a fourbar segment. The Gaussian process regression uses the constant mean from the training data as its mean function, a commonly used strategy in situations without a prior mean. The observation noise and friction as well as the perturbation factors for masses and inertias remain the same as in Sec. 4.2.1. The results are shown in Fig. 2 c) and d).

In Fig. 2, compared to the predictions with a prior mean, the errors and uncertainties reached are much higher for few training samples compared to integrating the nominal dynamics. As the number of training samples increases, the accuracy improves until it is close to the prediction accuracy of the integrators with a prior nominal model and partially surpasses the pure nominal dynamics. As before, minimal and maximal coordinates result in similar behavior while the sin/cos parameterization outperforms both, at least for the pendulum. We only evaluated up to 512 samples due to the long computation times for optimizing hyperparameters, which would also be undesirable in an experimental implementation.

5. Conclusions

We have presented an approach for structure-preserving learning of mechanical systems by combining variational integrators and Gaussian process regression to accurately model and integrate such systems. Known kinematic constraints can be treated with this approach as well. For correct predictions from the Gaussian process regression, the developed method is a variational integrator. The evaluation of the proposed methods on a variety of mechanisms in simulation shows satisfactory results both for unconstrained and constrained parameterizations.

Efficient algorithms exist for calculating the nominal dynamics with variational integrators, for example in [Fan et al. \(2020\)](#) or [Brüdigam and Manchester \(2020\)](#), and attempts have been made at obtaining efficient Gaussian process regression, for example in [Lederer et al. \(2021\)](#). Further advances in either area can directly be incorporated in the proposed approach.

The data-efficiency of Gaussian process regression and accurate predictions of variational integrators even for large time steps make the proposed method interesting for real-time control applications. Future work could entail the combination with higher-order variational integrators, or exploiting the modularity of maximal-coordinate descriptions in numerical methods.

Acknowledgments

We thank Armin Lederer and Samuel Tesfazgi for their help in preparing this manuscript. This work was supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 871295 ”SeaClear”.

References

- Jan Brüdigam and Zachary Manchester. Linear-Time Variational Integrators in Maximal Coordinates. In *Workshop on the Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics (WAFR)*, 2020.
- Jan Brüdigam and Zachary Manchester. Linear-Quadratic Optimal Control in Maximal Coordinates. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9775–9781. IEEE, 2021.
- Jan Brüdigam, Jana Janeva, Stefan Sosnowski, and Sandra Hirche. Linear-Time Contact and Friction Dynamics in Maximal Coordinates using Variational Integrators. *arXiv:2109.07262 [cs]*, September 2021. arXiv: 2109.07262.
- Alexandre Capone and Sandra Hirche. Backstepping for partially unknown nonlinear systems using gaussian processes. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 3(2):416–421, 2019.
- Alexandre Capone, Armin Lederer, and Sandra Hirche. Gaussian process uniform error bounds with unknown hyperparameters for safety-critical applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.02606*, 2021.
- Ching-An Cheng and Han-Pang Huang. Learn the Lagrangian: A Vector-Valued RKHS Approach to Identifying Lagrangian Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 46(12):3247–3258, December 2016. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics.
- Sayak Ray Chowdhury and Aditya Gopalan. On kernelized multi-armed bandits. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 844–853. PMLR, 2017.
- Marc Peter Deisenroth, Dieter Fox, and Carl Edward Rasmussen. Gaussian processes for data-efficient learning in robotics and control. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 37(2):408–423, 2013.
- Shaan A. Desai, Marios Mattheakis, and Stephen J. Roberts. Variational integrator graph networks for learning energy-conserving dynamical systems. *Phys. Rev. E*, 104:035310, Sep 2021.
- Taosha Fan, Jarvis Schultz, and Todd Murphey. Efficient Computation of Higher-Order Variational Integrators in Robotic Simulation and Trajectory Optimization. In *Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics XIII*, pages 689–706, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- A. René Geist and Sebastian Trimpe. Learning Constrained Dynamics with Gauss Principle adhering Gaussian Processes. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research (PMLR)*, pages 225–234. PMLR, June 2020.
- Oliver Junge, Jerrold Marsden, and Sina Ober-Blöbaum. Discrete Mechanics and Optimal Control. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 38(1):538–543, 2005. ISSN 14746670.
- Torsten Koller, Felix Berkenkamp, Matteo Turchetta, and Andreas Krause. Learning-based model predictive control for safe exploration. In *2018 IEEE conference on decision and control (CDC)*, pages 6059–6066. IEEE, 2018.

- A Lederer, J Umlauf, and S Hirche. Uniform error bounds for gaussian process regression with application to safe control. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019.
- Armin Lederer, Alexandre Capone, Jonas Umlauf, and Sandra Hirche. How training data impacts performance in learning-based control. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(3):905–910, 2021.
- Jeongseok Lee, C. Karen Liu, Frank C. Park, and Siddhartha S. Srinivasa. A Linear-Time Variational Integrator for Multibody Systems. In *Algorithmic Foundations of Robotics XIII*, pages 352–367, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- J. Marsden and M. West. Discrete Mechanics and Variational Integrators. *Acta Numerica*, 10: 357–514, 2001.
- J. Nocedal and S. Wright. *Numerical Optimization*. Springer, 2006.
- Houman Owhadi. Bayesian Numerical Homogenization. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 13 (3):812–828, January 2015.
- Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George Em Karniadakis. Machine learning of linear differential equations using gaussian processes. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 348:683–693, 2017.
- Carl Edward Rasmussen and Christopher K. I. Williams. *Gaussian processes for machine learning*. Adaptive computation and machine learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, 2006.
- Steindor Saemundsson, Alexander Terenin, Katja Hofmann, and Marc Deisenroth. Variational integrator networks for physically structured embeddings. In *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3078–3087. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020.
- Edward Snelson, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Carl Rasmussen. Warped Gaussian Processes. In S. Thrun, L. Saul, and B. Schölkopf, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 16. MIT Press, 2004.
- Laura P. Swiler, Mamikon Gulian, Ari L. Frankel, Cosmin Safta, and John D. Jakeman. A Survey of Constrained Gaussian Process Regression: Approaches and Implementation Challenges. *Journal of Machine Learning for Modeling and Computing*, 1(2):119–156, 2020.
- Jonas Umlauf and Sandra Hirche. Feedback linearization based on gaussian processes with event-triggered online learning. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(10):4154–4169, 2019.
- Jonas Umlauf, Armin Lederer, and Sandra Hirche. Learning stable gaussian process state space models. In *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1499–1504, 2017.
- Theresa Wenger, Sina Ober-Blöbaum, and Sigrid Leyendecker. Construction and analysis of higher order variational integrators for dynamical systems with holonomic constraints. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 43(5):1163–1195, October 2017.
- Yaofeng Desmond Zhong and Naomi Leonard. Unsupervised learning of lagrangian dynamics from images for prediction and control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.