

Natural Language Robot Programming: NLP integrated with autonomous robotic grasping

Muhammad Arshad Khan^{1†}, Max Kenney^{1†}, Jack Painter^{1†}, Disha Kamale^{3†},
Riza Batista-Navarro², Amir Ghalamzan E.^{1†}

Abstract—In this paper, we present a grammar-based natural language framework for robot programming, specifically for pick-and-place tasks. Our approach uses a custom dictionary of action words, designed to store together words that share meaning, allowing for easy expansion of the vocabulary by adding more action words from a lexical database. We validate our Natural Language Robot Programming (NLRP) framework through simulation and real-world experimentation, using a Franka Panda robotic arm equipped with a calibrated camera-in-hand and a microphone. Participants were asked to complete a pick-and-place task using verbal commands, which were converted into text using Google’s Speech-to-Text API and processed through the NLRP framework to obtain joint space trajectories for the robot. Our results indicate that our approach has a high system usability score. The framework’s dictionary can be easily extended without relying on transfer learning or large data sets. In the future, we plan to compare the presented framework with different approaches of human-assisted pick-and-place tasks via a comprehensive user study.

I. INTRODUCTION

The growing adoption of robotics automation in various industries has led to a need for humans and robots to share workspace, interact, and collaborate. However, commanding a robot to perform a task in such workspaces can be challenging. Although learning from demonstration, traditional teleoperated systems, and more recent collaborative robots provide useful tools for human-robot interaction, they still fall short of human-human interaction [1], [2]. Human workers use natural language to ask others to conduct a task for them while using teach pendants and joysticks can be difficult for untrained workers to communicate with the robot. Therefore, using natural language for intuitive collaboration between human and robot workers is crucial to unlocking the potential of bringing robots to human workspaces.

Fig.1 illustrates a collaborative scenario involving a Yumi cobot [3] from ABB and a human performing complementary tasks that may involve cognitively demanding tasks by the human and the precision ability of the robot worker. In order to ensure safe and efficient interactions, cobots are equipped with various features, including compliance, power, and force limiting, and haptic feedback. These features enable cobots to operate closely with humans in applications such as care robots[4], assistive robots [5], and museum guide robots [6].




Fig. 1: YuMi® - IRB 14000 — Collaborative Robot [3] co-working with a human while the tasks are shared between the cobot and human. The safety features (which may include robot compliance, intention recognition, emergency stop buttons, continuous monitoring of the robot and its workspace state via force/torque sensors, several visual sensing devices, proximity, and laser scanner sensors) allow secure task completions.

Additional features, such as continuous monitoring of the robot and its environment state through force, torque, visual, proximity, and laser scanner sensors, further improve the cobot’s efficacy. However, these approaches are still not as effective as human-human co-working [7]. Although beneficial to human operators, these approaches are associated with a limited capacity of human-robot and have a learning curve that may hinder their immediate usability. This paper aims to explore how natural language can be used to facilitate human-robot interactions in a more intuitive manner without compromising robot safety and performance.

Verbal communication plays a crucial role in facilitating natural interactions among human workers and coordinating task executions within a team. This aspect serves as a key differentiator between human-human and human-robot workers. In recent years, researchers have explored the use of verbal communication for coordination between mobile robots and humans, as evidenced by studies such as [8]. One such application is in tour guiding, where verbal communication is primarily used to provide the necessary information to the human. Additionally, Zhou et al. (2021)[9] proposed a novel approach for training a reinforcement learning agent using natural language goal-conditioned adversarial learning algorithm and a variational goal generator to sample natural language goals from trajectories of given demonstrations.

Coordinating task execution between a manipulating robot and a human using natural language processing (NLP) is a

[†] These authors have equivalent contribution.

¹University of Lincoln, UK
aghalamzanesfahani@lincoln.ac.uk

² University of Manchester, UK

³ Lehigh University, USA

more challenging task than using NLP for mobile/service robots. This is because, unlike mobile/service robots, manipulator robots are expected to physically interact with their environment through precise and fine-grained actions, such as reaching for an object, forming stable grasp or contacts with it, and delivering it to the target location [10].

This paper introduces one of the first frameworks for verbally commanding a cobot to perform pick-and-place tasks. Pick-and-place is a common yet straightforward task to automate. The proposed framework comprises three key components: natural language processing, semantic segmentation, and autonomous grasping. The autonomous grasping module generates grasping poses for a given scene, allowing a human operator to command the robot to execute a desired grasp. The contribution of this paper is manifold: (i) We created a dictionary of the common tasks involved in robotic manipulation in our NLP component. (ii) Our framework includes a translator-middleware capable of translating natural language instructions into low-level joint space or operational space robot commands. (iii) We provide two-level verbal commands in our framework, i.e., high (task) level and low (trajectory) level (either joint or operational space trajectory). (iv) We present a unified framework for verbally commanding a manipulator, integrating NLP with autonomous grasping. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed framework in a series of experiments.

II. RELATED WORK

Synthesising grasp poses from single or multiple point clouds is a topic of significant research interest. Several approaches have been proposed, including sim-to-real learning [11], deep learning via domain randomisation [12], learning hand-eye coordination for grasping unknown objects [13], and probabilistic generative models of grasping configurations [14]. A comprehensive review of available deep learning methods for grasp synthesis is presented in [15].

The process of correlating entities referred to in a natural-language expression with an agent’s physical environment is known as language grounding [16]. Referring expression comprehension is a type of language grounding that focuses on recognising the object in an image referred to in a natural-language expression [17]. This problem has been addressed using deep learning-based approaches. For example, Mao et al. [18] used a CNN-LSTM network to identify the image region with the highest probability of being the target object. Lu et al. [19] used a transformer-based ViLBERT model to jointly learn language and image representations and select the most likely target object.

Shridhar et al. [20] present an approach of learning long-horizon tasks, which consist of action sequences such as washing a coffee mug, represents a much more advanced form of language grounding. State-of-the-art language models have been employed to predict the granular actions an agent needs to take for learning such tasks [21], [22]. In our work, we focus on executing short-horizon tasks that require a robot to execute only one action at a time. Nevertheless, our

work goes beyond the recognition of referring expressions (which is only one component of our work) since our agent executes a pick-and-place task within its physical environment through robotic manipulation.

Various methods have been proposed for enabling robots to understand natural language commands, which can be broadly categorised into two types: (1) supervised and (2) grammar-based approaches. Kollar et al. [23] proposed the use of spatial description clauses (SDCs) to transform natural language commands into semantic structures, with each SDC comprising four components: an event, an object, a place, and a path. A conditional random fields (CRF) model was trained to recognise these four components in a given natural language command. However, the main drawback of supervised approaches, such as SDC transformation, is their reliance on labelled data. For example, Tellex et al. [24] used SDC transformation for robotic forklift manipulation but required a large manually labelled corpus of commands constructed through crowdsourcing.

On the other hand, grammar-based approaches do not require labelled training data, although they need constituency parsers to convert natural language instructions to a formalism that robots can understand, such as Robot Control Language (RCL). For instance, Matuszek et al. [25] employed a combinatory categorical grammar (CCG) parser, while Packard 2014 used a probabilistic context-free grammar (PCFG) parser to generate RCL instructions. These grammar-based methods, however, may still have limitations in their ability to understand and process complex natural language commands.

Natural language is proposed in a framework for correcting robot planning [26]. Suglia et al. [21] presented a language-guided visual task completion method for interactive navigation tasks. Ahn et al. [22] used pre-trained skills to provide real-world grounding and constrain the model to propose natural language actions that are both feasible and contextually appropriate.

In this work, we also convert natural-language instructions into a formalism, namely, SDCs, but using a simple approach. In contrast to the work by Tellex et al. [24], our NLP approach (described in the next section) does not require huge amounts of labelled training data. Furthermore, we chose to employ dependency parsers rather than constituency parsers which were used by Matuszek et al. [25]. Dependency parsers allow us to directly extract semantic relations between words based on the output dependency tree, whilst constituency parsers produce output that still require post-processing if we wish to extract semantic relations. Our approach relies only on an off-the-shelf dependency parser for transforming natural language instructions into SDC structures.

III. NATURAL LANGUAGE ROBOT PROGRAMMING

Simple pick-and-place is one of the major tasks for robotic manipulators yet not fully solved. Technology of autonomous grasping for simple pick-and-place task is maturing [15]. Autonomous grasping refers to an algorithms compute one




Fig. 2: Dependency tree generated by *spaCy* visualised. Each arrow shows a relationship between two words. Here it is identified ‘Move’ as the main verb and that it has as its dependants ‘forward’ which is an adverb, and ‘by’ which is a preposition. By traversing through the dependencies one is also able to reach ‘30’, a number since it is a dependent of ‘centimeters’, a noun. This system of hopping through dependencies and tracking part-of-speech tags allows us to create rules which generate the final action command.

or several grasping configuration for a manipulator given the visual sensory data, e.g. RGB-D data. In contrast to the classical analytical grasping approach (which computes necessary contacts/forces between object and robot’s fingers to make an equilibrium which is stable to some extends against some external forces [27]).


A. Speech module of NLRP

While we integrate a simple grasping in our Natural Language Robot Programming (NLRP) module (discussed in the next section), integration of available state-of-the-art grasping methods in our NLRP is straightforward. Our approach to understanding natural language commands is underpinned by a dependency parser, specifically the implementation made available by *spaCy* [28]. Dependency parsing automatically extracts the syntactic structure of a sentence as a tree, by identifying typed binary relationships between its words [29].

Each of these binary relationships encodes a dependency between two words: a *head* and its *dependent* (a word that modifies or specifies the head). The head of the entire sentence - typically the main verb - becomes the root of the dependency tree. Each *head-dependent* relationship is assigned a type, which is any of the known English grammatical functions (e.g., subject, direct object, indirect object, etc.). The *head-dependent* relations are thus able to capture semantic relationships (e.g., between an action and a receiver of that action). In Fig. 2, we show a sample sentence together with its dependency tree, as extracted by *spaCy*. Each of the words in the sentence appears as a node with the part-of-speech (POS) tag indicated, specifying if the word is a noun, verb, or preposition (Fig. 3).

In our approach, we leverage the information encoded in the dependency tree generated by the *spaCy* parser to construct a spatial description clause (SDC). As described in the previous section, an SDC comprises of four key components, namely:

- an *event* (E): the action that the robot is required to



(a) High level SDC

Fig. 3: Diagram visualising how the input text corpus is transformed into SDC format to output the final robot action using each words tag and dependencies sourced from *spaCy* – see Table I;

execute

- an *object* (O): the item that a command is directed at (can be any other object in the world or even a part of the robot itself)
- a *place* (PL): a place in the world such as a direction or the axes to move along
- a *path* (PA): the extent (in terms of a specific amount) to which the action should be taken

It is important to note that not all four components are always present in a natural language command. While the event component (E) is mandatory, any of the remaining components can be unspecified depending on the command.

As an initial step towards generating SDC structures from natural language instructions, we created a custom dictionary of action words specifically tailored for pick-and-place tasks. The dictionary was constructed in accordance with the grammar proposed by Song [30], which links high-level action words to other words that indicate similar actions. This enabled us to easily incorporate additional action words from the WordNet [31] lexical database, and expand the vocabulary as needed. Our dictionary comprises seven action categories, each containing up to 17 high-level words that can be further expanded to include additional synonyms.

In almost all of the cases, the word at the root of the dependency tree (i.e., the main verb) is contained in our custom dictionary and becomes the event E of the SDC. However, if the identified root is not in the dictionary, we iterate through all of the words in the sentence to find a match with the dictionary, which then becomes the value for E . Once E is identified, we iterate through each of its dependent, and based on the part-of-speech tag assigned to a word, we perform a different process in order to populate the SDC. For example, within the context of our problem, a word tagged as ‘NNS’ (plural noun) corresponds to a unit of measurement (e.g., “centimeters”). When this is encountered, its dependencies are used to search for another word with the dependency relation tag ‘NumMod’; this word will be a number. By joining these two words together we can obtain a number and a unit of measurement which will make up the path PA such as ‘30.Centimetres’. A similar process is performed for both the object O and place PL of the SDC.

TABLE I: SDC component shown in Fig. 3. The baseline of the primitive action library of VSC. This library allows a human operator to amend/improve it by adding new words to the library.

```

// dictionary.js SDC Component
class Dictionary {
  constructor() {
    // Synonyms of the verbs
    this.Verbs = {
      "Move": ["move", "go", "travel" ...],
      "Grab": ["grab", "grasp", "catch" ...],
      "Rotate": ["rotate", "revolve" ...],
      ...
    };

    this.Objects = {
      "Hand": ['hand', 'fingers', 'wrist' ...],
      "TeddyBear": ['teddy bear', 'teddy' ...],
      "Bottle": ['water bottle', 'bottle' ...],
      "Scissors": ["scissors", "scissor" ...],
      ...
    };

    //Used for finding the Path
    this.PlaceWords = {
      "Forward": ["forward", "forwards", ...],
      "Backward": ["backward", "backwards", ...],
      "Up": ["up", "upward", "upwards", ...],
      ...
    };

    this.triggerWords = {
      "Learn": ["means", "implies" ...],
      "Split": ["then", "before" ...],
      "Stop": ["stop", "halt", "quit" ...]
    };
  }
}

```




Fig. 4: Different levels of commanding the robotic manipulator in NLRP framework.

The resulting SDC is sent to the robot controller where depending on the high-level word found, it makes use of the other components to instruct the robot to perform the command. In real-time, this whole process takes seconds and allows for an easy and reactive control experience.

B. Robot Controller Module of NLRP

Four different ways were designed to convert the speech commands in the form of a single SDC into a motion command for different manipulation tasks as shown in Fig. 4. These include:

- 1) *Task-level* - give the robot task-level commands such as *grasp an object in the scene*.
- 2) *Operational-space Level* - command the manipulator to follow a specific path in operational-space such as *move forward 30 cm*.
- 3) *Joint-space Level* - move a specific joint such as *move joint 3 by +/- 15 degrees*.
- 4) *Action Level* - such as *stop execution, start execution or recover from error*.

Given an SDC C , \mathcal{B} takes in the current state of the robot and the given C and outputs a joint trajectory as follows:

$$\theta(t) = \mathcal{B}(S_i, C_i) \quad (1)$$

The mapping function from SDC C to the joint space trajectory is conditional based on the *event* (E) in the given SDC C . For example, if the given SDC C specifies a Task-level or Task-space level command, then the robot Cartesian planner and the object 2D pose, in case of Task-level command are used to generate the joint trajectory $\theta(t)$. On the other hand, if the given SDC C specifies a Joint-space level command, then the current robot joint-space states and the command joint-space instructions within the given SDC C are used to generate a robot joint trajectory.

Given that it is possible that the *path* (PA) may be missing from the given SDC, a set of default values for the Task-space and Joint-space commands are used. If the given SDC specifies a *path* (PA) then the default values are overridden.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

Our experimental setup for validating the proposed Natural Language Robot Programming (NLRP) framework consists of a 7-DoF Franka Panda robotic arm, manufactured by Franka Emika, equipped with a calibrated Intel Realsense D435i camera-in-hand. As illustrated in Fig.5 and Fig.6, we conducted experiments in both the Gazebo simulation environment and the real world environment.

In our experiments, the robotic arm is placed on a table top in an environment that contains several common objects, such as a cup, book, bottle, and scissor, which are visible in the robot camera view. The camera-in-hand image-feed is processed by a Mask-RCNN model [32], which has been previously trained on the COCO dataset, to obtain semantic segmentation predictions, as shown in the bottom-right of Fig.5 and Fig.6 (b). The resulting semantic segmentation results are displayed on the user interface to inform users of the objects that are pick-able in the scene. Using the segmentation results and the calibrated depth image, we locate 2D grasp poses for each visible object, as demonstrated in the top-right of Fig. 5. To facilitate natural language interaction with the system, we compile a custom dictionary of objects,






Fig. 5: Experimental setup in simulation with a Franka arm on top of a table with multiple objects. 2D object grasp poses and semantic segmentation of each pick-able object are shown as well.



(a) NLRP framework experimentation setup



(b) Semantic Segmentation Output

Fig. 6: (a) Experimentation setup for the proposed NLRP framework with camera-in-hand and bird-eye view visual feedback to the user. (b) Mask-RCNN semantic segmentation output of the scene on the robot side.

including their synonyms, and add them to the *Objects*-category of our NLRP dictionary. For speech input, we use a Veetop USB Microphone to record the human operator's voice, which is then processed by the Google API.




Fig. 7: Graphical representation of pick and place task completion time and number of SDCs used to complete the time.

V. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

We evaluated the efficacy of our Natural Language Robot Programming (NLRP) framework in both task space and joint space through both simulation and real-world experimentation. To assess the effectiveness of NLRP, we conducted four different manipulation tasks involving the pick and place of two objects - a teddy bear and a water bottle - in any order, as shown in Fig. 4.

To further evaluate NLRP, we recruited nine participants who were provided with a brief description of the study and experiments. Participants utilized a microphone and two camera views, including a bird's eye view of the robot's workspace and a camera in hand. They were instructed to speak clearly and use any grammatically correct sentences they preferred to complete the task.

The participants' speech input from the microphone was converted to text corpus using Google's Speech to Text API. This corpus was then processed using our proposed NLRP-layered approach to obtain joint space trajectories for the different manipulation tasks. These trajectories were subsequently transmitted to the Franka Arm control through ROS controllers. After completing the pick and place task, each participant was requested to complete a questionnaire, which included evaluations of the System Usability Scale and NASA TLX [33]. This enabled us to assess the efficacy and usability of our proposed approach.

In our preliminary subject tests, 33% of the participants were females and 67% males. English is not the first language of participants. Fig. 7 shows the number of SDC and time-to-complete the pick and place task. The average number of commands given by each participant was 45 and the average time in seconds taken to complete the pick and place task was 447.2 seconds as represented by the red lines on Fig. 7. The participant reported an average

workload rating of 62 using NASA TLX cognitive workload assessment whereas an average of 58.7 system usability rating was reported using System Usability Scale.

In future work, we plan to conduct comprehensive human-subject tests comparing the effectiveness of NLRP and traditional teleoperation systems. We also plan to expand the size of the NLRP dictionary and incorporate more primitive skills such as opening/closing cabinet doors and pressing buttons. Additionally, we aim to integrate higher-level instructions, where the robot can convert high-level orders into actions using ChatGPT to find the necessary steps and NLRP to execute them.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper presented a novel grammar-based natural language framework for converting high-level human text or verbal commands into robot motion for pick-and-place tasks. An initial user study validated the framework's effectiveness and usability, with users reporting nominal cognitive load and a high system usability score. The advantage of this approach is that the framework's dictionary can be easily extended without the need for transfer learning-based training or large datasets. Overall, the presented framework has promising potential for enabling more intuitive and efficient human-robot interactions in a variety of real-world applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. E. Colgate, J. Edward, M. A. Peshkin, and W. Wannasuppharasit, "Cobots: Robots for collaboration with human operators," 1996.
- [2] A. Ajoudani, A. M. Zanchettin, S. Ivaldi, A. Albu-Schäffer, K. Kosuge, and O. Khatib, "Progress and prospects of the human-robot collaboration," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 957–975, 2018.
- [3] ABB, "Yumi® - irb 14000 — collaborative robot," [Accessed on 07-08-2020], <https://new.abb.com/products/robotics/industrial-robots/irb-14000-yumi>.
- [4] A. Van Wynsberghe, "Designing robots for care: Care centered value-sensitive design," *Science and engineering ethics*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 407–433, 2013.
- [5] R. Bemelmans, G. J. Gelderblom, P. Jonker, and L. De Witte, "Socially assistive robots in elderly care: A systematic review into effects and effectiveness," *Journal of the American Medical Directors Association*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 114–120, 2012.
- [6] F. Del Duchetto, P. Baxter, and M. Hanheide, "Lindsey the tour guide robot-usage patterns in a museum long-term deployment," in *2019 28th IEEE International Conference on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [7] K. A. Demir, G. Döven, and B. Sezen, "Industry 5.0 and human-robot co-working," *Procedia computer science*, vol. 158, pp. 688–695, 2019.
- [8] I. A. Hameed, "Using natural language processing (nlp) for designing socially intelligent robots," in *2016 Joint IEEE International Conference on Development and Learning and Epigenetic Robotics (ICDL-EpiRob)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 268–269.
- [9] L. Zhou and K. Small, "Inverse reinforcement learning with natural language goals," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 12, 2021, pp. 11 116–11 124.
- [10] N. Mavrakis, E. A. M. Ghalamzan, and R. Stolkin, "Safe robotic grasping: Minimum impact-force grasp selection," in *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 4034–4041.
- [11] S. James, P. Wohlhart, M. Kalakrishnan, D. Kalashnikov, A. Irpan, J. Ibarz, S. Levine, R. Hadsell, and K. Bousmalis, "Sim-to-real via sim-to-sim: Data-efficient robotic grasping via randomized-to-canonical adaptation networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 12 627–12 637.
- [12] J. Tobin, L. Biewald, R. Duan, M. Andrychowicz, A. Handa, V. Kumar, B. McGrew, A. Ray, J. Schneider, P. Welinder, *et al.*, "Domain randomization and generative models for robotic grasping," in *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 3482–3489.
- [13] S. Levine, P. Pastor, A. Krizhevsky, J. Ibarz, and D. Quillen, "Learning hand-eye coordination for robotic grasping with deep learning and large-scale data collection," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 37, no. 4-5, pp. 421–436, 2018.
- [14] M. S. Kopicki, D. Belter, and J. L. Wyatt, "Learning better generative models for dexterous, single-view grasping of novel objects," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 38, no. 10-11, pp. 1246–1267, 2019.
- [15] R. Newbury, M. Gu, L. Chumbley, A. Mousavian, C. Eppner, J. Leitner, J. Bohg, A. Morales, T. Asfour, D. Kragic, *et al.*, "Deep learning approaches to grasp synthesis: A review," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.02556*, 2022.
- [16] D. K. Misra, J. Sung, K. Lee, and A. Saxena, "Tell me Dave: Context-sensitive grounding of natural language to manipulation instructions," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 35, no. 1-3, pp. 281–300, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0278364915602060>
- [17] Y. Qiao, C. Deng, and Q. Wu, "Referring Expression Comprehension: A Survey of Methods and Datasets," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 23, pp. 4426–4440, 2021.
- [18] J. Mao, J. Huang, A. Toshev, O. Camburu, A. Yuille, and K. Murphy, "Generation and Comprehension of Unambiguous Object Descriptions," in *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016, pp. 11–20.
- [19] J. Lu, D. Batra, D. Parikh, and S. Lee, *ViLBERT: Pretraining Task-Agnostic Visiolinguistic Representations for Vision-and-Language Tasks*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2019.
- [20] M. Shridhar, J. Thomason, D. Gordon, Y. Bisk, W. Han, R. Mottaghi, L. Zettlemoyer, and D. Fox, "ALFRED: A benchmark for interpreting grounded instructions for everyday tasks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 10 740–10 749.
- [21] A. Suglia, Q. Gao, J. Thomason, G. Thattai, and G. Sukhatme, "Embodied BERT: A transformer model for embodied, language-guided visual task completion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04927*, 2021.
- [22] M. Ahn, A. Brohan, N. Brown, Y. Chebotar, O. Cortes, B. David, C. Finn, K. Gopalakrishnan, K. Hausman, A. Herzog, *et al.*, "Do As I Can, Not As I Say: Grounding Language in Robotic Affordances," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691*, 2022.
- [23] T. Kollar, S. Tellex, D. Roy, and N. Roy, "Toward understanding natural language directions," in *2010 5th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, 2010, pp. 259–266.
- [24] S. A. Tellex, T. F. Kollar, S. R. Dickerson, M. R. Walter, A. Banerjee, S. Teller, and N. Roy, "Understanding natural language commands for robotic navigation and mobile manipulation," 2011.
- [25] C. Matuszek, E. Herbst, L. Zettlemoyer, and D. Fox, "Learning to parse natural language commands to a robot control system," in *Experimental robotics*. Springer, 2013, pp. 403–415.
- [26] P. Sharma, B. Sundaralingam, V. Blukis, C. Paxton, T. Hermans, A. Torralba, J. Andreas, and D. Fox, "Correcting robot plans with natural language feedback," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05186*, 2022.
- [27] A. Bicchi and V. Kumar, "Robotic grasping and contact: A review," in *Proceedings 2000 ICRA. Millennium Conference. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation. Symposia Proceedings (Cat. No. 00CH37065)*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2000, pp. 348–353.
- [28] M. Honnibal and M. Johnson, "An improved non-monotonic transition system for dependency parsing," in *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Lisbon, Portugal: Association for Computational Linguistics, September 2015, pp. 1373–1378. [Online]. Available: <https://aclweb.org/anthology/D/D15/D15-1162>
- [29] D. Jurafsky, *Speech & language processing*. Pearson Education India, 2000.
- [30] I. Song, F. Guedea, F. Karray, Y. Dai, and I. El Khalil, "Natural language interface for mobile robot navigation control," in *Proceedings of the 2004 IEEE International Symposium on Intelligent Control, 2004*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 210–215.
- [31] G. A. Miller, R. Beckwith, C. Fellbaum, D. Gross, and K. J. Miller.

- [32] K. He, G. Gkioxari, P. Dollar, and R. Girshick, "Mask r-cnn," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, Oct 2017.
- [33] J. Brooke *et al.*, "Sus-a quick and dirty usability scale," *Usability evaluation in industry*, vol. 189, no. 194, pp. 4–7, 1996.