

DMFC-GraspNet: Differentiable Multi-Fingered Robotic Grasp Generation in Cluttered Scenes

Philipp Blättner^{1,3}, Johannes Brand², Gerhard Neumann¹, and Ngo Anh Vien³

Abstract—Robotic grasping is a fundamental skill required for object manipulation in robotics. Multi-fingered robotic hands, which mimic the structure of the human hand, can potentially perform complex object manipulation. Nevertheless, current techniques for multi-fingered robotic grasping frequently predict only a single grasp for each inference time, limiting computational efficiency and their versatility, i.e. uni-modal grasp distribution. This paper proposes a differentiable multi-fingered grasp generation network (DMFC-GraspNet) with three main contributions to address this challenge. Firstly, a novel neural grasp planner is proposed, which predicts a new grasp representation to enable versatile and dense grasp predictions. Secondly, a scene creation and label mapping method is developed for dense labeling of multi-fingered robotic hands, which allows a dense association of ground truth grasps. Thirdly, we propose to train DMFC-GraspNet end-to-end using a forward-backward automatic differentiation approach with both a supervised loss and a differentiable collision loss and a generalized Q1 grasp metric loss. The proposed approach is evaluated using the Shadow Dexterous Hand on Mujoco simulation and ablated by different choices of loss functions. The results demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach in predicting versatile and dense grasps, and in advancing the field of multi-fingered robotic grasping.

I. INTRODUCTION

Robotic grasping is a fundamental skill required for manipulating objects in cluttered environments [1]. Multi-fingered robotic hands, such as the Shadow Hand, mimic the human hand’s structure, enabling complex object manipulations. For instance, the Shadow Hand was used to manipulate a cube in [2]. Data-driven grasp planning for multi-fingered robotic hands has been studied for decades with the aim of finding a hand configuration that provides a stable fixture of the target object inside the hand [3]. Grasp planning involves predicting the 6D pose of the robotic gripper, along with determining the joint angles of the fingers for multi-fingered hands. This increases the difficulty by increasing the number of degrees of freedom (DoF). In our study, we use the Shadow Hand, which has 24 degrees of freedom, including 3 positional, 3 rotational, and 18 finger joint angles, to perform robotic grasping. Grasping in a cluttered environment poses additional challenges, as the planned grasps must not collide with other objects in the scene or the table.

Several direct methods have been introduced to predict grasps [1], [4], [5]. Other methods can directly predict hand configurations, but they often predict only one grasp per prediction or require iterative decoding from different initial conditions to predict multiple grasps [6]. Some methods rely




Fig. 1. (Left) Grasped object from a multi-object scene with a Shadow Hand. (Right) Our model learns to predict a dense grasp distribution on the input point cloud. Each green point and the connected green line correspond to a prediction of a grasp. Each black line ends in a prediction of the palm translation. The length of the black line is defined by the predicted offset.

on additional components like classical grasp planners [7]. Contact-GraspNet [8] can predict dense 6D grasp predictions but only for parallel-jaw grippers and is limited to predicting grasps for points outside of the initial object point cloud. In particular, grasp representation with a multi-fingered hand should exploit the object point clouds in a different way from how a parallel-jaw does in Contact-GraspNet. Taking a different approach, these works [1], [9] proposing differentiable grasp metrics to take advantage of gradient-based optimization for multi-fingered grasp synthesis. In this work, a differentiable version of the epsilon metric was formulated and used to synthesize grasps. The computation of the epsilon metric is expressed mathematically as a semi-definite programming (SDP) problem. By utilizing the properties of SDP, the gradients of the solution can be derived with respect to the problem parameters, including the gripper pose.

In this study, we propose a novel approach that combines the strengths of i) Contact-GraspNet by representing and predicting a dense or multi-modal grasp distribution on the input point cloud and ii) the differentiable grasp planning theory that uses differentiable optimization as inductive bias to integrate a generalized Q1 grasp metric and a collision loss in an end-to-end training fashion. The proposed differentiable network extracts visual information by using four different cameras that record the scene from different angles. The proposed approach predicts dense grasp distributions for cluttered scenes and formulates differentiable grasp planning as a continuous optimization. Our method enables the efficient prediction of a diverse set of grasps for a cluttered scene

¹ Autonomous Learning Robot Lab, KIT

² Institute of Production Science, KIT

³ BCAI- Bosch Center of AI

of objects, densely projected to their much less ambiguous contact points, as depicted in Fig. 1.

II. RELATED WORK

Robotic grasping has been extensively studied for decades [10]. Recently, data-driven grasp planning, particularly using deep learning methods, has received significant attention [3]. In this section, we review deep learning approaches for grasp planning with multi-fingered robotic hands from visual information.

One popular approach for grasp planning is *direct regression*, where a neural network predicts the grasping posture directly from visual input. The network’s input is typically 3D visual information, and it is trained on pre-generated grasp samples for objects from object models. These samples are generated using classical grasp planners, such as [11] and [12]. In [4], a neural network predicts the palm pose from a single-depth image, and the finger state is determined by closing the hand until it touches the object. Additional post-processing is used to improve the grasp quality. In [5], a model predicts the palm pose as well as the joint angles of the fingers from a 3D occupancy grid. The model is trained on ground truth grasps with an additional collision loss to remove collisions in the predictions with the objects. This concept was further improved in [1], where an additional grasp quality loss was used to improve the quality of the predicted grasp. A neural network is trained to predict a single grasp proposal, and a lower bound of the Q_1 metric [9] is used to fine-tune and improve the predictions of the neural network. However, there work can only predict a single grasp per scene. In contrast, our approach can propose grasps densely on the input point cloud.

Another approach to predict grasps is *probabilistic inference*, also known as grasp success inference. These methods rely on additional grasp planners or sampling algorithms to generate grasp proposals. The neural networks are used to predict a measure that correlates with the grasp success. In [7], a model is introduced to predict a grasp quantity measure. The model processes a visual representation and adds additional haptic information. The output of the network then correlates with the success rate. In [13], a probabilistic grasp inference model is introduced, building upon earlier work in [14], where a model was trained to predict grasp success. In [13], additional models were used to model a grasp distribution. The overall success function is split into conditional priors to improve the overall performance. The predictions are further used to optimize the grasping pose by calculating the gradient of the success metric with respect to the input increase in the grasp success score during evaluation. Though these probabilistic inference based methods can generate multiple grasps per scene, they all require multiple inference rounds. In contrast, our method generates multiple grasps per inference round.

Generative models, such as variational autoencoders (VAEs) [15] or generative adversarial networks (GANs) [16], can also be used for grasp planning. These models use generative neural networks to predict grasps from a

combination of visual input and random sampling. These methods are able to predict many grasps by using different samples. In [17], a generative adversarial network is used to predict grasp poses. The proposed grasp poses are further refined by calculating the distance between a shape model of the object to grasp and the initial grasp proposal. The model can be used on scenes of objects by using a segmentation mask to extract the target object. In [18], a VAE is introduced to predict grasp poses directly from point clouds.

Reinforcement learning based approach has emerged as a powerful technique that can enable the model to discover solutions through trial and error. The authors in [19], [20], [21] have used RL to learn predictions for both grasp and shift motion primitives for parallel-jaw grippers. The model is trained by grasping simulated objects from a table to maximize the grasp success rate. In [22], active learning is employed to generate initial conditions for a neural grasp planner. The method utilizes a multi-armed bandit model to effectively determine whether to optimize an existing sample or generate an additional random start sample. Though these approaches can predict a multi-modal grasp distribution, they often require a large amount of online training data.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

We consider the problem of generating dexterous high-DoF robotic hand grasping with physically plausible and non-collision grasp configurations from cluttered scenes consisting of unknown objects. Formally, our method takes as input a recorded point cloud \mathcal{P} (possibly, registered from multi-views) and predicts grasps densely projected on the object point cloud. Each grasp is represented as a 6D reference palm point \mathbf{p} (the origin of the palm) and the joint angles of the hand fingers θ , i.e. $g = \{\mathbf{p}, \theta\}$. In particular, the Shadow Hand has (6+18)-DoF with: The parameter \mathbf{p} includes a 3-dim translation vector $\mathbf{t} = \{x, y, z\}$ and a 3-dim rotation vector $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ of the palm, while parameter θ includes 18-dim finger joint angles.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Our grasp generation model aims to predict a set of diverse, collision-free grasps for each object in a scene with a single inference from the model. We accomplish this by processing raw visual 3D data and directly predicting the 6D pose of the palm associated with each object point on the input point cloud as well as the joint angles of the fingers.

A. Grasp representation

We propose an efficient grasp representation that facilitates the acquisition of dexterous grasping skills on complex objects while achieving efficient training. Similar to Contact-GraspNet, we utilize a contact grasp representation, where the distribution of the palm’s translation, denoted by $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, of successful ground truth grasps is mapped to their corresponding contact points, denoted by p_{obj} . However, Contact-GraspNet restricts visible contact points to lie on surfaces observable with a depth sensor, leading to the representation of their 3D location using nearby points in a

recorded point cloud. Nonetheless, using such contact points directly to place the multi-fingered hand can result in an inadequate grasp pose for the fingers.

or multi-fingered hands, the state of the hand is characterized by the pose of the palm and the joint angles of the fingers. In contrast to Contact-GraspNet, our model is trained to predict these values directly in which the palm’s origin point is not necessary to be projected directly to points on the input point cloud. To simplify the learning task, we express the representation of the palm pose differently as follows. First, we use the 6D continuous representation of rotations to describe the orientation of the robot palm, i.e. use two 3-dim vectors $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$ and reconstruct the orientation matrix through the Gram-Schmidt process proposed in [23]. The 6D continuous representation can be adversarially transformed into a more conventional representation, such as quaternions. The advantage of this representation is that it eliminates any discontinuities, resulting in more stable training [23]. For the expression of the palm position, we use a grasp representation inspired by [24]. Instead of directly calculating it, we utilize an object point, denoted by $p_{obj} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, to calculate the translation of the palm as follows:

$$\mathbf{t}_{palm} = p_{obj} + \text{offset}_{x,y,z} \quad (1)$$

where $\text{offset}_{x,y,z} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the offset from the reference point to the palm. This approach reduces the prediction interval by only requiring us to predict offsets around the object points. For the joint angles $I \in \mathbb{R}^{18}$ of the fingers, we directly predict their values. The result of this representation is a 27-dimensional state vector that describes the grasp posture of the Shadow Hand, i.e. $g = \{\text{offset}_{x,y,z}, \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}, I\}$ associated with each contact point p_{obj} .

B. Grasp Data Generation

We generate different table-top scenes of training and testing. The scenes contain different selections of objects. We use the collection of object models with their *ground-truth grasp poses* from [1]. The selection contains object models from different object databases in the YCB testset [25], the BigBird dataset [26], the data grasping set [27], and the KIT object dataset [28]. We withhold the objects from the YCB [25] set for testing. We further use the generated Ground truth grasps from [1]. Liu et al. generated the grasps with GraspIt [11]. The labels contain hundreds of grasps for each object. We follow the scene generation from ACRONYM and Contact-GraspNet [29], [8] to generate three different datasets, ranging from simple to complex scenes.

- Our first training set contains 1000 samples of one object scene generated using all 533 non-YCB objects, with random poses. This leads to additional complexity in our dataset. The position of the objects is selected randomly to still be on the table. We randomly place the objects on the scene in a random quasi-stable pose generated with Trimesh [30].
- Our second set of training data contains table-top scenes of multi objects (3 to 5) using a similar pipeline from ACRONYM [29]. In particular, we place the objects

iterative in collision-free positions on the table similar to a single object. We generate random positions until a collision free position for mesh on the table is found. For the training, we generate 10.000 different scenes to train our model containing 3 to 5 different objects.

We render depth images of the scenes before the training. The depth images look at the table-top from all for sides of the table. During the training, we extract a point cloud from the depth images. Furthermore, we use the generated poses of the objects from the scene creation to transform the ground truth grasps in a canonical state to objects in the created scene. We match those grasps to object points in the input point cloud to generate dense annotations of the point cloud. We match the grasps by using a reference point on the palm of the hand. We calculate the distance d_t between the ground-truth reference point p_p of the palm origin and the object point i -th $p_{o,i}$. In addition, we calculate the signed distance d_n along the normal direction of the mesh object o as follows

$$d_t = \|p_p - p_{o,i}\|_2, \quad d_n = n_{o,i} * (p_p - p_{o,i}). \quad (2)$$

We match any ground-truth grasp to an object point in the point cloud, if the translation of the palm is closer than 5mm to this object point and has a positive distance in the normal direction. Specifically, for object point i , there is a set of ground-truth grasps whose reference point p satisfies the matching

$$g_i = \{g_p | d_t \leq 5mm \ \& \ d_n > 0\}. \quad (3)$$

The set of matched grasps g_i is a non-unique matching for each point i per object o . An object point with a non-empty set g_i is set with positive label, otherwise negative.

C. Network Architecture

Our model targets to predict dense grasp proposals for points on the input point cloud, $F : PCL \mapsto \mathcal{G}$ that maps from input point clouds in $\mathbb{R}^{N \times 3}$ to a grasp configuration space. As our output grasp distribution is dense, we define $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 27}$, where m is the number of predicted grasp points and 27 is the dimension of each grasp configuration as defined in IV-A. In our implementation we predict $m = 512$ points. Fig. 1 (Right) shows an intuitive result of a dense grasp distribution on the input point cloud.

Similar to Contact-GraspNet [8], we are based on PointNet++ [31], and our network also uses a segmentation-style structure. This allows the feature network to extract an embedding for individual points. We use a U-shaped network as a feature-extracting backbone. The layers of the backbone are based on the set abstraction modules from PointNet++. We employ 4 downsampling modules followed by 3 up-sampling modules. The network input receives a downsampled point cloud of $N = 2048$ points. The first downsampling module reduces the number of points to 512. This is the stage that we use for the predictions of the network. The backbone network predicts a 128-dimensional feature vector for each of these 512 points. The network structure is depicted in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. Structure of the backbone network. The pointnet++ [31] predicts a point wise geometry embedding for the point cloud. The head networks predict the individual components.

We deploy a head network to transform the feature representation for each point to our grasp representation. We split the grasp representation into the position offset, orientation, and the finger joint angles of each grasp prediction. We use one head network for each part. The motivation of using different heads for the 3 different parts is that each part has a different scale and unit. Separating each prediction allows each head network to learn a specific part. The heads are simple 3-layered MLP networks. The first two layers of the head network are linear layers with the relu activation function which also use batch normalization [32]. The following last linear layer predicts the outputs. The last layers do not have an activation function. The output dimensions of the head network corresponds to the dimensions of the grasp representation.

The network predicts $m = 512$ grasps for each scene. We want to be able to select the best grasps from the predictions. For this, we deploy an additional head network to predict a 1-dim confidence value. This is the same head network but with an additional Sigmoid activation function at the output.

We further want to transform a model of the hand to the predicted state in the scene. For this, we calculate the pose of each joint of the hand. Using predicted joint states as input, we apply the forward kinematic layer from [33] to transform the hand mesh model into its corresponding world coordinate state, i.e. all points on the gripper sampled from the hand model mesh are transformed to the predicted pose. Specifically, we use the predicted joint angles to calculate the homogeneous transformation from the parent joint to the each child joints. To enforce the joint angle limits in the predictions, we clamp the joint angles within a predefined range $\Theta = \max(\min(\Theta, \Theta_{max}), \Theta_{min})$. We calculate the position of each link by applying all transformation from the chain to the link. This allows us later to calculate loss functions based on collisions of the prediction with the object models and a differentiable Q_1 grasp metric.

D. Loss Functions

We use a task loss function which is a combination of different loss functions which is defined similarly in [1]. The task loss is to train our network to predict grasp

representations. It can be expressed for a prediction at point i on the input point cloud as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_{task,i} = w_1 \mathcal{L}_{ch} + w_2 \mathcal{L}_{co} + w_3 \mathcal{L}_{gu} + w_4 \mathcal{L}_{Q_1^{upper}} \quad (4)$$

where w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 are weighting coefficients among different loss terms. We now describe each loss term.

a) Supervised loss: The Chamfer loss \mathcal{L}_{ch} calculates the distance between the ground truth grasps and the predictions of the network. It was originally introduced in [1] to solve to correspondence problem of multi-fingered grasping. The correspondence problem relates to the fact that there are many different possible grasp for each object. Because the model in Liu et. al. [1] only predicts a uni-modal grasp distribution, i.e. a single grasp pose per prediction, they implemented this loss in a way that the closest ground truth grasp is selected to the prediction over the entire set of training grasps for this object. However our model can predict a multi-modal grasp distribution, e.g. densely on the point cloud. Therefore we propose to select the closest ground truth from the labels but should also satisfy the matching condition as described in Eq. 3. This added condition enables the matching of object points with ground truth grasps locally only. In essence, the Chamfer loss is calculated at each predicted point i with a predicted pose \hat{g}_i as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_{ch,i} = \min_{g_p} \|\hat{g}_i - g_p\|^2 \quad \text{s.t. } g_p \in G_i \quad (5)$$

where G_i is the ground-truth grasp pose set at point i as defined in Eq. 3. Note that we only calculate $\mathcal{L}_{ch,i}$ on points with positive label.

b) Differentiable collision loss: The collision loss is calculated based on the mesh model of the hands. For this loss function, we first sample 2000 collision points from the hand model mesh. We use these points to calculate the distance between the meshes of the scene and the hand model. We calculate the distance with respect to every mesh in the scene including the table, the objects and the links of the hands (to capture self-collision). Specifically, the collision loss is calculated as follows

$$\mathcal{L}_{co} = \frac{1}{2000 * L} \sum_{j=1}^L \sum_{i=1}^{2000} \max(d_j^i, 0)^2,$$

where d_c^i is the signed distance from the closed point of any object mesh to every collision point i and L is the number of meshes in the scene.

c) Guidance loss: We further employ a guidance loss to guide the inside of the hand towards the closest mesh. The guidance loss is supposed to minimize the distance between the hand and the surface of the object. The guidance loss uses the distance calculation from the loss functions and will guide the hand towards the next mesh surface. To calculate the guidance loss, we labeled a set of $V = 45$ hand points, which are located on the inside of the hand. We use these points to calculate the distance between the meshes of the scene and the hand model. We calculate the distance with respect to every mesh in the scene including the table,

the objects and the links of the hands. The loss is simply calculated with

$$\mathcal{L}_{gu} = \sum_j^V \|p_j - p_{\text{mesh},j}\|^2,$$

where p_j is the position of the hand point, and $p_{\text{mesh},j}$ is the point among all meshes closest to p_j . A similar loss function has been introduced in the DDGP [1]. The position of these points is calculated by the collision point layer. The inside the hand points define a subset of these points. For the multi-object input scenes, all object meshes are treated as one mesh. The hand is guided towards the closed face of a mesh regardless of the which mesh the face belongs to.

d) Differentiable Q_1 metric loss: The last term of the loss function is the upper bound of the Q_1 metric. The metric was first introduced by [9]. It describes the quality of a force closure grasp with the minimal wrench to break the grasp. We note that using lower bound of Q_1 metric can result higher grasp quality. However its computation is expensive, especially for our model predicting a dense grasp distribution we have to solve multiple SDP problems per forward pass. The upper bound has been first introduced in [34] and used for training a neural network in [1]. We use the notation from [1] for the upper bound

$$Q_1^{\text{upper}} = \min_{j=1,\dots,D} [\max s_j^T M w], \quad (6)$$

where M is a metric tensor to weight the torque components, w is the wrench of the grasp, and s_j is the support of the point. As a result, we define the loss $\mathcal{L}_{Q_1^{\text{upper}}} = e^{-Q_1^{\text{upper}}}$.

e) Confidence loss: In the task loss formulation, the confidence is not regarded in the loss function of the predictions. We adapt the loss augmentation from [35] to calculate the joint loss function including the confidence with

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{task, confidence}} = \frac{1}{B} \frac{1}{m} \sum_i^m c_i \mathcal{L}_{\text{task},i} - w_5 \log(c_i),$$

where c_i is a predicted confidence score at point i , B is the batch size and N is number of points in the prediction. We train our network with $\mathcal{L}_{\text{confidence}}$ with $w_5 = 1$.

E. Implementation Details

Our model training process employs the Adam optimizer [36] with a carefully chosen learning rate of 0.001 and a learning rate decay of 0.9 after every 10 epochs. The batch size is set to 4. The loss function is evaluated to ensure reliable and robust predictions. Due to memory constraints on the GPU, only the 64 samples with the highest error are selected for backpropagation during training.

Our training methodology involves a two-stage process. In the first stage, we pretrain our models using only the Chamfer loss for 50 epochs to reduce the task loss. This approach serves to guide the network’s predictions towards reasonable grasps. The pre-trained model is then fine-tuned with the task loss for an additional 20 epochs, further optimizing the model’s performance. The training on the large dataset of 10.000 scenes take 2 days on a single Nvidia V100 GPU.

To evaluate the effect of different loss functions, we train a model for each combination of loss functions on various training sets. In all cases, we pretrain the models on the data loss to ensure a solid foundation. Our initial loss function uses coefficient $w_1 = 1, w_2 = 1, w_3 = 1, w_4 = 0, w_5 = 1$. We fine-tune this model on the first training set of objects with a standard pose to assess the effect of various loss functions. The pre-trained model from the data loss is used as the starting point for fine-tuning different models.

V. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

We assess the efficacy of our grasp planner in the simulation environment, Mujoco [37]. Our evaluation employs a Shadow Hand model comprising 24 degrees of freedom. To streamline control and isolate the hand, we utilize a hand-only robot model without an attached arm. This approach enables us to evaluate grasp planning performance without kinematic constraints, further simplifying trajectory planning from the initial hand pose to the target grasp pose. In our evaluation task, we aim to lift an object from the table and sustain the grip for 2 seconds.

A. Evaluation Data

We employ the identical scene generation process utilized during training to create test scenes. Our model is evaluated using 16 selected objects from the YCB test set, {master_chef_can, mustard_bottle, potted_meat_can, banana, bleach_cleanser, mug, skillet_lid, wood_block, mini_soccer_ball, softball, baseball, tennis, c_cups, e_cups, f_cups, i_cups}. They are those used in training data generation. To construct 100 distinct test scenes, we randomly create scenes of i) one object with standard pose, ii) one object with random pose, and iii) randomly spawn 3 to 5 objects and place them on the table. We leverage the same four-camera configuration used during training to capture the test scenes.

B. Inference and Grasp Execution

We rendered 4 depth images of the scene using Mujoco and applied segmentation masks to remove the background, resulting in a point cloud with 2048 points for all objects in the scene. We used the same processing sets as in training to obtain a consistent representation of the global point cloud. Without any segmentation for specific objects, our trained model predicts 512 grasp configurations with associated confidence values. We sort the grasp proposals by confidence and select the highest-confidence grasps first, pruning those with confidence below 0.15 to prioritize better grasps.

Once we have selected a target grasp, we start the robotic hand in a resting pose above the table and move it to the grasping pose with a set of support hand poses, computed based on the predicted offset from the pre-grasp pose. To execute the trajectory, we directly control the position and orientation of the palm.

To evaluate the results, we lift the object straight upwards to the resting pose height and hold it for 2 seconds. A grasp is successful if the object remains inside the palm at the end of the waiting process.




Fig. 3. Example of a planned trajectory: The hand is moved from resting pose to the object in four steps. First, the hand is raised to a high pose above the object. Next, it moves to a pre-grasping pose, slightly offset from the final grasp pose along the normal direction. The fingers are open in this pose. Finally, the hand moves into the grasping pose and the fingers close around the object.

C. Evaluation metrics

For the evaluation, we try to select $K = 4$ grasps per scene to execute. From the list of grasps after filtering using confidence scores, we select K grasps using the farthest point sampling algorithm in order to assess the prediction quality in general.

We evaluate the grasp success with three different metrics. The first metric calculates the number of valid grasps in the scenes. The valid grasp rates is the number of successfully planned grasps from K . The grasp success rate describes the number of successful grasps out of the successfully planned grasps. The overall success rate is the combination out of both. The overall success rate describes the number of successful grasps out of K evaluated grasps. We evaluate the success rate of each tested grasps. The reported success rate is calculated with the number of total evaluated grasps.

D. Simulated Grasping Experiments

We now report the evaluation results collected on 100 random scenes through the physical execution of predicted grasps on Mujoco. We report the mean rate and its first standard deviation.

a) Evaluation on one object scene of random pose:

Our first experiment evaluates the model trained our first small training set of simple scene, i.e. single-object scene. We evaluate for $K = 4$ grasps for each object. The goal of this experiment is to evaluate the effectiveness of the different loss functions. For this, we run our experiment for each of the model with the same object starting conditions. Before each evaluated grasp in each scene, we reset the simulation environment.

The results in Table I show that the pretrained model with Chamfer loss only can perform poorly but fine-tuning helps improve either the valid rate or the success rate. All fine-tuning losses help improve the valid rate, but the collision and guidance loss reduces the success rate. Fine-tuning with the Q 1 upper bound loss helps improve the success rate significantly, however it has the lowest valid rate improvement. Fine-tuning with all losses including Chamfer gives the best balanced performance.

TABLE I

EVALUATION RESULTS ON ONE OBJECT SCENE OF RANDOM POSE.

Model	Valid rate	Success	Overall
Pre-trained w. \mathcal{L}_{ch}	0.67 ± 0.02	0.45 ± 0.02	0.29 ± 0.02
Fine-tuning w. \mathcal{L}_{co}	1.0 ± 0.0	0.13 ± 0.01	0.13 ± 0.01
Fine-tuning w. \mathcal{L}_{gu}	0.90 ± 0.02	0.35 ± 0.02	0.32 ± 0.02
Fine-tuning w. \mathcal{L}_{Q1}^{upper}	0.75 ± 0.02	0.73 ± 0.01	0.55 ± 0.02
Fine-tuning w. all	0.82 ± 0.02	0.68 ± 0.02	0.56 ± 0.02

b) Evaluation on multi-object scene of random pose:

This experiment evaluates the model trained on our large dataset of 10,000 complex scenes. The evaluation scenes contain 3 to 4 objects. We also use 4 grasp trials for each object. Due to high computation, we only train and evaluate the pre-trained model and the fine-tuning with all losses. The results in Table II show that both models perform well on both the valid and success rates. Fine-tuning with all differentiable losses helps improve the overall performance significantly. These performance is slightly better than the evaluation on one-object scene because we use a significantly larger dataset.

The overall results are encouraging and show that the model is able to predict grasps with improved collision avoidance and grasp quality. In addition, as shown in qualitative visualization in Fig. 1, our model can predict a multi-modal grasp distribution.

TABLE II

EVALUATION RESULTS ON MULTI-OBJECT SCENE OF RANDOM POSE.

Model	Valid rate	Success	Overall
Pre-trained	0.991 ± 0.001	0.511 ± 0.001	0.507 ± 0.001
Fine-tuning	0.994 ± 0.0	0.72 ± 0.001	0.71 ± 0.001

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have developed a novel neural network-based approach for grasp planning that can predict a dense, versatile distribution of grasps for a multi-fingered hand given an input of a point cloud. Our most important contribution is to predict a multi-modal grasp distribution, which provides grasp predictions densely on the object point cloud. In addition, our proposed grasp representation allows for the prediction of multi-fingered grasps on object points, which significantly improves the effectiveness of the grasp planner. On the other hand, our new loss functions also show that

they help further improve the accuracy and reliability of our model.

While our experiments have shown promising results, there is still much to explore in this direction. Future work will include evaluating our approach on different hand models and physical systems to evaluate its performance in more real-world scenarios. We also plan to integrate the Q_1 lower bound to improve the overall fine-tuning performance of our model. Overall, our fully differentiable grasp planner provides a robust and efficient solution for multi-fingered grasp planning tasks and opens up exciting possibilities for more advanced applications of human-like robotic hands.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Liu, Z. Pan, K. Xu, K. Ganguly, and D. Manocha, "Deep differentiable grasp planner for high-dof grippers," in *Robotics: Science and Systems XVI, Virtual Event / Corvallis, Oregon, USA, July 12-16, 2020*, M. Toussaint, A. Bicchi, and T. Hermans, Eds., 2020.
- [2] O. M. Andrychowicz, B. Baker, M. Chociej, R. Jozefowicz, B. McGrew, J. Pachocki, A. Petron, M. Plappert, G. Powell, A. Ray, et al., "Learning dexterous in-hand manipulation," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 3–20, 2020.
- [3] J. Bohg, A. Morales, T. Asfour, and D. Kragic, "Data-driven grasp synthesis—a survey," *IEEE Transactions on robotics*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 289–309, 2013.
- [4] P. Schmidt, N. Vahrenkamp, M. Wächter, and T. Asfour, "Grasping of unknown objects using deep convolutional neural networks based on depth images," in *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 6831–6838.
- [5] M. Liu, Z. Pan, K. Xu, K. Ganguly, and D. Manocha, "Generating grasp poses for a high-DoF gripper using neural networks," in *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1518–1525.
- [6] J. Lundell, F. Verdoja, and V. Kyrki, "Ddgc: Generative deep dexterous grasping in clutter," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 6899–6906, 2021.
- [7] S. Ottenhaus, D. Renninghoff, R. Grimm, F. Ferreira, and T. Asfour, "Visuo-haptic grasping of unknown objects based on gaussian process implicit surfaces and deep learning," in *2019 IEEE-RAS 19th International Conference on Humanoid Robots (Humanoids)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 402–409.
- [8] M. Sundermeyer, A. Mousavian, R. Triebel, and D. Fox, "Contact-GraspNet: Efficient 6-DoF grasp generation in cluttered scenes," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 13 438–13 444.
- [9] C. Ferrari and J. F. Canny, "Planning optimal grasps," in *ICRA*, vol. 3, no. 4, 1992, p. 6.
- [10] 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.
- [11] A. T. Miller and P. K. Allen, "GraspIt! a versatile simulator for robotic grasping," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 110–122, 2004.
- [12] N. Vahrenkamp, M. Kröhnert, S. Ulbrich, T. Asfour, G. Metta, R. Dillmann, and G. Sandini, "Simox: A robotics toolbox for simulation, motion and grasp planning," in *Intelligent Autonomous Systems 12: Volume 1 Proceedings of the 12th International Conference IAS-12, held June 26-29, 2012, Jeju Island, Korea*. Springer, 2013, pp. 585–594.
- [13] Q. Lu, M. Van der Merwe, B. Sundaralingam, and T. Hermans, "Multifingered grasp planning via inference in deep neural networks: Outperforming sampling by learning differentiable models," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 55–65, 2020.
- [14] Q. Lu, M. Van der Merwe, and T. Hermans, "Multi-fingered active grasp learning," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 8415–8422.
- [15] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling, "Auto-encoding variational bayes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114*, 2013.
- [16] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, "Generative adversarial networks," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 139–144, 2020.
- [17] J. Lundell, E. Corona, T. N. Le, F. Verdoja, P. Weinzapfel, G. Rogez, F. Moreno-Noguer, and V. Kyrki, "Multi-FinGAN: Generative coarse-to-fine sampling of multi-finger grasps," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4495–4501.
- [18] W. Wei, D. Li, P. Wang, Y. Li, W. Li, Y. Luo, and J. Zhong, "Dvgg: Deep variational grasp generation for dextrous manipulation," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1659–1666, 2022.
- [19] A. Zeng, S. Song, S. Welker, J. Lee, A. Rodriguez, and T. A. Funkhouser, "Learning synergies between pushing and grasping with self-supervised deep reinforcement learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1803.09956, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1803.09956>
- [20] L. Berscheid, P. Meißner, and T. Kröger, "Robot learning of shifting objects for grasping in cluttered environments," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1907.11035, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11035>
- [21] Z. Feldman, H. Ziesche, N. A. Vien, and D. D. Castro, "A hybrid approach for learning to shift and grasp with elaborate motion primitives," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation, ICRA 2022, Philadelphia, PA, USA, May 23-27, 2022*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 6365–6371.
- [22] Q. Lu, K. Chenna, B. Sundaralingam, and T. Hermans, "Planning multi-fingered grasps as probabilistic inference in a learned deep network," in *Robotics Research: The 18th International Symposium ISRR*. Springer, 2020, pp. 455–472.
- [23] Y. Zhou, C. Barnes, J. Lu, J. Yang, and H. Li, "On the continuity of rotation representations in neural networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 5745–5753.
- [24] A. Morales, T. Asfour, P. Azad, S. Knoop, and R. Dillmann, "Integrated grasp planning and visual object localization for a humanoid robot with five-fingered hands," in *2006 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 5663–5668.
- [25] B. Calli, A. Singh, A. Walsman, S. Srinivasa, P. Abbeel, and A. M. Dollar, "The YCB object and model set: Towards common benchmarks for manipulation research," in *2015 international conference on advanced robotics (ICAR)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 510–517.
- [26] A. Singh, J. Sha, K. S. Narayan, T. Achim, and P. Abbeel, "Bigbird: A large-scale 3D database of object instances," in *2014 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 509–516.
- [27] D. Kappler, J. Bohg, and S. Schaal, "Leveraging big data for grasp planning," in *2015 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 4304–4311.
- [28] A. Kasper, Z. Xue, and R. Dillmann, "The kit object models database: An object model database for object recognition, localization and manipulation in service robotics," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 927–934, 2012.
- [29] C. Eppner, A. Mousavian, and D. Fox, "ACRONYM: A large-scale grasp dataset based on simulation," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, ICRA 2021, Xi'an, China, May 30 - June 5, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 6222–6227.
- [30] Dawson-Haggerty et al., "trimesh." [Online]. Available: <https://trimsh.org/>
- [31] C. R. Qi, L. Yi, H. Su, and L. J. Guibas, "PointNet++: Deep hierarchical feature learning on point sets in a metric space," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [32] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, "Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift," in *International conference on machine learning*. pmlr, 2015, pp. 448–456.
- [33] R. Villegas, J. Yang, D. Ceylan, and H. Lee, "Neural kinematic networks for unsupervised motion retargeting," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 8639–8648.
- [34] J. D. Schulman, K. Goldberg, and P. Abbeel, "Grasping and fixturing as submodular coverage problems," in *Robotics Research: The 15th International Symposium ISRR*. Springer, 2017, pp. 571–583.
- [35] C. Wang, D. Xu, Y. Zhu, R. Martín-Martín, C. Lu, L. Fei-Fei, and S. Savarese, "DenseFusion: 6d object pose estimation by iterative

- dense fusion,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 3343–3352.
- [36] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [37] E. Todorov, T. Erez, and Y. Tassa, “Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control,” in *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 5026–5033.