

# Neo-FREE: Policy Composition Through Thousand Brains And Free Energy Optimization

**Francesca Rossi**

*Scuola Superiore Meridionale, Naples, Italy*

F.ROSSI@SSMERIDIONALE.IT

**Émiland Garrabé**

*Sorbonne University, Paris, France*

GARRABE@ISIR.UPMC.FR

**Giovanni Russo\***

*University of Salerno, Italy*

GIOVARUSSO@UNISA.IT

## Abstract

We consider the problem of optimally composing a set of primitives to tackle control tasks. To address this problem, we introduce Neo-FREE: a control architecture inspired by the Thousand Brains Theory and Free Energy Principle from cognitive sciences. In accordance with the neocortical (Neo) processes postulated by the Thousand Brains Theory, Neo-FREE consists of functional units returning control primitives. These are linearly combined by a gating mechanism that minimizes the variational free energy (FREE). The problem of finding the optimal primitives' weights is then recast as a finite-horizon optimal control problem, which is convex even when the cost is not and the environment is nonlinear, stochastic, non-stationary. The results yield an algorithm for primitives composition and the effectiveness of Neo-FREE is illustrated via in-silico and hardware experiments on an application involving robot navigation in an environment with obstacles.

**Keywords:** Autonomous Systems, Thousand Brains Theory, Variational Free Energy, Optimal Control

## 1. Introduction

When we are given a new task, we can re-use and compose what we know to achieve our goal. This compositionality ability is widely believed to be a key ingredient differentiating natural and machine intelligence (Lake et al., 2017; Russin et al., 2024). For state-of-the-art autonomous agents, designed by, e.g., leveraging deep neural networks, this desirable capability is promoted by endowing the network with inductive biases. This is achieved via, e.g., specialized architectures, meta-learning, or large-scale pre-training (Russin et al., 2024). However, there is little evidence that machines designed on this paradigm can exhibit compositionality and a key challenge transversal to learning and control is to equip autonomous agents with mechanisms mimicking this ability.

Motivated by this, we introduce Neo-FREE: a neocortical-inspired (Neo) control architecture enabling agents to compute an optimal policy from a set of control primitives via the minimization of the variational free energy (FREE). Namely, given a finite-horizon control task, Neo-FREE returns the (possibly, non-stationary) optimal policy built by linearly combining the primitives. We also show that, at each time-step, the policy can be found by solving an optimization problem that is convex even when the cost is non-convex in the states/actions and the environment is nonlinear, non-stationary and stochastic. Our control architecture is inspired by the Thousand Brains Theory (TBT) from computational neuroscience and cognitive science (Hawkins, 2021; Mountcastle, 1978). TBT argues that our ability to efficiently learn new concepts is hosted in our neocortex, a highly parallel

system having cortical columns as functional units. Each column processes sensory information and TBT postulates that our perception of the world arises from composing their outputs. In Neo-FREE, the functional units return simple policies that are composed by a gating mechanism. In turn, this mechanism is grounded into the minimization of the variational free energy, a central principle in information theory, statistical learning and cognitive science (Simeone, 2018; Ziebart et al., 2008; Friston, 2010). Next, we survey architectures related to Neo-FREE and refer interested readers to (Lake et al., 2017; Russin et al., 2024) for broader discussions on compositionality in natural and machine intelligence from the viewpoint of psychology, cognition and philosophy.

**Related Works.** The design of modular architectures enabling agents to fulfill a given task from a set of primitives is a central topic for learning and control, with robotics often used as a design, test and validation domain (Prescott and Wilson, 2023). The TBT is closely related to MOSAIC (Modular Selection and Identification for Control) and the mixture of experts models, see, e.g., (Wolpert and Kawato, 1998; Haruno et al., 2001; Jacobs et al., 1991; Van de Maele et al., 2022). The MOSAIC architecture builds control inputs via a weighted linear combination of motor *command* signals. The weights for the commands are obtained from *responsibility signals* computed via a stationary soft-max selection rule. Building on this, (Doya et al., 2002; Samejima et al., 2006) complement the soft-max rule for weights selection with temporal difference learning aimed at maximizing a stationary reward. Despite the experimental successes on nonlinear control tasks reported in these works, to the best of our knowledge there is no normative framework explaining why the soft-max rule should be used to compose the motor signals. The mixture of experts model was originally introduced in the context of machine learning (Jacobs et al., 1991) and has become a cornerstone for Large Language Model architectures (Cai et al., 2024). Following this approach, decisions are computed by learning a stationary policy (in infinite-horizon settings) to linearly combine the output of a pool of experts that also set the performance baseline. We refer to, e.g., (Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006; Masoudnia and Ebrahimpour, 2014) for more details and to (Cacciatore and Nowlan, 1993; Gomi and Kawato, 1993; Willi et al., 2024) for applications to control tasks where a stationary policy is again learned for infinite-horizon control problems. A complementary approach to combine experts is via architectures based on the so-called Product of Experts (Hinton, 2002) model where experts (probabilistic models) are combined by properly multiplying their probability distributions. While originally developed for inference, this model has been recently extended (Hansel et al., 2023) to learn stationary policies for control tasks. Non-stationary policies (in finite-horizon settings) can be instead computed with the architecture from (Garrabé et al., 2023). However, the results are obtained under the simplifying assumption that the agent can directly specify state transitions rather than policies.

**Contributions.** We present Neo-FREE, an architecture enabling agents to optimally combine control primitives in order to tackle finite-horizon control tasks. In Neo-FREE, primitives are optimally composed by solving an optimization problem that is convex even when the cost is not convex in states/actions and the environment is nonlinear, non-stationary and stochastic. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first architecture featuring an underlying optimization problem that is convex in this setting and that, additionally: (i) does not require that the agent specifies its state transitions; (ii) does not assume stationary/discounted settings. Our key technical contributions are as follows:

- our architecture, distilling TBT and variational free energy minimization into a coherent control-theoretical framework, provides a normative mechanism for primitives composition.

This mechanism links the decision rules determining how primitives are composed to the solution of an underlying constrained finite-horizon optimal control problem having the variational free energy as cost and primitives’ weights as decision variables;

- we comprehensively characterize the control problem and show that this can be tackled via recursive arguments. Moreover, we show that at each time-step finding the optimal weights for the primitives composition amounts at solving an optimization problem that we prove is convex even when the agent cost is not in states/actions. Also, we do not make specific assumptions on the environment dynamics besides the standard Markov assumption;
- the results are turned into an algorithm and validated both in-silico, via simulations, and on a hardware test-bed, using the Robotarium (Wilson et al., 2020). The experiments show the effectiveness of Neo-FREE on a rover navigation task, where the agent needs to reach a final destination while avoiding obstacles. Finally, the code implementing Neo-FREE is fully documented and made available at <https://tinyurl.com/mrka3wzk>.

The paper is organized as follows. After introducing (Section 2) the relevant background, we present Neo-FREE and recast the primitives composition problem as a finite-horizon optimal control problem (Section 3.1 and Section 3.2). Then, we present an algorithm (Section 3.3) to tackle the problem, characterizing: (i) optimality; (ii) convexity of the optimization problems solved within the algorithm. Neo-FREE is validated in Section 4 and concluding remarks are given in Section 5.

## 2. Background

Sets are denoted in calligraphic, e.g.,  $\mathcal{X}$ , and vectors in **bold**, e.g.,  $\mathbf{x}$ . A random variable is denoted by  $\mathbf{V}$  and its realization by  $\mathbf{v}$ . For continuous (or discrete) random variables we denote the *probability density function*, pdf, (or *probability mass function*, pmf) of  $\mathbf{V}$  by  $p(\mathbf{v})$ . The joint pmf of  $\mathbf{V}_1$  and  $\mathbf{V}_2$  is denoted by  $p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$  and the conditional pmf of  $\mathbf{V}_1$  with respect to  $\mathbf{V}_2$  is  $p(\mathbf{v}_1 | \mathbf{v}_2)$ . Countable sets are denoted by  $\{w_k\}_{k_1:k_n}$ , where  $w_k$  is a generic element,  $k_1$  and  $k_n$  are respectively the indices of the first and last element, and  $k_1 : k_n$  is the set of consecutive integers between (including)  $k_1$  and  $k_n$ . The support of a function  $p(\cdot)$  is written as  $\mathcal{S}(p)$ . The expectation of a function  $\mathbf{h}(\cdot)$  of a continuous random variable  $\mathbf{V}$  with pdf  $p(\mathbf{v})$  is  $\mathbb{E}_p[\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{V})] := \int_{\mathcal{S}(p)} \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{v})p(\mathbf{v})d\mathbf{v}$ . We utilize the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence (Kullback and Leibler, 1951):  $D_{\text{KL}}(p||q) := \int_{\mathcal{S}(p)} p(\mathbf{v}) \ln \left( \frac{p(\mathbf{v})}{q(\mathbf{v})} \right) d\mathbf{v}$ , that is a measure of discrepancy between two pdfs  $p(\mathbf{v})$  and  $q(\mathbf{v})$ . The  $D_{\text{KL}}(p||q)$  is finite only if  $\mathcal{S}(p) \subset \mathcal{S}(q)$ , i.e.,  $p(\mathbf{v})$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $q(\mathbf{v})$ , see (Cover and Thomas, 2006, Chapter 8). For discrete variables the integral is replaced with the sum in the above expressions.

**Variational Free Energy.** The minimization of variational free energy plays a central role for autonomous decision-making across optimization, inference, risk-aware control and learning (Jaiswal et al., 2024; Sanger, 2014; Mazzaglia et al., 2021; Kouw, 2023): a wide range of methods and frameworks, including reinforcement learning schemes (Ziebart et al., 2008) based on maximum entropy, Bayesian inference (Jordan et al., 1999), entropically regularized optimal transport (Carlier et al., 2017), rely on optimizing free energy functionals (Jose and Simeone, 2021; Simeone, 2018). Beyond artificial agents, this minimization principle is also central to the broader quest for a unifying theory of self-organization (Heins et al., 2024), brain function and sentient behaviors (Friston,

2009). Following this principle, adaptive changes in the brain are aimed at minimizing the free energy – an upper bound to the surprise in the data obtained from a generative probabilistic model. Formally, given a generative model  $q(\mathbf{z})$ , the variational free energy is defined by:

$$\mathcal{F}(p(\mathbf{z})) = D_{\text{KL}}(p(\mathbf{z})\|q(\mathbf{z})) + \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{z})}[l(\mathbf{z})],$$

where: (i) the first term is the statistical complexity of  $p(\mathbf{z})$  with respect to the generative model. Minimizing this term amounts at minimizing the discrepancy (in the KL divergence sense) between  $p(\mathbf{z})$  and  $q(\mathbf{z})$ ; (ii) the second term is the agent expected loss.

**The Thousand Brains Theory.** The TBT, recently popularized by (Hawkins et al., 2019) and based on the pioneering work (Mountcastle, 1978), suggests that our ability to quickly learn *models* of the world is hosted in our neocortex via a mechanism that combines the output of cortical units (see Fig. 1(a)). Each column can process different sensory information and the TBT postulates that each of these functional units learns its own model of the world from the data that it receives as an input almost independently on the other units. The result is that the neocortex implements a massively distributed and redundant processing system, in which different columns can independently represent the same object from different perspectives. According to the TBT, the output of the columns is then processed through a voting mechanism to obtain a coherent model from the sensory information (see Fig. 1(a) for an example). Next, we propose that a similar architecture can be devised for control purposes and that the minimization of the variational free energy can be used as a normative mechanism to compose the output of basic functional units returning control primitives.

### 3. The Neo-FREE Architecture

We consider the set-up of Fig. 1(b) where the agent determines an action  $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  based on the state  $\mathbf{x}_{k-1} \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ . The time indexing is chosen so that the environment/system transitions from  $\mathbf{x}_{k-1}$  to  $\mathbf{x}_k$  when  $\mathbf{u}_k$  is applied. The possibly stochastic, nonlinear and non-stationary Markovian environment is described, at each  $k$ , by  $p_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k)$ . The agent determines the action by sampling from the policy  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$  so that the closed-loop behavior over  $k \in 0 : N$  is described by  $p_{0:N} := p_0(\mathbf{x}_0) \prod_{k \in 1:N} p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ , with  $p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) := p_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k) p_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$  and with  $p_0(\mathbf{x}_0)$  being an initial prior capturing initial conditions. Also,  $c_k^{(x)}(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $c_k^{(u)}(\cdot) : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are the state and action costs.

#### 3.1. The Architecture

Neo-FREE is a control architecture that is inspired by TBT and free energy minimization. As shown in Fig. 1(b), given the state/action costs and the generative model

$$q_{0:N} := q_0(\mathbf{x}_0) \prod_{k \in 1:N} q_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = q_0(\mathbf{x}_0) \prod_{k \in 1:N} q_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k) q_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}),$$

the goal of Neo-FREE is to compute an optimal sequence of policies,  $\{p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\}_{1:N}$ , that minimizes the variational free energy functional

$$D_{\text{KL}}(p_{0:N}\|q_{0:N}) + \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k) \right] \right],$$




Figure 1: (a) Neocortical process of recognizing a coffee cup according to TBT. Each stream of sensory inputs (e.g., vision, touch) is processed by one or more cortical columns. Each column, based on its own model of the world and the data it receives, outputs a guess (e.g., coffee cups and wine glass). A voting mechanism is then used to form a unique opinion about the sensed object; (b) Neo-FREE architecture. Cortical columns provide control primitives based on the state. These are (possibly, simple) policies that are dynamically combined by a free energy gating mechanism. This mechanism, given the state, action/state costs and the generative model, computes the optimal weights for the primitives composition by minimizing the variational free energy. Consequently, the Neo-FREE possibly non-stationary policy,  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ , is a linear combination of these primitives, where the weights are determined by the free energy gating mechanism.

where  $p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$  is the marginal probability of the state at  $k-1$ . At each  $k$ ,  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$  is a linear combination of a set of  $P$  primitives, denoted by  $\pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{P} := 1 : P$  and have support  $\mathcal{S}(\pi) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ . In the architecture: (i) each *cortical column* provides a primitive,  $\pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ . The primitive is black-box in the sense that the column does not *disclose* what is the underlying control algorithm it is implementing. The terminology *primitive* is inspired by the fact that the columns provide policies encoding simple behaviors (e.g., basic motor commands as in our experiments); (ii) *free energy gating* mechanism, which given the primitives returns the weights,  $\mathbf{w}_k^{(i),*}$ , to optimally combine them. Thus, the optimal policy is  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \sum_{i \in 1:P} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i),*} \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ .

### 3.2. Free Energy Gating

In Neo-FREE, the gating mechanism aims at finding the optimal weights combination by minimizing the variational free energy over the time horizon  $1 : N$ . Namely, the problem of finding the optimal weights combination is recast via the following finite-horizon optimal control problem.

---

**Algorithm 1** Primitives Composition
 

---

- 1: **Input:**  $N, q_{0:N}, c_k^{(x)}(\cdot), c_k^{(u)}(\cdot), \{\pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\}_{i \in \mathcal{P}}$
  - 2: **Output:**  $\{p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})\}_{1:N}$
  - 3:  $l_{N+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_N) \leftarrow 0$
  - 4: **for**  $k = N : 1$  **do**
  - 5:  $\bar{c}_k(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{U}_k) \leftarrow c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k) + l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$
  - 6:  $\mathbf{w}_k^* \leftarrow$  minimizer of the problem in (2)
  - 7:  $l_k^*(\mathbf{X}_{k-1}) \leftarrow$  optimal value of the problem in (2)
  - 8:  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \leftarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)*} \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$
  - 9: **End for**
- 

**Problem 1** Given the generative model  $q_{0:N}$  and the set of primitives  $\pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{P}$ , find the sequence of weights  $\{\mathbf{w}_k^*\}_{1:N}$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \{\mathbf{w}_k^*\}_{1:N} \in \underset{\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{1:N}}{\operatorname{argmin}} & D_{KL}(p_{0:N} \| q_{0:N}) + \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k) \right] \right] \\
 \text{s.t. } & p_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \quad \forall k \in 1:N \\
 & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} = 1, \quad \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \in [0, 1], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{P}, \forall k \in 1:N,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where, at each  $k$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_k$  is the stack of the  $\mathbf{w}_k^{(i)}$ 's and  $p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$  is the marginal probability of the state at  $k-1$ .

In Problem 1, the constraints formalize the fact that the agent policy needs to be a combination of the primitives. The decision variables are the weights of the linear combination and therefore, at each  $k$ , the Neo-FREE policy is  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)*} \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ . In Problem 1,  $N=1$  yields biomimetic policies (Vincent et al., 2006) and these often arise as reflexes in bio-inspired motor control (Pezzulo et al., 2015). Next, we let  $\mathbf{w}$  be the stack of the  $\mathbf{w}_k$ 's and use the shorthand notation  $f_{0:N}(\mathbf{w})$  to denote the cost of Problem 1. We make the following standing assumptions:

**Assumption 1** The primitives are bounded.

**Assumption 2**  $\mathcal{W} := \{\mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \text{ is feasible for Problem 1 and } f_{0:N}(\mathbf{w}) < +\infty\}$  is non-empty.

**Remark 1** Assumption 1 is rather mild and always satisfied for discrete variables. Assumption 2 is standard in the context of entropic regularized optimal transport, see, e.g., (Nutz, 2020, Theorem 1.10). This assumption is satisfied when: (i) the state/action cost functions are lower-bounded; (ii)  $p_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $q_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k)$ ; (iii) the primitives are absolutely continuous with respect to  $q_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k|\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ .

### 3.3. Optimal Primitives Composition: Tackling Problem 1

In Neo-FREE, the free energy gating solves Problem 1. This is done via Algorithm 1, which outputs the optimal policy. Given the time horizon, generative model, state/action costs and the primitives, the algorithm computes the optimal weights  $\{\mathbf{w}_k^*\}_{1:N}$  via the backward recursion in lines 4 – 9. Within the recursion,  $\mathbf{w}_k^*$  is the minimizer of the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_k} & D_{\text{KL}}(p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \| q_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})) + \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})} [\bar{c}_k(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{U}_k)] \\ \text{s.t. } & p_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} = 1, \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{P}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{c}_k(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{U}_k) := c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k) + l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$  and  $l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$  is initialized at 0 and iteratively built within the recursion in Algorithm 1.

**Remark 2** *The cost functional in (2) is the variational free energy at time-step  $k$ . In this problem, the expected loss contains the term  $l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$ , which, as shown in Algorithm 1, is the optimal value that arises by minimizing the free energy at  $k + 1$ . By embedding  $l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$  into the expected loss at time-step  $k$ , the optimal policy  $p_{\mathbf{u},k}^*(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$  accounts for planning over the time horizon. For biomimetic actions, where  $N = 1$ ,  $l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$  is equal to 0.*

Next, we characterize optimality of the policy returned by Algorithm 1 (Property 1) and convexity of the optimization problems solved at each  $k$  (Property 2).

#### 3.3.1. PROPERTIES OF ALGORITHM 1

**Property 1 (Optimality)** *Algorithm 1 returns the optimal solution of Problem 1.*

**Proof** The derivations are inspired by (Gagliardi and Russo, 2022) and leverage the chain rule for the KL Divergence. Specifically, following the chain rule, the cost in (1) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\text{KL}}(p_{0:N-1} \| q_{0:N-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k) \right] \right] + \\ & \mathbb{E}_{p_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}_{N-1})} \left[ D_{\text{KL}}(p_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}) \| q_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1})) + \mathbb{E}_{p_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1})} [\bar{c}_N(\mathbf{X}_N, \mathbf{U}_N)] \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{c}_N(\mathbf{X}_N, \mathbf{U}_N) = c_N^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_N) + c_N^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_N) + l_{N+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_N)$ , with  $l_{N+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_N) = 0$ . Hence, Problem 1 can be recast as the sum of the following two sub-problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{1:N-1}} & D_{\text{KL}}(p_{0:N-1} \| q_{0:N-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k) \right] \right] \\ \text{s.t. } & p_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}), \quad \forall k \in 1 : N - 1 \\ & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} = 1, \quad \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \in [0, 1], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{P}, \quad \forall k \in 1 : N - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{\mathbf{w}_N} \mathbb{E}_{p_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}_{N-1})} \left[ D_{\text{KL}}(p_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}) \| q_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1})) + \mathbb{E}_{p_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1})} [\bar{c}_N(\mathbf{X}_N, \mathbf{U}_N)] \right] \\
 & \text{s.t. } p_{\mathbf{u}, N}(\mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_N^{(i)} \pi_N^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}), \\
 & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_N^{(i)} = 1, \quad \mathbf{w}_N^{(i)} \in [0, 1], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{P}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In the above problem, since the expectation in the cost functional does not depend on  $\mathbf{w}_N$ , its optimal cost is  $\mathbb{E}_{p_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}_{N-1})} [l_N^*(\mathbf{X}_{N-1})]$ , where  $l_N^*(\mathbf{X}_{N-1})$  is obtained by solving:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{\mathbf{w}_N} D_{\text{KL}}(p_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}) \| q_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1})) + \mathbb{E}_{p_N(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1})} [\bar{c}_N(\mathbf{X}_N, \mathbf{U}_N)] \\
 & \text{s.t. } p_{\mathbf{u}, N}(\mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_N^{(i)} \pi_N^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_N | \mathbf{x}_{N-1}), \\
 & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_N^{(i)} = 1, \quad \mathbf{w}_N^{(i)} \in [0, 1], \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{P}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

This is the optimization problem solved at  $k = N$  in Algorithm 1.

Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{p_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}_{N-1})} [l_N^*(\mathbf{X}_{N-1})]$  is bounded (Assumption 2) and can be conveniently written as  $\mathbb{E}_{p_{N-2}(\mathbf{x}_{N-2})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}_{N-1}, \mathbf{u}_{N-1} | \mathbf{x}_{N-2})} [l_N^*(\mathbf{X}_{N-1})] \right]$ , so that the cost in (1) can be written as the sum of  $D_{\text{KL}}(p_{0:N-1} \| q_{0:N-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{p_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})} [c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{X}_k) + c_k^{(u)}(\mathbf{U}_k)] \right]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{p_{N-2}(\mathbf{x}_{N-2})} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{p_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}_{N-1}, \mathbf{u}_{N-1} | \mathbf{x}_{N-2})} [l_N^*(\mathbf{X}_{N-1})] \right]$ . Hence, iterating the arguments above, we obtain that the optimal solution of Problem 1 can be found by solving, at each  $k$ , the optimization problem given in Algorithm 1 with  $l_{N+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_N)$  equal to 0 and,  $\forall k \in 1 : N-1$ ,  $l_{k+1}^*(\mathbf{X}_k)$  being the optimal value of the optimization problem at  $k+1$ . This yields the desired conclusions.  $\blacksquare$

**Property 2 (Convexity)** *At each  $k$ , the problem in (2) is convex in the decision variables  $\mathbf{w}_k$ .*

**Proof** Following (Garrabé et al., 2023) we only need to show that the cost is convex and we prove convexity by showing that the Hessian,  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ , is positive semi-definite. For compactness, we introduce the following short notation:  $\pi_k^{(i)} := \pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ ,  $p_{\mathbf{x}, k} := p_{\mathbf{x}, k}(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k)$ ,  $q_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, k} := q_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ . After embedding the first constraint of the problem in (2) in the cost, the first derivative of  $l_k(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) := D_{\text{KL}}(p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \| q_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})) + \mathbb{E}_{p_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1})} [\bar{c}_k(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{U}_k)]$  with respect to the decision variable  $\mathbf{w}_k^{(i)}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial l_k(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})}{\partial \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)}} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)}} \int \int \sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(j)} \pi_k^{(j)} p_{\mathbf{x}, k} \left( \ln \left( \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(j)} \pi_k^{(j)} p_{\mathbf{x}, k}}{q_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, k}} \right) + \bar{c}_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \right) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{u}_k \\
 &= \int \int \pi_k^{(i)} p_{\mathbf{x}, k} \left( \ln \left( \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(j)} \pi_k^{(j)} p_{\mathbf{x}, k}}{q_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, k}} \right) + \bar{c}_k(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) + 1 \right) d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{u}_k,
 \end{aligned}$$



where the integrals, well defined by Assumption 1, are respectively over  $\mathcal{S}(p_{\mathbf{x},k}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\pi) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ . We may then continue by computing the second order derivative:

$$h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) := \frac{\partial^2 l_k(\mathbf{x}_{k-1})}{\partial \mathbf{w}_k^{(i)} \partial \mathbf{w}_k^{(j)}} = \int \int \frac{\pi_k^{(i)} \pi_k^{(j)} p_{\mathbf{x},k}}{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(t)} \pi_k^{(t)}} d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{u}_k, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Pick now a non-zero vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ . We get:

$$\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \mathbf{v} = \sum_{j,m} v_j v_m h_{jm}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \int \int \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) \mathbf{v} d\mathbf{x}_k d\mathbf{u}_k,$$

where  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) := \frac{p_{\mathbf{x},k}}{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{w}_k^{(t)} \pi_k^{(t)}} \pi_k \otimes \pi_k$  with  $\pi_k := [\pi_k^{(1)}, \dots, \pi_k^{(P)}]$ . The desired conclusion then follows by noticing that  $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k-1})$ , being the outer product of a vector by itself rescaled by a non-negative fraction, is positive semi-definite for all  $\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{x}_{k-1}$ .  $\blacksquare$

#### 4. Numerical validation

We use Neo-FREE to control a unicycle robot so that this can navigate towards a goal point in an environment with obstacles. Neo-FREE is validated through the Robotarium (Wilson et al., 2020): this platform offers both a hardware infrastructure and a high-fidelity simulator. Consequently, Neo-FREE is validated via both simulations and real hardware experiments with rovers moving in a  $3.2 \text{ m} \times 2 \text{ m}$  work area. The code to replicate our experiment is available at <https://tinyurl.com/mrka3wzk> together with a recording from our hardware experiments. The Robotarium provides built-in functions to map the unicycle dynamics onto a single integrator. Hence, it gives the possibility to users to control the robot by considering an integrator dynamics. The dynamics we considered is therefore  $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_{k-1} + \mathbf{u}_k dt$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_k = [p_{x,k}, p_{y,k}]^\top$  is the state (robot position) at time-step  $k$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_k = [v_{x,k}, v_{y,k}]^\top$  is the input vector (velocities, in m/s) and  $dt = 0.033 \text{ s}$  is the Robotarium step size. We set  $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{X} := [-1.6, 1.6] \times [-1, 1]$ , matching the work area, and  $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{U} := [-0.2, 0.2] \times [-0.2, 0.2]$ . We emulated measurement noise for the robot position, which following, e.g., (Yoo et al., 2016) we assumed to be Gaussian. Hence,  $p_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1} + \mathbf{u}_k dt, \Sigma_x)$  is a truncated Gaussian. The covariance matrix was  $\Sigma_x = 0.008 \mathbf{I}_2$  ( $\mathbf{I}_2$  is the  $2 \times 2$  identity). Neo-FREE had access to 4 primitives allowing the robot to move along 4 directions (right, left, up, down - see Fig. 2(a)). The primitives were again truncated Gaussians  $\pi_k^{(i)}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k^{(i)}, \Sigma_u)$  with: (i)  $\Sigma_u = 0.005 \mathbf{I}_2$ ; (ii)  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k^{(1)} = [0.2, 0]^\top$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k^{(2)} = [-0.2, 0]^\top$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k^{(3)} = [0, 0.2]^\top$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_k^{(4)} = [0, -0.2]^\top$ . The generative model was  $q_{\mathbf{x},k}(\mathbf{x}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_k) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_{k-1} + \mathbf{u}_k dt, \tilde{\Sigma}_x)$ , with  $\tilde{\Sigma}_x = 0.002 \mathbf{I}_2$ , and  $q_{\mathbf{u},k}(\mathbf{u}_k | \mathbf{x}_{k-1}) = \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k, \tilde{\Sigma}_u)$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k$  is provided by the Robotarium built-in position controller, not accounting for obstacles, and  $\tilde{\Sigma}_u = 0.005 \mathbf{I}_2$ . For the control task, the goal position was  $\mathbf{x}_d = [-1.4, 0]^\top$  (Fig. 2(a)) and the robot needed to avoid obstacles positioned at  $[0, 0.5]^\top$ ,  $[-0.8, -0.1]^\top$ ,  $[0.5, -0.3]^\top$  and captured via the following cost adapted from (Garrabe et al., 2024):  $c_k^{(x)}(\mathbf{x}_k) := 0.5d(\mathbf{x}_k) + 300 \sum_{j=1}^3 g_j(\mathbf{x}_k) + 30 \sum_{j=1}^4 w_j(\mathbf{x}_k)$ . In this expression: (i)  $d(\cdot)$  is the Euclidean distance between the robot and the goal position; (ii) the second term is the cost due to the obstacles. For each obstacle,  $g_j(\cdot)$  is a Gaussian and the sum promotes obstacle avoidance; (iii) the last term is the cost associated to the boundaries, with the  $w_j(\cdot)$  again defined as Gaussians (see the GitHub for the details). Assumption 2 and Assumption




Figure 2: (a) trajectories when the robot is controlled by the 4 primitives described in Section 4; (b) heat map of the cost used in the experiments; (c) robot trajectories when controlled by Neo-FREE. In all the experiments, the goal position is reached while avoiding the obstacles. Different colors correspond to different primitives/experiments (colors online).

1 are satisfied (Remark 1). Hence, given this set-up (see our GitHub for more details) we used Neo-FREE to compute biomimetic actions enabling the robot to achieve the goal position. In Fig. 2(b) the heat map of the cost is shown and CVX (Diamond and Boyd, 2016) was used for the optimization problems in Algorithm 1. To validate Neo-FREE, we ran 5 experiments from different initial positions for the robot. For each of the experiments we recorded the robot trajectories and the results are shown in Fig. 2(c). As illustrated in the figure, in all the experiments Neo-FREE allowed the robot to successfully reach the goal position while avoiding the obstacles. A recording from an experiment with hardware is also available on our GitHub.

## 5. Conclusions

We introduced Neo-FREE: a control architecture to optimally compose a set of primitives in order to tackle control tasks. Neo-FREE, inspired by the Thousand Brains Theory and the Free Energy Principle, consists of a set of functional units that return control primitives. The primitives are composed by a gating mechanism that minimizes the variational free energy. This leads to recast the problem of finding the optimal weights for the primitives as a finite-horizon optimal control problem. This problem is convex even when the agent cost is not and when the environment is nonlinear, stochastic and non-stationary. After turning the results into an algorithm, the effectiveness of Neo-FREE is illustrated via both in-silico and hardware experiments on a robot navigation task. Based on the results presented here, our future work will be aimed at: (i) giving rigorous conditions establishing when the Neo-FREE policy outperforms the primitives, in the spirit of (Zhang et al., 2024); (ii) embedding function approximators, e.g., deep neural networks, to learn the cost-to-go; (iii) embodying Neo-FREE in applications where columns are engineered to process multi-stream, heterogeneous, sensory information; (iv) devising a *controllability* condition to understand what makes a set of primitives *good* for the task. This could trigger the agent to learn *new* primitives and/or adapt the available ones. Finally, we are also interested in implementing the gating mechanism presented here via biologically plausible neural networks using, e.g., the tools from (Centorrino et al., 2024).

**Acknowledgments.** GR was supported by the European Union-Next Generation EU Mission 4 Component 1 CUP E53D23014640001.

## References

- Timothy Cacciatore and Steven Nowlan. Mixtures of controllers for jump linear and non-linear plants. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 6, 1993.
- Weilin Cai, Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jing Tang, Sunghun Kim, and Jiayi Huang. A survey on mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06204*, 1, 2024.
- Guillaume Carlier, Vincent Duval, Gabriel Peyré, and Bernhard Schmitzer. Convergence of Entropic Schemes for Optimal Transport and Gradient Flows. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 49(2):1385–1418, January 2017.
- Veronica Centorrino, Anand Gokhale, Alexander Davydov, Giovanni Russo, and Francesco Bullo. Positive Competitive Networks for Sparse Reconstruction. *Neural Computation*, 36(6):1163–1197, May 2024. ISSN 0899-7667.
- Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi and Gabor Lugosi. *Prediction, Learning, and Games*. Cambridge University Press, March 2006. ISBN 9780511546921.
- Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory (Wiley Series in Telecommunications and Signal Processing)*. Wiley-Interscience, USA, 2006. ISBN 0471241954.
- Steven Diamond and Stephen Boyd. CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(83):1–5, 2016.
- Kenji Doya, Kazuyuki Samejima, Ken-ichi Katagiri, and Mitsuo Kawato. Multiple Model-Based Reinforcement Learning. *Neural Computation*, 14(6):1347–1369, 06 2002.
- Karl Friston. The free-energy principle: a rough guide to the brain? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13(7):293–301, July 2009.
- Karl Friston. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature reviews neuroscience*, 11(2):127–138, 2010.
- Davide Gagliardi and Giovanni Russo. On a Probabilistic Approach to Synthesize Control Policies from Example Datasets. *Automatica*, 137:110121, March 2022.
- Émiland Garrabé, Martina Lamberti, and Giovanni Russo. Optimal decision-making for autonomous agents via data composition. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:2557–2562, 2023.
- Emiland Garrabe, Hozefa Jesawada, Carmen Del Vecchio, and Giovanni Russo. On convex data-driven inverse optimal control for nonlinear, non-stationary and stochastic systems. *Automatica*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.13928>. In press.
- Hiroaki Gomi and Mitsuo Kawato. Recognition of manipulated objects by motor learning with modular architecture networks. *Neural networks*, 6(4):485–497, 1993.
- Kay Hansel, Julen Urain, Jan Peters, and Georgia Chalvatzaki. Hierarchical policy blending as inference for reactive robot control. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 10181–10188. IEEE, 2023.

- Masahiko Haruno, Daniel M Wolpert, and Mitsuo Kawato. Mosaic model for sensorimotor learning and control. *Neural computation*, 13(10):2201–2220, 2001.
- Jeff Hawkins. *A thousand brains: A new theory of intelligence*. Basic Books, 2021.
- Jeff Hawkins, Marcus Lewis, Mirko Klukas, Scott Purdy, and Subutai Ahmad. A framework for intelligence and cortical function based on grid cells in the neocortex. *Frontiers in neural circuits*, 12:431889, 2019.
- Conor Heins, Beren Millidge, Lancelot Da Costa, Richard P. Mann, Karl J. Friston, and Iain D. Couzin. Collective behavior from surprise minimization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(17), April 2024.
- Geoffrey E Hinton. Training products of experts by minimizing contrastive divergence. *Neural computation*, 14(8):1771–1800, 2002.
- Robert A Jacobs, Michael I Jordan, Steven J Nowlan, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural computation*, 3(1):79–87, 1991.
- Prateek Jaiswal, Harsha Honnappa, and Vinayak A. Rao. On the statistical consistency of risk-sensitive bayesian decision-making. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '23*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2024. Curran Associates Inc.
- Michael I Jordan, Zoubin Ghahramani, Tommi S Jaakkola, and Lawrence K Saul. An introduction to variational methods for graphical models. *Machine learning*, 37:183–233, 1999.
- Sharu Theresa Jose and Osvaldo Simeone. Free Energy Minimization: A Unified Framework for Modeling, Inference, Learning, and Optimization [Lecture Notes]. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 38(2):120–125, March 2021.
- Wouter M Kouw. Information-seeking polynomial NARX model-predictive control through expected free energy minimization. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.
- S. Kullback and R. Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22:79–87, 1951.
- Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 40:e253, 2017.
- Saeed Masoudnia and Reza Ebrahimpour. Mixture of experts: a literature survey. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 42:275–293, 2014.
- Pietro Mazzaglia, Tim Verbelen, and Bart Dhoedt. Contrastive active inference. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 13870–13882. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- Vernon B. Mountcastle. An organizing principle for cerebral function: the unit module and the distributed system. 1978. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59731439>.

- Marcel Nutz. Introduction to Entropic Optimal Transport. Lecture notes, 2020.
- Giovanni Pezzulo, Francesco Rigoli, and Karl Friston. Active inference, homeostatic regulation and adaptive behavioural control. *Progress in neurobiology*, 134:17–35, 2015.
- Tony J Prescott and Stuart P Wilson. Understanding brain functional architecture through robotics. *Science Robotics*, 8(78):eadg6014, 2023.
- Jacob Russin, Sam Whitman McGrath, Danielle J. Williams, and Lotem Elber-Dorozko. From Frege to chatGPT: Compositionality in language, cognition, and deep neural networks, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.15164>.
- Kazuyuki Samejima, Ken’Ichi Katagiri, Kenji Doya, and Mitsuo Kawato. Multiple model-based reinforcement learning for nonlinear control. *Electronics and Communications in Japan (Part III: Fundamental Electronic Science)*, 89(9):54–69, 2006.
- Terence D. Sanger. Risk-Aware Control. *Neural Computation*, 26(12):2669–2691, December 2014.
- Osvaldo Simeone. A Brief Introduction to Machine Learning for Engineers. *Foundations and Trends® in Signal Processing*, 12(3–4):200–431, 2018.
- Toon Van de Maele, Tim Verbelen, Ozan Çatal, and Bart Dhoedt. Embodied object representation learning and recognition. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, 16:840658, 2022.
- Julian FV Vincent, Olga A Bogatyreva, Nikolaj R Bogatyrev, Adrian Bowyer, and Anja-Karina Pahl. Biomimetics: its practice and theory. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 3(9):471–482, 2006.
- Timon Willi, Johan Obando-Ceron, Jakob Foerster, Karolina Dziugaite, and Pablo Samuel Castro. Mixture of Experts in a Mixture of RL settings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18420*, 2024.
- Sean Wilson, Paul Glotfelter, Li Wang, Siddharth Mayya, Gennaro Notomista, Mark Mote, and Magnus Egerstedt. The Robotarium: Globally Impactful Opportunities, Challenges, and Lessons Learned in Remote-Access, Distributed Control of Multirobot Systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 40(1):26–44, 2020.
- Daniel M Wolpert and Mitsuo Kawato. Multiple paired forward and inverse models for motor control. *Neural networks*, 11(7-8):1317–1329, 1998.
- Jaehyun Yoo, H Jin Kim, and Karl H Johansson. Mapless indoor localization by trajectory learning from a crowd. In *2016 International Conference on Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation (IPIN)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2016.
- Edwin Zhang, Vincent Zhu, Naomi Saphra, Anat Kleiman, Benjamin L Edelman, Milind Tambe, Sham M Kakade, and Eran Malach. Transcendence: Generative Models Can Outperform The Experts That Train Them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11741*, 2024.
- Brian D. Ziebart, Andrew Maas, J. Andrew Bagnell, and Anind K. Dey. Maximum Entropy Inverse Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 23rd National Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 3, AAAI’08*, page 1433–1438. AAAI Press, 2008. ISBN 9781577353683.